

**TEACHERS' UNIONS AND INDUSTRIAL POLITICS: THE  
CONTROL OF EDUCATION IN NSW AND VICTORIA, 1965-1980**

**Michaela Anderson, B.A. (Hons)**

**A thesis submitted in fulfilment of**

**the regulations for the degree of**

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**School of Behavioural Sciences**

**Macquarie University**

**April, 1985**

## Abstract

In the education debate of the 1970s, education was seen to play a major part in the perpetuation of inequality in Australian society. There was, however, a conspicuous absence of investigation of a key group in the debate, namely teachers. It is argued that such a situation was the logical outcome of the theories used, which, under various banners (structuralism and reproduction) assumed that teachers were doing what the system determined. The image of teachers as puppets of the state was already contained in these theories.

This study looked in the horse's mouth, so to speak, by examining the practical expression of teachers' collective interests through union activity. It examined government school teachers' unions in NSW and Victoria during the period 1965 to 1980, and teachers' efforts to gain greater autonomy in classroom practices and control of their occupation.

Four areas of union activity were identified: (1), the push for union representation on a central body controlling salaries and conditions; (2) the challenge to the functions of the inspector; (3), the debate about parents' right to participate in school decision-making; and (4), the struggle over control of curriculum.

It was in union struggles to remove the constraints of the central employer, that tensions were most apparent between teachers' notions of professional expertise and the unions' tactic of stressing the need for teachers to have a closer relationship with the client (student and parent). The question of 'to whom are they accountable?' was a dilemma for teachers as state workers. The struggles between employers, teachers and parents continually met the difficulty of separating teachers' working conditions from the practice of teaching, i.e. in separating, so called, industrial and professional issues.

Teachers' unions were caught in a series of ideological dilemmas: most remarkably in relation to inspection. The system of inspection for promotion to the school executive, a place which promised more autonomy to teachers, was itself a key factor in promoting central control of school organisations and curriculum.

It is apparent from union policy that many union activists sometimes recognised these tensions and contradictions in the course of the struggle but there were considerable differences in the unions' responses to and indeed in the unions' ability to act upon them.

## Acknowledgments

The teachers' unions in both New South Wales and Victoria deserve my warmest thanks for their cooperation. The interest and enthusiasm of individual members confirmed my conviction that there are heroic teachers who struggle against great odds to make good use of the contradictions which confront them in the education system. Similarly, thanks and admiration are due to the parent organisations and individual members who gave their time and encouragement.

Fellow labourers in the field of union research, Rob White and John O'Brien, have provided both theoretical and practical insights and a camaraderie which was just as important.

My supervisor, Dr Margaret Jolly, provided her knowledge, experience and suggestions in a manner which encouraged and gave me confidence. To Professor Bob Connell, I owe thanks for supervision and most importantly for helping me to understand the nature and politics of intellectual work. Long hours of discussion with Helen Smith and Charles Smith while in Victoria renewed my enthusiasm for the project on each visit.

I thank my husband, Tony, for his never flagging optimism, his keen awareness and practice of gender equality and his skill on the typewriter. Our children, Melina and Ilya, whose infancy was spent in a two-thesis household, have my love and gratitude.



## Contents

Abstract.	i
Acknowledgments.	iii
Contents.	iv
Abbreviations used.	vii
 Chapter 1: Puppets or actors	 1-1
Images of the teacher	1-2
Functionalism	1-3
Fabianism	1-5
The 'new' sociology of education	1-6
Structuralism I	1-12
Structuralism II	1-15
Departing from structuralism	1-16
Some conclusions about images of teachers	1-17
Sources of a sociology of teachers	1-18
The sociology of professions	1-18
Radical functionalism	1-25
The new middle class debate	1-28
The sociology of the teacher	1-44
Rationale and methodology of this study	1-50
 Chapter 2: Orientation	 2-1
Economic and political changes 1965-1980	2-2
Liberal ideology and its collapse	2-6
Changing issues 1965-1980	2-13
Structure of unions and changes: 1965-1980	2-25
Leadership, union structure and tactics	2-34
Conclusion	2-44
 Chapter 3: Unions and central bodies	 3-1
Arbitration and the NSWTF	3-4
Wage boards in Victoria	3-10
The Tribunal	3-13
Access to the Tribunal	3-15
Government response 1: The silent discussion	3-18
Government response 2: The tactic of division	3-21
Government response 3: Corporate management	3-25
Industrial issues and educational policy in NSW	3-28
Community participation	3-33
The development of NSWTF policy	3-35
The working party and interested parties	3-38

Some conclusions	3-42
Chapter 4: The inspector calls	4-1
The growth of centralised government and inspection	4-2
The state and education - early years	4-3
Inspection procedures - 1965	4-8
Inspection, curriculum and standardised teacher training	4-11
Inspection, accountability and quality control	4-20
Conclusion	4-33
Chapter 5: Inspection and promotion	5-1
NSW Inspection and union tactics	5-1
NSW Inspection and supervision	5-9
Principals and power	5-12
Women and promotion	5-15
Victoria - Inspection and promotion	5-20
Towards democracy in schools	5-30
Conclusion	5-32
Chapter 6: Articulating interests: unions and parents	6-1
Federal involvement and parents	6-6
Parents and teachers in NSW	6-10
Parents and teachers in Victoria	6-22
Parents and principals	6-32
Professional parents	6-38
Chapter 7: Curriculum politics	7-1
Federal influences	7-3
NSWTF - curriculum reactions	7-6
VSTA - curriculum actions	7-22
Technical schools - a special case of curriculum	7-32
Conclusion	7-37
Chapter 8: Conundrums and stratagems	8-1
Bureaucracy and autonomy	8-2
Industrial, professional or innovative?	8-5
School based curriculum and central monitoring	8-10
Strategies I: Central or decentralised action	8-15
Strategies II: Making friends and influencing people	8-21
Professionals and the state	8-25
Workers and the state	8-32
Epilogue	8-35

## Tables

Table 2.1	Demographic changes and teachers' working conditions	2-14
Table 2.2	Political changes in the alignment of interested parties in education	2-15
Table 2.3	Ideological changes and curriculum an school organisations	2-16
Table 6.1	Form of council chosen by schools	6-30

### Abbreviations used

ACSSO	Australian Council of State School Organisations.
ALP	Australian Labor Party.
ATF	Australian Teachers Federation.
BISS	Board of Inspectors of Secondary Schools.
BSSS	Board of Senior School Studies.
CAB	Curriculum Advisory Board.
CAE	College of Advanced Education.
CPA	Communist Party of Australia.
FISC	Federation of Infants School Clubs
NSWTF	New South Wales Teachers Federation.
TAFE	Technical and Further Education.
TFV	Teachers Federation of Victoria.
TOP	Tertiary Orientation Program.
TTAV	Technical Teachers Association of Victoria.
TTUV	Technical Teachers Union of Victoria.
VAT	Victorian Association of Teachers.
VFSSMC	Victorian Federation of State School Mothers Clubs
VFSSPC	Victorian Federation of State School Parent Clubs
VHSPA	Victorian High School Principals Association.
VICCSO	Victorian Council of School Organisations.
WISE	Victorian Institute of Secondary Education.
VSMPPA	Victorian Secondary Masters Professional Association.
VSTA	Victorian Secondary Teachers Association.
VTF	Victorian Teachers Federation.
VTU	Victorian Teachers Union.
VUSEB	Victorian Universities and School Examination Board.

## 1: PUPPETS OR ACTORS

The place of education in a capitalist society came to be seen in a new perspective in the late 1960s as theorists became critical of the content of curricula and practices within schools themselves. Education came to be seen not as a solution to society's problems of inequality but a contribution to the persistence of inequality. On the face of it this would suggest an immediate re-evaluation of the position of teachers as a social group and their relation to capitalism. For a decade, however, this issue was largely ignored, possibly because of the nature of the debate about education itself. After an initial period characterised by a phenomenological approach, (for example in Young) [1] the debate was heavily influenced by structural analysis, (most notably that of Althusser). [2] The subjectivity of the phenomenological works, where much emphasis was placed on the 'consciousness' of the actors and the power of 'awareness' as a force for change, was largely replaced by a concern with determined class positions which left little room for possible resistance by teachers and children. In a later modified version of structuralism the notion of resistance enters the argument but this 'resistance' tends only to trap the participants further into their allotted place in the structure.

Theories of education necessarily imply a view of teachers and to a large extent dictate the kinds of empirical investigation to which teachers could be subject. Grace [3] has referred to the 'social puppet' view of the teacher which involved 'taking for granted the compliance and conformity of the teachers to the public policies, dominant ideologies and given structures within which they have worked.' He makes the point that such a view has a strong historical basis because teachers of the urban working class in particular have historically been 'the objects of class control and supervision but that this

emphasis has overshadowed study of the ways in which some of them resisted the system of which they were part and sought to turn it to other ends.' Two possible sources of a sociology of teachers were first, within the 'sociology of professions' and second, within the debate about the New Middle Class. Both of these seem to be offering little to the understanding of teachers as a key strategic group within the education debate.

In what follows, then, I will look first at the covert image of teachers in the mainstream sociology of education and offer an explanation of why teachers have not been the overt subject of more investigations in the current education debate. Second, I will examine these two possible sources of a sociology of teachers, the sociology of professions and the New Middle Class debate. This is followed by an examination of specific works on the sociology of teachers. Finally, a rationale for this study is presented.

### Images of the teacher.

Here I will describe the images of the teacher in the mainstream or general sociology of education. The various theoretical orientations are outlined, followed by the view of teachers which each theory implied. There is a chronological flow to the development of theories within mainstream sociology of education though texts which continue in earlier theoretical frameworks are still being produced.

The treatment of the first two theories, functionalism and its variation, fabianism, is short and serves mainly to illustrate the fact that a theory of education necessarily implies a view of teachers. It should allow the reader to appreciate the massive changes in assumptions about the place of education in

capitalist society which occurred in the late 1960s in mainstream sociology of education. These changes suggest that school teachers may be a key strategic group in the current education debate.

### **Functionalism.**

Prior to the late 1960s the question of education in society was generally addressed from within a functionalist framework. People were seen as merely responding to the systems' requirements. It was assumed that a 'stratified' society was inevitable and the result of natural ability and that a good education system was one that could successfully harness this ability to the appropriate type and level of knowledge. This assumption is clearly present in Parsons' celebrated essay on the 'School class as a social System'. The social division of labour is a socio-technical division and the school is an agency of socialization. According to Parsons

Our main problem, then, is a dual problem: first of how the school class functions to internalise in its pupils both the commitments and the capacities for successful performance of their future adult roles, and second of how it functions to allocate these human resources within the role-structure of adult society. Each social system has a shared system of symbols, a 'common culture' which 'not only forms the basis of inter communication of its members, but which defines, and so in a sense determines, the relative statuses of its members.'[4]

The school class is one of the agencies responsible for the 'internalization' of this common culture.[5]

The selective process in schools operates on ascriptive as well as achieved factors. The ascriptive factor is the 'socio-economic status' of the child's family. The child's family determines the child's 'achievement' orientation. This value orientation together with the child's natural ability cause the differentiation in the allocation of adult occupational roles and the internalization of a value orientation which is appropriate to that adult role.

The same approach is found in a simpler form in Musgrave in the 1965 edition of The sociology of education and persisting in the revised edition of 1972.[6] The function of schools is to transmit culture. Though there may be some debate about whose culture is to be transmitted this appears to be adequately resolved by the provision of separate types of schools for different 'cultures' (working class and ethnic) or streaming within a comprehensive school. Schools may also provide for change necessary for a society 'to survive under modern conditions'. This is closely linked with the 'economic function of schools' to provide a labour force with the 'quality and quantity of educated manpower required under the current technological conditions'. In order to do this the school therefore has the function of 'social selection' by which 'the more able are sorted out of the population as a whole' and a 'political function' to provide political leaders and 'help preserve the present system of government by ensuring loyalty to it.' [7] The notion of 'dysfunction' is used when these aims of education are not met, especially that of the provision of workers with the appropriate skills for the labour force at a particular time.

The place of the teacher in the classic functionalist theories of education is largely unproblematic. There may be some role conflict or insecurity over social status. There may be some conflict in the influences or forces (external to the school or internal to it) upon the teacher. However, generally the role of the teacher in industrialised society is oriented towards preparing children for their future occupational roles and making them 'fit' the society. This is as expected for the theory operates on an overly integrated view of society as Wrong [8] noted in his famous essay on an 'oversocialized conception of man.'



## **Fabianism.**

Following World War II in the USA and later in Britain and Australia there was a proliferation of academic and government reports on the need to develop human resources. In the USA the 'Human Capital Theory' of the early 1960s was closely related to educational theory. In Britain, the sociology of education developed within a Fabian social theory in the two decades after World War II. The preoccupation with the efficient supply of appropriately skilled individuals for the labour force continued in the sociology of education of those who saw education as good, more education as better and a key to giving everyone 'equal opportunity' in the society.

Theorists looked for deficiencies within individuals in an attempt to explain why some individuals failed in the education system. Their concern was essentially that society's talent was being wasted. Studies showed an under-representation of working class children in academically oriented secondary schools and in tertiary education. This approach was particularly well developed in Halsey, Floud and Anderson where it was lamented that 'widespread social amelioration since World War II has not removed persistent class inequalities in the distribution of ability and attainment'.[9]

Finn, et al,[10] identify a shift within this functional approach from a concern with the material handicaps of the working class as a reason for educational failure to a focus on social behaviour as structured 'by norms, enforced by implicit or explicit sanctions which organise in a regular and predictable fashion, the social life of individuals and relationships they enter into.' The working class people were still seen as deficient but now they lacked correct attitudes, values or mental states rather than books at home. There is a strong resemblance here with Parson's discussion of the ascriptive

factor. But the practical applications were different. The school in this type of analysis was clearly given the function of compensating for the deficiencies of the home and the social group.

The role of the teacher was still geared to preparing children for future occupational roles but now those roles were not automatically set by the class position of the child. Teachers were the workers who would fix the problems which caused inequalities. They would in fact act more as agents of change to a new society based on merit rather than ascription. Because technocratic society was geared to continue innovation teachers must prepare children to face future unknown needs of the society. Emphasis was on 'flexibility of skills'.

It is clear that within the 'human capital' frame what was actually going on in schools was not explored. This became evident with the failure of 'compensatory' programs. The framework was not adequate for understanding the relationship between the economy and education.

### **The 'new' sociology of education.**

To move away from the deficiency model necessitated first, a break with the assumption that an hierarchical social formation was inevitable and based on 'natural' ability and second, questioning the assumption that school was good and did in fact merely carry out a selective function based on a child's natural ability. The shift was therefore first seen in some attempts to explain the problems of educational failure as resulting from practices within schools. Emphasis was on provision of adequate resources, both staff and facilities, but the argument involved discussion of the need for such resources for schools to become more flexible in organization and curriculum.

The schools themselves became the centre of a very different type of analysis both in the USA and Britain, when the curricula and its delivery was attacked. In the 'new sociology of education' in Britain the arguments centred around the question of knowledge. In Bernstein's [11] words: 'How a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control.'

Young and Bernstein share a common ground in arguing that education is crucial to the reproduction of an exploitative social system, though their analysis of how this occurs differs. The book Knowledge and control: new directions for the sociology of education, which Young edited and to which he contributed was a major departure from most previous studies of education. Young not only centred his criticisms of education in a new area but did so from a new perspective. Young (1972) was influenced by the phenomenologist, Schultz. All knowledge was 'socially constructed' and education was the 'imposition of meanings' by the ruling class. Educational knowledge had, therefore, a political character. The 'meanings' imposed by education are the socially approved knowledge which is culled from the whole stock of knowledge which exists in society. A sociology of knowledge would enable the new sociology of education to analyse what counts as educational knowledge.

Young's work in the early 1970s displays an extreme relativism and subjectivism which presents a dilemma for teachers - can education be anything but political indoctrination, that is, the imposition of someone else's meanings? This problem notwithstanding, in Young's early work, teachers with raised consciousness were given enormous potential to transform social structures, much as Fabian theory had allowed teachers to be agents of change. But the teacher now had to be aware of the 'meanings' imposed by education, to

question her ideas and actions rather than question the values and experiences of the children. For society to change, teachers must change themselves, not the children. It was, he later said, 'ludicrously naive' to think that if teachers could suspend their own taken for granted assumptions they could produce a transformation of their activities.[12] Yet he was conscious that he should find a path between this 'naive optimism' and the 'fatalistic pessimism' of Althusser,[13] Bowles and Gintis [14] and Sharp and Green.[15] Sharp has countered that although Young is correct in his argument that the apparatuses of the state are the significant sites of class struggle, his recent work still does not deal adequately with 'the nature of the context within which education works and plays its role.' [16] What Sharp has done, is to push the argument back into 'a more sustained attempt both to understand the nature of capitalist society and the various class forces within it.' [17] This suggests a compulsion to grasp capitalism in some abstracted or pure form before examining what people are actually doing.

Bernstein is often considered in the category of theorists who employed a notion of a 'deficient' working class. Although he denied that his work implied linguistic deprivation in the working class, it is easy to see why his work was interpreted in that way. It appears to have much in common with the philosophy behind programs developed in the USA to introduce 'deprived' pre-schoolers to concepts not found in their family experience. He argues that working class children develop forms of speech which he calls a restricted code. This code is the result of child rearing practices in which the mother places 'less emphasis upon language when she controls her child and deals with only the particular act and does not relate it to general principles and their reasoned basis and consequences'[18] Middle class mothering is said to develop an 'elaborated code' which orients the child to a universalistic order of

meaning. The linguistic form of the school is the elaborated code so the middle class child is advantaged. Bernstein has argued that working class mothers 'differ' from middle class mothers in the contexts which evoke universalistic meanings. They are not linguistically deprived neither are their children. [19] Bernstein does however, seem to be saying that acquisition of the elaborated code is education.

What view of teachers is implied in this? Teachers use the elaborated code in their work. They are thus the key figures in perpetrating the advantages of the middle class and denying legitimacy to the contexts and usage of working class codes. If the elaborated code is education, to bring about change through education seems no longer possible.

In the early 1970s two writers focused their criticism of schooling more directly at teachers. Though outside the 'New Sociology of Education', Illich [20] and Freire [21] were not unknown to that group and were probably better known in teaching circles. For this latter fact they are included in this description of theorists rather than for their contribution to the ongoing debate. Their popularity (or notoriety) raises the point that teachers generally remain ignorant of the debates within the sociology of education yet these two theorists, and particularly Illich, became well known. They are often equated with a libertarian critique. Both rely on an essentialist notion of humanity. Schools are alienating and oppressive and deny the potential we have to be fully 'human'. Both stress that the relationships between the teacher and the student is a major fault in schools. For Friere, classes consist of 'narrators' (teachers) and 'patient listening objects' (students). As in a bank, the teacher 'makes deposits' which the students receive, file and repeat. The educator's role is to regulate the way the world 'enters the student'. Facts which explain the way men exist in the world are concealed. For people to become truly

human, teachers must enter into dialogue with their students. 'Cultural invasion' is replaced by 'cultural synthesis', where they do not come to teach or to transmit or give anything but rather to learn with the people, about the people's world. Education would then become 'problem posing?' which 'affirms men (sic) as beings in the process of becoming ...' Education is an ongoing activity because humans are 'unfinished' and 'aware of their incompleteness.' In this incompleteness and this awareness lie the very roots of education as an exclusively 'human manifestation'. [22] There are certainly similarities here with the early Young: teachers are imposing meaning in the present system and for change to occur teachers must stop this and learn about the students' world, about their 'meanings'.

Illich's work is classic libertarianism. Schools' primary purpose is the 'shaping of man's (sic) version of reality.' The teacher has this task. But humans are essentially free and responsible so since schools make 'men (sic) abdicate the responsibility for their own growth',[23] they must be rejected. People should be provided with an 'opportunity web' to access education resources 'which may help him (sic) to define and achieve his own goals.' [24] Here again there is agreement that what the teacher is doing is a principal cause of the failure to develop 'proper' humans. There is an assumption of the teacher as 'social puppet' in both, but for Illich it is more extreme. His rejection of all institutions makes it impossible for teachers to be anything but bad for other humans. Illich's relationship to the 'progressive' child-centred doctrines of the time perhaps helps to explain his popularity within the profession. He may also have been confirming for many teachers the feeling that they were not succeeding with their task.

Two other critics, Bowles and Gintis,[25] were more influential within the new debate over the place of education in capitalist society. Their argument

was a response to the American debate on IQ testing, 'natural' ability, and the failures of compensatory education in that country particularly to the work of Jensen [26], Jencks [27] and Eysnck.[28] They attempted to establish the relations between the economy and the educational system. It is essentially a functionalist argument and has much in common with the work of the early sociology of education which made direct relationships between the needs of the economy and the function of schools. There is a correspondence between schooling and the social relations of production. The outcome, a society in which some people are dominant, is however no longer seen as the natural and inevitable product of differing abilities. The education system is determined by the needs of the capitalist economy. It is relatively powerless to promote equality because the pattern of economic inequality is predominantly 'set' in the economy itself.[29] The education system legitimises this inequality by 'providing an open objective, and an ostensibly meritocratic mechanism for assigning individuals to unequal economic positions'.[30]

The primary economic function of schools is not, as in earlier theories the production or selection of intellectual skills. Skill differences do not explain the economic success of some and the failure of others. Meritocracy is an ideology which serves an integrating function rather than an egalitarian function. The ideology of meritocracy produces the notion that economic inequality stems from 'natural' cognitive differences or intelligence.

Bowles and Gintis provide no 'mechanism' by which the economy secures the different forms of training. What is even more extraordinary and yet not unexpected, given the functionalist framework, is that their major work, Schooling in capitalist America, contains hardly any references to teachers (the index at the back gives no listing). Teachers, it implies, do nothing but reproduce and legitimate the inequalities in society. Since schooling 'neither

adds to nor subtracts from the degree of inequality and repression originating in the economic sphere,'[31] education can change nothing. Indeed an 'equal and liberating educational system can only emerge from a broad based movement dedicated to the transformation of economic life.' [32] The 'dissident teacher' may be an 'effective subversive through teaching the truth about society'[33] but the real revolutionary action is elsewhere. Teachers must wait for the 'Big Bang' of revolution.

### **Structuralism I.**

'Social reproduction' theory which became influential in critical educational circles in the 1970s had its origins in France in the works of Althusser and Bourdieu. In the period immediately following the French crisis of 1968, disappointment over the failure of advanced capitalism to crumble, provoked explanations of how such an exploitative social system could survive.

Central to all the arguments of reproduction theory is the notion that capitalist society needs to reproduce not only its labour power but also the existing relations of production. In Althusser's schema the job of reproducing the relations of production falls on the state around which the whole of the political class struggle revolves. The state has two kinds of 'apparatuses' to accomplish this task: 'a repressive state apparatus which contains the army, the police and functions by violence and an Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA) which includes the family, education and the legal domain which function 'by ideology' predominantly.[34] For Althusser the educational apparatus was the dominant ideological state apparatus of advanced capitalist society. It was seen as the means by which capitalist relations of production, i.e. relations of exploitation, were reproduced. The child at school must learn both the skills to perform different jobs in production and appropriate attitudes and rules of



behaviour for the job 'he (sic) is destined for.'[35] This may be a 'reproduction of submission to the ruling ideology for the workers or a reproduction of the ability to manipulate the ruling ideology correctly for the agents of exploitation and repression.'[36] Althusser makes a point that the skills learnt at school cannot be separated from the attitudes and rules of behaviour for the reproduction of the skills of labour power takes place in the forms of ideological subjection. For Althusser, ideology exists in the practices and rituals of the educational apparatus. [37]

The schools' 'reigning ideology' of neutrality conceals the mechanisms by which the relations of production are reproduced.[38] Althusser assumes that the school system sorts people out quite firmly into their future class position. The same determination and validation of appropriate attitudes and skills needed by the economy, proposed by Bowles and Gintis, is present.

Though Althusser could propose that 'the Ideological State Apparatus may not be only the stake but also the site of class struggle, and often of bitter forms of class struggle',[39] it is difficult to see any possibility of social transformation. Those teachers, who, as Althusser admits, struggle 'against ideology, the systems and the practices in which they are trapped'[40] may be considered 'heroic' because they managed to escape their destiny proposed in his theory! Here is a clear case of the structuralist tautology where the relations of production specific to capitalism are both the conditions of its existence and the effects of the capitalist mode of production. We must again await the 'Big Bang' of revolution.

For Bourdieu, the school is working on material already laid down by the student's class position when it enters into its sorting function. There is a ring of familiarity about Bourdieu's concept of 'habitus' which is understood as

the durably installed generative principle of regulated improvisations (which) produces practices which tend to reproduce the regularities immanent in the objective conditions of the production of their generative principle, while adjusting to the demands inscribed as objective potentialities in the situation, as defined by the cognitive and motivating structures making up the habitus. [41]

Your 'habitus' comes from your family but Bourdieu seems to be attempting something more than previous theorists who talked about certain norms or values or cognitive patterns which were derived from parents or the community into which structured relationships entered. These dispositions are shaped within the family and its class milieu. It is, as he says, 'history turned into nature' but it is class history to which he refers, a history of domination or subordination.

The education system reflects the culture of the dominant class. In the school situation a student's habitus may find a match and success be assured. The working class find that they are lacking in 'cultural capital' or 'symbolic capital' (a disguised form of physical economic capital). [42] Cultural capital, like money, may be handed onto the next generation through the habitus, thus reproducing class structure.

The lack of cultural capital by the working class ensures their subordinate place in society. Through compulsory schooling they come to recognise legitimate knowledge and know-how and devalue their own.[43] The working class thus participate in the reproduction of class inequalities rather than having them imposed on them by the education system. Though it is possible to dismiss Bourdieu's theory as mere cultural deprivation revisited, the theory differs in that the education system actively works with the working class pupil to keep them in a place of subordination. That is the purpose of schooling. In deprivation analyses, the school is good and can be an agent of change. The implied view of teachers is therefore different. In deprivation theory, teachers

can 'fix' the children by giving them what they lack. In Bourdieu's theory the teacher does not have the power to change anything because the institution is seen as geared to reproducing the inequalities of the society.

## Structuralism II

When 'problems' in education are located outside the school the emphasis is generally on teachers' methods and practices which can 'fix' the deficiencies of working class children. It is not until theories about education begin to really question the practices, rituals and knowledge within the school that we would expect some consistent notice being given to those who actually take part in the education of children. Yet, so far, this has not happened except for a very small number of case studies which set out to observe rather than assume what was happening in schools and to use this information to inform the larger theoretical debate on education and society.

Sharp and Green's primary interest in Education and social control [44] is a concern with the relationship between the construction of pupil identities and the practice of the teachers. The work is an attempt to clarify some of the problems in the phenomenologically oriented classroom studies which concentrate on the consciousness of the actors and the meanings they give to their social world without reference to the wider society.[45] The emphasis in Sharp and Green's study is on seeing the actor's consciousness in terms of the actors' embeddedness in a social reality which constrains them and of which they may be unaware. This involves going beyond the immediate situation and focussing on the political structure of staff relationships, the relationship between the teachers and their pupils and between teachers collectively and parents.

In an attempt to move beyond the phenomenological approach Sharp and Green move towards structuralism. For teachers then to be more than

'unwilling victims' of the structure they must comprehend their own structural location and work out ways of action which will transform that location. It is difficult to see how they will do this because the structure 'informs their own perspective on their activity'. [46]

Willis [47] attempted to show that schools do not merely reproduce inequality through some form of socialisation but that working class children actively construct for themselves a pattern of living, an ideology which fits them well to take a subordinate place in society. They construct, in a self conscious way, a partial awareness of the true nature of the school, but are limited in the responses they make to it. Willis manages to study how working class children do this with very little mention of what the teachers were doing. There is a culture clash between the school teachers and their working class students. This leads students and teachers to do certain things they are fated by the underlying structure to do, though the former do it in a creative and complex way.

#### Departing from structuralism.

An Australian study which moved away from the structuralist paradigm was the 'School, Home and Work' project of Connell, Ashenden, Kessler and Dowsett, reported in the book Making the difference. Its theme was 'the interplay of school, family and workplace and the larger social structures that shape them.' [48] It involved long interviews with students, their parents, their classroom teachers, and their school principals, in two types of schools - government comprehensive schools in working class suburbs and independent fee-charging schools. What became a central issue in the study was the importance of gender, in the relations between families and schools 'for understanding the issue of inequality.' [49] Both gender and class are conceived

by the authors not as static categories 'but primarily as a pattern of relations among people.'[50] Schooling is seen as 'a powerful institution through which people and their relationships are produced.'[51] It is notable that within the education debate of the 1970s the question of gender is absent. Connell, et al, are led in their study to propose that it is necessary to explore further the 'social situation of teachers, the constraints they work under, and the possibilities open to them.'[52]

### **Some conclusions about images of teachers.**

It seems then that outside some case studies of particular schools, teachers have received very little attention in the current debate. This we have seen is not so surprising because of the nature of the debate. In the structuralist arguments as with the earlier functionalist arguments teachers are doing what the system makes them do. There is a lot of common ground between the functionalist theorists and those who argue in terms of a structuralist 'reproduction' of capitalist relations of production. Those involved in educational institutions are limited to carrying out 'roles' (functionalist theories) or being 'agents' (structuralist theories). People merely respond to the requirements of the system and are not active subjects. The economic needs of the society are closely linked to what goes on in schools. Schools have to turn out workers, to sort out the successes and the failures. Both assume a crucial place for education in the society as an agent of socialization through which children 'internalise' the norms and values of the society (functionalist theories) or as the major ideological apparatus where ruling class ideology 'interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects' [53] (structuralist theories). Functionalists speak of 'integration', structuralists speak of control and cultural hegemony. For both, culture is static and the possibility for social change is problematic. The real difference is in the attitude to the function of

education itself which in the late 1960s came to be seen as part of the problem of inequality rather than being either a part of an inevitably hierarchical society or part of the solution to inequality. There is an assumption in these theories that what teachers are actually doing, either singly or collectively, is what their place in the structure makes them do: perform in the interests of capital as agents of social reproduction.

### **Sources of a Sociology of Teachers.**

The fact that an understanding of teachers as a social group has not been dealt with adequately throughout the debate on education has been observed by Grace, [54] Finn et al.[55] and Sharp[56] There are, however, two types of analysis from which attempts could and have been made to understand teachers collectively. Each of these types of analysis fits roughly within the two major ways of analysing the position of education in society discussed earlier, though the analysis has generally been separate from the analysis of education in society.

First, a functionalist approach can be identified in a body of literature which is concerned with finding the 'characteristics' of professions. Armed with this set of characteristics it was then possible to say how 'professional' an occupation was. Second, from within the structuralist realm, the 'new middle class' debate offers an opportunity for attempts to discover the class place of teachers in the structural determination of class.

#### **The sociology of professions.**

The debate over the class position of non manual workers did not begin with the structuralists in the late 1960s. Much of the early functionalist analysis had

similar preoccupations to the structuralist debate. Larson [57] suggests that the effect that the economic crisis of the 1930s had on professional and white collar categories, spurred forward a debate over the position of non manual workers. In this time of catastrophe the fate of not only socialist movements but of bourgeois democracies themselves seemed to hinge on the uncertain class alliances and ambiguous potential of the most heterogeneous stratum of workers. As Ben-David suggests, the interest in the professions in the 1930s stemmed from the fact that they could not be clearly defined 'by property relations or calculable economic life chances in a capitalist society' and were clearly a growing group and could not be explained away as remnants of a society of estates.[58] It was this same fact which precipitated the 'New Middle Class' analysis of the 1970s.

Pemberton and Boreham argue that the seminal work of Carr-Saunders and Wilson (1933)[59] on The professions, (which set in motion a great flurry of cataloguing the various characteristics of professions), was a response to criticisms of the professions' resistance to change by Shaw, the Webbs and Laski.[60] Carr-Saunders and Wilson led a line of theorists who saw in the professions a sign of the emergence of a new type of occupational structure which was exempt from capitalist relations of production. Individual competition and profit did not regulate these occupations. They were the softening edges of capitalism or even the means of resolving class conflict. The professions were seen as based on altruism, on a self-denying service to clients. Much earlier, however, Durkheim had viewed the professions as a source of moral cohesion in society, though his particular use of the word 'profession' must be kept in mind. It meant those who followed the same calling.[61] Tawney referred to the sense of community interest opposed to individual interest which was found in the professions.[62]

The 1963 issue of Daedalus, devoted to the crisis in obtaining enough trained personnel for the professions, demonstrated the continuation of the interpretation of the professions as the saviours of society.[63] Mannheim [64] had a similar view of intellectuals, a view echoed in 1979 by Gouldner in The future of intellectuals and the rise of the new class. Gouldner, while arguing a contest for power between capital and those in control of knowledge and skill, stated:

The New Class is the most progressive force in modern society and is the centre of whatever human emancipation is possible in the foreseeable future. [65]

Parsons contested the utopian view of the professions and saw their apparent altruism as a necessary requirement for efficient professional-client relationships.[66] The professionals took over those functions previously performed by family, neighbours or the community.[67] Parsons considered the professions within the total social structure and it is interesting to note the similarity between his analysis of the function of professionals and the Ehrenreich's [68] argument from within the 'New Middle Class' debate nearly thirty years later. They argue that 'the professional-managerial workers exist, as a mass grouping in monopoly capitalist society, only by virtue of 'expropriation of the skills and culture once indigenous to the working class.'

Most studies of the professions moved away from studying professions within the total social structure. The notable exception was C. Wright Mills, who, in White collar, was concerned with the possibility of the white collar sector becoming an autonomous political force. His analysis led him to the conclusion that such workers would not be autonomous but be drawn to either 'business' or 'labour'. [69] Mills, in turn, was responding to Burnham's The managerial revolution. [70] The debate was not dead; it had just moved into a different arena, 'the post capitalism' debate to be discussed later. [71] The question of



class was addressed in a limited way in the sociology of professions in studies which examined the question of 'social mobility' through the entry of children of working class families into the semi-professions (e.g. teaching). In other studies the exclusive nature of entry to certain professions was demonstrated.

Those studies which centred on a particular occupation often used role analysis to describe the socialisation for the profession, occupational choice and occupational values. The accounts generally take a social psychological approach and Ben-David [72] draws attention to the influence of G.H. Mead. This approach led some writers to an analysis of role conflict within a profession. Lortie, for example, examines the two depictions of the teaching role. As an employee, the teacher is subject to the authority of a public body but 'the rhetoric of teaching as an art projects autonomy rather than control.'[73]

Other studies sought to identify the processes an occupation must go through in order to become a profession.[74] There were also 'histories' of the various professions. Such approaches move away from mere listing of characteristics and necessitate some analysis of the interests and forces at play at particular times around the professionalizing occupation.

A major theme in the literature has been the problem of the growing trend towards bureaucratisation and its effects on professionals. The characteristics of a bureaucracy are often at odds with those characteristics of the ideal type profession. Bureaucracies are therefore, either taken as a cause of conflict within the profession [75] or, as for Harries-Jenkins, a source of tension between unionism and professionalism. [76] The differences between the ideal type of profession and the requirements for working in a bureaucracy, particularly a state bureaucracy, may form the basis for a continuum upon

which fully fledged professions and semi-professions (those wholly within the bureaucracy) are placed. A typology of 'bureaucratic professions' was developed by Fielder and Portwood to examine the profession-state relationship. [77] There was considerable justification in their claim that the traditional professional continuum did not show up the particular form of relationship that each profession had with the state.

The notion of a continuum may also incorporate the traits of knowledge specialisation, length of training, amount of status and rights to privileged communications. Barber suggests that the attributes are common to all occupational behaviour and implies a continuum of all occupations.[78] Goode developed the question of the powerful knowledge held by professionals. He maintained that the knowledge which the 'person professions' (law, church, medicine, and university teaching) possessed was potentially harmful and that they owed their status in the society to a recognition of this power. Such power was only acceptable if it was accompanied by an ideal of service to the client. All other attributes of a profession stem from this possession of esoteric and powerful knowledge. The long training is not only necessary to master the knowledge base but to allow initiation into the morality of service and responsibility.[79]

The fact that society has mixed feelings about the 'powerfulness' of teachers' knowledge is extremely interesting. To merely use this to catalogue the attributes of teachers as a profession demonstrates the problems of this approach in examining teachers as a group. Yet it is quite clear that this job of cataloguing is seen as the major task. Legatt epitomises the general perspective of most 'professional' literature.

The questions of greatest sociological interest in relation to each professional field are the following. What are the characteristics of a) the practitioner group, b) the group's clientele,

c) practioner-client relationship, d) the organisational context and e) the environmental setting? What are the effects of these upon the quality of professional experience and the status of the occupational group?[80]

Now we may agree that it is necessary to know these characteristics but the reason for doing so is where we must take issue, for Legatt's purpose becomes clear.

Answers to these questions will give a fuller understanding of the peculiar character of an occupation (from which comparative study can then proceed) and will allow well informed speculation about the occupation's future.[81]

In short, we should find out what professionals are doing so that we can measure them against other groups and produce a catalogue of occupations in hierarchical order and then predict whether other occupations are moving into incorporation in this catalogue. It is about distinguishing one occupation from another and assessing the stature of one occupation from another. Little is said about the place of professions within the society except that they have status. Why they have this status is not adequately addressed. From such an analysis Legatt comes to a list of characteristics which show him that 'teaching is a profession but not a highly esteemed one, and this it will never be.'[82]

Legatt's list of 'outstanding characteristics' of teachers as an occupational group is, however, very interesting; 'the large size of the group, its high proportion of female members, its lowly social class composition, its small measure of autonomy as a group and its segmentation.'[83] These, he says, lead to secondary characteristics such as high rate of turnover, low commitment to work, low prestige and disadvantageous stereotype. The second characteristic of the occupation, the high proportion of female members, is of particular interest because of its relationship to the other characteristics both primary and secondary. It is one to which studies of teaching as a profession continually return.

Legatt lists the findings of research. Teaching held higher prestige for women despite its general low ranking. Women were more satisfied with the occupation than were men whose dissatisfaction arose, in part, from the occupation being stereotyped as a women's profession. The occupation had several advantages for the 'low career commitment characteristic of women' [84] including lack of rapidly changing knowledge and short initial training. The former, it was claimed, allowed return to work after periods of absence for family duties; the latter did not cause delays in marriage. 'The bureaucratic nature of the work context, compatible only with a weak concern for autonomy is more acceptable to women than to men' because women have 'traditionally played more submissive roles.' [85] Women were less ambitious. Employers did not require geographic mobility for teachers yet there were openings for employment if the husband's job required mobility. Women were seen as a problem for the professionalisation of the occupation because their family commitments were 'less acceptable than men's with extra-familial group loyalties.' [86] This, it was suggested, may be a biologically based sex difference! Finally, the role of teacher was closer to the maternal than the paternal familial role. [87] These findings were, it seemed, accepted by the researchers including Legatt without any questioning of gender and power or of why gender appears such a crucial element in the state's provision of education. Women were in a sense, blamed for the inability of the occupation to become a profession. [88] The 'tenuous loyalty' to the occupation of which they are accused, hovers somewhere between a natural deficiency and just being wilfully uncooperative.

Discussion of the knowledge base over which professionals are said to have control is limited generally to questions concerning the amount of control rather than why some groups have control and others do not. In the same way

autonomy becomes a question of having or not having. The relationship between the professional and the client becomes a question of 'the status' of the client and the effect this has on the views society holds about an occupation. Most importantly, the effect of having 'highly esteemed' groups of people in a society is ignored. If, as is suggested by Legatt, teachers have difficulty eliciting respect for their learning and expertise [89] what effect does this have besides reducing their 'status' within the hierarchy of occupations? If autonomy in the classroom prevents 'the development of those significant colleague relations that would allow the emergence of a cohesive community of professionals',[90] what impact does this have other than preventing their classification as professionals?

It is clear that within the literature on professions it is not the data which is uncovered which is unsatisfying, indeed it leads to important questions, it is the use to which the findings are put which is inadequate.

### **Radical Functionalism.**

Much of the analysis of professions has been uncritical and as Boreham, et al, state 'has read more like a public relations exercise for the professions than critical, independent scholarship'.[91] However, from the early 1970s some of the literature on professions took on a critical note. Friedson, for example, wrote of the 'imposition' of the values and knowledge of the dominant classes onto everyday life by a special class of people.[92] Johnson presented a more critical appraisal.[93]

Lieberman [94] saw the rise of professionals or 'experts' as the negation of democracy. The public was losing the power to shape its destiny. Though

some of his sentiments could be found in radical critiques of professionalism there is an obsession with the individual in liberal democratic society and a wistfulness to return to some golden liberal age which occurred after the demise of feudal estates and before the rise of expert estates.

These appraisals were lamented by Halmos who saw the criticism as a departure from some value free stance which involved looking equally for the 'good' and 'bad' effects of professions.[95] Halmos in pleading for such value freedom was clearly worried that such criticism would undermine the saving quality which he identified with the 'personal service' professions.[96]

The 'crisis' in professions theme emerged with the failure of the professionals to meet clients' needs, their opposition to change and the decline in service.[97] The debate still remained largely a discussion of the failure of the professions to achieve their stated aims or goals rather than a search for what professional action actually meant in the society.

On the Australian scene, Pemberton and Boreham [98] drew attention to the need not only to examine the conflict which was occurring within the professions but to account for the professional's role in contemporary capitalism. They agreed that the professions were in a state of crisis because they offered 'demonstrably ineffective' services, were 'socially discriminating' and therefore being rejected by clients, and their knowledge base was coming into question. Since the evidence showed the helping professions were unsuccessful in meeting their stated goals, yet the number of professionals was increasing, this led to the question of what functions the professions are performing successfully in society.

One theorist who demands consideration is Larson who appears to stand apart from the functionalist examination of professions while using many of the tools

provided in descriptions of the characteristics of professions. She claims an allegiance to structuralist notions of class location. Her writing demonstrates a greater interest in concrete historical changes in capitalism.

Larson [99] identifies two professionalization movements. The first, in the late 18th and early 19th century, was a movement towards market control. Although this movement invoked a meritocratic legitimation, its goal was to create a standardised and uniform system of professional training which gave professionals monopoly of opportunities in a market and 'inseparably, monopoly of status and work privileges.' [100] She demonstrates how elements of the model of profession which had its structural roots in this period were 'adopted as a strategy by later occupations which were in radically different situations with regard to the market and to capitalist relations of production.' [101] She sees this 'second wave' of professionals as arising from new functional areas of the division of labour, new specialised roles in the private sector which result from dismemberment of capitalist entrepreneurship, new roles in the public sector and new technical specialties within older professional fields. These professions emerge typically then 'within preconstituted institutional domains or functional jurisdictions' and do not pass through an open market.[102] However, she makes a distinction between professions in the private sector and those in the state sector. First, in Marxist terms, productive and unproductive labour differ and second, because for those professions that

arise in the shadow of the state (teaching, school administration, social work and public health) the establishment of professional identity is inseparable from the defense of a public sector or, in other words, from the consolidation of a non repressive state function. Historically, the public service in education and health have been the stake, if not directly the outcome, of political struggles in which the working class and the labour movement have pre-eminently fought, even in the United States. [103]

In making this distinction Larson moves her argument from one which tended

towards a functional analysis of the professions to one which acknowledged the importance of struggle in class analysis. Larson takes up the arguments of Gouldner [104] and Veblen [105] to assert that some professions may obtain a 'cognitive autonomy' through certification of a skill or a knowledge by institutions other than those that buy skilled labor power. This represents for its possessors an independent market asset. [106] She also demonstrates that bureaucracy and professional autonomy may not necessarily be antagonistic. In 'real conflicts the ideological images associated with either bureaucracy or profession may serve as ideological resources and weapons in struggles and negotiations.' [107]

### **The New Middle Class Debate.**

The other place where teachers as a group have been discussed is in the 'New Middle Class' literature which attempts to explain that large mass of people who do not fit neatly into the bourgeoisie or the working class. Although as previously noted the debate over non manual workers is an old one, the political climate of the late 1960s and early 1970s provided a stimulus for its revival both in Europe and the United States. The non manual worker has been shuffled between theories of embourgeoisment; of proletarianisation; of the professional and managerial class, or 'The New Middle Class' or said to occupy 'contradictory class locations'. These accounts are wildly contradictory and show clearly the differences assumed in the amount of power and autonomy held by this group, its relationship to capital, composition and its revolutionary potential.

The importance of understanding this class becomes obvious when theorists are trying to predict its political potential and the kinds of alliances it is likely to make. This question would seem to be of profound importance for those



employed in state education systems, given the critique of the place of education in the reproduction of capitalist relations of production.

The 1950s saw a rash of writers in the USA and Britain involved in theorising about 'post capitalism'. The classless society was on its way. Workers were becoming 'middle class' in their standards of living, values and orientations. Power was being redistributed in a 'managerial revolution'. These managers would not be directed by a profit motive as were the old owner entrepreneurs but by an ethic of service to employees, customers and the public at large. They would in fact be a managerial profession.[108] Not that these ideas were entirely novel. The argument can be found in Veblen[109] and much of the early sociology of professions literature already discussed leads in this direction. Burnham's work, The Managerial Revolution, is interesting because of its determinism. Though the knowledgeable elites seem less directed by the profit motive, they are merely agents of a system which is unchangeable. C. Wright Mills' [110] work is, in part, a response to Burnham. He asserted that the corporate managers were not powerful in themselves but are the 'agents' of the owners. For Galbraith this 'new phase' in capitalism became a theory of pluralism or 'countervailing power'. [111]

In France from the 1960s and the United States in the 1970s Mallet[112] and Braverman[113] were concerned with whom to put into the working class but for seemingly different reasons and with different results. Mallet's concern was with the revolutionary potential of various sections of the society, Braverman, with changes in the work process.

Mallet was a member of the Political Bureau of the Parti Socialiste Unifie (PSU) and involved in the May 1968 crisis. His work on the 'New Working Class' dates from the early 1960s. His work from 1968 until his death in 1974

was, not surprisingly, very concerned with why the new working class did not succeed and asserting that 'power could have been taken.' [114] He condemns the notion of 'middle class' as fundamentally unscientific' and appears to include in his term, the 'new working class'; technicians, researchers and skilled workers in automated firms.[115] State or public sector workers seem to be included by references to their need to participate in workers' control.[116] He opposes those notions which imply that the working class is becoming incorporated merely because members aspire to certain material conditions.

Braverman focussed the analysis of 'the new working class' on the labour process itself. Work conditions were changing in many occupations through 'rationalization' and 'industrialization'. This led to proletarianisation of many workers previously considered 'middle class'. He rejects the 'arbitrary' conception of a new working class which 'embraces those occupations which serve as the repositories for specialized knowledge in production and administration: engineers, technicians, scientists, lower managerial and administrative aids and experts, teachers, etc.'[117] These groups float in an intermediate position having characteristics of both capital and labour but are not a class. They are referred to as a 'middle layer' or 'stratum' or 'intermediate category.'[118] For some of these employees particularly those in larger groups (like teachers and nurses) their 'true place in the relations of production, their fundamental condition of subordination as so much hired labour, increasingly makes itself felt.'[119] This comes about by rising rates of unemployed professionals forcing pay levels down and through rationalisation. These proletarian forms impress upon the 'consciousness' of the employees. There is a possibility that this 'intermediate stratum', like clerical labour earlier, will be 'divested of all its privileges and intermediate characteristics.' [120] But it has not happened yet.

Another group of theorists was more concerned to keep a 'middle class' but to see its composition as different from the petite bourgeoisie. I intend to look more closely at the most influential of these, first, because they are clearly associated theoretically with the great debate on education in the 1970s once it had set upon a structuralist path, and second, because these theorists have focused on state workers, as well as on technicians or managers. There is an underlying debate about the position of the state in advanced capitalism which is not addressed adequately (if at all) in embourgeoisement theories and perhaps also in the 'new working class' literature. None of the theorists treated here have looked specifically at teachers as a social group but they are mentioned at times and it is possible to assess the potential usefulness of this form of analysis.

The method of analysis used by Carchedi, Poulantzas and Wright stems from Althusser's identification of Marx's 'scientific concepts' and proceeds by taking an abstractly defined structure (a 'mode of production') to pieces by developing more abstract concepts. The analysis proceeds from the most abstract level to the most concrete where different modes of production may be found in the society. Classes, in the structuralist analysis, are not simply economic but are also political and ideological. These 'levels' or 'instances' have a 'relative autonomy'. There is a real sense in which examination of evidence or facts is somehow a lesser activity (if not heresy) than the elaboration of concepts from the logic of the system of analysis.

**Carchedi.** The method of analysis is illustrated by Carchedi and since Carchedi's framework is used by Harris[121] in one of the very few analyses of teachers specifically, I intend to describe it in some detail. He proceeds by a series of vertical and horizontal differentiations. Carchedi conceived his analysis of classes in terms of three levels of abstraction. At his highest level

of abstraction, he examines only the typical (ideal type?) production process of the capitalist economic system ('pure' capitalist) and the relations of production and distribution corresponding to it. [122] He distinguishes, therefore, only two classes, the capitalist and the working class. Though classes are defined in economic, political and ideological terms, the economic is determinant.[123]

On the next level down, the 'socio-economic system' level, he considers the modified definition of classes which occurs when he examines the relationship between the production and distribution relations or the relation between the economic structure and 'the superstructure and class struggle'. It is only at this level that Carchedi considers those people who are not easily seen as clearly capital or labour, including the old middle class. State employees are identified economically at the 'concrete society' level where there is 'the coexistence of several production processes and relations, all subordinated to the pure capitalist production process and relations.[124]

Central to his argument is the notion that there are three elements making up production relations. First, there is 'the place occupied by production agents in the process of production'. In this he makes a distinction between those workers who produce and are exploited and those who do not produce and are exploiters. He makes a further distinction between workers who are 'productive' i.e. those whose labour is appropriated in the form of 'surplus value', and those who are 'unproductive' but who add to the capitalist's income by helping him to reduce the cost of realising surplus value produced in other productive enterprises inasmuch as he performs partly unpaid labour.

Second, Carchedi distinguishes between those who own the means of production and those who do not. Third, and the most important element for him, is whether the agent performs the function of capital or labour in the

production process. Just as the function of the individual labourer has shifted towards the collective labourer, so too the function of the individual capitalist is now carried out 'collectively by a hierarchically organised bureaucratic structure'. The new middle class is made up of those agents who perform the global functions of capital even though they do not own the means of production.[125]

When it comes to an examination of school teachers, Carchedi's notion of the state is interesting because he proceeds with computer like precision to divide the state's activities into Capitalist State Activities (CSA) and non Capitalist State Activities (non CSA) on the grounds that the former 'spend their money in order to increase it' while the latter 'spend the money allocated to them basically in order to meet needs'. [126] Generally, Carchedi's notion of 'needs' is very vague and somehow contains a sense of the neutrality of the state as the following note illustrates.

When I speak of state activities (both capitalist and non capitalist) I refer to those activities the basic function of which is Technico-administrative (e.g. schools, hospitals, public works, industries, etc). I disregard, therefore, those activities the basic function of which is the domination of the working class.[127]

This division of the state into goodies and baddies is in complete contrast to Althusser and Poulantzas. However, his emphasis on identifying the 'function' performed when analysing the production process and thus identifying the economic position of employees makes it tempting to explore the economic identification of teachers within his schema if education is not viewed as the provision of technical skills somehow divorced from capitalist production. In Carchedi's argument there are the three phases of the process of circulation of money:

1. Capitalist changes money into elements of production.

2. Production process.

3. Product transferred back into money. [128]

The conclusion could be that education was part of his 'stage one' of the whole capitalist production cycle, i.e. a bureaucratic structure performing the global function of capital in preparing labour power required by the capitalist. State school teachers would then be identified at the economic level as the new middle class.

It is difficult to see why Carchedi did not follow this line because in 'The economic identification of the new middle class' he states that

The weight of providing that knowledge (necessary for production) is shifted from the capitalist to public education which performs the task more cheaply than the capitalists themselves would.[129]

The function of capital has become the task of a structure, not of an individual, it would seem from this statement. Harris[130] uses Carchedi's framework in his analysis of teachers and comes to the conclusion that they perform 'automatically' the global function of capital. He makes no mention of Carchedi's ambiguous treatment of the state.

The problem seems to be in separating the teachers own work process in which they 'perform the function of the collective worker' and are expropriated of surplus labor from the nature of the work they are doing. Once the notion of 'function' comes into the arena of 'productive relations' there is a certain amount of confusion over which level of 'function' we are talking about. Carchedi also implies that the school masters (holding promotions positions) perform the equivalent of the function of capital while the school teacher is the collective worker.[131] If we do not see the state as neutral and therefore the work of school teachers as neutral, then separation of their own economic, political and ideological subordination within a bureaucratic structure from the

nature of the job they are doing becomes very difficult by this type of analysis.

In Carchedi's scheme we end up with private school teachers being economically identified at the most abstract stage as working class because they are productive. State school teachers are unproductive but can be identified as economically working class 'only at the concrete society level of abstraction.' [132] The project does not have great use value.

**Poulantzas.** For Poulantzas,[133] the distinction between productive and unproductive labour is central to his analysis. Teachers could not be identified at the economic level as working class by Poulantzas because this is reserved for producers of surplus value only. Any non productive wage earner belongs at this level to the 'new petty bourgeoisie'. Since 'reference to political and ideological relations is absolutely indispensable in order to define the place of the petty bourgeoisie in the structuralist class determination'[134] we must look at the place of teachers in the division between mental and manual labour (ideological relations) and in relations of power and authority. Teachers are certainly 'in the the camp' of mental labour. Their work is the reproduction of the mental/manual labour division.[135] This does not mean that teachers actually 'teach' manual labour. He asserts, (without giving us the benefit of his evidence) 'the main role of the capitalist school is not to 'qualify' manual and mental labour in different ways, but far more to disqualify manual labour (to subjugate it) by only qualifying mental labour.'[136]

However, since monopoly of knowledge is a 'function of capital' there are lines of domination and subordination within the mental labour camp.

This class domination/subordination assumes the form of differentiation between, on the one hand, functions of control and their supports (the bourgeois personnel: managers and directors in the public and private sphere) and on the other hand, subaltern

functions, and it is particularly sharp in the educational apparatus.[137]

Bureaucratization, a marked feature affecting the organising of the work of non productive wage earners, is, he says, not simply a technical division of labour but is the effect at the institutional level of a 'combination of bourgeois ideology and new petty-bourgeois sub-ensemble, and of an embellished and deformed reproduction of bourgeois political relations of domination/subordination.'[138] The bureaucratized petty bourgeois, in a hierarchy based on bureaucratic secrecy and delegation of authority, internalizes and reproduces within itself these relations of domination and subordination.[139]

A most serious problem with Poulantzas treatment of the new middle class is the large and varied crowd who occupy these places. At the economic level the number of unproductive workers is reducing the working class. At the ideological level, his 'camp of mental labour' is also crowded. Poulantzas is much less rigorous here than in the productive/unproductive argument. He makes no distinction between those who actually perform ideological practices and those who shape and propagate them. If the structural determinants of ideological practice are considered in the form of ideological domination/subordination or control/execution a distinction must be made between those who dominate or control and those who merely execute. Therefore, bearing the rituals and symbols of a particular bourgeois ideological notion does not necessarily mean that one practices ideological domination. If it does, we have difficulty distinguishing the class practices of a teacher and a typist in a typing pool.



Poulantzas poses a more general problem for an analysis of teachers (or any other group) because of his use of the term 'struggle'. He stated that classes cannot be defined outside class struggle. Few would disagree, but the manner in which the word 'struggle' is used must be examined. First, we must have clearly in mind the fact that Poulantzas recognises two levels in his discussion of social class, an abstract and formal level, which he refers to as the mode of production, and a concrete level, that of the social formation, e.g. France, Germany at particular moments.[140] 'Struggle' seems to mean the antagonistic quality that is between the classes because of the division of labour. It is given in the structure of the mode of production. Struggle is equated with class practices which determine class. These practices (struggle) of classes include economic, political and ideological relations.[141]

Classes are 'determined'. Certain objective places are occupied by social agents in the social division of labour. These places are 'independent of the will of these agents.'[142] These class practices must be distinguished from class positions in a particular social formation at a specific conjuncture. Yet class struggle takes place in a concrete situation. A class position refers to the concrete action at a particular historical moment. Class places and class positions may not necessarily correspond at a particular conjuncture. A class or a part of a class, may take up a position that is the interest of another class rather than its own but that does not change the structural determinants of that class.[143]

The petty bourgeois 'sub-ensemble' is not uniform. It is divided by practices and polarizations making it possible for some groups to take up either working class or bourgeois positions. Yet the petty bourgeois has ideological elements peculiar to it. The petty bourgeois 'ideological sub-ensemble' is however a 'terrain of struggle' a particular battlefield between bourgeois ideology and

working class ideology.'[144] The problem is confused for though it would appear possible for a section of the petty bourgeoisie to take up a working class position, their place in the structural determination of classes remains unalterable within the theory. Such phrases as 'we cannot rule out the possibility of whole sections of the petty bourgeois not only adopting working class positions but actually placing themselves on the actual terrain of working class ideology' sound hollow yet this is 'one of the specific tasks of the working class's revolutionary organisation.'[145] There may be no point in examining teachers' class places and practices if their class positions in a concrete situation have little or no effect on the structural determinants which appear to be impossible to change. On the larger scene what is the point in doing sociology if its only purpose is to describe a situation which is unchangeable. There is a futility in all action. Good works cannot save us from what is predetermined.

For Poulantzas, the 'state apparatuses do not possess a "power" of their own, but materialise and concentrate class relations, relations which are precisely what is embraced by the concept "power"'. [146] The various functions that the state apparatuses fulfil are accepted as contributing to the reproduction of social relations. Apparatuses are not 'neutral' initially and later simply 'diverted' or 'misappropriated' by the ruling classes. These functions depend on the state power inscribed in the very structure of its apparatuses, through the classes and class fractions which occupy the terrain of political domination.'[147] To radically transform the social relations a change in state power is not sufficient, it is necessary to 'revolutionise' the state apparatuses themselves'. However, though state apparatuses are not reducible to state power, the 'particular configuration' of state power (power bloc, hegemonic and governing classes or fractions etc, as well as class alliances and supporting

classes) will determine 'in the last instance' the role of each apparatus in the reproduction of social relations.[148]

In the end then, it is not the intrinsic nature of an apparatus or branch of the state which makes it function to reproduce social relations but the power of the state. Class struggle determines the forms and modifications of the apparatuses. We have completed a circle. We are back to his conception of struggle and the static analysis of a determined, abstract antagonism: a structure within which the actions of people remain pointless.

**Wright.** In his attempt to understand 'class boundaries in advanced capitalist society', Wright relies heavily on the work of Poulantzas though he disputes some of Poulantzas's criteria for exclusion from the working class,[149] and presents an alternative conceptualisation of class boundaries 'that hinges on the concept of contradictory locations within class relations.'[150] He argues that 'not all positions in the social structure can be seen firmly rooted in a single class; some positions occupy objectively contradictory locations between class.'[151]

This concern with 'class boundaries' implies a form of analysis whose intent is identification of categories, Wright has little to say about relationships between groups but is concerned with putting groups into labelled boxes (positions). Teachers fall into a contradictory location between the petty bourgeoisie and the working class at the level of production relations since they have a fair amount of control over their work process but little control over the education system. At the ideological level, teachers fall between the bourgeoisie and the working class because they disseminate and elaborate bourgeois ideology. [152] Because of their autonomy 'at the level of social relations of (educational) production' they can 'potentially subvert bourgeois

ideology at the level of ideological relations.'[153] They pose a threat to the bourgeoisie but this is weighted against the need for a bourgeois ideology of liberal freedom and the need for scientific research and reformulated bourgeois ideology. As well, there could be some resistance from intellectual workers if they were attacked.

It is necessary to examine particular categories of teachers. Some have more autonomy than others and therefore pose a greater threat. Some are being proletarianised. Even these remain in contradictory class locations at the ideological level. Wright sees an extraordinary way out of this problem. With the advent of 'programmed learning', teachers may lose their role as disseminators and elaborators of knowledge and become 'machine tenders'. This would move them closer to the working class. Indeed, the general 'routinisation' of the role of teaching may yet accomplish this.[154]

What Wright or indeed any of the structuralists do not do is have a look at how teachers act in the face of their contradictory class locations. Do teachers use the potential power to subvert bourgeois ideology? How do teachers react to being 'routinised'? Wright does try to move away from a completely determined position. However, he draws a distinction between the structural capacities of a class, i.e. 'those links which are generated directly by the structural developments of a capitalist society' and organisational capacities, i.e. those links which are constituted by the conscious organisation of the members of that class. The working class has greater structural capacity to struggle effectively by developments within capitalism which have changed the labour process, particularly the development of the 'collective worker.'[155] The structural capacities shapes or set limits on the organisational capacities of a class e.g. the formation of unions which play a 'pivotal role' in class struggle.

Both class structure and organisational capacities are 'the objects of class struggle and are transformed by class struggle.' The 'limits' which the structure sets are the probabilities of being organised into a given class formation. There is for example, zero probability of bourgeois positions being organized into working class trade unions or revolutionary socialist parties.[156] Some positions, those with contradictory class locations, have a potential to be organised into a given class formation. The 'decoding of the class structure' is only a starting point of analysis. The 'boundaries' of classes must be found in order to access the potential for change. There is an oddity about this. The structure is still controlling the struggle. The structure 'organises' the struggle. It is not far removed from Poulantzas' formal antagonism.

Since state school teachers work within a state bureaucracy, Wright's treatment of the state is important to an understanding of the potential of his analysis for examining teachers as a social group. He examines the thesis that 'in advanced monopoly capitalism it is possible to use the democratic capitalist state apparatuses as a basis for (ultimately) destroying the capitalist state itself.'[157] He asserts that although state interventions are structurally limited by the underlying class structure of the society, the class structure of the society generates 'limits of functional compatibility on the effects of state interventions'.[158] Some possible state interventions may be compatible with the reproduction of capitalist society as a whole but not optimal while others may be 'actually non reproductive of capitalist social relations' and set in motion 'a chain of consequences which will either lead to a negation of that state activity, or eventually to a break with the structure of capitalism itself.'[159]

Wright suggests there has been a change in the class character of state

bureaucratic positions since Lenin referred to bureaucratic personnel of the state apparatus as tied to the bourgeoisie 'through a thousand threads'. Many personnel are in contradictory class locations and others are 'essentially proletarian in character (excluded from both the creation and execution of state policy)'[160] or being proletarianised. There are therefore many potential allies of the working class in class struggle able to be drawn into working class organisations. To do this it is necessary that state workers are mobilized around larger political demands of the working class ('better social services, or smaller classes in the schools, for client and consumer participation in the management of state services'), rather than purely economistic demands.[161] The aim of the left is to develop 'state actions which potentially minimise disorganisation of the working class.'[162]

Unlike Poulantzas it is possible within Wright's framework to see some actions of teachers as having the potential to transform structures. He differs from Poulantzas in the claim that the state is not always optimally functional for the reproduction of economic relations. Class practices can 'directly affect the processes of structural limitation, selection and reproduction/non reproduction.'[163] The relationship is dialectical. Yet for teachers as we have previously seen the only hope of a move towards the working class offered by Wright seems to be a removal from their role and a replacement by a machine or set of routine practices (a prescribed curriculum?). Is the choice for teachers forming an alliance with the working class limited to this? If it is, what are teachers own class interests which prevent any other? Are they satisfactorily explained by the notion of class locations at the ideological level? His arguments that state workers must organise around political demands which will erode the barriers between the working class and the bureaucracy, sound promising but they seem to be dependent on the 'left'

organising them. [164]

**Ehrenreichs.** The Ehrenreichs have argued that for Wright 'the problem of building inter class alliances hinges solely on the choice of the Professional Managerial Classes (PMC) groups: the possibility that the working class might have something to say about it, or that the PMC groups might have some 'determinate' interests of their own has been excluded.'[165] Wright acknowledges that contradictory class locations share interests with other classes and have some interests identical to those but he does not examine what these interests might be. It is these interests which the Ehrenreichs explore. In their view, the historical function of the PMC has profound relevance to a class analysis. The new petty bourgeoisie exists in a particular relation to the working class.'[166]

The Professional Managerial Class is the name given to the group of workers which exist in an objectively antagonistic relationship both to the capitalist class (because they are wage earners) and to the working class because of its interest in extending its cultural hegemony over the working class. This class consists of salaried mental workers 'who do not own the means of production and whose major function in the social division of labour may be described broadly as the reproduction of capitalist class relations.'[167] It is a formation specific to the monopoly stage of capitalism and its function is necessary to the capitalist class because the 'maintenance of order can no longer be left to episodic police violence.'[168] The key to its antagonism with the working class is the fact that the PMC has expropriated 'the skills and culture once indigenous to the working class.'[169] The antagonism does not exist in the realm of abstract relations of control but in real life contacts between teacher and student (parent), manager and workers, social worker and client. The PMC has the characteristic form of self organisation in the profession. The

characteristics of the profession have allowed the class to exclude the working class effectively from joining its ranks and the class exhibits common culture or lifestyle and substantial interorganisational stability.

In reply to criticisms of their initial article, the Ehrenreichs point out that theorists in the 1970s have been preoccupied with a definition of class, with the problem of whether the middle class truly comprises a class[170] and with a 'prevailing Marxist usage in which class was defined simply by "relation to the means of production".' [171] This, they argue, has the effect of leaving out the people who actually make history and their 'social and cultural existence which is shaped both by and in opposition to the other classes of society.' [172] This is generally true of the three theorists examined so far. The Ehrenreichs succeed in showing that the preoccupation has left us with categories and abstractions which at times deny peoples' experiences of class and with a presentation of the 'problem' of the PMC for alliance with the working class. Their own form of analysis of the New Left and the PMC moved beyond the constraints of the structuralist method.

### **The Sociology of the Teacher.**

Some examples of specific studies of teachers are in need of brief examination. The first epitomises the kind of analysis which a structuralist framework demands. The second, while also attempting to understand the class position of teachers, does so by providing empirical evidence of the kinds of constraints on contemporary teachers and the effects these have on their actions.

Harris' [173] work was specifically on teachers and remained entirely within the structuralist frame. There is a distinct break between his analysis of the class places of teachers at the economic, political and ideological levels and his



final chapter on 'revolutionary strategy for teachers.'[174] It appears as little more than a plea not to despair when the theory is logically incapable of reaching that conclusion. Teachers cannot escape the fact that the production of unproductive labourers must at least be counterbalanced by the production (at minimal cost) of productive labourers, nor can they escape 'the ironic paradox underlying the economic function of their work' because 'through their very efforts to better the conditions of all they become (largely) unwilling agents in worsening the conditions of the majority of their charges.'[175] At the economic level in this theoretical framework teachers carry out the global functions of capital. At the political level 'Their political function qua teachers parallels the political function of schooling ... and just as schooling is a direct form of political control over children, teaching is a direct form of political struggle with children, especially working class children.'[176] Though teachers may have a different political position within their workplace (subordinate to their employer, the state), the 'function' of schooling cannot change without breaking up state power. But the power of the state is 'given'. It is not an arena of struggle. The existing contradictions remain abstract and out of the reach of action. At the ideological level teachers are bearers of the relations of ideological dominance. This is not to say that teaching need always happen in relations of dominance, nor need it be 'connected with constituting ideological subjects well placed to enter capitalist production relations'[177] but again the way to proceed to this condition is not and indeed cannot be presented.

Grace [178] studied teachers of the urban working class. He was particularly concerned to avoid the kind of analysis that was either 'disembodied structuralism' or an 'unrelated world of consciousness'.[179] Teachers' consciousness ('subjective account') had to be set beside an 'objective' account

of the 'historical origin of the occupational group and its historical and contemporary relation to a particular form of ideological struggle'.

Grace attempts to reconstruct 'the experience of being a teacher.' He uses autobiographical and historical accounts to show how teachers' understanding of the social world of the school related to 'given situations and of the solutions and strategies which teachers devised or were forced to make, to deal with the problems of their working world.'[180]

He concludes that the ideology of professionalism and respectability distanced teachers from 'their socio-cultural origins and from any dangerous association with the organised working class.'[181] Teachers were however not entirely determined by the massive apparatus of control. Ideological conflict within the middle class over appropriate education for the urban working class provided some space for 'manoeuvre and some possibility for alternative pedagogies.' [182] Most importantly, he demonstrates that there have been changes in the 'modality of control in urban education' partly as a result of conscious political action, as a result of action by organised teachers and as a consequence of crisis conditions in inner city schools. Though urban teachers have achieved a measure of real, if limited autonomy, there has been 'a movement from essentially visible and centralised control to essentially invisible and diffused control.'[183] This invisible control is found in the activities of examination boards, constraints in the work situation and in notions of 'being a good teacher', or 'being professional'. Only those teachers who challenge these features could recognise the reality of control.

The activities of teachers' unions were discussed by Finn, et al,[184] White [185] and Ozga and Lawn.[186] There was agreement by the first two that in striving towards the characteristics of a profession, teachers reinforce the

existing social hierarchies. Both were particularly concerned with the notion of autonomy based on knowledge which obscures class relations. White used the activities of the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association (VSTA) to argue that teachers' struggles with the bureaucracy were not the result of any left political viewpoint nor likely to cause such a viewpoints to emerge.[187]

the militancy is for a special position for the professionals for the rule of abstracted knowledge and status based upon its usages, rather than the older bureaucratic forms of control.

Demands for 'control of entry' to the profession, responsibility for curriculum, abolition of external examinations for pupils and inspection for teachers, all aim towards giving teachers control over education. But the demands also arise out of particular problems at particular points in time.

Governments may seek to lower the education bill by employing non qualified people. The question remains, is it possible to fight such a government move using the framework of 'professionalism?' Can notions of professionalism be used by teachers as weapons against the employer without causing a greater space to develop between teachers and their clients? There is an assumption in White's argument that only teachers and the central bureaucracy have an interest in the outcomes of such conflicts. What of parents and students who must of necessity be drawn into the conflicts? Without the backing of the central bureaucracy it is possible that teachers may have to enter into different relationships with their clients. This is particularly so as teachers possession of an esoteric body of knowledge (the 'science of pedagogy' to use Larson's term)[188] is fairly tenuous and length of training will not hide this fact. The kind of 'science' which teachers find at hand to give them authority and status is often administrative credentials. This in turn suggests that it may be important to note differences between teachers in promotions positions and those who are not. At any rate, we cannot be sure of the consequences of

moves by teachers' unions to break with the central bureaucracy. Could these not have unintended consequences in the long term which only detailed analysis of particular issues would reveal?

Ozga and Lawn set out to look at organised teacher activity and came to the conclusion that teachers were being 'proletarianised.' They make the legitimate point that nobody investigates what 'professionalism' means to 'different groups at different historical periods'.<sup>[189]</sup> How do teachers themselves use the concept? They also point to the need to see 'how teachers' perceptions of their relationships with the state change in a period of teacher redundancy and redeployment unparalleled since the 1920s? They claim that teachers were 'sold' professionalism by the state as a means of control. It stopped them from joining with their clients. Changing relations with the state in the economic crisis as teachers become scapegoats for education failure and working conditions decline, may bring teachers' relationships with workers closer. The work is critical of studies which assume the 'existence' of a new middle class, and which characterise teachers as oppressors of the working class and puppets of the ideological state apparatus. They attempt 'an account of teacher unionism based on giving prominence to teacher resistance'.<sup>[190]</sup>

The authors do not address the ideological and political relations between teachers and their clients, and the question of defining and controlling knowledge with which so many authors have wrestled seems to be resolved by teachers seeing themselves as workers. There is a concern to show that teachers' 'problems' are like other workers' problems. They argue that teachers are being deskilled, have lost control over the conception and execution of work and that duties previously carried out by class teachers have become specialised. The school counsellor is a kind of 'production' control eliminating 'line' difficulties.<sup>[191]</sup>

But would identifying with other workers automatically solve the problem of one group of people defining and controlling knowledge? Would new relationships develop automatically which would make such control impossible? Education is not like a factory.

What the authors do succeed in doing is to show that teachers are not automatically puppets of the state. Their evidence reveals the complexity of teachers' situation, the 'consistency' of their concern for conditions of work and pay and their resistance to employers.[192] Such evidence is important if the state is to be seen as not just an automatic appendage of the ruling class but as an arena for struggle. However, for Ozga and Lawn, the state seems just another employer. As well, the teachers' concerns they document could easily be taken as moves against the state for teachers' own particular interests. The arguments about the struggle for professionalism of Finn, et al, and White are not addressed because the question of knowledge control is never faced. The central interest of the work is wages and conditions.

For Finn, et al, and White, teachers' unions have actively distanced them from the working class. For Ozga and Lawn teachers' activity has shown that their problems are the same as working class problems. We have therefore returned to the central problem that for an analysis of teachers it is difficult to separate issues of work process and the nature of the job they are doing and its impact on the type of society it helps to create. This has profound implications for assessing the action that they and their unions take. If we return to the arguments of Mallet in his Essays on the new working class the dilemma becomes obvious.

Mallet stated that 'the union is the necessary link between spontaneous class consciousness and political class consciousness.' [193] He speaks of going

beyond the 'elementary trade-unionist consciousness based on wage demands' to struggle for workers control. He notes that unions are 'organised and conceived for defensive actions whose goal is to serve the immediate interests' and that they have difficulty in understanding an offensive perspective.[194] Unions must, he says, adapt themselves to this kind of perspective and union struggle is 'institutionalised' when its demands can be integrated into the system (e.g. wages). Demands for control of working conditions (productivity, distribution and scale of pay for different jobs, hierarchical systems in the firm) or management (e.g. goals of production) are not easily integrated into the system.[195] But Finn, et al have rejected the notion of teachers as workers since this 'neglects the particular determinations of what Poulantzas (1975) describes as the political and ideological levels.'[196] They have characterised the whole tendency of teachers and their organisations as one which emphasised their 'professional status, the mental-manual labour divide', their distance from parentdom ... so that teaching has been ideologically constructed to emphasise differences from the working class.'[197] Attempts by teachers to gain workers' control in this analysis is then merely a petit-bourgeois strategy 'aimed at creating a unified and self governing profession'.[198] In this view all organisational action is doomed to reproduce capitalism. Demands for control of working conditions or management do not have the effect mentioned by Mallet because the class consciousness generated is a middle class consciousness.

### **Rationale and methodology of this study.**

This study attempts to examine some of the 'solutions' and strategies which teachers have devised collectively to deal with their working world. It is necessary to move beyond the structuralist approach in any analysis of teachers because within that frame the exercise of examining the place of teachers in

the debate on education in advanced capitalist society reverts to one of categorising without understanding their particular struggle. The categorising exercise takes the form of deciding how much bourgeois and how much working class there is in a particular occupational group. What seems to be left aside is the possibility noted by the Ehrenreich's that there might be other interests than working class and bourgeois. Even more important is the related problem that categorising prevents analysis of relationships between groups.

It seems important also to respond to the assertion by Larson (among many others) that public services like education and health, arise out of struggle expressly by the working class. This implies a different theory of the State. One major problem with a functionalist or instrumentalist view of the state is that the state is seen to automatically respond to the needs of the capitalist system even though Wright concedes that it may not be always 'optimally' functional. Yet the needs of the capitalist system must be conveyed to it by people and there may be many people, groups, classes or fractions of classes. It is the actions of these that ultimately establish the state in its particular form. Though there is not a unanimous view of the state from the structuralists it is impossible to disentangle its general tendencies from the major problem of structuralist analysis - the question of how change can occur. Within the analysis we never actually see how the system works, first, because the method discourages research as we appear to have the answers in the abstract analysis of the system, and second, because people as subjects have no place within the structuralist framework. We are also left with the feeling that we must change the whole society before we can change any part of it.

Struggle in the Althusserian sense becomes an antagonism which is in the structure that is, at a level of abstraction so removed that it is hard to realise

that such an antagonism makes people act. In concrete situations people actually plan, scheme, negotiate and fight to relieve some of the pain of this 'antagonism'. The idea of 'reproduction' implies a constancy which is at odds with what we observe. There have been changes in the education system. We have changes in curricula, all teachers are no longer inspected annually by a department inspector, parents are members of school councils in some states. The outcome of one confrontation between those in antagonistic relationships sets up a different situation and this new situation contains in it the possibility of yet another confrontation with a different set of strategies available to the actors. R.W. Connell speaks of generative theory as a

type of theory which incorporates rules that specify possible transforms of a given structure and rules out others, which then 'generates' the possible transforms by specific operations.[199]

The outcomes of confrontations produce new situations that are sometimes intended, sometimes completely unexpected by both parties. At the same time there seem to be limits to the strategies open to parties in conflict. The actions seem to be limited by what is possible at that historical moment. There is a need then to see how people contribute to their condition by the actions they take and by the way they perceive the choices open to them.

What is needed is a study of teachers' collective interests, and struggle, that is, a study of the way teachers organise themselves in relation to issues of control of education. Since teachers organise themselves collectively in associations or unions these organisations form the basis of this study.

Though Grace's study attempts to look at teachers strategies and 'solutions', it is essentially dealing with teachers individually in their classroom practice. It was not his intention to focus on their collective strategies, their collective political expression. By contrast this study sets out to uncover the forces



which shape the actions of teacher' organisations and the implications of those actions.

The study compares teachers' organisations in New South Wales and Victoria. In New South Wales there is one organisation, the New South Wales Teachers Federation (NSWTF), which embraces infants, primary, secondary and technical and further education (TAFE) teachers in state schools. It also has some members from Colleges of Advanced Education and from some universities in a Lecturers Association. In Victoria there are three main organisations corresponding to the different departmental divisions. The Victorian Teachers Union (VTU) represents infants and primary teachers though until the mid 1970s it contained secondary and technical teachers. The Victorian Secondary Teachers Association (VSTA) represents teachers in state secondary schools and was formed in a break from the VTU in 1948. The Technical Teachers Union of Victoria (TTUV) represents teachers in state technical schools and colleges. It was formed in a break from the VTU in 1967. Until 1982 it was called the Technical Teachers Association of Victoria (TTAV) and it is this earlier name which is used throughout this study to avoid confusion in the references. There are thus quite different forms of organisations between the two states even at this level of discussion. New South Wales is extremely large and centralized. Attempts by secondary teachers to break away have been few and unsuccessful.

The thesis generally concentrates on the area of secondary education though reference must be given to the primary area and the technical college area where some explanation of events needs to be seen in the light of action by other sections of the union in the case of NSW or in Victoria in the light of action taken by different unions. The existence of a dual system of secondary education in Victorian high schools and technical schools, also necessitates some

examination of the relationship between secondary technical schools and tertiary technical schools by the same departmental division and covered by the same union, the TTAV, in the period under discussion. Victoria is the only state in which technical secondary schools are still found.

Certain issues, central to the control of education and which the teachers' associations have addressed, are examined. What is needed is a history of these issues, a study of why they became issues within the organisations, how they were presented and the kind of action which resulted, the solutions and strategies which emerged. The time period in which the issues examined are situated is roughly from 1965 to 1980 though for some issues it will be necessary to show the lead up to the particular way the issue is being addressed within the teachers' organisations.

The main sources of information for the study have been the documentary archives of the unions, the organisations' journals, and interviews. Analysis of documentary archives has been most successful in NSW where the size of the organisation's building and staff permit extensive storage and where a general concern to document and file every statement, meeting or resolution is in evidence. In Victoria, particularly in the secondary unions, the retention of information was not as zealous and information on a particular subject was often dependent on the 'bower bird' nature of some participant.

Unions in both states do produce journals for members through which it is possible to identify subjects of importance and the particular way the union wishes the subject to be perceived. Decisions made by Council, Conference or Executive (or their equivalents in the VSTA) are usually available through this channel. Most importantly, this is the only real contact most teachers have with their union. The publications during the period were in themselves an

extremely useful piece of data because of the emphasis given to particular issues and the way in which they were presented to members. The VSTA publication, Secondary Teacher which, during the period studied, carried numerous articles on curriculum and assessment, proved a major source for understanding the philosophical background behind many of the union's actions. The chief protagonists could also be identified. It was, however, less helpful in some instances, in giving detailed descriptions of specific actions though these were often found in a supplementary newssheet. At moments of heightened conflict between the union and the minister or department the journal often presented a comprehensive history of the issue.

The NSWTF journal Education, on the other hand, gave blow by blow descriptions of union and employer action. The format of Education is that of a newspaper while the Secondary Teacher leans towards a professional journal style. The TTAU and the VTU journals were a combination of the two styles with the VTU following the newspaper format more closely.

On the debit side, within the union, debates often remain 'in house', that is, there may be heated discussion over an issue between executive and organisers which may not be visible to members of Council, let alone rank and file members. Besides investigation of union documents and interviews with participants in some of the issues studied, it was useful to attend some current Council meetings of the NSWTF as an observer to understand the procedures and the tactics used by the various factional groups. I also attended one Annual Conference as an observer and another as a delegate for the NSWTF Lecturers Association. In 1983-4 I was a branch delegate to this associations executive. I became a member of the current Committee for Secondary Education. In Victoria, I had the opportunity to obtain recollections of the period investigated and assessments of the contemporary situation from several

rank and file members as well as key participants. Without these forms of participant observation, the articulation of the various interests within the union and indeed, the complexity of the unions would not have been such a salient issue.

As a member of the union since 1962 (primary/infants) I had experience of the rather distant relationship between a rank and file member and the union hierarchy. During the study I taught for a few days in an inner city school as a casual teacher which was valuable as a reminder of the real conditions of teachers and students and the everyday concerns which engulf most rank and file members.

In Victoria, I had some brief contact with trainee teachers in a course examining the question of parent involvement in education. Again, greater understanding of the role of the parent groups was acquired when I attended two Council meetings of the Federation of Parent and Citizens (P&C) Associations and was a delegate at Annual Conference. Three workshops for parents and teachers organised through In-service Training Programs, two in Sydney (NSW) and one in Melbourne (Victoria), provided further insights. I attended several meetings of a group of parents and a few teachers advocating School Based Decision Sharing and participated in the Seminar for Community Involvement and Accountability in Education initiated by the Premier of NSW. At the local level I became a member of the P&C Association at a primary school in Sydney and the parent representative at a parent/teacher lobby day protesting government cut-backs in funding to government schools.

These forms of participation both in the teachers' unions and the parent organisations have allowed greater contact with a fairly wide range of people who participate in organisations not just in the upper echelons but at the local

level. They have at time served to put the machinations of the executives of the organisations, government departments and government ministers, in perspective. The study then is based on documentary evidence and interviews, informed by a fairly large component of participant observation in the contemporary scene.

The interviews were with teachers and parents who were prominent in various issues and served mainly to give an impression of the period. Many were quite informal and occurred while the writer was observing or participating in current activities of the union. Some, at the beginning of the research, were used particularly to establish the key areas of study and the figures prominent in those areas.

Because most of those interviewed were still in key positions within the organisations or in other prominent positions, some informants did not wish to be identified as sources of some particular insights. Some documents obtained from participants in various issues are not identified for the sources would become too obvious. The information contained could, however, be used as a stimulus in understanding the reasons for the outcomes of various actions.

The study did not closely investigate the Departments of Education themselves. Except where publications have been available to either the parents or the teachers no attempt has been made to gain access to records. Some difficulty was encountered in gaining access to submissions presented to the Working Party for the establishment of the Education Commission in NSW from the appropriate channel, the Department of Education. From the unions, parent organisations and members generally, cooperation was overwhelming.

1. M. Young, Knowledge and control, London, 1971.
2. L. Althusser, Lenin and philosophy, New York, 1971.
3. G. Grace, Teachers, ideology and control, London, 1978, p.2.
4. T. Parsons, 'The school class as a social system', Harvard Educational Review, XXIX, Fall, 1959.
5. T. Parsons, The social system, New York, 1959.
6. P.W. Musgrave, The sociology of education, London, 1972.
7. Musgrave, 1965, p.242.
8. D. Wrong, 'The oversocialised conception of man', in L. Coser and B. Rosenberg (eds), Sociological theory, New York, 1964.
9. A.H. Halsey., J.E. Floud and C.A. Anderson, Education, economy and society, New York, 1961. p.7.
10. D. Finn, et al, 'Social democracy, education and the crisis', in Working papers in cultural studies, 10, on ideology, Birmingham, 1977, p.165.
11. B. Bernstein, 'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge', in M.F.D. Young, Knowledge and control, London, 1972 p.47.
12. M. Young, and W. Whitty, Explorations in the policies of school knowledge, Driffield, 1977, p.2.
13. L. Althusser, Lenin and philosophy. London, 1970.
14. S. Bowles and H. Gintis, Schooling and capitalist America, London, 1976.
15. R. Sharp and H. Green, Education and social control, London, 1975.
16. R. Sharp, Knowledge, ideology and the politics of schooling, London, 1980, p.85.
17. *ibid.*, p.86.
18. B. Bernstein, Class, codes and control, London, 1977. p.220.
19. *ibid.*, p.221.
20. I. Illich, Deschooling society, Harmondsworth, 1973.
21. P. Friere, Pedagogy of the oppressed, Harmondsworth, 1972.
22. *ibid.*, pp.45-59.
23. Illich, *op. cit.*, p.65.

24. *ibid.*, p.18.
25. S. Bowles and H. Gintis, Schooling in capitalist America, London, 1976.
26. A. Jensen, 'How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement?' Harvard educational review, Vol. 39, No. 1, 1969, pp.1-123.
27. C. Jenks, Inequality: a reassessment of the effects of family and schooling in America, New York, 1972.
28. J. Eysnck, The IQ argument, New York, 1971.
29. Bowles and Gintis, *op. cit.*, p.102.
30. *ibid.*, p.103.
31. *ibid.*, p.265.
32. *ibid.*, p.266.
33. *ibid.*
34. L. Althusser, Lenin and philosophy, New York, 1971, p.145.
35. *ibid.*, p.132.
36. *ibid.*, pp.132-133.
37. *ibid.*, p.173.
38. *ibid.*, p.156.
39. *ibid.*, p.147.
40. *ibid.*, p.157.
41. P. Bourdieu, Outline of a theory of practice, Cambridge, 1977, p.78.
42. *ibid.*, p.183.
43. P. Bourdieu and J. Passeron, Reproduction in education, society and culture, London, 1977.
44. R. Sharp and H. Green, Education and social control, London, 1975.
45. *ibid.*, p.21.
46. *ibid.*, p.227.
47. P. Willis, Learning to labour, Westmead, 1978.
48. *ibid.*, p.9.
49. *ibid.*, p. 33.
50. *ibid.*, p.34.

51. *ibid.*, p.207.
52. *ibid.*, p.205.
53. L. Althusser. *op. cit.*, p.173.
54. Grace, *op. cit.*, p.2.
55. Finn, et al, *op. cit.*, p.170.
56. Sharp, *op. cit.*, p.161.
57. M.S. Larson, 'Proletarianization and educated labour', Theory and society, Vol. 9, No. 1, Jan., 1980.
58. J. Ben-David, 'The professions in the class system of present-day society', Current sociology, No. 12, p.247.
59. A.M. Carr-Saunders and P.A. Wilson, The professions, Oxford, 1933.
60. A. Pemberton and P. Boreham, 'Towards a reorientation of sociological studies of the professions', in P. Boreham, et al (eds), The professions in Australia, St Lucia, Queensland, 1976, p.18.
61. E. Durkheim, Professional ethics and civil morals, London, 1957.
62. R.H. Tawney, The acquisitive society, (1920), New York, 1946.
63. Daedalus, No. 4, Fall, 1963, 'The professions'.
64. K. Mannheim, Ideology and utopia: an introduction to the sociology of knowledge, London, 1936.
65. A. Gouldner, The future of intellectuals and the rise of the new class, London, 1979, p.83.
66. T. Parsons, 'The professions and social structure', Essays in sociological theory, Revised edition, Illinois, 1958, pp.34-50.
67. T. Parsons, The social system, Illinois, 1951.
68. B. and J. Ehrenreich, 'The professional-managerial class', in P. Walker (ed), Between labour and capital, 1979, p.17.
69. C. Wright Mills, White collar; the American middle classes, New York, 1951.
70. J. Burnham, The managerial revolution, Harmondsworth, 1945.
71. For a gossipy description of the origins of Mill's White collar see R. Gillam, 'White collar from start to finish', Theory and society, 10, 1981, pp.1-30.
72. Ben-David, *op. cit.*, p.251.
73. D.C. Lortie, 'The balance of control and autonomy in elementary school teaching', in A. Etzioni (ed), The semi professions and their organisation, New



York, 1969. p.2.

74. See R. Bucher and A. Strauss, 'Professions in process', American journal of sociology, 66, Jan., 1961, pp. 325-34; H.L. Wilensky, 'The professionalisation of everyone?' American journal of sociology, 70, Sept., 1964, pp.137-58.

75. W.R. Scott, 'Professionals in bureaucracy: areas of conflict', in H.M. Vollmer and D.L. Mills (eds), Professionalisation, New York, 1966, pp.264-275.

76. G. Harries-Jenkins, 'Professionals in organisations' in Jackson (ed), Professions and professionalisation, Cambridge, 1970, pp.53-107.

77. A.G. Fielding and D. Portwood, 'Professions and the state - towards a typology of bureaucratic professions', Sociological review, Vol. 28, No.1, 1980, pp.23-53.

78. B. Barber, 'Some problems in the sociology of the professions', Daedalus, 92, 1963, pp.671-2.

79. W.J. Goode, 'The theoretical limits of professionalization', in A. Etzioni (ed), op. cit., pp.216-313.

80. T. Legatt, 'Teaching as a profession', in Jackson (ed), op. cit., p.161.

81. *ibid.*

82. *ibid.*, p.175.

83. *ibid.*

84. *ibid.*

85. *ibid.*, p.164.

86. *ibid.*

87. *ibid.*, pp.163-165.

88. T. Caplow, The sociology of work, Minneapolis, 1954, p.246.

89. Leggat, op. cit., p.173.

90. *ibid.*, p.175.

91. P. Boreham, H. Pemberton and P. Wilson, Introduction to The professionals in Australia, St Lucia, Queensland, 1976, p.6.

92. E. Freidson, Professional dominance, New York, 1970.

93. T. Johnson, Professions and power, London, 1972.

94. J.K. Lieberman, The tyranny of experts - How professionals are closing the open society, New York, 1970.

95. P. Halmos, Review of T. Johnson's 'Professions and power', British journal of sociology, 24(1), 134-5, 1973.

96. P. Halmos, The personal service society, London, 1970.
97. M. Naug and M.B. Sussman, 'Professional autonomy and the revolt of the client', Social problems, 17 (2), pp.153-61; Australian and New Zealand journal of sociology, Professions Symposium, 9(3) pp. 29-63.
98. A. Pemberton and P. Boreham, 'Towards a reorientation of sociological studies of the professions' in Boreham, et al (eds), The professions in Australia, St Lucia, Queensland, 1976, p.33.
99. See M.S. Larson, The rise of professionalism, Berkley, 1977, for a full exposition of her thesis.
100. M.S. Larson, 'Proletarianization and educated labour', Theory and society, Vol. 1, 9, No. 1, Jan., 1980, p.142.
101. *ibid.*, p.143.
102. M.S. Larson, 'Professions rise and fall', International journal of health service, Vol. 9, No.4, 1979, p.614.
103. *ibid.*
104. A. Gouldner, 'The new class project', Parts I and II, Theory and society, Sept., and Nov., 1978.
105. T. Veblen, Engineers and the price system, New York, 1963.
106. Larson, 'Professions rise and fall', *op cit.*, p.615.
107. *ibid.*, p.618.
108. See for example, M. Young, The rise of meritocracy. London, 1958; J. Burnham, The managerial revolution, Harmondsworth, 1945.
109. T. Veblen, *op. cit.*
110. C. Wright Mills. White collar, *op. cit.*
111. J.K Galbraith, American capitalism: the concept of countervailing power, Boston, 1956.
112. S. Mallet, Essays on the new working class, St Louis, 1975.
113. H. Braverman, Labor and monopoly capital, New York, 1974.
114. Mallet, *op. cit.*, p.153.
115. *ibid.*, p.31.
116. *ibid.*, p.162.
117. Braverman, *op. cit.*, p.25.
118. *ibid.*, p.403-409.

119. *ibid.*, p.407.
120. *ibid.*, p.408.
121. K. Harris, Teachers and classes, London, 1982.
122. G. Carchedi, 'The economic identification of the state employees' Social praxis, 3(1-2), 1975 p.94.
123. G. Carchedi, 'Reproduction of social classes at the level of production relations', Economy and society, Vol. 4, No. 4, 1975, p.368.
124. Carchedi, 'The economic identification of the state employed', *op. cit.*, p.107.
125. Full exposition in G. Carchedi, 'The economic identification of the new middle class', Economy and society, No. 4., 1975, pp.13-33.
126. Carchedi, 'The economic identification of the state employees', *op. cit.*, p.105.
127. *ibid.*, p.102.
128. Carchedi, 'The economic identification of the new middle class', *op. cit.*, pp.33-36.
129. *ibid.*, p.62.
130. Harris, *op. cit.*
131. Carchedi, 'The economic identification of the state employees', *op. cit.*, p.111.
132. *ibid.*, p.108.
133. N. Poulantzas, Classes in contemporary capitalism. London, 1975.
134. *ibid.*, p.207.
135. *ibid.*, p.259.
136. *ibid.*, p.266.
137. *ibid.*, p.270.

138. *ibid.*, p.274.
139. *ibid.*, p.276.
140. *ibid.*, p.22.
141. *ibid.*, p.23.
142. *ibid.*, p.14.
143. *ibid.*, p.15.
144. *ibid.*, p.289.
145. *ibid.*, p.289.
146. *ibid.*, p.26.
147. *ibid.*, p.27.
148. *ibid.*, p.27.
149. E.O. Wright, Class, crisis and the state, London, 1979, p.53.
150. *ibid.*
151. *ibid.*
152. E.O. Wright, 'Intellectuals are the class structure of capitalist society', in P. Walker (ed), Between labour and capital, Boston, 1977, p.208.
153. *ibid.*
154. *ibid.*, pp.210-211.
155. Wright, Class, crisis and the state, op. cit. p.99.
156. *ibid.*, p.106.
157. *ibid.*, p.227.
158. *ibid.*, p.230.
159. *ibid.*, p.230.
160. *ibid.*, p.239.
161. *ibid.*, p.240.
162. *ibid.*, p.246.
163. *ibid.*, p.105.

164. *ibid.*, p.241.
165. B. and J. Ehrenreich, 'Rejoinder', in P. Walker (ed), Between labor and capital, Boston, 1979, p.332.
166. B. and J. Ehrenreich, 'The professional managerial class' in P. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp.16-17.
167. *ibid.* p.12.
168. *ibid.*, p.14.
169. *ibid.*, p.17.
170. Ehrenreichs, 'Rejoinder', *op. cit.*, p.321.
171. *ibid.*, p.328.
172. *ibid.*, p.325
173. K. Harris, Teachers and classes, London, 1982.
174. *ibid.*, p.142-154.
175. *ibid.*, p.70.
176. *ibid.*, p.90.
177. *ibid.*, p.126.
178. G. Grace, Teachers, ideology and control, London, 1978.
179. *ibid.*, p.215.
180. *ibid.*, p.109.
181. *ibid.*, p.215.
182. *ibid.*
183. *ibid.*, p.218.
184. D. Finn, et al, 'Social democracy, education and the crisis', in Cultural studies no. 10: on ideology, Birmingham, 1970.
185. D. White, 'The profession of teaching', in P. Boreham, et al, (ed) The professions in Australia, St Lucia, Queensland, 1976.
186. J.T. Ozga and M.A. Lawn, Organised Teachers, London, 1981.
187. White, *op. cit.*, p162.

188. M.S. Larson, The rise of professionalism, Berkley, 1977, p.184.
189. Ozga and Lawn, op. cit., p.vi.
190. ibid.
191. ibid., p.137.
192. ibid., p.68.
193. Mallet, op. cit., .209.
194. ibid., p.207.
195. ibid.
196. Finn, et al, op. cit., p.170.
197. ibid.
198. ibid.
199. R.W. Connell, 'Logic and politics in theories of class', in Which way is up?, North Sydney, 1983, p. 93.

## 2: ORIENTATION

Chapter One explored the correspondence between the images of teachers and theories of education. Teachers' collective expression of their particular interests remains a neglected area within the debate over the place of education in capitalist society. The nature of those interests is largely a matter of assumption. Indeed, there is difficulty in much of the literature in discerning a separate realm of interest for teachers who appear to respond to the dictates of capitalism whether the theoretical perspective is functional or structural, i.e. teachers are puppets of the state and/or, the servants of capital.

The result of this is that the state in particular, and capitalism generally, take on a peculiarly static quality which denies both experience and the accumulated evidence of other debates which identify the changing face of capitalism. Historical specificity is lost. Even if the puppet model of teachers is accepted, changes in state structure and capitalism would suggest that the forces which shape teachers' actions do not remain constant. If such a view is questioned, it becomes even more important to identify particular interests at specific periods and to examine the articulation of those interests at particular nodes in the system.

The historical approach taken by Finn, et al,[1] was one such attempt to demonstrate the complex alliance of forces; in their case, the Labor Party, the sociology of education and teachers' quest for professional status, at a particular conjuncture in British history. The authors reject the notion that teachers are unambiguously members of the working class but conclude that teachers' actions can be read as an equally unambiguous struggle for professional status. This struggle for professional status, they state, 'has

characterised the teaching organisations since their emergence as a force on the political landscape during the educational debates of the late nineteenth century.'[2] Since the 'political landscape' changes, not only would we expect some changes in the outcome of such struggles but in the very purpose and nature of those struggles. Moreover, we should not assume that teachers are unaware of the shifting forces and alliances which exist within the field of education and more generally in the economic, political and ideological realms of capitalism.

The present study is essentially a close study of teacher union strategy, examining, in particular, issues centred around the question of control of education. The aim is to identify the reasons why those particular issues were central, why certain strategies were chosen and what were the outcomes of action. This chapter describes the broad features of the Australian scene during the fifteen year period 1965-1980 to draw attention to the vast changes in the economic, political and ideological expressions of capitalism which occurred during that period and their particular consequences in the area of education, for it was within this context that teachers' collective interests were articulated. The chapter concludes with a description of the unions involved in the study and a brief exploration of changes which have occurred in union organisation, factional alignment and division and the relationship of political parties to the unions' structure and tactics.

#### Economic and political changes 1965-1980.

In economic terms, the fifteen years studied start in a period of economic buoyancy followed by a downturn in production and its accompanying inflation and unemployment. After a peak in 1968-69 when the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) reached 8.8 percent, an 'Indian Summer' in 1973-74 when it reached 5.7



percent, the world recession heralded its arrival in Australia when the GDP fell to 0.6 in 1975.[3]

The period also saw two dramatic changes of government in the federal sphere. The Australian Labor Party (ALP) came to office in December 1972 after an absence of 23 years. It arrived then at the end of the long boom and was committed to an expansion of social welfare.[4] Aged pensions increased, a national health scheme was introduced and the federal government moved further into the funding of education which had previously been largely a state concern. This government was dismissed by the Governor General in November 1975 after the Senate (where Labor did not have the numbers), refused supply and the subsequent elections in December brought back the coalition government. It remained in office until 1983. The coalition government's immediate answer to the worsening state of the economy was to tackle inflation by cutting public sector expenditure. It reduced social services and froze the growth of the public service.

The coalition government tried to effect economic recovery by increasing profitability in the private sector. To this end it gave taxation concessions, varied the investment guidelines (particularly those that required 50 percent Australian equity) and amended the Trade Practices Act and the Prices Justification Act. The amendments to the former which were a direct attempt to curb union power, were reinforced by government intervention before the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

Hagan comments that although the boom continued until the mid 1970s 'after the mid sixties both political and economic certainty began to recede.'[5] The number of jobs in manufacturing began to decline reflecting changes in technology and control of companies, though the growth of the tertiary sector

offset the results of this for the next ten years. At the same time the mining and minerals industry increased export income but manifested a high degree of foreign control following the pattern already established in the manufacturing sector.

Other certainties were questioned by the mid 1960s. The boom itself, not the end of the boom seems to have provoked much of the radical activity of the 1960s. The boom time prosperity brought higher expectations for improved standards of living.[6] The new consumerism included not just fridges, cars and washing machines but civil rights, equal pay and more and better education.

The consumers' demand for education is reflected in school retention rates. Between 1956 and 1968 the proportion of students remaining at school in Australia increased from 46 percent to 78 percent for sixteen year olds, from 22 percent to 48 percent for seventeen year olds, and from 8 percent to 25 percent for 18 year olds. [7] In the 1950s and 1960s growth in the number of students in compulsory schooling years caused by increased birth rates and the Australian migration policy in the post world war two era, had already stretched the states' resources in education to breaking point.

The large numbers of children in schools had two quite dramatic effects. First, it produced a shortage of teachers and facilities and a corresponding cry from the unions for more teacher training facilities and for the injection of federal funds into the floundering state education systems. Second, education became a vote catcher in the federal arena. For the teachers' unions these two effects became intertwined and brought about unintended consequences. The arrival of federal funding into the states was greeted with cries of victory from the unions but it brought with it a return of government funding to non-government schools. In a series of politically expedient moves over roughly

a ten year period the notion of state responsibility for education was undermined with the result that a new interested party, i.e. the federal government, entered the educational arena and brought with it the interests of the non-government schools in a new legitimated form.

In 1963 the Liberal Party had begun the bid for the Catholic vote by forming an electoral alliance with the Democratic Labor Party which had formed after the split in the Labor Party in 1955. In 1964 the State's Grants (Science Laboratories) Act started federal funding to government schools to improve the teaching of science in secondary schools. This was Australia's response to the USSR victory in the space race in 1957. The extension of the legislation to cover non-government schools in 1967 owed more to the practicalities of winning elections.

It took the Labor Party four years, from 1965 to 1969, to get agreement on a policy to change the Party's approach to state aid to non-government schools and put it in a position to win the Catholic vote. The notion of 'needs' based funding, rather than per capita funding, was developed in an attempt to rise above sectarian interests. The recommendations of the Karmel Report [8] commissioned by the incoming Labor government in 1972 thus changed the basis of funding to non-government schools but the notion of government responsibility to ensure adequate schooling for all children, regardless of their school sector, remained.

The fight against state aid to non-government schools has been most vehement in NSW. It has been the NSWTF which has pushed the matter onto the agenda of the Australian Teachers Federation (ATF). The stance of the Victorian unions has at times been to make the non-government schools who receive funds more 'accountable'. Neither tactic has made much impression on

the federal governments' policies on funding.

In 1965 in conjunction with the Federation of Parents and Citizens Associations and the Federation of Infants and Nursery Schools Clubs, the NSWTF placed an advertisement in the media objecting to any form of government aid to private schools. By 1980 the NSWTF was still objecting to state aid. It was again joining the parent organisations and unions in other states in a National education campaign: 'Let's Develop Education.' The theme of the 1980 national campaign by state school parents' organisations and teachers' unions was a signal of the end of the economic boom and the onset of recession which had taken place in the last fifteen years. Education was no longer a top election issue. The provisions of state aid to non-government schools was now clearly a fight for scarce resources between the government and non-government schools' sectors. Though the title, 'Let's Develop Education', suggests a desire to put education back on the political agenda, there remained a hesitancy in some states to spell out the extent of the conflict of interests between the two sectors. Such hesitancy diminished considerably in the 1980s. Coupled with the economic recession was the collapse of the liberal ideology of the 1960s and early 1970s and the corresponding hope that schooling would solve the problems of social inequality.

#### Liberal ideology and its collapse.

During the 1960s overseas trends in education had gradually made their way into Australian rhetoric and practice. Both in America and Britain, during the mid 1960s education came to be viewed as a cure for social ills with the introduction of compensatory education programs for culturally 'disadvantaged' groups. This trend was not officially picked up in Australia until the Labor government came to office in 1972 and set up the Schools Commission with its

funding for a Disadvantaged Schools Program. It fitted neatly with Labor's image of social reform and provision of services.

The large numbers of students entering secondary schools stretched human and material resources. The increased retention rates also brought into question the suitability of the academic curriculum for what was becoming a vast and heterogeneous mass of students. Provision of federal money not only won votes from Catholics but offered relief from poor conditions in both state and Catholic systems in inner city areas.

The late arrival of compensatory education in Australia in the form of the Disadvantaged Schools Program in 1973, meant that it was somewhat tempered by the growing criticism of such programs and a wider criticism of schools. The writing of A.S. Neill,[9] Illich[10] and Reimer[11] appealed to the growing discontent among the middle class over their inability to participate in the institutions which affected their lives. Alternative private schools joined resident action groups. 'Green Bans' and alternative medicine were expressions of this desire for 'involvement' and the revolt against centralised bureaucracy. It is difficult to assess how far these were merely middle class expressions, especially given the involvement of the Builders Labourers Federation in 'Green Bans' and the participants in some resident action. Alternative schooling was, however, the preserve of the middle class. The essential goal of alternative schools was to be more responsive to their clients; the parents and the students.

Beyond these popular criticisms of education with their emphasis on individualism, freedom, and choice, was another level of criticism. The failure of education to bring about social changes in both Britain and the USA had massive effects on the development of theory of education in academic

circles. This was discussed in Chapter One but it is restated to show the relationship between these theories and the events which surround them. In the USA the failure of compensatory education brought the race and IQ debate into full swing.[12] The structuralists' pessimism had its origins in disillusionment, in particular, the left's failure to seize the opportunities of the late 1960s. Though the Karmel Report (1973) implies some knowledge of these criticisms of schools themselves, the arguments were not pursued. In any event it was possible to interpret some of these theories as models of cultural deprivation in their early formulations (e.g. Bernstein) or, in those with a phenomenological base, to give the teacher the power to bring about enormous changes once she had her consciousness raised (e.g. Young). Looking at reading lists for teachers in training, it is, however, clear that it was the writings of Illich, Reimer and Freire which dominated 'radical' thought in the early 1970s.

In the state education systems the responses of teachers and parents to the new wave of progressivism in education varied though no state was left untouched. The Disadvantaged Schools Program gave recognition to notions of community needs which, in the interpretation of some schools, changed the implied compensatory underpinnings of the program.

The desire for participation in the decision-making processes of institutions not only challenged the traditional hierarchical structures of institutions with notions of 'devolution of responsibility' and 'community involvement' but also brought into being ideas of a new type of 'accountability'; to the client rather than to the central bureaucracy. Again this was reflected in the recommendations of the Karmel Report in 1973 with its emphasis on innovation, diversity and community involvement. The Karmel Report recommendations thus combined elements of compensatory education and the new progressive education.

The civil rights movement and black militancy in the USA, student radicalism and the rebirth of the women's movement in Europe and the USA were echoed by developments in Australia. During the early 1960s, student action groups on university campuses took up the issue of racism in anti-apartheid demonstrations, campaigns against the 'white Australia' policy and protests over the treatment of Aborigines (e.g. the 1965 'Freedom Ride' into North West New South Wales). The question of peace and disarmament was another prominent issue. Starting first with opposition to Anzac Day a public celebration of war, the entry of Australia into the Vietnam war in 1965 and the introduction of selective conscription, made military involvement the central issue of the late 1960s. Students in tertiary institutions and to a lesser extent in secondary schools were politicised by the anti-Vietnam war movement.

The peace and disarmament issue and later the anti-conscription, anti-Vietnam movement was not the sole prerogative of student radicals. However, after the defeat of the ALP in the federal elections of 1966 demonstrated the difficulty in obtaining a political solution to the Vietnam involvement, the students separated into a more militant group which broadened its criticism beyond the anti-Vietnam war stance. There was also discontent with the content and process of education in universities.

The split between radical students and other sections of the population opposing the war involvement was more than just a 'generation gap' of difference in tactics. It involved a rejection of old methods, either liberal political solutions through established parliamentary structures or through established left groups, most notably the Communist Party of Australia (CPA) which had suffered a mass exodus of members particularly intellectuals from 1956 and still lacked credibility. Gordon,[13] argues that the ex-communist

New Left intellectuals had, in turn, 'failed to develop the beginnings of an indigenous Australian socialist consciousness.'

Irving and Berzins [14] agree that the student radicals had little 'home grown' theory and practice to provide, other than an 'evolutionist view of history'; perhaps 'apocalyptic' view is a better description. In any event this lack may account for the 'inward turn' into the critique of the universities themselves. Though the influence of student power movements was strong it did not succeed in politicising campuses because, Gordon suggests, students did not understand the 'cultural and historical peculiarities of that society' and 'developed their revolutionary theory out of overseas contexts, rather than allowing their own praxis in Australia to determine the basics of political and social developments.' [15] He describes the movement, probably quite accurately, as highly fragmented politically, geographically and

historically without continuity and interconnectedness and its ideological and political sterility is a function of a basically liberal, non sociological, issue oriented militant protest movements, rather than a genuinely oppositional counter culture which is perpetually on the offensive and expanding its social base.' [16]

Nevertheless some of those involved in this period as student activists found themselves teaching in state schools and active in teachers' unions in the 1970s. They brought their experiences with them.

The most notable expression of the end of the economic boom and the related collapse of liberal ideology as it related to education was found in the media where from the late 1970s there appeared an attack on progressive education and a call for a return to the basics of education to counter 'declining standards'. This coincided with the growing rates of youth unemployment. Schools, it was claimed, were failing in their task of preparing students for jobs. However, analysis of the media in the years 1979, 1980 and



1981 [17] shows clearly the movement of emphasis from a 'back to basics' argument to one of comparison between government and non-government schools.

The debate forced teachers' unions into a defensive position, that is, defending the products of government schools against the products of the non-government sector. The funding of non-government schools became locked into the cry that they were providing what parents, employers and the community generally wanted, namely greater discipline and an emphasis on the basics in a competitive academic curriculum. Coupled with this was an element of the liberal ideology which stressed the need for choice and diversity to meet students' needs. Choice was now translated as the parents' right to choose the sector in which children would be educated. The main protagonists in the declining standards argument differed between states. In NSW the argument was propounded by several academics. In Victoria local academics had a lower profile though the NSW critics were reported. The main criticism of government school education in that state came from the Employers' Federation.

As a consequence the teachers' unions found themselves fighting on several fronts: against academics, employers, the non-government school sector, and - because of its stance on the provision of aid to the non-government sector - the federal government. Fighting for a 'share of the cake' meant justifying the products of government schools against the products of the other sector. During the economic boom and its accompanying liberal ideology, the activities of teachers' unions were carried out amid ever increasing government expenditure on education. By the second half of the 1970s that expenditure was being questioned by the media which claimed to speak for the public generally. The political advantages of a short supply of teachers had passed.

From the late 1970s the growth rate of students began to level out.

The period studied demonstrates that not only are teachers' struggles conducted within shifting economic, political and ideological landscapes e.g. but that these larger shifts have particular expression in the area of education which affect the power of teachers' unions to argue for and act upon teachers' collective interests. Who they must struggle with may take on a new complexion or highlight previously dimly recognised antagonists or allies. For example, one significant outcome of the intervention of the federal government into education has been a closer relationship between the teachers' unions and the state school parent organisations. The reasons for this are many and interrelated and have their origins both in the liberal ideology of the early period and in the defense of government schools in the recession. Federal intervention during the brief period of federal Labor government, 1972-75, brought with it the rhetoric of participation in education by both teachers and parents. It institutionalised it through parent and teacher membership of the federal advisory body, the Schools' Commission. In the same breath, the Labor government institutionalised the government's responsibility for non-government schools by appointing their representatives to the same Commission. The conflict of interests between the two school sectors in the provision of resources thus thrown into relief, it is not surprising that the teacher unions' representative and the parent representative on the Commission join in efforts to secure funds for government schools.

As well the issues around which the underlying themes of teachers' collective interests are fought may take on a new character. For teachers' unions the issue of government aid to non-government schools, had by 1980, become more than just a fight for resources. With the collapse of liberal ideology and the media attack on government schools' ability to produce suitable products, the

question of government aid was developing into a competition over the content and practices of schools in the two sectors.

### **Changing issues 1965-1980.**

The issues around which teachers collective interests are fought may, of course, change completely. For example, teachers' working conditions involved the issue of teacher shortage in 1965 whereas by 1980 the issues of forced transfers or limited tenure were more telling.

The following table sets out briefly some of the demographic, political and ideological changes in education which can be observed in the fifteen year period. Underlying all these changes (though in no direct causal relationship to all) is the economic shift from a time of boom into recession and the accompanying restructuring of industry, growth of unemployment, inflation and government responses to effect economic recovery by cuts to the public sector.

Table 2.1

Demographic Changes and Teachers' Working Conditions.

1965	1980
Large numbers of students	Falling enrolments
1. Growth of schools and training colleges.	1. Threat of school closures. Amalgamation of training colleges, diversification away from teacher training in multi-purpose Colleges of Advanced Education.
2. Shortage of teachers.	2. Excess of teachers.
3. Untrained teachers entering schools.	3. Forced transfers, limited tenure, unemployed teachers.
4. Younger teaching service.	4. Older teachers, longer periods of training.
5. High rates of resignation because of availability of jobs in other occupations.	5. Few resignations.
6. Shortage of teachers for promotions positions. Opportunities for fast movement into promotions positions hierarchy.	6. Limited career opportunities.

Table 2.2

Political changes - changes in the alignment of interested parties in education.

1965	1980
Education a political weapon.	Education no longer high on the political agenda.
1. Education mainly a state concern.	1. Education a state and federal concern
2. Teacher training under the control of state departments.	2. Teacher training in autonomous institutions financed by federal government.
3. Gov't funds for the gov't school sector.	3. Both school sectors a legitimate government responsibility.
4. Teacher union and state school parent organisations demand for federal aid.	4. Both sectors demanding a larger share of the education 'cake'.
Non-government school sector lobby for government funds.	
5. Parents and teachers in gov't sector had no place in federal gov't structures for articulating interests.	5. Parents and teachers in gov't schools represented on federal gov't Schools Commission.
Parents and teachers in non-gov't school sector had no place in federal gov't structures for articulating interests.	Individuals with interest in non gov't school represented on School Commission. Non-gov't school teachers <u>not</u> represented on Schools Commission.
6. Lobby from parents and school administration in the non-gov't sector. Largely non-unionised independent school personnel. Independent schools' teachers not a strong voice in education. Many teachers in Catholic schools belonged to religious orders.	6. Independent schools' teachers becoming a force through their own union. Major decline in number of religious orders teaching in Catholic schools.

1965	1980
7. Movement into an argument by federal gov't for special area funding e.g. science laboratories, libraries - extending to non-gov't sector. Search by Labor Party for suitable policy on federal gov't funding of education.	7. Federal gov't funding for both sectors on a 'needs' basis.
8. Catholic schools element of non-gov't schools sector acquiescing to a 'needs based' attitude on gov't funding to non-gov't school sector.	8. Non-gov't school sector beginning to unite in arguing the right of all school children to gov't assistance regardless of parents wealth or wealth of school. Non-gov't schools teachers union searching for a position on gov't funding, i.e. 'entitlement' or 'needs'.

Table 2.3

Ideological Changes and Curriculum and School Organisation.

1965	1980
Liberal ideology.	Collapse of liberal ideology.
1. Schools seen as a solution to social ills, an avenue of social mobility.	1. High youth unemployment. School seen as failing in task of preparing youth for employment.
2. Consumer demand for education increasing retention rates past compulsory age.	2. Gov't schemes to keep youth in schools and delay entry in ranks of unemployed.
3. Attempts to provide comprehensive secondary education.	3. Media campaigns for 'back to basics'. Criticism of of 'falling standards'.
4. Innovation in organisation and curriculum.	4. A conservative push centring on a comparison of the practices, curriculum and outcomes of education in the two sectors.

Some of these issues are now explored in more detail to emphasise the shifts in the period and the more general nature of teacher unions' responses.

For teachers' unions the demographic situation of the 1960s meant large class sizes, inadequate accommodation, shortages of teachers, (particularly mathematics and science teachers) and inadequate facilities for the teaching of science. The unions' immediate response was to seek grants for state education from the federal government; a solution which we have seen brought with it a new set of problems involving the non-government sector. These problems became more intense when changes occurred not only in the demographic but in the ideological and the political arenas.

One group which emerged in the 1970s, the independent school teachers' union, must be mentioned for it presented the government school teachers' unions with a number of dilemmas, most of which they preferred to resolve by closing their eyes. The growth of independent school teachers' unions was influenced by changes in funding in the non-government sector, most importantly by more money flowing into poor Catholic schools, which stimulated an interest in how it could be used. Links with federal funding cut down the isolation. But the emergence of industrially organised teachers had probably more to do with the decline in the number of teachers who belonged to religious orders in the Catholic systemic schools and the employment of lay staff. The vast majority of members of the Independent Teachers Federation and its state affiliates are employed by the Catholic church.

This group stands in a peculiar relation to the government school unions. It is aware that its wages and conditions are largely a flow on from the government school unions' actions. Some of its members would be teaching in

state schools if there were jobs. It has tried to distance itself from some of the debate over funding waged by the Catholic church officials and the non-government parent group which is heavily influenced by the wealthy private schools. However, some of its members teach in wealthy private schools.

The Independent Teachers Federation has no official avenue for voicing its concerns and interests in the Schools Commission but has been in conflict with other parts of the non-government schools' lobby when it supported the Schools Commission's recommendation to make private schools more 'accountable' for the funds they receive from government sources.[18] These teachers particularly those in the Catholic systemic schools share some of the same interests as teachers in government schools which would identify them as allies. Yet, for many government school teachers, particularly in NSW where the opposition to state-aid is hardest and strongest, the similarities are outweighed by the fact that they teach in schools which can discriminate on grounds of religion and wealth and often academic ability and behaviour as well.

The states' response to the shortage of teachers in the boom period also produced a series of new issues for the unions, a notable one being the employment of untrained teachers. All unions responded to the problems of teacher shortage by demands for more places for teacher trainees and, later, after the 'solution' began to appear in classrooms, for the provision of programs and time for teachers to acquire training. Finally, however, the Victorian post-primary unions but particularly the VSTA, tackled the problem of untrained teachers head on through a campaign to give the union control of entry to the occupation.

By 1980 the demographic changes generated a different set of issues. Falling enrolments brought the departmental response of 'forced transfers',



threatened school closure or amalgamation. In Victoria a system of limited tenure appointments was introduced. By the 1980s the NSWTF had an officer to serve unemployed teachers. A log of claims was lodged with the Education Commission for casual teachers. The union used its computer facilities to enable schools needing casual staff to contact the union. This not only helped members find work but enabled the union to implement to a greater degree the preference clause inserted in the award in 1974. In spite of the preference clause, in 1980 union membership was only 83 percent of those eligible. In 1969, 97 percent of teachers were members of the union.

A primary/infants staffing campaign concentrated on reduction of class sizes, relief from face-to-face teaching and reclassification of schools to remove the problems caused by school numbers falling below those set in the classification formula. In the secondary area, teachers were concerned with class sizes above 30, teaching in subjects for which they were not trained and teaching over 27 periods in a week. In the TAFE area, a campaign started in 1979 and continued in 1980 to reduce the face-to-face teaching hours of all trade teachers and to bring them in line with the pattern of work of general studies and certificate TAFE teachers and with secondary teachers. Diverging momentarily, it is irresistible to note the expression of the mental/manual divide in this inequitable situation. The ready availability of unemployed trained teachers for relief and for reducing class sizes or hours made such campaigns seem 'winnable', and infants, primary and TAFE teachers have separately taken industrial action on these issues.

The demographic changes in the fifteen year period had a marked effect on teaching personnel. By the 1960s in both states the teaching service was becoming younger.[19] This trend not only demonstrated the growth in the provision of secondary education and subsequent recruitment of teachers but

was also the result of high resignation rates by young teachers. Many young teachers moved into private industry. From the mid 1970s the resignation rates were very low as opportunities for employment outside the teaching service were fewer and the process of re-entry to the service involved standing in a queue with ex-students, sometimes for three years. Those entering the service in 1980 had better academic qualifications. By 1980, length of training had been increased in Colleges of Advanced Education and the proportion of university graduates in secondary schools had increased after a fall during the 1960s.

The class background of teachers appears to have remained fairly constant however in the period 1965 to 1980 if we examine studies of students in tertiary institutions. There can be little doubt that students in universities and CAEs represent a privileged groups and this has continued despite the abolition of tuition fees in 1973.[20] Only 18.7 percent of students in universities and 23.4 percent in CAEs had fathers in foremen, skilled or semi-skilled positions in 1976. The National average for this group is around 50 percent.[21] Between faculties in universities, however, there are considerable differences. Education has the lowest proportion of students from families in the highest income category (Law and Medicine 28.2 percent; Education 9.8 percent). Education students have the lowest proportion of fathers in upper professional occupations (Medicine and Law 29.6 percent; Education 16.0 percent). They have the least likelihood for fathers to have university education (Medicine 23.4 percent; Education 11.7 percent). These patterns are not so pronounced in CAEs.[22] Education students are more likely to have been educated in government schools.[23] The proportion of female primary teachers has increased since the 1950s from 56 percent to 60 percent. During the 1950s the proportion of female secondary teachers decreased from 43 percent to 39 percent. It has

remained stable since the late 1970s at around 44 percent.[24]

One of the most obvious outcomes for the unions of the growth in the number of teachers needed for schools was a parallel growth in the number of union administrative officers needed to service members. Because New South Wales had only one union for the whole teaching service its growth appears more spectacular though a similar pattern is found in the Victorian unions. In 1965 there were 14 administrative officers in the NSWTF. In 1980 there were 35 full-time administrative officers. In 1965 these officers included the General Secretary, a deputy General Secretary, a deputy General Secretary-Treasurer, two Assistant General Secretaries, an editor, a research officer, an Interviewing and Correspondence Officer and Assistant Interviewing and Correspondence Officer and six organisers.

By 1980 some of the titles had been changed and some areas expanded, but new positions had also been created. The positions were General Secretary, Administrative Officer, Organising Secretary, Research Officers (2), Industrial Officers (2), Education Officer, Women's Coordinator, Welfare Officers (3), Publicity Unit (3 members), Organisers (7 city, 8 country, 1 trainee teachers, 2 TAFE, 1 minority groups, 1 unemployed co-ordinator). The list itself signals not just growth but the emergence of certain groups e.g. women, unemployed.

In NSW the large numbers of students in secondary schools, higher retention rates in post compulsory school years, i.e. over fifteen years of age, and community expectations of schools as an avenue of class mobility in the post World War II years were largely responsible for a reorganisation of the secondary schools. A system of comprehensive schools usually referred to as the Wyndham Scheme was introduced in 1961. The reorganisation had the blessing of the NSWTF for it followed closely recommendations made by the

union during the 1940s, though its entrepreneur was the Director of Secondary Education, Dr Wyndham. It was introduced without adequate preparation and provoked continued cries from the union for adequate resources for its proper implementation during the next decade.

While New South Wales teachers battled to implement their scheme of comprehensive education as set out in the Wyndham Report of 1957, Victoria, faced with similar problems, set sail in search of school-based curriculum and innovative organisation in the secondary area, encouraged by the Director of Secondary Education, R. Reid. During the period of the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Victorian high schools union, the VSTA obtained a reputation for being both the most innovative in the area of curriculum and school organisation and for using the strike or its threat more than any other teachers' union in Australia.

Inspection of schools and inspection of teachers for suitability for promotions positions was challenged by unions in both states. Much of the argument by the unions was couched in terms of professional autonomy but any understanding of the impetus to resist external auditing must acknowledge the liberal ideology of the late 1960s and early 1970s which stressed teacher responsibility to their clients rather than to a central bureaucracy.

The entry in 1972 of the federal Labor government into the previously mainly state concern and particularly the ideology which backed its 'needs' based policy, further legitimated the school as the centre of the education system rather than the head-office bureaucracy. 'Diversity', 'Innovation', 'participation' were given concrete form in the availability of federal funds for specific projects and programs. The ability of schools, teachers, groups of teachers and/or parents to apply for funds for innovative programs changed

the notion of central control in some teachers' heads if not always in their classrooms.

By the 1980s more federal funds were being tagged for schemes for transition from school to work. This reflected the growing unemployment situation for youth, and presented problems for the unions as they recognised a move to shift the blame for current economic and social problems onto the education system. The provision of money for innovative programmes was welcomed but the status of such education was questioned in the current economic climate. In the NSWTF there was concern that participants in such courses could be disadvantaged by not having a School Certificate. However, the union also recognised that the accreditation of courses to gain School Certificate status involved approval from the Board of Secondary Studies. This might mean some loss of the relative autonomy for schools associated with federal grants.

By 1980 the VSTA held fears for a reintroduction of the former powers of the Board of Inspectors in Secondary Schools (BISS). Members were once again critical of the selection procedures and standardisation measures used for the selection of students entering university. In both these areas they had made considerable inroads during the 1970s, giving teachers greater participation in evaluation of schools, the selection of teachers for promotion and the accreditation of courses and students.

The threat of national and state testing programs was being interpreted as an attack on school-based curriculum by unions in both states. 'National Testing', a program of sample testing 2000 students in each state in literacy and numeracy, was commissioned by the education ministers in all States.[25]

In the early 1980s the question of curriculum in secondary education was a

central issue as teachers and their unions reevaluated the innovations of the last ten years in the light of economic, political and ideological changes and the corresponding responses of government, departments, academics, industry representatives and the media. Victoria again led the way in keeping with its image as the more innovative state in the area of curriculum and school organisation. The debate over 'core' or 'common' curriculum in the NSWTF came to prominence slowly in the 1980s but the gauntlet was thrown down in Victoria by the new Minister for Education, Mr Alan Hunt in December 1979. He presented a Ministerial statement on aims and objectives in education and followed with a 'Green Paper' on the strategies to achieve these aims in May 1980,[26] a 'White Paper' [27] later in the same year and a corporate management plan in 1981. [28] Both the VSTA and the TTAV saw the 'Green Paper' as a further attack on the curriculum innovations gained in the late 1960s and 1970s.

From this brief overview of some issues it can be seen that though there was a commonality of experience for teachers and their unions in both New South Wales and Victoria in the fifteen year period, there were differences in the emphasis on particular issues. For example, we have seen the question of innovation in curriculum and school organisation was a much more central issue in Victoria than it was in NSW where more than a decade was spent battling for resources to implement the Wyndham Scheme in a period of liberal ideology and consumer demand for education.

The states were similar in that ultimate control rested legally with the Minister for Education but differed in the delegation of control to other legal bodies. For example, in the legal body designated as the employer, in the authority which controlled promotion into positions of administration in schools, in the arrangement of education departments (Victoria remains the last state in

Australia to have high school and technical school divisions) and in the structures and mechanisms for articulating and resolving industrial disputes. These arrangements have not only presented different tactical possibilities to both teachers' unions, government ministers and departmental officers but have themselves become the source of issues or have coloured the way in which an issue was perceived by each party. In the following chapters the configurations of forces at particular conjunctures are analysed in relation to particular themes central to the area of control of education and teachers' collective interests.

At this point I want briefly to outline the structure of the unions themselves and foreshadow the argument that their responses to particular issues come not just from the particular structure of the education system in the state and from those larger social forces discussed earlier, but also from the union's own structure. This includes the history of the alignment of factions and interests within it, the history of its relationship to the legally designated controlling bodies within the education system and the union's response to and ongoing dialogue with the larger political, economic and ideological forces in the society.

#### **Structure of unions and changes: 1965-1980.**

The New South Wales Teachers Federation (NSWTF) was formed in 1918. It was registered as an industrial union in 1919. The Union affiliated with the New South Wales Labour Council and the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) following an Annual Conference decision in 1942. Eligible members are teachers and education officers employed in the Departments of Education, Technical and Further Education (TAFE), Youth and Community Services and Corrective Services. Lecturers in Colleges of Advanced Education (CAEs) and

universities are also eligible for membership. Members are divided into associations which are the basic unit of the union. These originally were based on sectional interests (principals primary, secondary) in the metropolitan area but changed to regional associations. The Annual Conference is the chief policy making organ of the union. It is composed of delegates elected by the associations on a proportional basis and Council members.

Between conferences, the Council is the body which manages the affairs of the union and deals with matters submitted to it by Conference, Executive, Associations, Committees and individual counsellors. Council consists of presidential officers and representatives of Associations elected on a proportional basis. Administrative officers are members of Council but have no voting rights. Council meets on a monthly basis. From 1967 expenses of country Councillors were paid by the union to enable them to attend council.

The Executive consists of the presidential officers (President, Deputy President, Senior Vice President) four Vice Presidents, two Trustees, and eight Association Representatives elected in a secret preferential vote from Council. The Presidential officers have been elected since 1951 by secret preferential ballot of all financial members in a biennial postal vote. These positions are now full-time. The executive may exercise any of the powers and carry out any of the functions lawfully performed by the Council.

The General Secretary is a full time administrative officer elected by council triennially. It became an elected position in 1944. All other administrative officers are full time and are responsible to the General Secretary. Such officers are elected from all members triennially. Nominations must be considered by the Administrative Officers Committee to assess the candidates qualifications and credentials. This committee consists of the president and



four members elected from Council at the beginning of each year. The committee reports to Council on the day of the elections of administrative officers. After considering the committee's report, Council may decide to advertise the positions again.

At the school level, members of each school or department or section of school, elect, from among their number, a Federation Representative or a school Federation Committee at the commencement of each school year. This recognised spokesperson calls union meetings at the school, notifies the General Secretary of any decisions of such meetings and ensures that information (circulars, bulletins) from the union executive and the appropriate union Association come to the notice of members. The Federation Representative is usually the first person to receive and act upon complaints and problems which a staff member may have with the school administration or the employing authority. A member may request the presence of the Federation Representative at a personal interview with the school, college, or university administration.

In Victoria in 1965 there were two teachers' unions and a separate association of high school principals though these were often also members of one of the other unions. By the end of the period examined there were four teachers' unions and two principals' organisations. What is required then is not just a description of union structure but how this situation arose. Why unions proliferated in Victoria and not in New South Wales is a much more difficult question but some tentative reasons are discussed in Chapter Three in the analysis of mechanisms of dispute in the two states.

In organisation the three main unions VTU, VSTA, and TTAV are similar to the NSWTF being based on a system of branches or associations, having an

annual policy making conference (called the Annual General Meeting in the VSTA) and an elected council (called the Central Committee in the VSTA). One marked difference is that the school is the basic unit of organisation for the VSTA and the TTAV. The VTU is based on sectional branches though the separation of men and women was eliminated during the 1970s.

The number of administrative officers is less than in NSW and these are not elected positions. The General Secretary became an elected position in the TTAV in 1979 but remains an appointed position in the VSTA. In the VSTA the executive officers are not elected by all members but by the Committee of 40 members (in 1980) who are, in turn, elected by rank and file members in a secret postal ballot. In the VTU and TTAV the executive officers are elected by the delegates of the Annual Conference. Until 1971 the VSTA held open Annual General Meetings. It now follows the branch delegate system.

The first union, the Victorian Teachers Union (VTU), was established in 1926. In 1948 some secondary teachers broke away to form Victorian Secondary Masters Professional Association (VSMPA). With the introduction of women to the association in 1953 this became the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association (VSTA).

The immediate cause of the secondary teachers' breakaway was a union policy to establish a single salary schedule for all teachers, thus threatening the salary margin of high school teachers compared with primary school teachers. This policy, many secondary teachers claimed, demonstrated the domination of the union by primary school teachers.[29] The Teachers' Tribunal, established after continued pressure by the VTU in 1946 did not accept the proposal to eliminate the salary margin in full but reduced the margin. The Teachers' Tribunal is the body which controls the salaries and conditions of teachers in

Victoria.

Secondary teachers were not united in their stance against VTU policy. The High School Teachers' Branch of the union was unwilling to fight for the salary margin. The most vocal opposition to the policy came from the staff of the academically selective high school, Melbourne Boys High School. Most of the secondary teachers were comparatively young and had qualified for secondary teaching through part time study in the 1930s.[30] Bessant argues that they 'enjoyed prestige associated with the schools (and) saw themselves more akin to the 'masters' in the neighbouring private secondary schools rather than the teachers in primary schools, who had a dominating influence over the VTU'.[31]

Women secondary teachers, who constituted 37 percent of secondary teachers, did not initially join the male secondary teachers in opposition to the single salary schedule policy. They were fighting their own particular battle for equal pay for women teachers and judged their cause to be aided by alliance with the primary school women teachers.[32] The VSMPA appears to have decided to avoid the issue of equal pay through exclusion of women.[33] The Technical Men's Branch did not support the retention of a salary margin but was a 'consistent protagonist' of what Bessant and Spauld have described as the 'egalitarian principles' within the VTU.[34] The division over salary margins was a symptom of more chronic differences over union tactics, image and appropriate areas of involvement. The breakaway group was concerned to present a 'professional' image and opposed affiliation with the Victorian Trades Hall Council and the ALP and involvement in larger social issues such as nationalisation and price control.[35] In an attempt to highlight differences in qualifications and duties, the group excluded all but classified high school teachers from membership.

The VSTA was not recognised by the Teachers' Tribunal in its own right until 1965. Some secondary teachers continued as members of the VTU. Bessant calculates that in the early 1960s membership of the VSTA and the secondary membership of the VTU were roughly equal, though it is impossible to estimate the number of teachers who were members of both unions. He also notes the high percentage of teachers failing to join either union. By 1971 VSTA membership was 6812 and VTU secondary membership was 1100. [36]

The most pressing issue for the VSTA from its formation was recognition by the Teachers' Tribunal. This was achieved in 1965 and partly explains the membership increase. Problems of union organisation and a divergence of opinion on the appropriate tactics for the union to use in response to contemporary issues emerged in the VTU during the 1960s. High School Teachers wanted constitutional changes allowing greater autonomy for each division within the VTU. This was opposed by other sections of the union, particularly the head teachers. Part of the problem for the High Schools' Branch was the beginning of VSTA direct action through strikes. Many VTU secondary members did not relish working in schools while VSTA members were striking.

There was clearly a division also between the Technical Men's Branch and other sections of the VTU, over what were appropriate union issues. The earlier (1940s) wider scope of union interest had diminished. Following extreme caution on involvement in public issues, the VTU had, in 1965, decided not to take a public stance on the Vietnam issue though the Technical Mens' Branch called for the adoption of the resolution passed by the NSWTF.[37]

In 1967 the technical teachers broke away from the VTU after a failure to gain autonomy of the association at the Annual Conference and formed the

Technical Teachers Association of Victoria (TTAV). The union contains members from technical secondary schools and from technical colleges. At the same time the majority of high school teachers who still remained in the VTU joined the VSTA. The VTU continued to claim coverage of all teachers and relations between the VTU and the two post-primary unions was often strained or openly hostile until the mid 1970s when the VTU ceased to claim coverage of the whole teaching service.

The VTU, then, had suffered two breakaways though the reasons for the breaks were quite different. In the 1940s, questions of status and appropriate recognition were in evidence. A problem for the VSTA was the stigma of professional elitism which remained throughout its campaigns to control entry to the profession and to abolish inspection during the 1970s. The reputation it gained in those campaigns for industrial militancy, i.e. striking, presented a strange paradox. These tactics were those of the industrial arena, while their motives appeared to many, to smack of professional elitism. The teachers who remained with the VTU in the 1940s appear to have been those more committed to an egalitarian view. John Harris, honorary secretary of the VSTA in 1962, noted that 'Secondary teachers on the political left stuck to the VTU until the walk out in 1967.'[38]

The second exodus from the VTU in the late 1960s saw the departure of the Technical Teachers who formed the TTAV and most of the remaining secondary high school teachers. The issue then was clearly one of autonomy of sectional branches to implement policy using tactics which they thought were appropriate for the time.

The relationship between the two post-primary unions was one of co-operation though a former president of the VSTA, Geoff Reid, commented in

1978 that joint policy and action was often 'easier to achieve in theory than in practice.' This he attributed to the fact that the TTAV leadership was 'more consistently left wing and more committed to an ideological world view than to the narrow field of Victorian technical education.' [39] This observation is verified by the noticeable difference in style between the two unions. The VSTA acted in virtual isolation and with a single-mindedness within a narrow definition of educational concerns until the mid 1970s. The TTAV had a tendency to become associated with other organisations, e.g. the Australian Teachers Federation, the Victorian Trades Hall Council and to develop policy on larger social issues. The TTAV resembled the NSWTF in this tendency to see itself as part of the larger union movement. Of interest here is the fact that both the NSWTF and the TTAV had clearly visible influence from the Communist Party of Australia (CPA) through some senior officers. This association is discussed later.

It should be noted that there appeared to be no discussion of a joint post-primary union in 1967 which suggests an awareness of differing styles and interests. By the late 1970s however, the three unions were seriously discussing federation but with a wary eye on retaining autonomy in their sectional interests.

The Victorian Association of Teachers (VAT) emerged rather than broke away from any union in 1976 but its emergence owed much to the policy and action of the VSTA and a more radical stance being taken by the VTU by the mid 1970s. Relationships between the post-primary unions and the VTU were more cordial as they were searching for joint policy on reform of the Teachers' Tribunal. Though VAT's membership was low, it was formally recognised by the department before it had a constitution or an elected president. The department allowed automatic deduction of union fees from salary and

authorised paid leave for the president. VAT was recognised by the Tribunal except in the area of technical education.

The other unions viewed its formation and quick recognition by the Department of Education and the Tribunal as an attack on their policies and activities, its arrival coinciding with a period of particular industrial unrest most notably over the failure of the Teachers' Tribunal and the introduction of penal clauses for teachers' strike action. The recognition by the Teachers' Tribunal of the Victorian High Schools Principals Association (VHSPA) in 1973 was viewed as a similar divide and conquer move. The Association was formed in 1948 and had some 800 members by 1980. An association of Primary School Principals was formed in 1972.

In organisation and in interests pursued, VAT differs markedly from the three major unions. In March 1983 it was claiming a membership of approximately 2500 teachers from primary, secondary and technical divisions.[40] Its president described other teacher union executives as 'all push, noise and dirt.'[41] Study of VAT's publications [42] showed it to be in favour of selective schools, competitive academic curriculum, graded assessment, teachers 'dressing in a style appropriate to a professional person', 'teacher authority in the classroom' and corporal punishment. It was against any moves to break down the hierarchy within schools. It opposed school council involvement in staffing of schools and advised members to 'keep an open mind on the question of private schools.'[43]

In February 1983 VAT announced that it was 'wiping certain issues off the teacher's blackboard, leaving it nice and clear for words and phrases like "Governor Phillip", "bunsen burner", "computer", and "simple fractions".' VAT would abolish from its vocabulary 'drugs', 'homosexuality', 'sexism',

teachers who wished to separate education and politics.[44] VAT did not have an annual policy making conference but relied on member feed-back through opinion surveys.

### **Leadership, union structure and tactics.**

I want now to examine the internal union struggles during the fifteen year period and the relationship between union organisation and the ability to use certain tactics. In part, this has already been discussed in relation to the VTU in the question of autonomy of divisions or sectional interests to pursue union policy. The outcome there was breakaway unions.

Perhaps the most obvious difference between the two states in the late 1960s was the fact that while the Victorian unions were dividing off along sectional interest lines, the NSW teachers in different sections were coming together. Members of the NSWTF in the metropolitan areas were originally divided into associations based on interest, that is, primary, secondary, and those in school executive positions. Country associations were based on regions. The growing outer metropolitan associations were based on regions also from 1962. These outer metropolitan branches were usually filled with young teachers, active in union affairs. By 1974 the other Metropolitan areas had completed a change to regional rather than sectional associations.

Some members who work in Colleges of Advanced Education (CAEs) or Universities, TAFE teachers, trainee teachers remain in state wide associations, such as the Lecturers' Association. It should be noted here that in NSW post-primary teachers form one division and technical teachers, those who work in tertiary Technical Colleges, are under a separate Department of Technical and Further Education (TAFE). In Victoria the TTAV covers teachers in technical secondary schools and technical colleges. By 1980 this amalgamation



of secondary and tertiary teachers again posed the question of sectional autonomy, this time in the TTAV. Annual Conference proposed changes to the union constitution to allow a separate system within the union for its Technical and Further Education (TAFE) members.

In line with the tendency of Victoria to divide into separate interest unions and NSW to favour the 'one big union' the VTU moved out of the tertiary area of Teachers Colleges which were now called CAEs, while the NSWTF remained in uneasy competition with other associations also seeking to cover this area and the universities.

Although the movement to regional rather than sectional interests in NSW is the opposite to the developments in Victoria, the same question of autonomy to pursue policy may be deduced from the union's action. The argument offered is that it allowed regional action or decentralised action on specific issues as opposed to centre-directed mass action. The movement coincided with an extensive change in leadership style during the period from 1968 to 1974 and the passing of the 'old left' which had dominated the executive of the NSWTF on and off since the 1940s.

One of the marked differences between the two states has been the publicly recognised influence of the Communist Party of Australia (CPA) on the NSWTF. Gollan notes that: 'By 1942 communists, or people who were prepared to work with them, controlled the Teachers Federation, but it was a control within definite limits.'<sup>[45]</sup> In 1965, Sam Lewis, a prominent member of the Communist Party was president. He had been president from 1945 to 1952, deputy president from 1958 to 1963 and president again from 1964 to 1967. On his retirement Lewis was succeeded by W.J. Whalan, who, though not a member of the CPA represented the 'old guard'. However, a 'new left' group of radicals

was beginning to challenge the 'old left'. By the early 1970s the 'new left' faction which appealed particularly to the younger members of the union, the products of the 1960s and early 1970s began to make its presence felt on the union Council. Disagreement between these two 'left' factions and inept handling of preferences allowed, L.H. Childs, a conservative, country primary school deputy principal, to slip through to the presidency in 1972. In 1974, however, the 'new left' held the senior officer positions. Another change which had occurred in 1967 also brought new factional alignments into the Council. Prior to 1967 a metropolitan member had acted in proxy for a country area, a situation which provided an avenue for 'getting the numbers' for factions. From 1967 country councillors had their travelling expenses paid to attend council.

Mitchell attributes the leadership changes in the early 1970s to 'the fragmentation of the Communist Party hegemony, that coalition of left wing factions which had been so influential in Australian politics from the early 1930s'.<sup>[46]</sup> He has argued that Lewis and his supporters 'achieved their ascendancy' because by the 1940s they had abandoned the educational radicalism of the Educational Workers' League which challenged syllabus content and some school practices e.g. examinations, homework, corporal punishment.<sup>[47]</sup> The League had also proposed that all teachers should have 'real and active participation and voice in the government of schools'.<sup>[48]</sup> It seems that in an effort to preserve unity the radical practices and ideas were dropped and the League members set about managing the bureaucratic structure and emphasising wages, thus setting it on a course of centralism and economism.

Mitchell also notes that Lewis' tactics did not often follow Communist Party 'orthodoxy'.<sup>[49]</sup> Generally, Party membership was kept secret to avoid disciplinary action by the Education Department and rejection by members and the Party's activity was not based on direct action as this would not have been

acceptable to most members. Instead it concentrated on mass meetings and involvement of the community to publicise the deficiencies in teachers' salaries and conditions and deficiencies within the education system generally. Gollan comments that the union's policies involved a 'fusion' of trade union objectives and the idea that 'the state education system was one of the lynchpins of a democratic society.'[50]

Even acknowledging the observation by both Mitchell and Gollan that the tactics used by the CPA members of the NSWTF had been far from orthodox, the CPA influence on union organisation was undoubtably considerable. The criticisms of the 'new left' of the way in which the 'old left' leadership acted suggests that the union reflected the bureaucratic centralist organisation of the CPA itself which persisted until the late 1960s.

Higgins suggests that the internal working of the CPA encouraged a talent for infiltrating and controlling the bureaucratic structure of unions.[51] Following the exodus of intellectuals in the 1950s the party had remained based on unions. Its organisation was 'of classic bureaucratic centralist type in which internal debate was almost totally absent.'[52] This was not a new phenomenon. By the 1930s the party had become a small scale replica of the organisation of the CPSU. It followed political trends in Russia. 'As the CPSU became steadily more authoritarian and dogmatic in ideology, so too did the Australian party.' [53] By the mid 1960s the CPA was moving away from the Moscow line, a move hastened by the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia. An earlier split occurred in 1963 and a Peking oriented party was formed with about 200 ex-CPA members, mostly from Melbourne.

By the late 1960s some of the old 'internationalist' leaders were giving way to a new leadership. But the growth of radical movements in the wider

community found the CPA ill-prepared to participate in the new debates. The Party has been characterised as 'anti-intellectual and philistine'[54] suffering from 'theoretical impoverishment and isolation from debate in the intellectual community.'[55]

The twenty first congress of the CPA in 1967 shows that the CPA was doing some soul searching. It approved sweeping organisational changes and a new constitution offered greater scope for rank and file participation by emphasising grass-roots activism. The Central Committee was critical of the Party's anti-intellectualism and lack of theoretical analysis. This, coupled with the emphasis on 'grass roots activism', was a fitting response to the growing demand for participation and the rise of protests in sections of the community. The new policies were also a fitting response to a growing concern about 'wastage of membership.'[56]

The CPA had to find a place within the movements concerned with anti-war, women, aboriginal, student and environmental issues. There was opposition within the Party to encouragement of grass-roots activism and workers control initiatives for 'they were offensive to right wing union officials whom some communist officials saw as useful allies.'[57] The involvement in political issues (women, environment and so on) was seen as abandonment of the working class. The critics accused the CPA leadership of 'adventurist policies and tactics.'[58] Because many critics held important positions in trade unions they were in a powerful position. In December 1971, 400 CPA members broke away to form the Socialist Party of Australia.

The search for a new style of leadership in the NSWTF thus coincides with searches for a new direction within the CPA. Some young radical members of the union were already politicised by the very movements to which the CPA

was struggling to respond.

Opposition to the CPA influence on the NSWTF had occurred previously and was at times successful. During the late 1940s the leadership was attacked in both state and federal parliaments.[59] Within the union the conservative forces mustered in the Teachers' Federation Anti-Communist League, a combination of the Catholic 'Movement' with conservative protestants, which opposed trade union affiliation and involvement in issues.[60] In 1951, Conference voted to elect the three senior officers by membership postal ballot rather than Council. Though changes to the election of these offices had been discussed since the 1920s, the moves during the 1940s were clearly an attempt to remove Lewis from office. During the 1960s a Reform Committee, formed in the union to rid it of 'Communist controlling influence', campaigned against Sam Lewis. It was supported by the federal politician, W.C. Wentworth and by sections of the media. [61] The difference during the period 1968-1974 was that the challenge came not from the right, or from some 'middle road' position but from a 'new left' position which was associated with a new type of political practice.

In Victoria the association of teachers' unions with the CPA has not been as visible as in NSW though a Progressive Teachers Association, fearing a Communist plot to capture the VTU, campaigned against the presidential candidacy of George Lees of the Technical Teachers' Branch of the VTU in 1966 and Brian Dixon, MLA, and later Assistant Minister for Education, alluded to CPA interests in the VTU and the VSTA. [62] This latter claim is at odds with the comments of John Harris, the Honourary Secretary of the VSTA in 1962, that since the CPA backed the idea of the 'one big union', it 'condemned the VSTA as a group of bourgeois intellectuals.' [63] According to Harris the Labor Party was suspicious of the VSTA in the 1960s because of ALP commitment to 'one big union'. 'An important result of this was that secondary

teachers on the political left stuck to the VTU until the walk out in 1967.'[64] Harris claimed that the left wing leaders of the High School Branch of the VTU were the 'most strident critics' of the direct action taken by the VSTA during the mid 1960s. Their action following the defeat of moves towards branch autonomy in 1967 suggests they had a change of heart.

Though the VSTA did not have a history of CPA influence, its leadership too posed problems for many radical teacher activists, many of whom were products of the universities in the late 1960s. Criticism was not confined to the conservative teacher element in VAT. Throughout the 1970s but particularly since 1975 an almost constant battle occurred on the Central Committee. The outcomes are visible in the changes during the 1970s which brought VSTA organisation and practices closer to those of the other teachers' unions. NSWTF, VSTA, TTAV and VTU sub-committees are important in forming union policy which is ratified by Conference or Annual General Meeting. These are generally open to members. However, the VSTA did not establish open sub-committees until the mid 1970s and even then in the face of considerable opposition from many Central Committee members.

Despite opposition within the Central Committee, the 1975 VSTA Annual General Meeting decided to affiliate with the Victorian Trades Hall Council and, in 1976, decided to affiliate with the ATF. A constitutional amendment in 1976 allowed the VSTA to have policy on issues outside teachers 'professional' concerns, for example on uranium mining.

All these policy changes were claimed as victories by the 'Reform' group in the election campaign for the 1982 Central Committee. [65] Both conservative and radical critics drew attention to the lack of participation by members in decisions. It would appear, however, that it was the success of the radicals in

bringing in a new policy which disturbed some other teachers. The formation of VAT coincides with some of the victories of the radical group in the Annual General Meeting.

The fact that struggle over the union's direction was occurring at the centre (Executive and Committee) during the 1970s was partly the result of a failure to involve the branches in issues of a professional nature in the early 1960s. A prominent activist in the 1960s and 1970s, Bill Hannan, noted in 1980 that though the word 'professional' now contains 'overtones of elitism, exclusivism and feather bedding', in the mid 1960s it meant 'taking an interest in educational issues generally.'<sup>[66]</sup> Hannan and another prominent activist, Bruce McBurney, later president of the union, had attempted during 1962 to 'put some life into branches in city schools' through a 'metropolitan group'. This was largely unsuccessful but the chief activists were elected onto Central Committee which together with the general meetings, the union journal and some strong branches became the forums for policy making.<sup>[67]</sup> The unintended consequence was a reinforcement of the power of the Central Committee and Executive, for it was here that questions of direction of the union were fought out rather than in the branches.

By the beginning of the 1980s there was mounting dissatisfaction with the VSTA Committee and Executives. The leadership was accused by members of being 'detached from the rank and file, arrogant and high handed in its attitude to membership involvement in the union and expressively secretive in its negotiations with the employer.'<sup>[68]</sup> A large number of teachers called for the reform and revitalisation of the VSTA through increased member participation in decision making. The 'Reform' platform for election of the 1982 committee had four themes: a leadership in touch with members; support for the branch representatives; an integration of curriculum and industrial concerns; stronger

links with allies in other teachers' unions and parent organisations.[69] The pursuit of these same aims had led activists into the central structure in the 1960s and 1970s but their ability to effect changes in education from a central position using the same tactics had diminished.

By the late 1970s, the demographic, political and ideological changes of the period were having major effects on the union organisation. In the early 1980s conditions won earlier were being eroded. Morale was low. Some members worked VSTA conditions while others did not. Young teachers were not joining the union, older activists were burnt out. Non-members benefited from the hard work of a few. This was not a new situation but in the new climate had different implications. Between June 1980 and June 1981 VSTA membership fell from 9316 to 8776 (over 5 percent). A further 6,000 teachers eligible for membership were not in the union. [70] As a 'reform' campaigner put it: 'Once upon a time we would have been getting the energy to fight from new radical teachers, but there aren't many new teachers now, and those who are employed feel very vulnerable in L.T.E. (limited tenure) positions'.[71] (My insert).

Another reform campaigner remembered back to the early 1970s and called the VSTA 'a union that has lost its way', most importantly it was no longer a pace setter in the debate over curriculum.[72] In the years from 1977, it was argued, the leadership of the VSTA failed to incorporate well developed educational arguments alongside its 'industrial' rationale in the face of constant attacks on teaching conditions. Individual members continued their commitment to curriculum reform but, because of 'leadership' disinterest, were now often working in other bodies, such as VISE Committees, subject associations and so on. [73]

By the beginning of the 1980s education was not a high priority for



governments, though, in the states, it continued to take the largest share of the budget. There was also a growing feeling that the government was prepared to take a hard line against teacher action, a feeling confirmed when the Victorian government promulgated stand down regulations in late 1980.

Brian Henderson, yet another 'reform' campaigner, summed up the implications of these factors for union action in 1981. He argued that in the 1970s the committee decided policy which the branches were expected to implement. It knew that only a few branches would act but hoped for a flow on effect to other branches. Control of Entry campaigns and the HSC boycott had used this approach. However, by the end of the 1970s those branches which took action were being 'picked off' by the government. Henderson suggested that the type of branch action of the late 1960s and 1970s was successful because of 'the favourable economic climate and the high priority afforded education.'[74] The branches taking action in the early 1980s needed greater support from the centre (e.g. union training programmes and support from other branches as well as from parents). He proposed joint action by three unions.

At 1980 Annual General Meeting, the VSTA resolved to work for a federation of the three main unions. Bessant argued in 1978 that 'the present tendency for unions to amalgamate is not simply based on the old adage "unity is strength" but is the result of very practical considerations related to costs, resources, administration and organisation. These factors rather than the ideological, are more likely to influence teacher unity in the future.'[75] But the 'practical considerations' were much wider than union administrative costs by that period as Bessant himself acknowledged 'In a period of teacher surplus and cuts in educational expenditure, it might also become necessary for unions to get together as governments become more intransigent.'[76]

## Conclusion.

It is within the setting of vast changes in the economic, political and ideological expressions of capitalism and their corresponding implications for education and for teachers and their unions that teacher union struggles must be seen. In this context we can identify the nature of those interests and the forces which shape them. We have seen that changes during the fifteen years brought about demographic, ideological and political changes in the education scene which changed the issues around which teachers' unions campaigned e.g. shortage of teachers as against an excess of teachers. These changes of issues may represent changes in teachers' interests or merely present new faces of the same interest.

The period brought new interested parties into government education struggles or at least highlighted dimly recognised ones e.g. the federal government, the non-government schools sector, and changed the nature of the association between these parties and the government schools. As well, the liberal ideology gave a new legitimation to the rights of the parents and the students. The unions had to respond to each of these new situations. This response could be the discovery of shared interests or perhaps new conflicts with other groups.

This chapter has also shown that the ability of teachers' unions to act upon their interests may depend in part upon the structure of the union particularly its leadership. The leadership needs the ability not just to identify members interests but also to read the changing alignment of forces in education, to recognise the type of intervention possible at that time and be in a position to take appropriate action. In Victoria the leadership of the VTU throughout the latter half of the 1960s was unable to respond to the contradictory situation of

economic boom but worsening conditions in schools in a way perceived as suitable by some sections of the union. Its refusal to give secondary and technical branches the autonomy to act in ways they deemed appropriate led to the formation of a new union, the TTAV and the growth of that earlier breakaway union, the VSTA. In NSW the change from the 'old left' to the 'new left' may also be seen as a bid to change the union's tactics to those deemed appropriate for the kinds of issues members needed to address in the period 1965-1980. By the late 1970s the VSTA was in a leadership crisis and its ability to respond appropriately to issues in a period of recession was questioned by a reform group.

The following chapters explore some issues in the control of education. The theme of control is complex but four areas have been chosen which are perceived as central areas of struggle by the unions: (1), the push for union representation on a central body controlling salaries and conditions; (2), the challenge to the functions of the inspector both in school evaluation and in assessment of teachers for promotion; (3), the debate about parents' right to participate in school decision-making; and (4), the struggle over control of curriculum. The need is to understand why these areas became important during the particular period, how the issues were approached by the unions in the two states and what both of these tell us about teachers' collective interests.

1. D. Finn, et al, 'Social democracy, education, and the crisis', in Cultural studies No. 10, on ideology, Birmingham, 1977.
2. *ibid.*, p.171.
3. Official year book of Australia, 1977-78, p.742.
4. P. Wilenski, 'Labor and bureaucracy', in G. Duncan (ed.), Critical essays in Australian politics, Port Melbourne, 1978, p.28.
5. T. Hagan, The history of the ACTU, Melbourne, 1981, p.209.
6. See A. Game and R. Pringle, 'The making of the Australian family', in A. Burns, et al, The family in the modern world, Sydney, 1983.
7. D. Bennett, in Labour essays 1982, p.164.
8. Schools in Australia: report of the interim committee for the Australian Schools Commission, Canberra, 1973.
9. A.S. Neill, Summerhill; a radical approach to education, 1966.
10. I. Illich, Deschooling society, Harmondsworth, 1971.
11. E. Reimer, School is dead: an essay on alternatives in education, Harmondsworth, 1971.
12. S. Bowles and H. Gintis, Schooling in capitalist America, London, 1976.
13. R. Gordon, (ed) The Australian new left, Melbourne, 1970, p.15.
14. T. Irving and B. Berzins. 'History and the new left - beyond radicalism', in R. Gordon, (ed) *op. cit.*, p.68.
15. Gordon, *op. cit.*, p.35.
16. *ibid.*, p.37.
17. Literacy working group, 'Literacy in the schools', 1979; H. Bannister, et al, 'Media definitions ...' 1980; J. foley, 'Media representations ...' Melbourne working papers, 1979, 1980, 1981.
18. Sydney Morning Herald, 9 Aug., 1984.
19. B. Mitchell, Teachers, education and politics, St Lucia, Queensland, 1975, p.199.
20. D.S. Anderson, et al, Students in Australian higher education, ERDC Report, No 23, 1980.

21. *ibid.*, p.81.
22. *ibid.*, pp. 77-89.
23. D.S. Anderson, New patterns of teacher education and tasks, OECD, Paris 1974, p.19.
24. D.S. Anderson and R.E. Vevoorn, Access to privilege, Canberra, 1973, p.59.
25. TTAV news, No. 11, 1980, p.15-16.
26. Victoria. Green paper on the strategies and structures for education in Victoria, Melbourne, May, 1980.
27. Victoria. White paper on strategies and structures for education in Victorian Government schools, Melbourne, 1980.
28. Department of Education, Vic., The rationale and definition of the proposed organisation structure, Melbourne, 1981.
29. B. Bessant and A.D. Spaul, Teachers in conflict, Melbourne, 1972, p.29.
30. *ibid.*, p.29.
31. B. Bessant, Secondary Teacher, No.19, 1978, p. 10.
32. Bessant and Spaul, *op. cit.*, p.30.
33. B. Bessant, Secondary teacher, No.19, 1978, p. 10.
34. *ibid.*
35. B. Bessant and A.D. Spaul, *op. cit* p.30.
36. B. Bessant, Secondary teacher, No. 19, 1978, p.10.
37. Teachers journal, Vol 47, No 6, p. 256.
38. J. Harris, Secondary teacher, No. 4, 1980, pp. 11-15.
39. G. Reid, Secondary teacher, No.19, 1978, p.13.
40. VAT, Vol. 8, Mar., 1983, p.3.
41. *ibid.*, p.3.
42. See particularly the 'Education Manifesto of the Victorian Association of Teachers', reprinted in VAT, Vol. 7 Jun., 1982; 'An Honest Look at the Achievement of the Victorian Federation and the VAT', VTF Vol 8, Sept/Oct., 1983.
43. VAT, Vol. 7, Aug/Sept 1982. p.13.
44. VAT, Vol. 8. Mar., 1983, p.2.
45. R. Gollan, Revolutionaries and reformists - communism and the Australian

labour movement, Canberra, 1975, pp. 76-77.

46. B. Mitchell, Teachers, education and politics. St Lucia, Queensland, 1975, p.180.

47. *ibid*, p.174.

48. Cited in Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p.174.

49. *ibid.*, p.174.

50. Gollan, *op. cit.*, p.77.

51. W. Higgins, 'Reconstructing Australian communism', The socialist register, 1974, p.158.

52. *ibid.*, p.158.

53. R. Gollan, *op. cit.*, p.287.

54. Gordon, *op. cit.*, p.13.

55. Higgins, *op. cit.*, p.160.

56. L. Churchwood, 'Reform or revolution, the search for a new strategy', Meanjin quarterly, Dec., 1970, p.535.

57. Higgins, *op. cit.*, p.165.

58. *ibid*, p.169.

59. Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

60. *ibid.*, p.169.

61. B. Bessant and A.D. Spaul, *op. cit.*, p.25.

62. Bessant and Spaul, *op. cit.*, p.25.

63. J. Harris, Secondary teacher, No.4. 1980, pp. 11-15.

64. *ibid*.

65. C. Kelly & M. Bluer, 'An end to terminal boredom', Reform, p.5. (Copy held by author).

66. Bill Hannan, Secondary teacher, No.4, 1980, p.5.

67. *ibid*.

68. Vic Sbar, 'Where to from here?', Reform, p.4.

69. Letter to members, Reform, p.3.

70. P. Noyce, 'We stand or fall on membership', Reform, p.8.

71. B. Kelly. 'Reflections on recent union decisions', Reform, p.4.
72. J. Keating, 'A union that has lost its way', Reform, p.9.
73. Gil Freeman, 'A declining influence', Reform, p.9.
74. Brian Henderson, 'Rethinking action strategies', Reform, p.6.
75. B. Bessant, Secondary teacher, No.19, 1978,p.12.
76. *ibid.*

### 3: UNIONS AND CENTRAL BODIES

In all Australian states, government employees, including teachers, have a long history of organised government-union bargaining in contrast with, for example, the USA, where state government employees have a history of organisation but, until the mid 1960s, have concentrated on lobbying. [1] There have been two differences between Victoria and New South Wales in the employment of teachers which we would expect to have some impact on teachers' unions. The first is the fact that the body which employed teachers differed between the states. The second is a difference in the structures and practices for negotiation of wages and conditions.

In NSW the question, 'who shall be the employers?' was a preoccupation of the teachers' union since its formation in 1918 until establishment of the Education Commission in 1980. In Victoria, the VTU was preoccupied with establishment of machinery for negotiation of conditions and salaries until the formation in 1946 of the Teachers' Tribunal. Since then the three major unions but particularly the VSTA and the TTAU have been concerned with the deficiencies of the Tribunal.

Yet the issues underlying the preoccupation have much in common, particularly in that they concern teachers' rights to have some say in decisions on their employment conditions (including salaries). The questions are first why have these rights been sought in different areas, i.e. why was NSWTF concerned to be represented on an employing body and why did the Victorian unions seek representation on a body which determined wages and conditions? Second, what effects have struggles in these major areas of control of the occupation had for teachers and their unions? The third related question is what has been the response of governments in the two states to teachers'



struggles to be part of the central decision making process?

In NSW until 1980 the employer of teachers was the Public Service Board (PSB) though changes in 1970 removed some authority to the Director General of Education. The NSW PSB had wide jurisdictional scope which included all civil servants, teachers and the police. A large number of statutory authorities of the state were also required to consult with and have regard to standards established by the Board. In Victoria both teachers and police were outside the jurisdiction of the Public Service Board: and statutory authorities were co-ordinated by the office of Industrial Relations Co-ordination in the Department of Labour and Industry. [2] The employer of teachers in Victoria is the Education Department through the Director General. In NSW salaries and conditions were determined by the PSB until 1980 with the right of appeal on disputes over salaries to the State Industrial Commission. Disputes over conditions were not heard until 1976. In Victoria, prior to 1946, salaries were determined under the Public Service Act and required an amendment by Parliament to introduce changes. From 1946 salaries were determined by the Teachers' Tribunal. Decisions by the Victorian PSB, the Teachers' Tribunal and the Police Tribunal were final, unless the Parliament intervened. Derber draws attention to the possible differences in perception of the PSB which its members may have. [3] The PSB in NSW is composed of four full time members appointed for life by the Governor. One must be an 'educationalist'. All members appear to regard themselves as representatives of management. The Victorian PSB has three full time members and one part time member appointed by Governor in Council. Because one full time member and the part time member are appointed after election by the permanent members of the Public Service and the third division of the Mental Hygiene Branch of the Department of Health respectively, 'these were widely regarded as

representatives of their employee organisation.' [4] Certainly within the NSW context the PSB has not been viewed by teachers as anything but management even when one of their own number was made a board member in 1950 and again in 1955 when the President, Harry Heath, accepted appointment to the Board. Despite the factional divisions of that period, all perceived it as joining the 'enemy'. [5]

The Teachers' Tribunal, which determines Victorian teachers salaries though it is not the employer, has much in common with the Victorian PSB in composition. [6] Why then has it been viewed with such hostility?

First, I am going to look at the system of wage and condition determination in each state. This, as stated earlier, has been the obsession of Victorian unions. This exercise is given added impetus by the fact that the Victorian Teachers' Tribunal has at times been cited within the NSW union as a possible model for the employing authority which the NSWTF sought to have established, namely its Education Commission. Yet the comparison between NSW and Victoria is not simple because, as noted earlier, there is not a straight correspondence of structures and functions. The tribunal is not the employer, nor is it easily comparable with the system of arbitration since it determines salaries and conditions but is not an avenue of appeal for disputes.

Much of this chapter is spent analysing the NSWTF's obsession with separation from the PSB. It is in this context, that notions of central control, how they are articulated and justified should be visible. The question of the employer in both states has involved many anomalies despite legislation. A 'Green Paper' on Strategies and structures for education in Victoria in 1980, commented that there was 'doubt as to whether the Educational department or the Teachers' Tribunal is the employer of members of the Teaching Service or

as to whether each is to be regarded as the employer for some purposes. The Education Department currently possesses only some of the characteristics and functions normally attributed to an employer.' [7]

In NSW problems also existed in the separation of functions performed by the PSB and those by the Department of Education. The difficulty seems ultimately to be in separating those functions concerned with employing a group of workers (teachers) and the overall provision of the state systems of education though, in Victoria, the position of the Tribunal added to the problems. In some aspects, notably the determination of salaries, it performed the function of the NSW PSB, yet unlike the Board, it was not the employer.

#### **Arbitration and the NSWTF.**

All states except Victoria and Tasmania introduced systems of compulsory arbitration in the first two decades of this century. This, it is often suggested, helped shape the form and practice of trade unionism in Australia. [8] Arbitration imposed a centralised form on unions and a tendency to single industry unions. Arbitration is based on the notion of 'dispute' between parties. For an issue to become a 'dispute' one party must make a demand and the other must either refuse or fail to agree. The Arbitration Tribunal is notified or takes cognizance of the dispute and assumes jurisdiction. The Tribunal calls a compulsory conference between the parties. If an agreement is reached by the parties, a memorandum of the terms of agreement may be certified by a member of the Arbitration Commission thus giving it the status of an award. An award is a legally binding contract between the employer and employees. If agreement is not reached the arbitrator hands down a compulsory solution, the award.

Sykes [9] claims that there is a tendency to over-emphasise the 'dispute'

aspect. Arbitration Tribunals play a vital role 'with the co-operation of the parties in forming the rules governing the labour-management relationship.' This role was assumed in early times because there was no developed system of collective bargaining. [10] In some cases a matter may become a dispute, i.e. not agreed to by one party, simply because a party may want the legislation of the court not because there is any disagreement.

Within the basic logic of arbitration, the position of state workers was difficult from the start. Both governments and teachers themselves saw public servants as somehow different from other workers. [11] Was teaching an industry in the sense arbitration usually recognises? Indeed all public servants posed a difficulty for the government in the negotiations on wages and conditions. Mitchell notes that in 1908 when wage boards were being considered as appropriate industrial machinery for public servants, the Minister for labour and Industry, G.S. Beby, stated that 'the proper wages board for public servants is the parliament itself.' [12] The question for many teachers was would arbitration lessen their status by reducing them to the situation of workers in general? By 1917 NSW teachers were calling for access to arbitration to secure 'fair play'. [13]. In 1919 the Industrial Arbitration Act was amended to enable organisations of public servants to register as trade unions. [14] Though the debate over the suitability of arbitration courts as an avenue for teachers' grievances was now settled in teachers' minds, the matter remained contentious as we shall see. In the federal sphere the ruling in 1929 that teaching was not an industry testifies to the lingering problem of defining the occupation. [15]

Arbitration imposed a centralised or unified form on teachers' unions. The move towards organisations including men, women, primary, high school and technical teachers, assistants and headmasters, is demonstrated in all states

which came to arbitration, or where legislation gave one union the right to represent all teachers as in Western Australia.

In NSW access to arbitration was granted in 1919 after protracted discussion and negotiation between teachers and government. Though there were clear conflicts of interest between teachers at different stages of the educational hierarchy and between urban and rural teachers, these were submerged in the bid to demonstrate that teachers constituted a single industry union. The fight for recognition of particular interests is obvious in the form of organisation which emerged in 1918 as the NSWTF.

Mitchell [16] notes that there were three main parties whose interests had to be negotiated for federation to be accomplished in 1918: the Assistant Teachers' Association; the Headmasters' Association; and the Teachers' Association. Though the Headmasters' Association had a small membership of about one hundred it was viewed with suspicion by the Assistant Teachers Association formed in 1916 with a membership of 1,105 members in 1918. [17] The assistants wanted autonomy to take their particular matters to the relevant authorities, fearing that their interests might not be recognised by a union dominated by headmasters. In the end a compromise was reached where Council decided whether a matter affected more than one association and could, at its discretion, allow an association to act independently. Unity clearly took precedence over autonomy of associations. In the matter of representation on the Council, however, the headmasters were defeated in their bid for equal representation and representation was based on a proportion of membership.

During 1922-25 the right to arbitration for public servants, including teachers, was removed by the Nationalist-Country Party coalition government.

When the incoming Labor government restored the right it became something to be held to tenaciously whatever other forms of organisation the teaching service might aspire to. The return of the Nationalists in 1927 and their continued threat to change the system of arbitration confirmed the NSWTF's staunch support for compulsory arbitration.

Access to arbitration may have kept teachers in NSW united in a single union. Mitchell has labelled it, 'The Cult of Unity.' [18] Attempts to break away have been unsuccessful. However, the fear of loss of access to the industrial courts does not completely explain the absence of breakaways. An attempt in the 1930s shows clearly that other issues within the larger political arena and shifting allegiances must also be studied to understand particular failures. Some assistant teachers led by Paddison, a prominent member of the ALP and President of the Assistant Teachers' Association, Sam Lewis and Clara McNamara, formed the Educational Workers League [19] which was a reaction against the headmasters' domination of the NSWTF particularly the failure of Council to appeal against an award. For a time it looked as if the group would breakaway.

The failure to do so can be partly explained by the conflicts within the Labor Party at that time. J.T. Lang had been Premier from 1925 to 1927 when his social reforms of child endowment, widows' pension and the reintroduction of the forty hour week had endowed him with considerable respect from socialists within and outside the party. On his return to office in 1930 he had refused to pass on the 20 percent wage cut in award wages determined by the Commonwealth Arbitration Court. He rejected the Premier's Plan of the federal Labor government in 1931 and proposed his own plan. Mitchell [20] suggests that Paddison may have written this plan. However, when Lang reintroduced the public service salary reductions he lost the support

of League members. Many including Lewis joined the Communist Party of Australia (CPA).

When Paddison left the League and supported the Lang Plan, this ended the move to a breakaway assistants' union since it would have relied heavily on his position within the NSWTF to attract members and he seems to have been the chief proponent of a breakaway union. Paddison subsequently became a vocal opponent of the League and the breakaway group was thus dissociated from the major political party. It is also possible that by 1932 when many of the League members joined the CPA, breaking away was not a suitable party tactic. The League remained within the NSWTF which reflected the tactics of the CPA, though the League contained socialists both outside and inside the CPA. Though the League formally disbanded in 1937, Mitchell claims that it was through the League that the CPA group in the NSWTF emerged and 'preserved until the late 1960s the delicate claims which bound together the various types of revolutionary Socialists.' [21] The League worked initially through the Assistants' Association which became more influential from 1934 to 1937. By that time many League members were ensconced in the union's hierarchy.

The Secondary Teachers' Association had regularly in the period to 1965 sought to put its own case in the matter of salaries. In 1949 the Secondary Teachers Association requested that the PSB receive a deputation on secondary teachers' salaries. The Board accepted the opinion of the NSWTF that the Association was acting unconstitutionally and refused to hear it. In 1954 the matter of autonomy in negotiating salaries was raised again and a legal opinion on seceding from the NSWTF was obtained by the Association. The opinion was negative but a further opinion in 1957 was more positive. [22]

In 1960 a group of graduate secondary teachers who had formed their own association were refused recognition by the Industrial Commission. The major aim of the group was to obtain a salary margin for secondary teachers and the right to negotiate secondary teachers' salaries. They withdrew their application for registration as a union on legal advice that it would be unsuccessful. [23] However, the South Australian experience shows that access to the courts remained a possibility. After three years the South Australian Industrial Court recognised the breakaway Woman Teachers' Guild in 1940 after an appeal but disallowed its application for costs against the SAPTU. Spaul [24] suggests that the weight of numbers (60% of all woman teachers) forced access to the court and later to the Teachers' Salaries Board. A merger was made in 1951.

Hyams [25] describes the situation of the women's breakaway group as essentially a protest over their underrepresentation on Council and particularly on the Salaries Committee and the indifference of the men to salary anomalies. In 1935 the minimum wage for women teachers was 62.5 percent of the men's wage. When the women proposed a plan for members of the union to be organised in a number of affiliated associations based on differences in rank, sex and/or nature of duties, the men feared that they would lose power based in the country associations (40 from a total of 59 associations). The 1937 Conference was packed by men to oppose the women's proposal. The graduate teachers in NSW could conceivably have tried for recognition as a union. One reason why the graduate teachers backed away from separation could be that during the 1960s their numbers dropped as rising secondary student enrolments forced the department to employ non-graduates in the secondary schools.

Access to arbitration has not been without its adverse side in union terms either. At times it has been a most powerful weapon not only in preventing



breakaway groups but in actually preventing or trying to prevent union action. In 1972 the PSB applied to the Industrial Commission for cancellation of the NSWTF registration as a union. The threat of deregistration continued until November 1973. This incident is discussed further in Chapter Five but it should be noted here that the union came increasingly to view the resort to arbitration by the PSB and the way the Industrial Commission was being used as a form of 'blackmail'. There were previously accusations that the employer was, in the early 1970s, resorting to declaring a dispute instead of proceeding to negotiate with the union.

By the late 1970s the PSB was succeeding in having teachers' salaries cases stopped because teachers were 'talking about' industrial action over working conditions. One member of the union likened the exercises of going to the Industrial Commission to 'entering the lists of a tournament - with local rules in operation that are not published on billboards for public consumption.' Not only did the opponent have extra weapons to fight with but 'the groundsman has turned his end (unions) of the field into a quagmire.' Most importantly, 'the tournament director is seen to be responding to signals emanating from persons sitting in the reserved seats in the grandstand.' There was finally a conspiracy against the union to have long delays between jousts 'with the result that his horse loses condition from eating less and less hay and his attendants' loyalty and support may waiver or else they may become embittered and plot violence and revolution in order to gain satisfaction.' [26]

### **Wages Boards in Victoria.**

From 1896, when legislation was introduced, Victoria had a system of numerous wages boards rather than compulsory arbitration. Though the Teachers' Tribunal is not part of the wages board system, it is modelled on a

wages board. The system requires a brief description. Boards consist of an employer representative, an employee representative and an independent chairman. By 1976 there were 214 separate wages boards in Victoria. [27] The representatives may not in fact come from the employers' organisations or the unions since representatives must be actively engaged in the trade. In spite of this, wages boards stimulated unionism. [28] Moribund unions were often revived by the need to elect a representative in the late 1800s. In later years modification has allowed full-time union officials and employers' representatives to be members of the board alongside those actively engaged in the trade. Boards may, in fact, now contain a minimum of 4 and a maximum of 10 representatives plus the chairman. [29] Though the wages boards were heralded as a means to prevent sweated labour, they also had advantages for the well established employer who could afford to pay the wage set by the board and thus force the small competitor out of business.

In general, the ideology associated with wages boards at their inception contained the notion of the 'fair employer'. Hagan [30] suggests that the alliance between the 'fair employer' and the trade union working behind a tariff wall helps to explain the lack of progress made by the Labor Party once it was established in Victoria and why in 1906 it could seek formal coalition with the Liberal Protection Party. Though the notion of the 'fair employer' was soon dispensed with, especially after the formation of employers' groups and their subsequent alliance with non Labor parties, this heritage may in fact still linger in the way the boards are constituted. The minister appoints the representatives from nominations, though these appointments may be disputed in the Industrial Appeals Court. This court has representatives nominated by the Victorian Chamber of Manufacturers or the Victorian Employers' Federation and by the Trades Hall Council and a County Court Judge as chairperson. Whereas

the meetings of wages boards are closed to the public and informal, in the Industrial Appeals Court hearings are open and operate on an adversary system where parties may be legally represented. The position of the chairperson is notable in a wages board. Since determination is reached by majority vote, the role requires the chairperson to arbitrate in the case of a deadlock by exercising a casting vote in favour of either the employer's last offer or the employees' final demand. [31] The Industrial Appeals Court is not a feature of the Teachers' Tribunal and the chairpersons' role and the employers' role are as we shall see less clear.

The wages boards are a mixture of conciliation and arbitration but the major emphasis appears to be on conciliation. The wages boards are different from the usual arbitration system found in other states in that there is no forced settlement by an independent third party. The final decision must come from the parties themselves and the extent to which the chairperson can arbitrate or make an independent decision is limited by the final position taken by the conflicting parties, i.e. he or she is not in a position to suggest a compromise position. Though it is claimed that in practice there is little difference between the 'determination' of the wages board and the 'award' of the arbitration court, that arbitration tribunals have a conciliation role [32] and wage boards have arbitration roles, [33] the fact remains that the basic principle behind each is quite different. One works on the adversary model, the other on a conciliatory model. Within each of these models there are differing potentials for recognising the power dimensions and basic antagonisms within the employer-employee relationship. The conciliatory model places greater emphasis on consensus of interest which one could attribute to the heritage of the model of employer-employee behind the tariff wall in the 1880s.

Most importantly, within the Victorian industrial relations system, the wages

board may recognise representatives from a single employer, a group of employers or an employers' association. The employee representative may be nominated by an organisation of employees or by a group of more than six individual employees. [34] Since the wages boards form a model for the Teachers' Tribunal it is possible for more than one group to gain recognition before the tribunal. The group does not have to demonstrate complete coverage of a sectional interest or to be covering some section not already represented on the Tribunal. For example, the VSTA with only 30 per cent of secondary teachers had partial recognition from the Teachers' Tribunal from 1950 to 1956. VAT gained recognition in 1979 with 4 per cent of all teachers or 9.5 per cent of all secondary teachers. [35]

### **The Tribunal.**

Until the introduction of the Teachers' Tribunal in 1946, teachers' salaries and conditions were determined by the Public Service Act and required an amendment to introduce changes. From its inception in 1926 the VTU campaigned for the introduction of a teachers' Tribunal. The formation of the union from the various separate organisations which existed may have been in part the result of a plan to gain access to the Federal Arbitration Court. This attempt failed in 1929 when the High Court ruled that teaching was not an industry. [36] The depression years were followed by campaigns to recover salaries but by 1937 the VTU was making stronger efforts to convince members, the public and the government that a teachers' Tribunal should be established to determine salaries and conditions in the teaching service.

A PSB with Governor-in-Council control was set up in 1940 but conflict continued. Tension ran so high in 1943 in a dispute over slow promotion rates

for teachers that strike action was considered. Voting by members in this was close (2,587 to 2,674 where 92 percent voted) but lost in favour of a mass rally at Parliament House. [37] Negotiations in 1944 were unsuccessful as the government proposed a tribunal of three with one teacher representative but again with decisions subject to Governor-in-Council control. The Tribunal would not have been separated from parliamentary control in this plan.

The Labor Party attempted to win teacher support by offering a teacher Tribunal in its platform. In the state election of 1945 the VTU campaigned for sympathetic Liberal and Independent candidates and Labor candidates. The Labor Party honoured its promise to establish an independent Tribunal with teacher representation and power to make final decisions on salaries and conditions when it came to office in 1945. Teachers were given credit for the change of Government by both winners and losers. [38]

One other feature of the Victorian system further complicates the division of powers. In 1883 a Committee of Classifiers was established. This consisted of the Inspector General of Education, head teachers of large schools and a government nominee. This committee determined the conditions of appointment of student teachers in-training, pupil teachers and sewing mistresses. It compiled a classified roll of teachers twice a year. [39] After changes in teacher training and the growth of the number and complexity of schools, its role became essentially the classifying, appointing and promoting of teachers. A similar committee was established for the secondary division in 1925 and for the technical division in 1946.

From 1946 the government nominee on the three Committees became the Chairman (formerly the chief inspector's role) and the field of election for the teacher representative was enlarged. The practice was, however, to make the

chairman of the Teachers' Tribunal the Governor in Council nominee to chair the three Committees of Classifiers (Primary, Secondary, Tertiary). Badcock describes the system as 'appealing from Caesar unto Caesar' when appeals against the decisions of the classifiers came before the Teachers' Tribunal after 1946. [40] This practice continued until 1967. The change to using the government nominee as chairperson shifted the balance of power from the department to the government.

### **Access to the Tribunal.**

When many male teachers broke away from the VTU in 1948 to form the Victorian Secondary Masters Professional Association, the Tribunal failed to recognise the Association. This situation continued in 1953 when the Association became the VSTA after women teachers were admitted, though partial recognition was given from 1950 to 1955. Full recognition was not granted until 1965, some seventeen years after establishment. [41] This did not mean representation, however, for there was no provision for separate divisions at that time.

Though the Tribunal was extremely slow to recognise the VSTA, it did have this power since it was modelled on a wages board system which could recognise more than one organisation. By not recognising the VSTA the government kept from Tribunal discussions many of the most vocal critics of the teaching service. Since the VTU still retained as members many secondary teachers, the government made use of an antagonism within the teachers' organisations to give representation to the the less militant organisation. The Tribunal, as constituted, allowed representation of only one teacher. The primary division had the numbers to ensure a place on the Tribunal.

After 1965, the VSTA members resorted to stoppages to bring about divisional

representation and separate tribunals. [42] The VSTA campaigned for a teachers' representative to be elected from each division, primary, secondary and technical. These representatives were to sit on the Teachers' Tribunal as the sole representatives of teachers in matters which affected the division which elected them. The rights of teachers' organisations to appear before the Tribunal were also to be defined to overcome the numerical strength of the VTU endorsed representative. [43]

It should be noted that the removal of partial recognition for the VSTA in 1955 coincides with the change of government in Victoria and the beginning of the long reign of Sir Henry Bolte. The announcement, without notice, in December 1955 that the Tribunal had amended the Teaching Service Act so that only one organisation could make representation in salaries' claims was a swift indication that critics of the system, especially clever ones, would not be tolerated. The VSTA had just challenged a ruling by the Tribunal on the grounds that it was illegal. The Minister of Education remained committed to the view that separate (divisional) Tribunals for salaries would increase conflicts. The only area in which the government and the department appeared willing to give ground was in the area of appeals.

In 1965 the VTU proposed four separate Tribunals (Primary, Secondary, Technical and Professional Officers). It was not prepared to strike for Tribunal reform.[44] After a council decision to change this plan because of government rejection there was opposition from the Technical Men's Branch and the High Schools' Branch and many country branches. [45] There was heated discussion over whether Council could change the previous decision of Conference without referring the matter back to the branches. [46] Even the 'revised' plan for Tribunal reform was rejected by the government. It proposed, in effect, separate tribunals for appeals, promotions and qualifications but not salaries

which was the area the minister had stated as his main objection in reform proposals. Since the VTU had secondary members, the question of VSTA access to the minister remained a problem. Yet, the High Schools' Branch and the Technical Men's and Women's Branches seemed to have favoured a more united front with the VSTA on questions of Tribunal reform. [47] Opposition to this came from the executive [48] and from G. Grose representing Technical Principals [49] and J. Bold representing Head Teachers. [50]

In these negotiations, the VTU and the VSTA were not able to come to common policy. As we have seen the VTU itself had difficulty with factions within its own organisation. The VSTA faced opposition not only from the government and the department but also from the VTU which continually tried to find a position acceptable to the minister but without consultation with the VSTA. [51]

After the breakaway of the technical teachers in 1967 the VSTA had an ally in its campaign for reform. It is important to note also, that with the rapid growth in post-primary numbers, teachers had more political clout generally. The continued push for more autonomy of the Technical Branch within the VTU was certainly associated with the question of Tribunal reform. [52] The continued action by the VSTA and the breakaway of the technical teachers to form the TTAV bore fruit when, after a change of minister, the new incumbent, Thompson, brought in a reconstituted Tribunal in 1968. Thompson was a former high school teacher.

The Teaching Service Act was amended in 1968 to allow the Tribunal to have five members; a chairman, a government representative, a primary teacher representative, a secondary teacher representative and a technical teacher representative. The appropriate teacher representative met with the chairman



and government representative on any deliberation. In general matters the Tribunal elected a representative to speak for teachers.

The amendment was closer to the proposals put forward by the VSTA than the 1965 proposals by the VTU but the main gain by the VSTA was access to information on Tribunal deliberations. The government still had control of the Tribunal by its power to appoint both its representative and the chairman. The government would not accede to the VSTA proposal of a chairman acceptable to both parties. The VSTA accepted the changes because members were worn out after fighting for 20 years against both the government and the VTU. The issue had gone 'rather stale' since the last strike in support of VSTA policy in April 1966. [53]

With access to the Tribunal given to the three unions the government's tactic of refusing entry to those groups potentially most critical was removed. Why did the government give in? What forced its hand? First, we could note that the time corresponds to a change in the Minister for Education. The previous minister, Bloomfield, had been criticised by his own party for his handling of his portfolio. Second, by giving in at that moment when the VSTA was winded, the concession was not so great. The government still had the upper hand in the appointment of the chairperson.

I wish now to look at three particular tactics used by the government in the operation of the Tribunal, the 'silent discussion' tactic, the tactic of division and corporate management.

#### **Government response 1: The silent discussion.**

The procedure of the Tribunal came under attack from all three unions in the early 1970s. The established practices were as follows. First the Union

notified the Tribunal of a log of claims. The Tribunal decided whether or not to hear the union. If it agreed to hear the claims, it heard the submissions from the union representatives only. The employer's view was not revealed. A decision was handed down. The union then notified the Tribunal of another log of claims to correct any omissions in the decision and the whole procedure started again!

The chief problem which the unions saw in the Tribunal was the government's refusal to put its case to the Tribunal. This should in theory have come from the government representative. It is clear from Minister Field's speech in 1946 when introducing the legislation that this was the original intention. [54] The representatives seem to have favoured a position of 'independence', a view upheld by the Liberal Minister, Thompson. [55] Duncan, the government representative in 1972, described his role as Government 'member', not representative. [56] Neither the department nor the government presented a direct submission. The VSTA proposed that the submission of both the employer and employee view could, if submitted, have formed the basis for discussions in the Tribunal. Thompson, the Minister, was unsympathetic to this proposal and claimed that the Tribunal was independent. Both the chairman and the government representative had access to and sought information on government's proposed expenditure and departmental decisions which effected their decisions. This access was denied to the teacher representatives.

The oddity of the government's refusal to put its view is clearly seen in the area of staffing. This was a departmental responsibility but submissions by the department were not openly made. When the Director of Technical Education did present a case the Government Representative, Baker, walked out in protest. This was presumably because it was his job as government representative to put the case yet he would not put it. [57] Who should put

the government case? Baker's view was also that he was the government 'member' not its representative. [58]

The VSTA summed up the 'Not me' charade thus: 'Teacher representatives have walked out because no one has put it. Baker (Government representative) walked out when the Director of Technical Education came along and put it. The past Director of Secondary Education has stated it would be embarrassing to the Tribunal to put it. The Government representative says he won't put it because he is independent.' [59] The choice of government representative in this case needs to be further examined to show the minister's strategy.

The appointment of J.G. Baker as government representative on the Secondary and Technical Tribunal was interpreted as a deliberate move by the minister to prevent negotiations between technical and secondary teacher members and government members. There was a history of antagonism between Baker and the TTAV and the VSTA. [60] Baker was a former president of the VTU who was hostile to the formation of the TTAV (and a defeated candidate for the position of secondary teachers representative in 1971). He maintained the line of complete independence from government direction. The VSTA interpreted this plea of 'independence as an attempt by the government to disassociate itself from its own actions.' [61]

The minister's response to criticism of the Tribunal and to the boycotts by the post-primary teacher representatives, Desally and Lawson, in 1970 (which resulted in meetings lapsing for lack of a quorum) was to introduce legislation giving the chairman powers to make decisions alone. [62] This was dubbed the 'unibunal legislation' by the VSTA. [63] It meant that at the withdrawal of the government representative the chairman could then exclude teachers representatives by declaring lack of a quorum and making decisions on his

own.

Staff at Melbourne High School protested this legislation and supported VSTA Tribunal policy by staging a prolonged strike at the start of 1971. The Minister countered by ordering the department to cease collecting union subscriptions for the VSTA. He later introduced regulations which penalised teachers who took strike action by forfeiture of one year of long service leave entitlement or four years for more than one offence. [64] He obviously hoped to curb the mounting action for Tribunal reform. His action, however, only gave teachers another reason to protest. When thousands of secondary and technical teachers defied the regulations the minister withdrew them and set up an enquiry into the Tribunal, in 1971 (The Southwell Inquiry), in an effort to ease the situation. [65]

The VSTA refused to co-operate in the Southwell Inquiry claiming that its terms of reference were predictable since it was an official enquiry decided by the government and there was no indication of the status of its findings. The TTAV chose to attend the enquiry so that 'no recommendation could be made using the absence of the TTAV view as an excuse.' [66]

The enquiry was critical of the VSTA but its findings were also highly critical of the government's policy of keeping secret its view on matters before the Tribunal. It recommended that the word 'representative' be deleted from the Act and that the views of the government and the department be put to the Tribunal as a whole by the Personnel Branch of the Department. Failing such presentation of views, the report recommended that the government advise its member 'who should thus become a true representative.' [67] The minister did not implement any of the recommendations. The VSTA predictions were thus vindicated.

## Government response 2: The tactic of division.

The fragmentation of teachers' organisations in Victoria is usually recognised as one of the causes of lower membership rates for teachers in that state (some twenty percent lower than in NSW). [68] We have seen earlier that fragmentation is the result of dissatisfied groups within the union. These groups have sought more action on particular issues. This is true for the secondary teachers who demanded a salary margin in 1948. Recognition from the Tribunal was slow. The TTAV fared somewhat better than the VSTA. By the 1970s, however, the government was clearly playing a 'divide and conquer' tactic which went beyond recognising only one group, the VTU, and leaving dissidents without a voice on the Tribunal. Having been forced to recognise the VSTA and the TTAV, it now began to recognise more conservative groups who voiced dissatisfaction with union (particularly the militant VSTA) action.

In 1973 the Victorian High School Principals' Association was recognised by the Tribunal. This association had been in existence since 1948. In 1976 the Victorian Association of Teachers (VAT, later the Victorian Teachers' Federation, VTF) was formed. Both of these organisations gained recognition by the Tribunal with an ease which has been a continued source of bitterness on the part of the three major organisations. The extremely conservative policy of VAT is thought to have endeared it to the Liberal government. It has supported the government's disciplinary measures taken over militant teacher action. [69]

By 1971 the fight for Tribunal reform had, however, brought the two post-secondary unions together. They issued joint policy on the Tribunal in which they required the government member of the Tribunal to unequivocally represent the government's case. The chairperson was to be acceptable to both

sides, retain independence, and refrain from voicing a view until both parties had stated their views and attempted to come to an agreement. [70] The emphasis was on equal partnership between the union and the employer on the Tribunal. This was a final attempt by these unions to get proper negotiation within the Tribunal.

By 1974 the VSTA had changed its policy on the way the Tribunal should function. Instead of negotiations proceeding within the Tribunal it now pressed for negotiations to take place with the department before putting the matter to the Tribunal. [71]

In 1975 the VTU joined the post-primary unions in a joint campaign to secure for teachers the right to deal directly with the Minister of Education. [72] The VTU was now firmly backing VSTA policy which meant that the government could not play these two unions off against each other, a useful ploy in previous years. [73] The Tribunal was to use its arbitration function only when there was disagreement between the government/department and the unions. The Tribunal would ratify agreements. [74] Unity between the three unions was now broken by the TTAV. A special conference in June adopted a policy of abolition of the Tribunal. [75] The VSTA and the VTU wanted the Tribunal to remain. They proposed that all union claims be first negotiated with the department or minister and each agreement then be ratified by a Tribunal. The TTAV rejected even this power to ratify. The pressure upon the government was weakened by this breakdown of unity and the two separate approaches to the Minister of Education.

When the VSTA and VTU sought negotiations with the department in 1975, the Director General, Dr Shear's response was that this was impossible because the department did not have the power to make decisions. For negotiations to

proceed 'the Department will need to assume some of the powers presently held by the Tribunal and the Committee of Classifiers.' [76] The President of the VSTA during the period 1971-5 saw the lack of clarity in the Director General's powers as working in the government interest. It was

'a smart move because it meant that after the VSTA had compromised in order to reach an agreement with the Director General, it was found that there had to be further referral to the faceless operators in the corridors of power, the Minister, the Committee of Classifiers, the Director of Secondary Education, etc., who might, and did, demand further change'. [77]

The government's recognition of conservative teachers' organisations presented a range of views, any one of which it could claim to be responding to. Similarly, the confusion of powers in the education structure left teachers' organisations unable to find the appropriate body to approach. This problem was widened by the government's secrecy discussed earlier. The outcome was often a form of shadow boxing by the organisations. The failure of VSTA/VTU compromise left them more willing to join the TTAV in abandoning the Tribunal and searching for new machinery and procedures for negotiations.

The unions saw their only hope in a unified policy. As a former VSTA president said in 1977, unity was their main 'pressure-point on government.' [78] In mid 1976 a joint working party set out to find acceptable policy for a combined onslaught. They made a joint statement of policy for direct negotiations in late 1977. Its most essential component was, of course, that both the employer and employee have the power to enter into agreements.

The unions were tired of shadow boxing with the sources of power on the Teachers' Tribunal. The agreements were to be ratified so that they were legally binding. No chance would be left for a higher authority to enter the arena suddenly and change the decision. The policy also called for 'an agreed process of grievance settlement where an agreement between the employer and

employee is allegedly being breached.' However, the unions wanted arbitration to be voluntary and matters to be referred only when agreed upon by both parties, 'with arbitrators being agreed upon annually.' [79] It may be that the Victorians had been watching the use being made of arbitration by the employer in NSW where as earlier mentioned resort to arbitration had become an employer tactic.

### **Government response 3: Corporate management.**

1979 marked the start of a whirlwind of activity in the education area by a new Minister, A. J. Hunt, appointed in May. Early December saw a ministerial statement on aims and objectives in education. This was quickly followed by a 'Green Paper' on the Strategies and structures for education in Victoria, in May 1980.[80] A flurry of submissions, Committees (Organisations Reference Group) and surveys led to a 'White Paper' [81] at the end of the year. In April 1981 the Management Consultants P.A. Australia, were called in to design the 'reorganisation' and 'decentralisation' of education in Victoria in 'corporate management' style. [82] The 'key themes' of the White Paper were: 'devolution and decentralisation of power and responsibility, where appropriate, to local and regional units; increased participation by parents, teachers, the community and principals in education governance at all levels; improved consultation; economy and efficiency in management; effective coordination of functions and policies; and appropriate mechanisms for internal and external reviews of schools.' [83] Why did these take place at this time?

First, the relationship between the VSTA and the secondary division was often strained throughout the 1970s but towards the end of the decade it reached crisis point, particularly, over the issue of inspection. For all the divisions, primary, secondary, technical, the Tribunal was unworkable. There



was no mechanism to deal with the industrial issues, indeed the very mechanism which had that role in theory was itself the cause of industrial dispute. Second, the personal style of the new minister was what Spauld describes as 'reformist zeal'. [84] Third, though one of the central 'themes' of the 'Green Paper' and the 'White Paper' is devolution of power and responsibility to the region and the school, school responsibility for curriculum and programs is tempered by great emphasis on core curriculum [85] and school reviews i.e. assessment of the schools' ability to meet their 'stated objectives' and 'system-wide objectives' [86] There is an effort to establish the legitimate role of the central bureaucracy which had been challenged in the development of school-based curriculum and challenged in struggles over inspection of both schools and teachers. The effort included a clarification of who was the employer and the employer's functions. With much drawing of figures to show the flow of power, the P.A. Associates Report proposed a Victorian Education Council which advised the minister, Regional Education Councils which advised the regional director and school councils which advised the principals. Bessant assesses the minister's primary aim as getting rid of the three teaching divisions (primary, secondary and technical), each of which had become a little empire with much in-fighting and duplication of services. This would have centralised power considerably. [87]

At the same time the minister was searching for a new system of industrial relations. The 'Green Paper' suggested that the ambiguity between the functions of the department and the Tribunal was to be solved by giving the department 'the normal functions of an employer including initial responsibility for appointments, placements, and conditions of work. This implies changes in the powers and functions of the Teachers Tribunal and the Committee of Classifiers.' [88] The latter Committee was a three member body (one teacher

representative) in each division chiefly responsible for promotions.

The minister proposed, in 1980, that a Victorian Teaching Service Conciliation and Arbitration Committee (VTSCAC) should be based on the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission with members appointed by the Governor in Council. If no agreement was reached by the negotiating parties, the department (employer) and the unions, either party could apply to the Commission for the matter to be arbitrated in public proceedings. Appeals could be lodged against an award, order or decision by the Commission by either party. Finally, the minister could 'on behalf of the State of Victoria, request the Commission to review the award, order or decision.' [89]

A comparison of the unions' and the minister's proposals shows that the teachers' wish to have some say in the composition of the arbitration panel was not met by the minister's proposal. As well either party could resort to arbitration. On the question of appeals, the minister's proposal also seemed to offer the right of intervention by the minister.

Both proposals were moving towards a more adversary model where the employer was clearly identified and the arbitration function carried out by a separate body. Spaul notes the minister's determination to establish a new system of industrial relations by the end of 1981 'before he is subjected to backbencher or Cabinet criticism, and before the next state elections.' [90] He was not successful. A change of government in 1982 halted the Liberal Government's plans.

What was clear in the late 1970s to the early 1980s was that the question of wages and conditions was the key to movement toward a federation of the major unions. Given the economic climate with cut-backs in the public sector and little interest in education as a major issue by the Liberals the question of

strength in unity is understandable. What is unclear is whether the pressures on Victoria to produce a united front would have resulted in a federated body without the push from the new system of arbitration. On the other hand, it is clear that although the Victorian unions were presenting a united front in presentation of their case, they were not suggesting a highly centralised wages and conditions body with union participation. They had learned that participation on these terms can be an equivocation. In the proposals for direct negotiations each union would address the source of power in education, i.e. the employer would be able to make a decision on the matter raised.

What the Victorian unions had struck in the process of attempting direct negotiations was the problem of identifying the employer who had the ultimate power. With whom could they negotiate? Could powers be given to the Department of Education to allow it to negotiate? As state employees were they always to experience the minister's intervention as the 'sword of Damocles?' Perhaps there was an inevitable truth in G. S. Beeby's statement in 1908 that 'the proper wages board for public servants is the parliament itself.'

[91]

If Victoria was moving away from notions of representative bodies in the area of wages and conditions, the NSW union was, in 1980, seeing the culmination of its efforts to be part of a central body which would be the employer of teachers. The union had since its formation in 1918 been battling with the question of who should be the employer?'

#### **Industrial issues and educational policy in NSW.**

Attempts in NSW to have union participation in education were not confined

to matters of wages and conditions. The contention of the NSWTF has always been that it is impossible to hold separate the question of wages and conditions and the question of education policy. As early as 1905 the forerunner of the NSWTF was suggesting the removal of the Education Department from the control of the PSB. The immediate cause was an announcement of a regrading system for teachers which would, when implemented, reduce the salaries of some teachers. The Association claimed that 'the PSB - constituted as it is - is not a competent body to have the management of the teaching service.' The teaching service, it continued, should be 'placed under the entire control of a body of educationalists.' [92]

The reasons given by the Association for its opposition to control by the PSB are of interest because they call upon arguments removed from the immediate problem of wage struggle. Two separate but related assumptions can be found. First, the difficulty in separating the function of being employer and financial controller from the function of producing and implementing educational policy, the latter not being a duty of the board. Second, that there was a specialised body of knowledge crucial to the control of education, held by a particular group of people, i.e. educationalists, who, by implication, should control the education system. It should be noted, however, that teachers were not, at this time, calling directly on any notion of the autonomy of professionals or the right of workers to participate in decisions made about their employment.

Even while access to arbitration was being threatened during the 1920s the question of 'Joint Control' by employees and employers based on the reconstruction policy in Britain was being debated. [93] Generally, this Committee of Joint Control was envisaged as concerned with management of staff. However, it is clear from the debate during the 1919 Annual

Conference, that the Committee would also determine syllabuses and methods in schools. [94] Joint control was hailed as superior to arbitration. This debate continued until 1927 but seems to have lost momentum because of the continued struggle against the Nationalist government threats to arbitration and proposals for control by a board without NSWTF representation.

During the late 1930s there had been campaigns for salary restoration, inspectorial reform and reclassification of schools and the provision of a teachers' certificate. An 'extraneous Duties Policy' and a Code of Ethics adopted at 1936 Conference [95] highlight the notions of professionalism of the period. All of these campaigns were bids for greater control in the classroom. In 1942 the call for a change in the control of education appeared again after the Labor minister's proposals to abolish inspection for the duration of the war were opposed by the PSB, the department and the inspectors. In the cry for an Education Commission at this time, the union stressed union representation thus voicing its frustration at the difficulty in making changes on the periphery (the classroom) while lacking control at the centre. The situation also shows the diversity and power of other interested groups. Though final power lay with the minister and, teachers must have presented a powerful lobby, the departmental officers, the PSB and the inspectors were more persuasive on the issue of inspection.

Dr Harold Wyndham became Director General of Education in 1952. His immediate task was to survey and recommend changes in secondary education. In this, he involved the NSWTF quite extensively. Its proposals for restructure adopted at the 1944 Conference were very similar to the Wyndham Report published in 1957. [96] He seems also to have encouraged the NSWTF's belief in the PSB as 'the enemy' who was preventing full implementation of educational innovations by holding back resources. The PSB seemed almost willing to set

itself up as the bête noir of the union. [97] The Board had also in 1958 and 1962 found two teachers guilty of offences against pupils after the charges had been dropped by the courts. The first of these was Lewis, President of the union. [98] It made provocative statements about its power relationship with the department and teachers in general.[99] However, the Labor government, in office from 1941 to 1965, continually refused to yield to pressure from the union to establish an education commission.

The Liberal-Country Party coalition government came to office in 1965 after offering the incentive of an education commission. The NSWTF had actively campaigned against the Labor government, although the Liberal Party's proposed commission was only for control of staff, not formulation and administration of policy as resolved by union's 1961 Annual Conference. [100]

In 1967, setting up a commission turned into 'an enquiry to report on the establishing of such a commission.' [101] The most striking thing about this enquiry (the Rydge Enquiry) was the fact that its negative finding was foreshadowed in Premier Askin's press statement announcing its establishment. He positively endorsed changes already in motion. In the two years since the Coalition had come to power, the holes in the system which gave the NSWTF arguments in favour of a commission had been carefully plugged without making major changes in the power relations. There were 'experts' dealing with education and representation of teachers had been increased on committees, boards, councils and trusts associated with the Ministry of Education and Science. The government was also proposing to establish a special Public Service Tribunal which would give Public Servants the right of appeal on salaries and conditions presently excluded from the jurisdiction of existing tribunals. The Premier was quick to allay fears that a commission would have control over educational policy. This was a matter for the minister acting on

advice from the heads of his department. Yet in interpreting the terms of reference it is clear that the panel had difficulty trying to hold separate educational policy from employment conditions, salaries, staff categories, classifications, qualifications, promotions, etc. [102]

In Wyndham's submission to the enquiry his main objections were that by controlling employment the commission would 'by force of circumstances' come to 'invade the field of educational administration', and that teachers did not have 'an exclusive interest' in 'the provision and ordering of educational services', the community also had an interest. [103]

The union's submission to the Rydge Enquiry contained a record of its grievances with the PSB and a demonstration that the Board 'has immense powers over teachers and therefore over public education'. [104] Its main points were a rehash of those old favourites that 'educationalists should formulate and administer educational policy; that 'dual control hampers educational progress' and that 'the education service is too big for part time control.' [105] The NSWTF proposed that the commission be responsible to the minister; the Departments of Education and Technical Education not to be superseded but all matters now under the control of the PSB be transferred to the commission. The commission was to have five members - two NSWTF representatives, two government appointees, an acceptable chairman. [106]

This sounds fairly straightforward until the functions of the commission are clearly spelt out as employment conditions 'as well as the organisation of public school education'. The place of the departments in such an arrangement was clearly not well considered but there was no hesitation in discouraging all other interested bodies for the NSWTF stated that if the functions of the commission were to include control of employment conditions as well as public school

education, 'there can be no place on such a Commission for representative bodies other than of public school teachers and of the government.' [107] It was prepared to concede only that an advisory body of representatives of parents' organisations, trade unions and any other appropriate bodies could be set up in conjunction with the commission. The inclusion of this proposal for a separate advisory body was perhaps an acknowledgment of the Labor party's attempts to harness parent support in policies it was formulating at this time.

What came out of the Rydge Report? Teachers were removed from the jurisdiction of the Public Service Act by the passing of the Teaching Service Act of 1970. This Act gave the director general some of the powers previously held by the Board which still remained responsible for salaries and conditions. [108] The director general appeared then to make the most gains in the reshuffle of power. An Education Advisory Commission was established. This was to have parent and teacher members. The union refused to participate in this advisory commission because of its limited role.

### **Community participation.**

The year 1966 marked the start of a serious search for an education policy in the Labor Party at both state and federal levels. The policy which had evolved by the mid 1970s was heavily concerned with community involvement, and proposed to inquire into 'the most appropriate manner in which parents, teachers and the community can participate in the governance and organisation of the school.' [109] The NSW policy included a suggested administrative structure for a commission which was responsible to the minister but independent of the PSB. An employing authority from within the commission of two departmental officers, two NSWTF representatives and an independent chairman was included. The commission proper, however, was to have nine



members, three NSWTF representatives, two parent group representatives, the two directors of education, a 'continuing' education representative and two community members. Its functions included both the employment of staff in schools and formulating educational policy.

Where did this policy come from? Though the Australian Labor Party has a tradition of supporting ideas about worker and community participation, these were not particularly obvious in its education rhetoric. Bennett argues that the Australian Labor movement lacked interest in education in the first half of the twentieth century. He suggests two reasons for the low priority accorded to education before the 1960s. First, Labor 'lacked a significant participation by middle class intellectuals' and second 'a very large proportion of its (the Labor Party's) membership and electoral support, and more than half its leadership, were Catholics.' [110] Since most of these people sent their children to religious schools they probably had 'no direct personal interest in the schools for which governments were responsible.' [111] By the 1960s however, there was an active demand for more and better education in both Catholic and government schools by the population. For the Labor Party, especially at the federal level, it was clear that the electoral platform must include education policy for electoral purposes. Bennett comments that 'the mid 1960s represented the highpoint in faith in education' to establish an 'equal society, maintain economic growth and promote national prosperity...' [112] At the same time, for sections of the middle class, the question of 'better education' led to a desire to actively participate in the decision making in schools. The Report of the Interim Committee of the Schools Commission, established by the federal Labor government when it came to office in 1972, supported some participation of both teachers and parents in decision making in schools. [113]

When the Labor Party came to office in New South Wales, it announced in

August 1976 the formation of a Working Party to draw up recommendations for the establishment of an Education Commission. Professor J.S. Hagan, a member of the ALP Policy Committee was appointed chairman. He was also a member of the NSWTF. The working party consisted of three NSWTF representatives, two parent organisation representatives, the Director General of Education and the Director of Technical and Further Education.

### **The development of NSWTF policy.**

Though there was a continual cry from the NSWTF to be removed from the control of the PSB, it could not be seen as the initiator of radical restructuring. Until 1976 the NSWTF did not have detailed policy on the functions and powers of the commission. A resolution passed at 1973 Annual Conference merely added a demand for the power of recall of representatives to the confused demands in the submission to the Rydge Enquiry. [114]

At the 1974 Annual Conference, members were still recovering from the attempt by the Minister, Willis, to introduce school councils, (which will be discussed further in Chapter Five). The evidence indicates that this was entirely a government initiative and, though it embraced the prevailing rhetoric of 'community involvement' was singularly ill timed. The NSWTF was already fighting an application for deregistration of the union and a discontinuance of deduction of fees at source, (discussed in Chapter Four). It saw the school councils proposal as a deliberate attack.

The effect of the threat of school councils was to send the NSWTF into a flurry of rhetoric about 'professionalism'. The preamble to 1974 Conference resolutions on the education commission contained an eight point list of professional rights and entitlements, the main point being that teachers were experts and should not be subject to the decisions of any 'non-professional'

body. At the same time there was an increased effort in trying to find a position for parents acceptable to the organisation. [115] NSWTF viewed the school council proposal as an attempt by the government to use parental involvement as a cover for greater control over teachers. It feared a repeat of this tactic. It was also conscious of the fact that a united front by the parent groups and the NSWTF was successful in defeating the government proposals for school councils.

Although 1974 union policy on control of education still called for a five member commission, an independent Education Council containing parent representatives to 'decide broad aims and objectives of curricula' was recommended. These aims would be implemented by the commission. As a response to the cooling relations between the department and the NSWTF because of the former's involvement in the school council affair, the department was to become 'the servants of the Education Commission.' [116]

By July 1976 the NSWTF Ad Hoc Education Commission Committee was searching for a compromise between NSWTF policy and Labor policy. It identified the positions of the Higher Education Board, ancillary staff and the Public Service Association and parents as areas which were to be clarified in its policy. Yet it appears to have underestimated the powers of all except the parents. A position paper [117] set out three options open to the union in its policy concerning the role of parents, and the consequences of each. Parents could remain with no power, have an advisory role, or be included in the power structure. The first two options, it was argued, would not be acceptable to parents and would force them to seek real power at the school level and make them vulnerable to manipulation by the Liberal/Country party opposition. The third option, though giving them a taste of power which was viewed as dangerous, might keep them out of schools. By October 1976 NSWTF had

accepted the inclusion of parent group representatives because it was ALP policy. [118]

The inclusion of departmental directors was another problem. It was seen as logical only if the commission was an 'extra' grafted onto the present structure. The NSWTF view of the role of the employing authority included not only the powers held by the PSB but also by the Director General of Education under the Teaching Service Act, 1970. [119]

The emerging policy stated that the commission was to be the sole controlling body of all public education, responsible only to the minister. It should control CAEs and teacher education in universities. Statutory Boards would become standing committees and the departments would become independent bureaux headed by an executive officer appointed by the commission. Clerical staff were to be controlled by the commission which would have nine full time members (but no clerical representative), viz, chairperson, two government appointees, two elected by parent organisations and four elected by the union (primary, secondary, TAFE and advanced). The employing authority drawn from the commission was the old five person model. [120]

By 1978, before the final report of the Working Party became public, NSWTF was campaigning jointly with the two parent organisations for the establishment of the education commission. A pamphlet stressed the 'contemporary developments in community involvement' and 'industrial democracy'. [121] By contrast the union submission to the Rydge Panel of Enquiry in 1967 had emphasised the need for efficiency and the value of experts in education. [122]

Perhaps the best gauge of the ideology of the 1970s is a glance at the selected bibliographies included in the Second and Final Reports of the Working Party. One contains many publications on 'employee participation' or 'industrial democracy', [123] the other is concerned with community involvement in schools. [124] The Labour Party of NSW had earlier (1975) made a policy statement favouring worker participation and the Minister for Labour and Industry had set up an enquiry into that subject. [125]

#### **The working party and interested parties.**

The first Interim Report of the Working Party was presented on June 30, 1976. The major part of it deals with the case for an employing authority which was separate but responsible to the commission. With precognition the report stated

The Working Party feels that this division is necessary to prevent the Commission's other functions from being swamped by preoccupation with personnel management and industrial matters. Moreover, this preoccupation would force the Commission to rely heavily on permanent officials, and this in turn would restrict its capacity to deal with general policy in a broad perspective as a result of collegiate decisions.[126]

There is no separate authority recommended in the two later reports or in the 1980 Act. Though various reasons are given in the Second Report for this change, [127] it is clear that an employing authority, especially as envisaged by the union, would have threatened the considerable powers held by the Directors General of Education and of TAFE. Under the 1980 Act, they are responsible to the minister but must consult with the commission before exercising their management functions.[128]

Three other educational groups quickly identified themselves as concerned with the possible impact of a commission on their present degree of autonomy:

the universities and colleges of advanced education; the non-government schools, and the Department of Technical and Further Education (TAFE). The unsuccessful attempt by the TAFE director and senior officers to obtain a separate TAFE commission is a subject worthy of detailed study at another time. However, the impact of the lobbying of non-government schools' groups on the recommendations of the final report as seen through the statutory bodies which controlled curriculum,[129] was quite considerable. Pressure from this sector could account for the recommendation in the Final Report (and the 1980 Act) that the Secondary School Board and the Board of Senior School Studies remain as statutory boards [130] since this sector is represented on the study boards. What amounts to a Bill of Rights for the non-government sector of education is also contained in the 1980 Act. [131]

The difference in the composition of the commission recommended by the Working Party and that set out in the 1980 Act further demonstrate the pressure from interested groups. Though the second Interim Report suggested that the Higher Education Board (tertiary education) be responsible to the commission, [132] the Final Report recommended that the Board be required to consult with the commission [133] and the 1980 Act provides for a member of the Higher Education Board (HEB) on the Education Commission. [134] Although there is little evidence of vice chancellors or college principals previously embracing the Board as a guardian of their autonomy, fearing that the commission would take some of their powers, they argued and lobbied for the independence of the HEB. [135] The Commission is also larger than that recommended by the final report. The two extra members were government appointments so it is assumed that there was fear for the government's 'minority' position on the commission by Labor 'numbers men'.

Two other differences between the recommendations of the Final Report and

the 1980 Act demonstrate more interested parties in the question of control of education with which teachers must come to terms. The dominant faction of the Public Service Association was able to impress the Premier with its arguments against the recommendation that administrative and clerical staff should come under the control of the commission. [136] Finally, though the recommendations seem to envisage the demise of the Ministry of Education created in 1969, it still remains. [137]

The NSWTF in its development of policy on the control of education, is best seen as responding to pressures from governments, other bureaucracies or interest groups rather than initiating action. First, the cry for a commission was a response to an immediate problem teachers were encountering in their dealings with those who had control of education decision making. Second, the policy constructed by the union on the composition and function of the commission was a response to the pressures from various contending interest groups and more generally from the prevailing ideology which legitimated the kinds of arguments which could be used at that particular time. Sometimes the union come close to serious discussion of the nature of education in its argument for an education commission, particularly in the early years of the NSWTF's existence, immediately after World War I. On those occasions the union seems to have been forced back into the narrower issue of defending teachers' working conditions within the prevailing system - often defending gains it had won previously for members, e.g. access to arbitration or a 'degree of freedom' in the classroom brought about by improved resources.

The best example of this 'retreat' is to jump to the end of the story, to the relationship between the NSWTF and the Education Commission set up in 1980. The NSWTF was preoccupied with the Education Commission's function as employer. This is despite the fact that the Commission has a policy function.

Why did the union retreat into concern with employment in its dealings with the Commission? A simple answer may be that it recognised the powerlessness of the Commission. Recent budget cuts to education and proposals to restructure secondary education which appear to have little input from that body certainly fuel this impression. But such an answer merely describes the present situation and it is necessary to unravel how the Commission is made powerless and the part the NSWTF plays in keeping it so.

Briefly, the commission is the employer of teachers. There is no separate employing authority from within the commission. The members are not generally experienced in industrial relations. Except for the chairman they are part time members (the teachers are de facto full time members) and its support staff is very small. For these reasons the industrial matters were not handled quickly and smoothly, especially in its first year of operation. This concentrated attention in this area and detracted and/or distracted from any potential the Commission may have as a policy maker if it had more active support from the NSWTF.

It may be more than just ironic that the only clear parts of the NSWTF policy on control of education prior to 1976, (besides responsibility to the minister and continued access to the industrial courts), are those matters for which it is still pressing. These are: direct union representation; a five member employing authority; full time members on the commission; no Directors of Education Departments as commissioners. The representatives are 'teacher representatives' not NSWTF representatives.

The NSWTF took some time to decide to participate in the Education Commission as set out in the 1980 Act. Perhaps the final blow to its hopes of some real control in the education system of New South Wales, (after what was



seen as a huge series of compromises to come in line with ALP policy), was that Hagan was not appointed as chairman of the Commission. Both parent and teacher groups admit to considerable shock at the passing over of the obvious candidate after they had signalled their readiness to participate. The powers of the commission hinge to a large extent on the willingness of the only full time member, the chairman, to use them. Why Hagan was not appointed was never publicly explained. The more interesting question is probably who had the power to stop the appointment. Obvious candidates are the Premier himself and the head of the Premier's Department. It is possible that the prospect of an active Education Commission was at odds with the general movement towards centralised control within the Labor government in NSW, a policy evidenced by the growth and power of the Premier's Department and the weakening of other bodies. From the government point of view the setting up of the Education Commission lessened the sphere of influence of the PSB and facilitated the centralising of power in the Premier's Department through the establishment of a weaker employing body for teachers.

#### **Some conclusions.**

One of the most outstanding similarities between the activities in the two states is the involvement in party politics as a union tactic. Campaigning for (or against) a particular party has been a tactic in both states to gain representation on a central body which controls the industry. The formation of the Victorian Tribunal in 1946 was the direct result of teacher activism to bring in a Labor government. The Liberal Party promised an education commission in NSW. The union took what was to all intents a pro-Liberal stance. The same promise from the Labor Party in 1976 plus the failure of the Liberals to honour their promise brought a pro-Labor campaign.

The presence of a Labor government seems at times to have kept the union hoping it would be an ally who would give them 'a piece of the action.' The VSTA has been considerably more militant in terms of direct action in the fight for Tribunal reform than the NSWTF has been in its fight for an education commission. Is it perhaps easier to fight against a Liberal government who is clearly labelled 'the enemy'? Until the change of heart in the mid 1960s, the NSWTF seems to have been very unwilling to confront the Labor government with its failure to introduce an education commission because of the Labor connections of many of its executive. In NSW it is also very clear that the ALP policy on teacher, parent and community involvement in education caused major reconsideration of union policy on an education commission during the late 1970s.

Second, we have seen that there was no straight correspondence between the structures and functions of bodies which employ teachers and determine awards, salaries and conditions in NSW and Victoria. Until 1980, NSW teachers were employed by the large monolithic PSB. The union had access to the arbitration courts which stopped groups breaking away from the union. Threat of deregistration is perhaps the ultimate weapon but even the declaration of a dispute prevents further action by the organisation and stops negotiations. Both of these imposed a tendency towards a large and unified organisation of teachers and we may assume a tendency to view the education scene from a centralist perspective and to act on it accordingly.

In Victoria access to the Tribunal has been a problem for some breakaway groups but it has not prevented such actions. Once represented on the Tribunal, however, the unions found it unworkable. Part of the reason for this was obviously the actions of the government and its representatives. It is also possible that the Tribunal could not easily accommodate an adversary mode but

was modelled on notions of consensus. The move by the Victorian unions into policy for direct negotiations may signal a desire to move to a more direct adversary role and a clear cut vision of who is the employer and who is employed.

The question of representation has had quite a different history in the two states and is inexorably interwoven with notions either of consensus or adversary modes. Victoria was engaged in the contradictions explicit in representation when the parties are not equal. The NSWTF was coming to an awareness of the contradictions in representation of the employees on employing bodies after the formation of the Education Commission.

The question of the separation of industrial issues (salaries, appointments, staffing, policies) and educational policy appears not to have caused such a problem in Victoria. Yet, from the first decade of this century the NSW union has been disputing the possibility of separating industrial policy from educational policy and advocating the need for 'educationalists' on any controlling body. Victorian unions have been campaigning predominantly for representation in industrial issues only, while the NSWTF has campaigned for representation in a body which controlled both industrial and educational issues. The NSWTF was obsessed with the problem of 'dual control' i.e. control by the PSB of industrial matters (wages and conditions) and by the Education Department of education policy. Why then has 'dual control' not aroused the concern of teachers' unions in Victoria? Why has pressure for the formation of a central educational policy body on which the unions had representation not been such a major feature in Victoria?

Part of the reason may lie in the fact that wages and conditions were both the subject of the Teachers' Tribunal and it is the difficulty with separating

conditions from educational policy which causes problems. In NSW until 1976 only salaries were the prerogative of the arbitration courts. In fact what the NSWTF was asking for in its 'employing authority' was a version of the Tribunal but without loss of access to the arbitration court. However, in proposals for the restructuring of the education system in Victoria in the early 1980s the Victorian organisations seem still to favour the separation of the industrial and the educational. The arguments for change in the Victorian Tribunal have not taken the form of arguing the impossibility of an industrial educational split, though this line of argument is not unknown in other areas, particularly in the area of tactics, i.e. the union must back its industrial claims with good educational policy arguments.

Since Victoria had teacher representation in salaries and conditions, the actions of the government were designed to make this representation useless - to make sure that the Tribunal did not work in the manner which the legislation allowed. The tactic was first to limit the access of teachers to the one union, the VTU. This was accomplished by making use of the internal divisions between teachers. A second tactic was to make the government's representative not responsible to the government. Discussions simply could not take place when one party refused to give its point of view. A third tactic was to recognise other associations of teachers which were sympathetic to government action. This created conflict amongst teachers and prevented united action. When the first tactic of limiting access failed, the government made use of the VSTA's and the TTAV's 'win' to introduce this new tactic.

The problems of the Tribunal made it unworkable and allowed the minister to use his ultimate powers. In a similar way the NSW Education Commission falls far short of the union's expectations and is largely a powerless body easily ignored by both minister and department. If the NSWTF desire in creating the

Education Commission was to create a central body which would give teachers' power for action in educational matters, the exercise was a failure. Teachers do now have representation in the area of salaries and conditions, but also suffer the problems of being part of a body which is overshadowed by the Minister of Education and the Premier himself. Perhaps here is the crux of the matter. For state workers, ultimate responsibility rests with the minister who is seen to represent the people. As a tactic then for more control over education, representation in central bodies may not be fruitful. Finally, the NSWTF has talked more than the Victorian unions about educational policy in this issue of union representation on bodies which control the occupation. This does not mean, however, that NSW has been more active in making and implementing educational policy. The Victorian unions were taking action to make teachers more involved in educational policy but not directly in attempts to redefine the relationship with the employer through the Tribunal. This involved action on both the conditions of employment, particularly who should be employed as teachers and the policies which determine the career paths of teaches, and the evaluation of the curriculum and organisation of schools. This is the subject of Chapters Four and Five.

- 
1. M. Derber, 'State government management-union relations in Victoria and New South Wales', Journal of industrial relations, Vol.19, 1977, p.366.
  2. *ibid.*, p.367-8.
  3. *ibid.*, p.368.
  4. *ibid.*
  5. B. Mitchell, Teachers, education and politics, St Lucia, Queensland, 1975, p.176.
  6. Derber, *op. cit.*
  7. Victoria: Green paper on strategies and structures for education in Victoria, 8 May, 1980, p.10.
  8. A. Spaul, 'Towards a theory of Australian teacher union development', 1982, p.7. (Copy held by author).
  9. E. Sykes, 'Labour arbitration in Australia' in G.W. Ford, et al, (eds), Australian labour relations - readings (3rd edition), South Melbourne, 1980, p.300.
  10. *ibid.*, p.310.
  11. Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p.6.
  12. G.S. Beeby, cited in Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p.34.
  13. Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p.37
  14. *ibid.*, p.47.
  15. *ibid.*
  16. *ibid.*, pp. 45-46.
  17. *ibid.*, p.24.
  18. *ibid.*, p.211.
  19. See Mitchell, *op. cit.* pp. 90-109. for a description and analysis of this period. The events described are taken from that source.
  20. Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p.105
  21. *ibid.*, p.109.
  22. B. Bessant and A.D. Spaul, Teachers in conflict, Carlton, Victoria, 1972, pp.45-7.
  23. See Mitchell, *op. cit.*, pp.186-7; Bessant and Spaul, *op. cit.*, pp.48-50.

24. Spaul, 'Towards a theory ...' op. cit., p.10.
25. B.K. Hyams, 'The battle of the sexes in teachers' organisations: a South Australian episode 1937-50' in A.D. Spaul, Australian teachers, Melbourne, 1977, pp.215-6.
26. J. Gormley, Penrith High School, 'The anatomy of a strike', C1982, (Unpublished paper held by the author)
27. K. Hince, 'The Victorian wages board system: structure and performance' in G.W. Ford et al (eds), Australian labour relations - readings (3rd edition), op. cit., p.344.
28. J.S. Hagan, The history of the ACTU, Melbourne, 1981, p.9.
29. J.M. Fristacky, 'Collective bargaining conciliation and arbitration in Victorian wages boards', Journal of industrial relations, 18 December, 1976, p.310.
30. Hagan, op. cit., p.9.
31. Fristacky, op. cit., p.311.
32. Sykes, op. cit., p. 311.
33. Fristacky, op. cit., P.310.
34. Hince, 'The Victorian wages board system', op. cit., p.346.
35. A.D. Spaul, 'Teacher unionism in Victoria', draft chapter for P. Warhurst (ed.), Victorian politics - a reader, 1981, p.5. (copy held by author).
36. Spaul, 'Towards a theory ...' op. cit., p.9.
37. Bessant and Spaul, op. cit., p.53.
38. See B. Bessant, 'The Victorian Teachers' Union and the 1945 election campaign' in A.D. Spaul (ed.), Australian teachers, Melbourne, 1977 pp. 257-263.
39. O.S. Green and C.J. White, 'A complex of organisations', in L.J. Blake (ed.), Vision and realisation, Melbourne, 1973, p.1152.
40. A.M. Badcock, 'The Secondary Division', in L.J. Blake, Vision and realisation, op. cit., p.564.
41. Bessant and Spaul, op. cit., pp.28-33.
42. VSTA, 'Performance of a decade', The secondary teacher documents, No.6, 1978, p.4.
43. VSTA booklet, 'The Teachers' Tribunal' (early 1960s), VSTA files.
44. Teachers journal, Aug., 1965, p.254.

45. VTU Council debate, Teachers journal, Sept., 1966.
46. VTU Council debate, Teachers journal, Aug., 1966.
47. Teachers journal, Mar., 1966, p.20; Oct., 1966, p.383.
48. Teachers journal, Aug., 1966, p.260.
49. Teachers journal, Mar., 1966, p.20.
50. Teachers journal, Aug., 1966, p.260.
51. Teachers journal, Aug., 1966, p.260; Oct., 1966, p.357.
52. Teachers journal, Oct., 1966, p.357.
53. VSTA 'Performance of a decade', op. cit., p.5.
54. Hansard, p.1192, cited in VSTA, 'Performance of a decade', op. cit., Appendix B, p.26.
55. H.W. Birrell, MLA, to VSTA Branch, 11 Feb. 1972, in VSTA, 'Performance of a decade', op. cit., Appendix E, p.27.
56. VSTA, 'Performance of a decade', op. cit., p.9.
57. *ibid.*, p.7.
58. *ibid.*
59. *ibid.*, p.9.
60. TTAV booklet, 'A decade of disillusionment' op. cit., p.65.
61. VSTA, 'Performance of a Decade' op. cit., p.24.
62. Amendments to the Victorian Teaching Service Act, in VSTA, 'Performance of a decade', op. cit., Appendix D, p.27.
63. VSTA, 'Performance of a decade' op. cit., p.10.
64. *ibid.*, p.12-13.
65. Victoria. Report of the board of enquiry into the state teaching service (Southwell Report), 1971, p. 77.
66. TTAV, 'A decade of disillusionment', op. cit., p.5.
67. Southwell Report, op. cit., p.77.
68. A.D. Spaul, 'Teachers organisations', paper for the Australian Encyclopedia, C.1982. (copy held by author).
69. Herald, 20 March, 1981.
70. VSTA/TTAV joint policy statement on Tribunal - 1971, in 'Performance of a



decade'. op. cit., Appendix C, p.26.

71. VSTA, 'Performance of a decade', op. cit., p.17.

72. TTAV booklet, 'A decade of disillusionment', op. cit., p.8.

73. VSTA, 'Performance of a decade', op. cit., p.18.

74. Direct Negotiations Policy, 1975, in VSTA, 'Performance of a decade', op. cit., Appendix F, p.27.

75. TTAV, 'A decade of disillusionment', op. cit., p.8.

76. Dr. Sheers, 'without prejudice' response to VSTA-VTU submission, 3 Jan 1976, in VSTA, 'Performance of a decade', op. cit., Appendix G, p.27.

77. G. Reid, 'A comment on some negotiations', in VSTA, 'Performance of a decade', op. cit., p.25.

78. *ibid.* p.25.

79. The secondary teacher documents, No.1, 1980, p.5.

80. Victoria. Green Paper on strategies and structures for education in Victoria, Melbourne, May 1980.

81. Victoria. White Paper on strategies and structures for education in Victorian government schools, Melbourne 1980.

82. Department of Education, Victoria, The rationale and definition of the proposed organisation structure, Melbourne, 1981.

83. Victoria. White Paper, op. cit., p.10.

84. A.D. Spaul, 'Teacher unionism in Victoria', op. cit., p.23.

85. White Paper, op. cit., p.22

86. *ibid.*, p.17-18.

87. B. Bessant, 'A Gamble Pays Off' The Australian teacher, No. 1, 1982, p.7.

88. Green Paper, op. cit., p.14.

89. The Victorian Teaching Service Conciliators and Arbitration Committee - reproduced in The secondary teacher documents, No. 1, 1980, p.4.

90. A.D. Spaul, 'Teacher unionism in Victoria', op. cit., p.19.

91. Mitchell, op. cit., p.34.

92. Australian journal of education, Nov., 1905, pp.3-4.

93. Education, 15 Nov., 1919, pp.8-9.

94. Education, 15 Jan., 1920, p.63.

95. Education, 30 Jan., 1937, pp.40.41.
96. Report of the committee appointed to survey secondary education in NSW (Wyndham Report), Sydney, 1957.
97. See examples of the Board's replies to the union in the NSWTF booklet, 'The Public Service Board of NSW. Antique attitudes to industrial relations', 1973, pp.10-12, NSWTF Education Commission file.
98. NSWTF pamphlet, 'No four men should have these powers', 1964, NSWTF Education Commission file.
99. PSB. Statement in reply to NSWTF, Sydney Morning Herald, 25 Aug., 1959.
100. Education, 24 Jan., 1962, p.3.
101. R. Askin, NSW Premier, press statement, 11 Aug., 1967, NSWTF Education Commission file.
102. Report of the enquiry into the establishment of an Education Commission (Rydge Report), 1969, p.4.
103. DR. H.S. Wyndham, submission to the Rydge Enquiry, in Rydge Report, Appendix III-I, p.83.
104. NSWTF submission to the Rydge Enquiry, in Rydge Report, Appendix II-I, p.62.
105. *ibid.*, p.63.
106. *ibid.*, p.64.
107. *ibid.*, p.65.
108. Teaching Service Act (1970). Part III.
109. ALP (NSW Branch), Education policy concerning an Education Commission, in Working party for the establishment of an Education Commission, Second Interim Report, 5. Oct., 1977, Appendix F.
110. D. Bennett, 'Education: back to the drawing-board', in G. Evans and J. Reeves (eds), Labor essays 1982, Richmond, Victoria, 1982, p.162-3.
111. *ibid.*
112. *ibid.*, p.162.
113. Schools in Australia: report of the interim committee for the Australian Schools Commission (Karmel Report), Canberra, 1973.
114. Education, 30 Jan., 1974, p.7.
115. NSWTF, resolutions of Annual Conference, 1974 'The Community and its Schools, and the Education Commission'. NSWTF Education Commission files.

116. *ibid.*
117. NSWTF ad hoc committee, Education Commission. July 1976, NSWTF Education Commission files.
118. NSWTF ad hoc committee, Education Commission statement to union Executive, 5 Oct., 1976, NSWTF Education Commission files.
119. *ibid.*
120. NSWTF policy statement on the Education Commission, 1978, NSWTF Education Commission file.
121. NSWTF information pamphlet, 'The Education Commission', 1978, p.3, NSWTF Education Commission files.
122. NSWTF submission to the Rydge Enquiry, in Rydge Report, Appendix II-I, 1969, p.63.
123. Working party, Second Interim Report, *op. cit.*, pp.102-103.
124. Working party for the establishment of an Education Commission, Final Report, 19 April, 1978, pp.124-126.
125. M. Derber, 'State government management - union relations in Victoria and NSW', in G.W. Ford, et al. (eds), *op. cit.*, p.15.
126. Working party for the establishment an Education Commission, Interim Report, November, 1976, p.10.
127. Working party, Second Interim Report, *op. cit.*, pp.62-65.
128. Education Commission Act. (1980). Part III, 37, (1) and (2).
129. Submission to the Working Party by Board of Senior School Studies. (Copy held by author).
130. Working party, Final Report, *op. cit.*; Education Commission ACT (1980), Part II, 36, (1) and (2).
131. *ibid.*, Part II, 35, (a) - (e).
132. Working party, Second Interim Report, *op. cit.*, p.51.
133. Working party, Final Report, *op. cit.*, p.26.
134. Education Commission Act (1980) Part II, 7 (2)c.
135. Submissions to the Working Party by NSW Higher Education Board. (Copies held by author).
136. Working party, Final Report, *op. cit.*, p.86.
137. *ibid.*

#### 4: THE INSPECTOR CALLS

In efforts to redefine the place of teachers in the education systems of the states, teachers' unions in both New South Wales and Victoria have used two approaches. One has been to attempt to become equal partners in control of the centralised bureaucracy and perform the tasks which the superior administrators have of providing direction and making proposals to the minister. The previous chapter was concerned with this question of representation on central bodies of control in education. The second approach has been to attempt to change the duties of the field executive (the inspector), to control the recruitment and terms of office of inspectors and ultimately to remove the office altogether. This and its following companion Chapter Five examine this method.

The first task is to very briefly set the scene for the emergence of the role of inspector in the growth of centralised government in England during the nineteenth century and apply the historical themes to the question of state intervention in education. Some comparison is made with the early experiences of the penal colony of NSW to highlight the early involvement of government in education in the Australian example and the accompanying use of field officers (inspectors). After this, the inspection procedures at the start of the period under examination (1965) are described. Subsequently, three issues are discussed: first, the relationship between inspection, curriculum and standardised teacher training; and second, school inspection and 'accountability'. The third issue, inspection and promotion of teachers to administrative positions within the school, is examined in Chapter Five.

## **The growth of centralised government and inspection.**

In nineteenth century England there was a profound change in the structure and function of government. Central to this change was the development of an executive corps, a group of inspectors who were charged with implementing legislation. In the area of education, inspectors supervised the government grant, primarily for the building of schools from 1833. Without this new type of civil servant, legislation was often ineffectual. MacDonagh [1] argues that the appointment of these 'field executives' not only brought about the enforcement of regulations but also created an 'interior momentum' of its own which shaped further state intervention and therefore the form of modern government. He calls this a revolution. Their action in the field gave them knowledge which, in turn, brought about the framing of new legislation. They were more than just the expression of state intervention. The execution of their duties caused them to re-shape existing administrative arrangements. Inevitably, their work brought about centralisation and the creation of a hierarchy of superior administrators to provide direction, uniformity and permanence for their executive practice, to facilitate the collection of data and framing of future reform proposals and to act as a link between the field executive (inspector) and the Parliament.[2] The style of administration moved generally, from the early 1830s, first to Boards, directly responsible to parliament and then to an administrative system based on hierarchical Ministerial Departments.[3]

The move to ministerial responsibility was not without its critics, particularly of the problem of patronage in government employment.[4] Departmental administration was accompanied by the growth of a regulated, neutral public service. The growth of these administrative departments in time replaced the role of inspectors with a complex system of specialists. Despite the development of complex and specialised departments, in some areas the role of

the inspector remained, most notably in education.

### **The state and education - early years.**

In the penal colony of NSW the ultimate power for all aspects of daily life lay with the governors. This early history had profound effects on the involvement of the state in all areas but particularly on education. The state, at first represented by the governors, was continually involved in the provision of education to a degree not experienced in England.

Though much of the organisation of schools was left to the Church of England clergy, the church in fact provided the administrative arm of the state. In education, the clergy functioned as inspectors. As well, both governors and chaplains acted on the assumption that the Church of England was the state church though the legal basis for this has subsequently been debated. The power of the governor over the chaplain was still obvious in 1822 when Governor Brisbane directed that tenders for the position of schoolmaster advertised by the Rev. R. Hill in The Sydney Gazette be returned to him for decision. [5]

My purpose is not to argue that the state, in the form of the governor took control of and financed all education in the colony. Indeed interest was spasmodic. The spirit of voluntarism was still present.[6] From about 1800 onwards a distinction was recognised between state-aided public schools and private schools. From this time also a distinction has to be made between government school teachers and private school teachers. As Smart[7] remarks, the difference in status between these two classes of teachers was the result not only of possible superior qualifications for the latter but also of the lack of independence of the government teacher who was supervised and controlled by the local clergyman and doubled as the parish clerk.

As the growth of the colonies made direct and personal oversight of all government activities an impossibility for governors, they used administrative forms with which they were familiar, sometimes at the direct suggestion of the colonial office. [8] Wettenhall notes that 'the evolution of Australian self-government and the refining in the British political system of techniques to ensure administrative accountability to parliament were virtually contemporary processes.' [9] From the late 1820s there are examples of boards created usually of senior ranking civil servants to deal with administration. [10] In the area of education the Church and School Corporation of 1826 demonstrates very early this tendency though, besides showing movement towards a new form of central control of administration, it also illustrates the power struggle in education between church and state. From 1815 the balance of power was moving to the Church of England but by the late 1920s the privileged position of this Church was under siege. [11]

In 1843 New South Wales had limited self-government and the effort increased to find a solution to the administration of education. In 1848 Governor Fitzroy succeeded in establishing a National system of education through a compromise dual system - a Denominational Board supervised one set of schools already under clerical supervision and a National Board created an entirely new system. [12] To do this 'agents' were appointed to 'advertise the system throughout the colony, assist in the establishment of schools and exercise some of the functions of an inspector.' [13] These agents were the entrepreneurs of the National system which was largely decentralised and relied on local patrons for one third of the actual expenditure. Agents had, however, to send weekly reports to the Board on their progress in the field. [14] After 1855 the system became more centralised but remained moulded on the board system. [15]

The centralising of the education system had effects on teachers in two particular areas. First their place within the system of education was reorganised on more bureaucratic lines and the content of their lessons became more standardised. William Wilkins became headmaster of the Fort Street Model school in 1851. He introduced the pupil teacher training system, a system of apprenticeship for teachers before entry into the Normal school for additional training. This system remained in NSW until 1904 when some secondary education was required before entering a period of pre-service training. It lingered in a modified form in Victoria until 1949. The change also required Wilkins to establish a classification of elementary school teachers according to their training and academic qualifications. Thus from the mid 1800s a centralised system of training made teacher practice in the classroom more likely to be standardised and a hierarchy within the school system based on merit acquired through examination was beginning to emerge. Wilkins had further effects on teacher practice in the classroom when under his guidance in 1856 a 'Table of Minimum Requirements' set down the subjects and standards for each class.[16]

After the granting of responsible government in 1856 there was a gradual move away from boards to centralised control with executive responsibility vested in the minister.[17] In education the move to full ministerial responsibility was through a 'half way house' in 1866. [18] The special characteristic of this board was that several of its members were also members of parliament. It had economic control and its power also gave it control over curriculum and the training, appointment and classification of teachers. The 1880 Act brought into being unequivocal state control of education with the formation of a Ministry of Public Instruction and the endowing of civil service status on teachers.



Until 1851 Victoria was part of the colony of NSW. It inherited the New South Wales dual system of Denominational and National Schools Boards. In 1862 this was changed to administration by one board.[19] Under the Common Schools Act 1862, the Board of Education had to 'frame general regulations for the Inspection of schools and the examination and classification of teachers.'[20] Under the Act, the Board was not responsible to Parliament but the Governor in Council appointed an Inspector General of Schools. There is considerable evidence that the Board, recognising the link between this appointment and the virtual control of education by the government, 'redefined' the role of the Inspector General. Inspectors were directed to report directly to the Board, thus denying the Inspector General his co-ordinating role and his role as a link between the field executive and the government.[21]

After a Commission of Inquiry in 1866, the failure of a Bill in 1867 and a change of government causing another Bill introduced in 1870 to lapse, an Education Act was passed in 1872 which gave the minister full responsibility. The government now had the power to control both teachers and the curriculum.

After 1872 in Victoria and 1880 in NSW, inspectors came under the control of the Inspector General. Their reports were used in presenting the minister with the state of education and difficulties in carrying out the regulations of the Act. Some complained that their voice was not heeded by central authorities but their actions in schools contributed to a uniformity of curriculum and methods. In Victoria from 1864 to 1901 a system of payment by results was in practice.[22] This in itself made inspection necessary in all state-aided schools.

The point of this introduction is to demonstrate that from the beginning of

settlement the state had been involved in education. The Church of England played the role of inspector in the early years. From 1848 with the introduction of a National system, the role of the Church was gradually replaced by a secular administration. The progress is from a partly voluntary system based on boards but still with an aim to centrally control curriculum and teaching service, to highly centralised departments with teachers as civil servants, controlled by inspectors all under the umbrella of a minister.

The relationship between teachers and inspectors tends to have been negative and the subject of much 'gallows humour'. Nevertheless, in both New South Wales and Victoria there is evidence that inspectors were partly responsible for the setting up of early associations of teachers in the last decade of the nineteenth century. These were formed to discuss educational topics, particularly in country areas. Inspectors did not take part in 'industrial' matters.[23] This classic distinction made by both teachers and inspectors suggests an awareness of the difference of interests between both parties because of their position within the education hierarchy. This culminated in the removal of inspectors from the NSWTF but the VTU still had 73 inspectors as members in 1965.[24]

Mitchell [25] argues that most teachers viewed with hostility the departmental machine as represented by 'the Boss', the regulations and the annual visits of the inspector. However, in the decade after the NSWTF was formed in 1918, its relationship with the department was generally one of friendly co-operation. If this was so, it raises the question of the difference in the quality of contact between executive levels (union executive and departmental senior levels of administration) and the contact between rank and file members and the department at its lower levels, i.e. inspectors.

Until the late 1930s two inspections a year were customary except in some country areas.[26] They assessed staff, rewarded with promotion, disseminated and policed the rules and regulations of the department and advised teachers on classroom methods. From the late 1920s there was considerable awareness of the new teaching techniques and systems. More emphasis was placed on the measurement of ability leading to mass IQ testing and ability grouping. The inspector's roles as entrepreneur of new methods and upholder of standards and efficiency may have been in contradiction. Cleverley argues that 'the inspectors had two postures: they adopted the names, slogans and messages of "the new education" but then identified them with their own practices which were conservative.' [27] This pattern of administration was still largely intact at the start of the period under investigation. Though some of the duties of the inspector had changed in detail, the principles remained.

#### **Inspection procedures - 1965.**

At the commencement of the period under investigation, 1965, inspectors came from the ranks of teachers but usually from executive positions and remained as inspectors unless they moved into senior administration. In NSW and Victoria they had their own organisations which submitted proposals on educational and organisational matters to various department enquiry committees or working parties.

Inspection involved both the school generally and teachers individually. Schools were inspected to assess their administrative efficiency. This required the principal to keep records of everything that occurred in the school and, in theory, to know everything that was going on. Teacher inspection involved both general checking for efficiency and consideration for promotion. During such an inspection the inspector observed lessons, checked all records and

preparation, often checked children's books and, of course, discussed teachers with their immediate supervisor. If the candidates for a promotion were supervisors, then not only was their work under inspection but also the work of the people they supervised. There were four promotion levels, that is, four categories of teachers' 'lists' in NSW and four 'classes' in Victoria.

In both states there have been differences in the inspection practices between primary and secondary divisions. There have been changes in the frequency of inspection, in the categories of teachers which the regulations stated must be inspected and in the academic qualifications needed for promotions between primary and secondary divisions. The growth of secondary schools after the Second World War and the phasing in of an area system of administration led to a fairly complex system of inspection in NSW. The primary district inspector and the area secondary inspector reported to the area director. The members of a panel of inspectors of secondary schools reported to the Director of Secondary Education. In Victoria, secondary inspection was controlled by the Board of Inspectors of Secondary Schools (BISS). The inspectors advised the Committee of Classifiers of their assessment of a candidate for promotion. The Committee controlled placement of teachers in schools in their various 'classes'.

In the 1960s in NSW, primary schools and central schools were inspected under the guidelines of a system amended in 1957-58. These amendments were in keeping with the progressive developments in inspection of schools and teachers, and are symptomatic of the current trend in the placing of emphasis on the advisory functions of the inspector. [28] School reports by inspectors took place once every four years unless the principal wanted promotion. Teachers were reported upon in each biennial period by the inspector if they desired promotion or if the school was small or if the teacher preferred a

report from the inspector rather than the principal. The principal or mistress wrote reports in other cases. Probationary teachers were inspected every year by the inspector. The inspector continued to pay an annual visit to the school either for 'supervision' or 'inspection'. Principals wrote personal reports upon all members of staff at the time of school inspection and personal inspection.[29]

In the 1965-66 biennial period, inspection for secondary schools and teachers was reorganised. There was to be a full school inspection and report on all aspects of organisation, each subject department and individual teachers every six years. Teachers could elect or decline inspection each biennial period for up to three biennial periods. This ability to decline inspection was dependent upon a Certificate of Efficiency signed by the Principal. However, if a subject master was inspected this would still 'involve an assessment of his department - its organisation and teaching.' The Director of Secondary Education retained the power to direct the inspection of a teachers at any time and inspection was obligatory for teachers on probation.[30]

In Victoria, primary schools were inspected annually until 1972. All primary teachers received an annual private report. Academic qualifications for promotions varied. For example, the Trained Primary Teachers Certificate entitled teachers only to promotion to Class III. Further study was needed to gain promotion to Class II and Class I. The three year course for Infants Teachers allowed women to progress to Class II. From 1949 until 1969 primary teachers were assessed as 'Outstanding' which meant accelerated promotion; 'Very Good' meant promotion would be received 'in turn'; 'Good' meant no promotion but salary increments continued; 'Not Satisfactory' meant the cessation of increments.

In the secondary area the system of inspection was complicated by the

existence of Class A Schools, a system of accreditation of pupils through internal examination. Approval was given to a subject after it had been inspected. The Board of Inspectors of Secondary Schools (BISS) had in fact been formed in 1914 to implement this system.[31] Until 1965 High Schools were inspected annually. Biennial inspections introduced in 1965 were changed to triennial in 1966. In the 'off' years inspectors visited teachers wanting assessment or advice. From 1968 to 1970 three groups of ten inspectors provided the link between the department and the high schools.[32]

In both states the criteria other than academic qualifications necessary for promotion remained ill-defined. However, by the late 1970s in NSW, statements by the department on criteria reflected the prevailing notions of individual 'needs' of children, school autonomy in curriculum within a framework of state aims of education and teacher participation in decision making. The 'underlying principle' was, however, to 'foster the progress' of those who could provide strong 'leadership' in schools amid the 'diverse expectations of the community, parents, students and teachers.'[33]

#### **Inspection, curriculum and standardised teacher training.**

Two arguments were traditionally used for the necessity of inspection. First, that it acts as a form of quality control when teachers enter the service with differing degrees of training and second, that it ensures a conformity of content and practice in schools. Both of these arguments were becoming less tenable by the 1960s. A more detailed discussion of curriculum and organisational changes in schools during the period is found in Chapter Six. The purpose here is to highlight some of the contradictions between inspection and what the NSWTF began to call 'the new pupil-teacher relationship characteristic of modern education.'[34]

The notion of 'child-centred' education was reawakened in the 1960s and was accompanied by increased awareness of its relationship with classroom autonomy. In infants' schools in particular there was a growing trend towards 'innovative' methods of teaching. New methods of teaching reading and mathematics were being experimented with and ability streaming was being questioned and in some schools, tinkered with. In the NSW Secondary schools the introduction of the Wyndham Scheme of comprehensive education had put considerable emphasis on student 'needs' and pressure on teachers to understand and implement the new guidelines which were not as prescriptive as the former secondary organisation. In Victoria, experimental schemes in school organisation and subject divisions in high schools began after the formation of a Curriculum Advisory Board in the mid 1960s at the instigation of the Director of Secondary Education.

A focus on the needs of individual children and movement away from prescribed curriculum and school organisation threw into question both the role of the inspectors and the relationships of classroom teachers to their supervisors. It necessitated a redefinition of the criteria for personal inspection of those seeking executive positions. If we examine NSW we find the union in 1958 asking that the supervision senior teachers gave to staff not 'undermine the professional prestige of teachers.' Methods and procedures were the concern of the individual teachers.[35] By 1965 the union demanded that school policy, the application of that policy and guidance and supervision practices, should be established after discussion with staff.[36]

The inspector's function in schools, the union stated, gave them power to 'interfere with supervisory policy and practices in schools.'[37] It was argued that inspectors, in judging the work of teachers in senior positions, should stress inspirational measures and the cooperative and sympathetic relations developed

with other members of the staff and not supervision which was based on personal directives. I shall return to the question of relationships between school executives and staff later. The purpose here is to note that movement away from prescribed curriculum and school organisation led the unions to an examination of this relationship and this in turn to an examination of the criteria used by inspectors in determining fit candidates for executive positions in schools.

The 1965 Annual Conference of the NSWTF stated that 'a qualified member of a profession is a fit and proper person to practice that profession.' [38] This drew attention to the fact that teachers entering the profession had received a standardised period of pre-service training. The introduction of a teachers' certificate in 1943 had recognised this standardised period of training in NSW.

From 1930 Annual Conference the NSWTF had pressed for a teachers' certificate. The introduction of this certificate in New South Wales recognised the changes which had occurred since William Wilkins organised the classification of primary school teachers in the 1850s into a series of classifications with 1A as the highest going down to 3C. The 'pupil-teacher' system had gone. Most teachers now had pre-service training on top of a school Leaving Certificate. Most teachers left training college with a ranking which would have previously taken some years of self-education and a series of departmental examinations and inspections in the classroom to achieve. By the late 1930s it was obvious to the PSB that the old system could not cope with the new circumstances.

A series of negotiations took place between the Board and the General Secretary of the NSWTF from 1937 to 1943 to determine the new procedures



for classification which would follow the granting of a teachers' certificate. On completion of secondary education prospective teachers entered a period of pre-service training. After a period of probation in the classroom, teachers whose work satisfied the inspector, were granted a certificate. The union argued that these certificated teachers formed the basis of the profession. Continued efficiency should guarantee all teachers an annual increment and a respectable salary. The teachers' union looked to other professions (doctors in particular) to point to the logic and reasonableness of their claim. [39]

In the 1950s we find this standardised training, now recognised through certification, being used as a weapon by the union to attack the practice of inspection. Reports by the union's Inspectorial Committee adopted by Annual Conferences in 1955 and 1958 drew attention to the fact that inspectors were not now needed because training was standardised. The raising of qualifications 'to a recognised professional level' had led to a situation 'in which imposed uniformity is to be deprecated.' [40] Three other recommendations of the reports are of interest. First, inspectors should only hold the position for four years and then revert to the teaching service. Second, 'appointment of inspectors shall be made from the applicants by a committee of an equal number of representatives from the Federation and the department...' [41] A general requirement was added in 1958 that any changes to inspectorial procedures should be done in consultation with the NSWTF. [42] The reports show that the writers were not only intent on limiting personal inspection and reducing school inspection but also in controlling who became inspectors.

In Victoria, the continuation of a type of apprentice training for some teachers in primary service until 1949 and the late implementation of two year teacher training in 1951 gave little ground for the use of standardised training as an argument to reduce personal inspection. The VTU argued for the removal

of Junior Teachers until 1949.

Compounding the problem of teacher accreditation and inspection in the post war period was a teacher shortage in both states. The post-war period saw rapid growth in the school population. Though the shortage of primary teachers was largely over by the late 1950s, the crisis had moved into the secondary area. The shortage of secondary teachers brought about a situation in which short courses were given to future secondary teachers in teachers' colleges [43] and many university graduates received no training in classroom procedures before entering the classroom. These teachers were designated 'temporary' status, i.e. they were not eligible for promotion. In NSW, graduate teachers were employed without training from 1959. By 1969 there were about fifteen hundred in the schools. [44] In Victoria the situation was worse.[45]

This growth in the secondary area and the increase in untrained staff brought different reactions from unions in the two states and also differences from the various Victorian unions. The NSWTF and the VTU campaigned to have the governments train more teachers and provide training for those already in schools. For example, in NSW this was done with media publicity highlighting the number of suitable applicants who failed to gain scholarships to train as teachers, especially during the period prior to the state election in 1968.[46] As well as demanding more teachers, the NSWTF was also calling for upgrading and lengthening of training in autonomous teachers' colleges.[47] The union was also campaigning for reduction in class sizes and reduction in face-to-face teaching.[48] The emphasis in union activity was on working conditions (class sizes, hours of face-to-face teaching) rather than untrained teachers.

In Victoria the unions attacked the problem of staffing in a similar manner to NSWTF in the early to mid 1960s. [49] By 1969, however, the VSTA took a

completely different line of attack. The 1968 Annual General Meeting of the VSTA, adopted the resolution of the Westall High School Branch that all secondary teachers employed by the Education Department should be placed by the VSTA on a professional roll and that admission to this roll should thereafter be controlled by the VSTA. Only persons on this roll should teach in a state secondary school.[50] The VSTA had carried out its own survey in April 1968. From a sample of 63 percent of schools it found only 53 percent of the teachers were classified graduate teachers. Of the temporary teachers only 20 percent were graduates. Of three hundred primary teachers employed in secondary schools only six possessed degrees.[51]

The VTU response to this move was decidedly negative not because of opposition to standardized professional training but because the union saw the methods used by the VSTA as a deliberate form of 'poaching' of VTU secondary teacher members which still numbered some 1900. The VSTA was using 'industrial blackmail' to make all new members of school staff become registered with the VSTA. It was 'unethical' and 'unprofessional'.[52] The VTU brought to the notice of the press the policy, which it had had for 35 years, for a National Professional Institute. This was to contain representatives of academics and all sections of the teaching service and govern the certification of teachers to the profession. The more immediate aim, it stated, was the autonomy of existing teachers' colleges on a state-wide basis for which it was campaigning with other organisations in the Australian Teachers Federation.[53] The Victorian Council of School Organisations (VICCSO) initiated a meeting between itself, the VTU and the Education Minister in October 1969 seeking the early establishment of a Board of Teacher Education. The VSTA and the TTAV were in strong opposition to this move.

The newly formed TTAV supported the VSTA stand on 'control of entry' and

was critical of the view taken by the VTU President, Pitts, that temporary teachers were valuable in stemming the crisis in education.[54] By 1969 the TTAV had its own 'Registration Authority'. It pointed out to members that it was doing nothing more than making the department implement the terms of entry set down by Tribunal regulations. They were prepared to take direct action if pressed but their central approach was one of negotiation.

From April, secondary teachers were requested by the VSTA to stage 'sit-down-strikes' if an uncertified person was placed in charge of a class. This action was to coincide with attempts by the VSTA to have adequate courses provided by the department to assist temporary teachers to obtain qualifications and permanency. Though the plan was presented to temporary staff by the VSTA as a tactic to force the department to provide training with no loss of salary, the situation in many schools became extremely personal and bitter.[55]. The main argument used in the executive 'White Paper' sent to members was that 'control of entry is basic to the professional status of teachers.' Teachers had been relegated to a 'sub-professional status' but, the argument ran, entry standards were necessary not to maintain status but to 'protect the client from the practice of unqualified persons.'[56] Some temporary teachers formed their own 'federation' in May 1969. It was composed of members from high schools and technical schools. It was opposed to strikes in schools and to any registration of teachers by a group other than the proper government authority. In 1970 it had a membership of 200 in the metropolitan area. Its aims were presented as opposing the disruptive tactics of the VSTA. It stressed the need to protect the students from these harmful influences and the seeking of solutions to educational problems through negotiations worthy of professionals. [57] Its status was acknowledged by a deputation with the Minister for Education.

Bruce McBurney,[58] President of the VSTA from 1966 to 1970, analysed the union action and the government/departmental response in three stages. In the first stage in 1969, there were half day stoppages in many school, several mass stoppages and a strike at Northcote High School. The government had 'second thoughts on teachers presumed gutlessness.' Stage two, 1970, began with some concessions on salary for training adult recruits. The aim of the government was to keep the union chatting instead of taking action while it continued to send untrained teachers to schools. There were again numerous stoppages and one and two week strikes in two schools. In stage three, 1971, Melbourne High School took strike action over Tribunal reform. The government 'declared war' on any VSTA action and refused to deduct union subscriptions from salary and began charging individual teachers implementing VSTA policy under newly introduced penal clauses. It established an Enquiry into certain aspects of the state teaching service. [59] Stoppages and strikes continued. One, at Maribyrnong, lasted for 11 weeks, while the Enquiry, which was chiefly concerned with the functioning of the Tribunal, took place. For the union the 'war' had profound effects. Membership fell by more than a third and its legitimacy as the representative of secondary teachers was thrown into question.

The government finally responded to the control of entry situation by creating Teacher Registration Boards in 1972, for implementation in 1973. The VSTA condemned the Government Boards for they continued a 'temporary category' for untrained teachers. The Government Boards were composed of 4 teachers, 2 principals, 1 teachers' college lecturer and 2 government representatives.

The TTAV decided to participate and its endorsed candidates were elected. By 1973 some schools had effective VSTA registration which was in conflict

with the government's system of registration. Within the VSTA there was opposition to the union policy. Several VSTA members defied the union and stood for positions on the Government Secondary Board. They won two of the four teacher positions. The VSTA suspended the member who was also a member of the VSTA central committee.[60] In 1975 the Annual General Meeting authorised VSTA candidates to be endorsed but also stated that VSTA 'control of entry' would continue.[61] The union claimed responsibility for the improvements in teacher training which had occurred. Three year training was now standard entry requirement, full time courses of teacher training were available on full pay, the great majority of trainee secondary teachers were now completing recognised four year courses and departmental training colleges had greater autonomy.[62] In 1975 the four positions on the Secondary Teachers Registration Board were held by VSTA endorsed members. [63]

It is clear from this brief description that in both NSW and Victoria the question of pre-service training for all teachers was a major issue which all unions addressed. It was only in Victoria in the post primary area that unions took direct action or threatened to take such action. By seeking to be the body which registered teachers the VSTA challenged the state's role in accrediting teachers in a direct way. In doing so they left themselves open to charges of elitism, a charge which had followed them since the formation of the union in 1948 when they set up a claim for a salary margins above that of primary teachers.

Their action highlights some ambiguity in the notion of professionalism and in the use of arguments of professionalism as a union tactic. The VSTA policy did appeal to those sections of the union who aspired to the status of professionals but it was also a tactic for overcoming the conditions under which some teachers worked. 'Temporary' teachers may, as the union claimed, have been

unprepared to face a class of students. This situation placed both the students and the teacher at a disadvantage. The teachers were at a further disadvantage in their working conditions for they could not take advantage of the way the education system was organised. Only permanent teachers could seek promotion and its associated increases in salary, yet temporary teachers were required to do the same duties in the classroom.

In the process of requiring registration with the VSTA they also challenged the role of the VTU as a union with responsibilities in the post-primary area. By 1968 this challenge was heightened by internal struggles within the VTU for more autonomy by the Technical and High School branches though the High Schools Branch of the VTU was not in favour of the actions of the VSTA. The tactics used by the VSTA were seen as divisive of teachers' long-term interests. The VTU was also unwilling to take upon itself the job of accrediting teachers but looked towards the tertiary institutions to perform this role. In NSW where the question of unity was always a central concern the possibility of the union acting as a registration board for teachers was never seriously considered. In all, the NSWTF located its fight for teacher conditions in the provision of more teacher training scholarships and more training colleges and in action to reduce the workload of teachers in the classroom. During the same period that the VSTA was conducting its 'control of entry' campaign it was campaigning against inspection. These campaigns were in tandem.

### **Inspection, accountability and quality control.**

Throughout this chapter it is necessary to keep in mind the fact that inspection involved two procedures, inspection of the school and inspection of teachers for promotions. Changes in school organisation and curriculum had an impact on both these areas. I will now consider government and departmental

responses to growing demands for more school autonomy.

Two documents produced by the respective state education departments during the first half of the 1970s are examined. The first is the Report of a Working Party established by the NSW Director General of Education in May, 1970 'to examine all aspects of the work of inspectors and advisers.'[64] The second is a paper distributed in 1974 by the Victorian Director General of Education, 'The Teacher and the School Administrator.'[65] Though both documents were instigated by their department heads their formation took different roads, or so it would appear on the surface. The NSW Education Department has a partiality for working parties. The name suggests involvement of many interested parties and even perhaps an egalitarian atmosphere. In fact the working party had only one representative nominated by the NSWTF, the Senior Vice President, Mr J. Frederick. The union made repeated demands that a primary representative be admitted but to no avail. The other members of the working party were the directors for the Primary and Secondary Divisions; a nominee of the NSW Institute of Inspectors of Schools; the assistant secretary, Teachers Personnel; and an executive assistant. The Victorian document came directly from the departmental head, though who within the department had contributed to it is unclear. It was a document which called for response from teachers and their unions. The NSW report, having come from a working party on which the NSWTF was represented, was the departments' response to union dissatisfaction with inspection procedures.

The resolutions of each Annual Conference of the NSWTF were taken in deputation to the minister. Council resolutions also reached departmental ears. There had thus been a steady demand for change flowing from the central administration of the NSWTF to the central administration of the Education Department. The 1969 Annual Conference resolution was a list of



anomalies and deficiencies in the inspectorial system which came directly from members through their schools and through associations. [66] If the senior members of the department needed proof of growing discontent amongst teachers, here it was.

Generally the inconsistency and arbitrary nature of inspection was criticised. The system, it was claimed, was based on the assumption that teachers cannot be trusted and will not discharge their duties without constant and close supervision. This inhibited the professional freedom of teachers, demoralised them, caused some to resign and often resulted in distortion of school policy in order that the unreal demands of inspectors be met. Inspectors were, because of their activities, not professional educationalists. They spent too much time devising and implementing policies which were harmful to the interests of pupil, teachers and education generally, (makeshift accommodation, increase in class sizes, combination of classes, etc).[67] This final point draws out the inconsistency between inspectors' jobs as administrators confined by questions of resources and their jobs as expert educationalists.

Either because of the complicated nature of the exercise or because of the enormous implications of its decisions, this committee met on more than fifty occasions. The union nominee was withdrawn in March, 1971, following a council decision.[68] The failure to obtain a primary school representative had been compounded when the union's position as the body representing teachers in the state became an issue. The Working Party was addressed in January by a primary school principal who was not an endorsed representative. The President of the union, complained that the PSB had only dealt with the NSWTF on matters of salaries and conditions.[69] The chairman of the Working Party, would give no assurance that the Committee would deal only with the union. He stated that the Committee was established by the Director General,

not the Public Service Board and 'was not concerned with the basic working conditions of teachers.'[70] The union president replied that 'the Federation found it impossible to separate the inspectorial system from the teaching service.'[71] There was thus a problem for the union in responding to this division of powers between the Department of Education and the Public Service Board. The division was based on a distinction between professional or educational issues and industrial issues. Clearly, however, inspection, with its link to the career structure of the occupation and the duties which teachers performed in the classroom, was hard to separate from 'working conditions'.

The Report of the Working Party, places particular emphasis on the need for 'accountability', 'quality control' and clear 'levels of authority'. Accountability was necessary because the minister must be able to discharge his ultimate 'responsibility to the people'. This was done 'by requiring all facets of the work of each school to be reported upon systematically by visiting officers'. These officers were more necessary now because, the report states, the increased cost of schooling and 'the action by militant industrial groups' had made taxpayers and parents 'look much more critically at Public Education than formerly.' [72] 'Quality control' was achieved through 'a cadre of specially selected officers' working within an 'administration hierarchy (Head Office, Area, District and School) and in co-operation with a hierarchy of supervisors within the school'.[73]

The report supported the keeping of a career officer structure for inspectors, rather than using a seconded group because this provided 'increasing maturity and objectivity as their experience widened.'[74] Chapter Three of the report on 'Supervision of Schools' states that the purpose of such supervision is 'to improve learning by improving teachers.'[75] The inspector's position as adviser was continually stressed particularly now that 'curriculum construction has been

an onerous responsibility for many of the inspectors in recent years.'[76]

The report recommended that some of the previous duties of the inspector be taken by the principal, e.g. assessment of probationers and those teachers not wanting promotions. [77] Panels to decide on suitability for placement on a promotions list should consist of the inspector, the principal and the teachers' in-service supervisor. [78] It rejected the NSWTF call for a panel of assessors consisting of a peer teacher, a principal (both elected by the NSWTF) and a nominee of the state director because, it said, the power to select for promotion could lie with the NSWTF which was not responsible to the director general, the minister and the parliament. This would 'militate against state wide equality of opportunity for promotion and increase inconsistencies', [79] though how this was so was not explained.

Accountability was not a new cry. The debates around the establishment of state centralised education systems in the second half of the nineteenth century were laden with rhetoric about the emerging British principle of 'ministerial responsibility'. [80] It became necessary to draw on this principle again because of the changes occurring in schools. As curriculum becomes less prescribed or at least more complicated in the methods of its prescription, it was harder for the department to retain central control. Though the notion of 'individual differences' and individual needs was voiced there was throughout the report a strong sense that education was a fixed entity, the only differences available being a matter of quantity. The recommendation that some duties be given to the principal further entrenched the hierarchy within the school as did the suggestion that a teacher's immediate supervisor be involved in the assessment panel.

As a result of this report some inspection duties were given to the principal

but assessment for promotion remained firmly in the hands of inspectors.[81] The main change came in school inspection. In keeping with the new rhetoric that schools had more autonomy, the inspector's role was now that of 'supervisor and evaluator of schools, an agent of change, a consultant concerned with quality improvement and control.' [82] This involved appraising at least once in six years, how well each school met the particular aims and objectives it had formulated. Assessment of individual teachers was not a component of appraisal.

By 1974 school appraisals were being questioned by schools. The NSWTF representative on yet another departmental review of inspection practices said that the NSWTF had had complaints that school appraisal was 'an exhausting and humiliating experience' and that it retained the inspection system for teachers whose efficiency was not in question.' [83] Since teachers were also directed to continually evaluate the work of the school, the need for appraisal by an 'outsider' seemed superfluous. This matter was put to the test early in 1976 when Narwee Boys High decided to refuse school appraisal in line with the 1975 Annual Conference Policy which offered full support to any member who refused inspection or any school which refused appraisal.[84] The school was not appraised and no action was taken against staff.[85] In 1977 several schools decided to reject appraisal but the department's stance was again to avoid confrontation.[86] Blakehurst High School forwarded a statement to the Director General, Mr Swan, including the following words: 'we are professional people ... we are responsible to ourselves ... we treat the Department of Education as a servicing agent.' [87] Mr Swan queried the statement and asked: 'Is the school accountable to itself?' He wondered whether this idea was not merely something to 'strive for'. [88]

The question of school appraisals seems to have gradually faded, although the

question of how schools could be 'accountable' was still alive in 1980, the end of the period examined. In May 1980 the Director General was offering support to a proposal made directly to him by Muswellbrook High School on 'accountability of schools'.<sup>[89]</sup> It proposed that the principal make a short annual report to the director and that the district inspector report also on the basis of his continuous administrative contact with his schools and staff.<sup>[90]</sup> The NSWTF was concerned that its rights as representatives of teachers were again being threatened by the consideration of this document. No action was taken by the department.

In Victoria 'accountability' was also a large question for the teachers' unions, particularly for the secondary unions which were promoting more innovation in school-based curriculum and organisation in the late 1960s and early 1970s than those found in NSW. From 1970, access to some secondary schools was becoming more problematic for inspectors. The VSTA was taking action against inspection for promotions positions and had challenged the concept of inspection by substituting references as a measurement of aptitude directly to the Committee of Classifiers, the body which was responsible for placement and promotions. It thus by-passed assessment by the Board of Inspectors of Secondary Schools (BISS).

From its formation in 1968 the TTAV was examining the role of the inspector and seeking a solution to the dual role of inspectors to aid in accountability and to act as advisors to teachers.<sup>[91]</sup> In 1970 the Technical Schools Board of Inspectors' functions were separated into 'advisory' visits and 'assessment' visits. In 1971 the high schools division made a similar distinction. The move proved unworkable in the Technical division and both the TTAV and VSTA objected to impositions from outside the school and demanded consultation with seconded teachers. <sup>[92]</sup>

In mid 1974 the Director General of Education in Victoria, Dr L.W. Shears, distributed his paper for discussion and debate entitled 'The Teacher and the School Administrator'.<sup>[93]</sup> It addressed many of the same issues which the New South Wales Working Party on inspectors and advisers had addressed in 1970 but clearly indicated a more advanced stage of the debate on the professional responsibility of teachers in Victoria. It noted the increasing desire of members of the community to participate in the administration of the school system and the expectation of teachers of 'acceptance equal to that given to members of other professions and a greater degree of individual professional responsibility'.<sup>[94]</sup> One reason for the latter was the 'extended basic and professional training'.<sup>[95]</sup> All this was taking place amid 'increasing feeling and diversity of opinion about the purpose of the schools and the nature of educational programmes'<sup>[96]</sup> and increases in resources to education which led the community in general to expect 'greater accountability by educators'.<sup>[97]</sup> It should be mentioned here that concurrently the government, department, unions and parent organisations were negotiating a change in the structure and function of school councils, the formal bodies for parent involvement in schools. I will return to this later.

Two 'basic principles' emerged which must be 'balanced'; the principle of 'government responsibility' and the principle of 'professional responsibility'.<sup>[98]</sup> To do this it proposed a system of school reviews which would 'meet the need for government to account to the public for the functioning of schools and the need for teachers' aspirations towards professional responsibility for their actions to be accepted'.<sup>[99]</sup>

The second part of the document reasserted the hierarchy within the school by stressing, as did the NSW Report of the Working Party, the need in the

complicated structure of school organisation for positions 'which require qualities of leadership, personality, technique and understanding'. [100] Such positions would be principals and deputy principals. However, Shears also proposed two very different solutions to the problem of management within the school. He proposed first that there should be a career structure for practising teachers, i.e. teachers would be rewarded in salary for staying in the classroom rather than just for taking on positions of administration. Second, he proposed that practising teachers prepared to act as co-ordinators of studies or of subject departments or teaching areas should be chosen from within the school and such positions should be determined by the needs of the particular school and its programme. The Teachers' Tribunal should establish an allowance for these positions. [101] This part of the document will be discussed in the next section but it is mentioned here to demonstrate how the employers' proposals about management of the school became, in both states, a question of general accountability for schools and of hierarchies within the school.

The procedures for accountability being put forward by the department in Victoria differed greatly, however, from the New South Wales proposals for school appraisals just as the question of positions of responsibility within the school had taken a different turn. In New South Wales appraisal involved a panel of inspectors. The Victorian department's proposal combined self and outside evaluation in School Review Boards (SRB) and gave the school a choice of evaluators. [102] The school hierarchy at the same time was in some cases to be determined by the school itself. The differences in these proposed changes in Victoria must lie in large measure in the actions of the unions, particularly the VSTA, over inspection and curriculum innovation. The VTU commented that Shears was 'obsessed with the accountability threat' and with VSTA policy. In attempting to meet the VSTAs 'demand' that inspection be

abolished, Dr Shears' is potentially more dangerous.' [103]

Though the proposal for SRBs came from the Director General of Education each divisional head (high school, technical and primary) responded differently. The technical division did not implement the SRB though a small number of schools conducted their own reviews. The TTAV opposed the SRBs but accepted the principle that schools should seek expert opinion in curriculum evaluation from people outside the school. The initiative, timing, procedures and people involved in the evaluation should, it said, be a matter for the school concerned.[104]

For the VTU, the question of school reviews in the primary division became of chief importance as it was moving out of the union coverage of the secondary area. The system of review for primary schools differed in several ways to the system being tested in 1975 in secondary schools. School reviews in primary schools were to be conducted every four years in special grade schools, every three years in Grade I schools, every two years in Grade II schools. The district inspector was responsible for the conduct of the review.[105] The VTU put pressure on the Director of Primary Education to have staff as well as principals agree on the composition of the Review Board. It also fought to have agreement not only on the composition of the Review Board but also on its operation. [106] The department's directions for primary school reviews made no mention of self evaluation as a first step. It was not until early March 1981 that VTU policy argued that the responsibility for initiating and conducting the review should come from the school not the department. [107]

Shears' proposals remained directed at the high schools and consequently the VSTA. In 1976, following experiments in six high schools, the division formally



introduced School Review Boards. The VSTA viewed this move as 'a means of reintroducing inspection in another guise.' [108] The VSTA responded by opposing the Boards, stating that review was a matter for individual schools' staffs to decide. They should decide who was suitable to aid their review, the timing, procedures, methods of reporting and any follow up procedures.[109] The Committee told branches not to co-operate with school reviews until an agreement had been reached between the VSTA and the Department of Education on the nature and composition of SRBs [110] but later deferred the boycott until the results of negotiations were known.

By late 1977 about 31 high schools had been reviewed on a voluntary basis.[111] Schools were enthusiastic at first but became disillusioned with the process particularly with the SRB reporting back to the school. The follow up reports were either slow to come (seven months in one case) or non-existent. There was also pressure for schools to be reviewed and evidence that the Director of Secondary Education, Ford, equated SRBs with the old triennial inspection.[112] This same equation may account for the inspectors' failure to get SRB reports back to schools. They were not perceiving the reviews as staff initiated, self-improvement exercises but as an external check on efficiency. Opposition was coming from principals as well as the VSTA especially after Shears announced in 1978 that reviews would take place in a six year cycle.[113]

From 1975 the unions met to discuss a common approach to SRBs. By 1977 the VSTA was recommending the inclusion of the parent organisations who were demanding more participation in discussions with the department on SRBs. [114] The involvement of parent organisations in school 'accountability' can in part, be explained by the presence of school councils in Victoria but not in NSW. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter Six but, as noted earlier, there had

been negotiations on the structure and function of councils in 1974. Victorian parent organisations had been ready to respond to government moves to give school councils more responsibilities in the early 1970s. They had, in fact, proved themselves both well organised and capable of instigating the kind of compromises that would make allies of the teachers' unions (or at least the VSTA and the TTAV) while allowing those schools which could, to move towards much greater involvement of parents in both school policy and administration. The final 'enabling' legislation which allowed the restructuring of school councils in 1975 was a tribute to the parent organisations and the processes which led to it were a learning experience as they tested the waters of cooperation.

On the other hand, both the teachers' union and parent organisations in NSW had cooperated in resisting the introduction of school councils as proposed by the government in the early 1970s. Neither had been able to present a satisfactory alternative plan to the proposals which, for various reasons, were unacceptable. In this case it was the teachers' union which seemed to be the stronger partner in the alliance. The question as to whom should the school be accountable was made more complex both by the experiments in school curriculum and organisation taking place and by this additional structure of school administration in Victoria, the school council. For the VSTA, the parent groups offered a potential ally in their struggle for school autonomy. By July 1978 the department was claiming consultation with both the VSTA and the parent organisation.[115]

In 1979 the federal government entered the scene.[116] The Schools Commission's Report for the Triennium 1979-81 had argued for 'efforts to involve teachers, parents and members of the community in the improvement of schools and their programs.' [117] From 1979, \$200,000 was available to assist schools in all states in pilot projects to develop the process of more

responsibility to schools. Though the money concerned was negligible when divided among states, the Schools Commission voice gave more weight to the unions' claim that members of SRBs and procedures for school review should be decided by the school.

During August 1980 agreement was reached between the department, the VSTA, the VHSPA and the parent organisations that all high schools should be reviewed in the period 1980-86. However, 'the exact nature of each review (would) be a matter for discussion between the school concerned and the Director of Secondary Education, or his representative.' Schools could defer reviews and teachers could refuse classroom visitation during reviews. [118]

In 1980 the Technical Schools Division, the TTAV, the Association of Principals of Victorian Technical Institutions and the Associations of Councils of Technical Institutions came to an agreement on the review of technical schools. It followed that pattern agreed to in the high schools division.[119]

The media greeted the new arrangements with 'Public scrutiny of Victoria's 300 high schools will start this term with the introduction of a system of review boards' (my italics). [120] It quoted Mr Hec. Gallagher, an Assistant Director of Secondary Education saying that 'no other professional group is offering to have its performance evaluated as the teaching profession is.' [121] The debate over accountability had reached the media earlier in the year when a Mr McGarvie wrote on behalf of school inspectors on the necessity of inspection.[122] Ruth Hoadly, president of VICCSO and parent member of three School Review Boards, replied that parents were 'sceptical about the reports of inspectors' which, she argued, did nothing to improve the school and were unseen by parents. 'All accountability was upwards, to the Director of Education and the Minister' not to the clients of the school.[123] This response

must be seen in the light of the formal acknowledgment of the rights of parents in schools found in the restructure of school councils. Hoadley's statement points to the contradictions found in a system which had made such acknowledgments but which continued to make schools accountable to the central bureaucracy.

### **Conclusion.**

The question of school accountability through evaluation had a different path for the three departmental divisions in Victoria. The following discussion presents some tentative reasons for these differences and then foreshadows some differences between the states which are discussed in Chapter Five.

Inspectors remained deeply entrenched in primary administration and the VTU view of school evaluation. The primary union was involved in negotiations with the department to have staff participation in the selection and procedures of evaluation but took some time to accommodate the idea of greater parent and community involvement. It took longer for the primary union to develop policy which placed initiative for school evaluation with the school rather than the central administration. Teachers in primary schools have traditionally less recall to owning a professional body of knowledge. This affects their relationship with both the department and with the community. The pre-service training is generally shorter than for secondary teachers. Their job is more easily understood by the community generally. If they want to argue possession of a body of knowledge it must be in the realm of educational psychology, methods and assessment procedures. The content of their lessons is knowledge possessed by the majority of the community. The community may be in awe of their 'patience' in working with small children but not in awe of the information they are transmitting to students.

The TTAV continued without real confrontation with the division administrators and eventually came to an agreement following the high schools' battle with their administration. There is widespread opinion among teachers and unions in all divisions that technical teachers have had a different relationship to the administration, one characterised by more amicable settlement and greater freedom in the schools. The question of school autonomy has been less problematic. One reason often given is the small size of the division and the consequent ability of division administrators to be more in touch with schools. The need for central monitoring may also be affected by the nature of the clients in technical schools. Generally they are students whose place in the society has been decided. They have already been sifted into technical schools rather than high schools. It is in the high schools that the sorting process into tertiary education is still taking place. Traditionally many students from the technical division moved into trade areas. The case is not so clear cut, however. During the 1970s this pre-selection of outcomes between the divisions was undergoing change. More general education rather than vocationally specific education was being promoted in technical schools. There was provision made for students to move into universities and CAEs. This move towards a general education and the lessening of the distinction between the two secondary divisions is discussed in Chapter Seven. The move in 1980 towards similar patterns of school evaluation could be interpreted as a reflection of these changes. As well, the search for a continued place for technical schools while they were in a sense becoming more like high schools, i.e. offering similar avenues for their students, could be seen as a strong force to produce an alliance between the teachers and the Technical Division administration. Neither party wanted to lose the division and become part of a much larger pool with the consequent loss of an administrative empire. Teachers spoke of the possibilities for innovations in a smaller pool with a

reasonably sympathetic or even bewildered administration in the face of changes in technical schools' purposes and aims. Victoria is, of course, the last state to retain a division of technical secondary education and, during the 1970s, this situation was becoming less tenable as education was viewed not as vocationally specific, but as an avenue for class mobility. In the struggle to justify being separate while accepting these ideologies of education, the teachers and their union had considerable power. It was they who had to come up with the answers to the contradictions in classroom practice. It was they who had to find new justifications for the continuation of the administrative empire.

The full force of the accountability struggle remained with the high schools. Unlike the primary division they were challenging the inspectors' role in the identification of teachers for promotions positions. They stressed their professional position and highlighted their training through the control of entry campaign. For the administrators, getting an inspector into some schools became difficult. School evaluation remained a way of securing continued entry to schools by departmental representatives.

The movement away from centrally prescribed curriculum and class organisation and standardised pre-service training for teachers set in motion notions of school autonomy inconsistent with assessment by an outside body for general school inspection. Victorian secondary teachers moved further along the road to school-based decisions on curriculum and particularly organisation. The idea of accountability was moved into the area of self appraisal. In a sense the VSTA through its policy redefined the purpose of this procedure. The movements towards the community added an extra weight to the argument. The presence of school councils made the question of 'to whom should the school be accountable?' more visible to both teachers and parent organisations.

In NSW the assessment of schools by an inspector stopped but no formal alternative of self evaluation was devised. The schools were thus vulnerable to statements by the department that they lacked a mechanism for 'accountability'. Unlike Victoria they did not attempt to redefine the purpose of school inspection in formal procedures which required them to choose 'experts' from outside the school, nor did they embrace the concept of accountability to parents in their attempts to prevent the entry of inspectors. The department seemed reluctant to confront schools which refused school assessment by inspectors. This reluctance cannot be attributed solely to pressure from the NSWTF but requires an examination of the inspector's other role in schools as the assessor of teachers for promotion. Changes in the training of teachers and the movement away from prescribed curriculum and school organisation affected not only the union's responses to school assessment but also the relationship between teachers and those in executive positions in schools.

School assessment and inspection for promotion were separate procedures though in practice these functions were traditionally carried out by the same agent of the central employer. Inquiries or statements by the departments in the early 1970s on inspection have included proposals for both school evaluation and for the career structure of teachers. In the following chapter the inspector's function as the assessor of teacher aptitude for promotions is examined.

---

1. O. MacDonagh, A pattern of government growth 1800-60, London, 1961, p.323.

2. *ibid.*, p.332.

3. See F.M.G. Wilson, 'Ministries and boards: some aspects of administrative

- development since 1832.' Public administration, London, Vol. 33. Spring, 1955, pp.43-59.
4. R.L. Wettenhall, 'Administrative boards in nineteenth century Australia', Public administration, Sydney. Vol. 22, No. 2, p.257.
  5. J.F. Cleverley, The first generation - school and society in early Australia, Sydney, 1971, p.72.
  6. *ibid.*, p.39.
  7. D. Smart, 'The status of the teacher in penal and early colonial NSW society, 1788-1845', in A.D. Spaul (ed), Australian teachers, Melbourne, 1977, p.8.
  8. Wettenhall, *op. cit.*, p.256.
  9. *ibid.*
  10. See examples in Wettenhall, *op. cit.*, p.256-257.
  11. See D.C. Griffiths, Documents on the establishment of education in NSW 1789-1880, Melbourne, 1957, pp.32-47.
  12. A.G. Austin, Australian education 1788-1900, Carlton, Victoria, 1972 p.51.
  13. *Ibid*, p.52.
  14. *ibid.*, p. 53.
  15. J. Ely, Reality and rhetoric, Sydney, 1978, p.9.
  16. A. Barcan, A history of Australian education, Melbourne, 1980, pp. 84-85.
  17. Wettenhall, *op. cit.*, p.257.
  18. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p.51.
  19. J. Grant and G. Serle, The Melbourne scene 1803-1956, Sydney, 1978, p.82.
  20. The Common Schools Act. No. CXLIX. (Victoria), 18 June, 1862.
  21. K. Dear, 'Some influences affecting the status of public school teachers under the board of education in Victoria, 1862-72', in Spaul (ed), Australian teachers, *op. cit.*, p.27.
  22. L.J. Blake, 'The primary division', in L.J. Blake (ed), Vision and realization, Vol. 1. Melbourne, 1973, p. 305.
  23. B. Mitchell, Teachers, education and politics, St. Lucia, Queensland, 1975, p.81.
  24. VTU Annual Report, 1965.
  25. Mitchell, *op.cit.*, p.41.



26. J. Cleverley, 'The state primary school teacher between the wars', in Spaul (ed), Australian teachers, op. cit., p.91.
27. ibid., p.93.
28. Education gazette, 1 May, 1957, p.107.
29. ibid., p.107.
30. Education gazette, 1 April, 1965, pp.49-50.
31. A.M. Badcock, 'The secondary division', in Blake (ed), Vision and realization, op. cit. p. 487.
32. ibid., p. 567.
33. Department of Education, NSW, 'Criteria for assessment for promotion within the NSW teaching service', Aug. 1979, p.3, NSWTF Inspection files.
34. Policy on the inspectorial system adopted by NSWTF Council, 16 Aug.,1958, NSWTF Inspection files.
35. NSWTF Council resolution, Aug., 1958, NSWTF Inspection files.
36. NSWTF Annual Conference resolution, 1965, NSWTF Inspection files.
37. ibid.
38. NSWTF Annual Conference resolution, 1965, NSWTF Inspection files.
39. Mitchell, op. cit., p.156.
40. NSWTF Annual Conference resolution, 1955, NSWTF Inspection files.
41. ibid.
42. Policy on inspectorial system adopted by NSWTF Council, 16 Aug., 1958, NSWTF Inspection files.
43. Barcan, op. cit., p.339.
44. Mitchell, op. cit., p.195.
45. TTAV press release, 13 September, 1968, TTAV files.
46. NSWTF Annual Report, 1968, p 20.
47. NSWTF Annual Conference report,1967 in Education, Feb., 1968, p.21.
48. NSWTF Annual Conference 1967, working conditions resolutions, NSWTF Working Conditions file.
49. Teachers journal, Oct., 1964, p.362; Secondary teacher, No. 19, 1977, p.10.
50. VSTA Executive, 'White paper': Control of entry to the secondary teaching Profession, Sept., 1968.

51. *ibid.*
52. High school news, Vol. 9, No. 2, Sept., 1968, p.1.; Teachers journal, Mar., 1969.
53. High school news, Vol. 9, No. 2. Sept., 1968, p.2.
54. Editorial, Associate news 20 Sept., 1968; TTAV press release, 13 Sept., 1968.
55. Personal communication with teachers employed in this period.
56. VSTA Executive, 'White paper', *op.cit.*
57. Age, August 27, 1969.
58. B. McBurney, 'Maribyrnong dissidents', Secondary teacher, Aug., 1971, pp.4-5.
59. Board of enquiry into certain aspects of the state teaching service (Southwell enquiry), Melbourne, 1971.
60. David Spencer, McKinnon High School, Secondary teacher, March 1973, p.8.
61. Secondary teacher, No. 13, 1975, p 7.
62. 1975 Professional action campaign, Secondary teacher, March 1975.
63. Secondary teacher, No. 15, 1975, p.7.
64. Department of Education, NSW, Report of the working party on inspection and advisory services, Sept., 1971.
65. L.W. Shears, Director General of Education, Vic., 'The teacher and the school administrator', Reprinted in Teachers journal, Aug-Sept., 1974, pp.392-397.
66. NSWTF, Annual Conference resolution, 1969, NSWTF Inspection files.
67. Replies from Associations re inspection system 28 July 1969. NSWTF Inspection files.
68. I. Lancaster, Gen. Sec., NSWTF to J.A. Vercoe, Director General of Education, NSW, 15 March 1971, NSWTF Inspection files.
69. NSW Dept. of Education. Minutes of working party on inspectors and advisory services, 18 Feb., 1971, p.1, NSWTF Inspection file.
70. *ibid.*
71. *ibid.*
72. Working party, *op. cit.*, p.11.
73. *ibid.*, p.12.
74. *ibid.*

75. *ibid.*, p.15.
76. *ibid.*, p.34.
77. *ibid.*, p.17 and p. 23.
78. *ibid.*, p.24.
79. *ibid.*, p.21.
80. See J. Ely. Reality and rhetoric, Sydney, NSW, 1978.
81. NSW Dept. of Education, memorandum to principals. 15 Feb., 1972, NSWTF Inspection files.
82. Working party, p. *cit.*, p.19.
83. NSW Dept. of Education, Report of the working party on assessment of teachers and evaluation of schools, Aug, 1974, p.10.
84. NSWTF circular to members, 'Inspection alias appraisals, advisory visits, etc', 1976, NSWTF Inspection files.
85. J. O'Brien, 'The Narwee saga', Education, 8 Dec., 1976, p.449.
86. NSWTF, report of deputation to the Director General of Education, NSW. 14 June, 1977, NSWTF Inspection files.
87. Cited in above.
88. *ibid.*
89. D. Swan, Director General of Education, NSW, to J. George, Gen. Sec., NSWTF, 20 May, 1980, NSWTF Inspection files.
90. Muswellbrook High School, submission on accountability of schools, Dec., 1977, NSWTF Inspection files.
91. TTAV inspection policy 1970, TTAV files.
92. Secondary teacher, No. 1 1978, Appendix C.5. p.20; TTAV pamphlet, Inspection policy, 1970., TTAV files.
93. L.W. Shears, Director General of Education, Victoria. 'The teacher and the school administrator'. reprinted in Teachers journal, Aug-Sept., 1974, pp.392-397.
94. *ibid.*, p.393.
95. *ibid.*
96. *ibid.*
97. *ibid.*
98. *ibid.*

99. *ibid.*
100. *ibid.*, p.396.
101. *ibid.*, p.395.
102. *ibid.*, p.394.
103. Teachers journal, Aug-Sept., 1974, p.395.
104. Combined TTAV, VSTA, VTU meeting, Sept., 1975, VTU School Review file.
105. Education Gazette, (Viv.), 23 Feb., 1977.
106. VTU reports of deputation with Director of Primary Education, 17 Jun., 1976; 22 Jul., 1976; 31 Mar., 1977, VTU School Review files.
107. VTU, notice of ratification of industrial committee recommendation, 6 Mar., 1981, VTU School Review file.
108. Secondary teacher, No. 1, 1978, p.17.
109. VSTA Central Committee, Dec. 1976, Secondary Teacher, No.1, 1978, Appendix C.8, p.22.
110. VSTA Central Committee, July, 1977, Secondary teacher, No. 1, Appendix C.8, p.22.
111. Dr L.W. Shears, Director General of Education, Victoria, to principals, staff and members of school councils, 24 Jul., 1978, VTU School Review file.
112. Secondary teacher, No.14, 1978, p.21.
113. Secondary Teacher, No. 14, 1978, p.12.
114. Assistant Secretary, VSTA to B. Rummen, Assistant Gen. Sec., VTU. 14 Oct., 1977; Report of the Five Organisations (VTU, TTAV, VSTA, VICCSO, VFSSPC) meeting, 15 Sept., 1977, VTU School Review file.
115. R.M. McGregor, Acting Assistant Director of Secondary Education, memorandum to schools and school councils, 17 July, 1978, VTU School Review file.
116. R.H. Costello, Gen. Sec., ATF & ATF representative on the Schools Commission Ad Hoc Committee on School Evaluation, to Gen. Sec., VTU, VTU School Review file.
117. K.R. McKinnon, Chairman, Schools Commission, to V. Davy, President, Australian Teachers Federation, 1 Jan., 1979, VTU School Review file.
118. VSTA News, 15 Sept., 1980; Education Department, Victoria, memorandum to all principals, teachers and members of school councils of secondary schools, School review, 8 Feb., 1980. TTAV files.
119. R.G. Ritchie, Acting Director of Technical Education, to principals, staff

and members of school councils, 1980. TTAV files.

120. Age, 11 Sept., 1980.

121. ibid.

122. Age, 21 Mar., 1980.

123. Age, 31 Mar., 1980.

## 5: INSPECTION AND PROMOTION

In both NSW and Victoria staffing in schools has been rigidly hierarchical. A chain of power to make decisions in the school existed with teachers at the bottom, the principal at the top and various positions of authority in between (deputies, subject or department masters/mistresses). The number and duties of these middle positions of authority depended on the size of the school and its type (e.g. primary, secondary). Promotion to positions of greater salary and authority, i.e. to the school executive, was regulated by systems of inspection.

### **NSW - Inspection and union tactics.**

Before the report of the Working Party on Inspection and Advisory Services in NSW [1] was presented in 1971, schools received notice of a union resolution which called on the minister, the director general and the PSB to stop all inspections for the remainder of 1971 except for certification and placement on promotions lists and to implement the Inspections and Promotions Policy adopted by the 1970 Annual Conference in 1972.[2] If the authorities failed to comply, the NSWTF called upon school staffs to refuse inspection.

The 1970 Annual Conference[3] had resolved that assessment of efficiency was necessary only for candidates for promotion. Teachers seeking the award of a teachers' certificate or the placement on a promotions list should be assessed by a panel. This comprised; principal or mistress, the subject master or a certificated teacher and a certificated teacher nominated by the assessee for the former. For promotions lists, the panel was to consist of the nominee of the director, a principal or mistress and a practising teacher nominated by the union. The position of inspector was to be abolished and

replaced by consultative services of advisers, appointed for a maximum of three years. This was to take place within a system of small area units administered by committees with equal representation for the NSWTF and the Department of Education. In the assessment procedure, stress was to be placed on the teacher's relationships with pupils and with staff members.

The policy resolution came from a committee set up in 1970 to examine the question of inspection and which had received further comment on the policy resolutions of 1969 from schools and associations. Much of the 1970 resolution seems, however, to have been influenced by the Secondary Teachers' Association Professional Committee. Its original proposal was much more radical.[4] It proposed, on a small area basis, committees very similar in power to the Classifier's Committees in Victoria. The assessing would be done by these Committees without the report of an inspector which, as we will see, was what the VSTA was pressing for in Victoria. This suggests the presence of a radical group in the Secondary Teachers' Association but the resolution finally adopted by Annual Conference 1970 remained much more within the prevailing structure. Though the assessment was to be carried out by a panel, the inspector remained on it in the form of a 'nominee of the director'. The promotions structure remained the key to the control of teachers by an outside body. Some inspectors were quite open in their use of inspection for this purpose. A principal complained to the NSWTF that following the two-day inspection of the deputy principal for promotion by two inspectors, he (the principal) received a communication from the director which read as though either he, as principal, or the school, had undergone an inspection or appraisal.[5]

The immediate target attacked in the August 1971 directive to refuse all inspection, except for promotion, was school inspection or appraisal. The union

was objecting to the need to inspect teachers or schools unless they were seeking promotion. The difficulty in separating the inspection of individual teachers from those in their supervision soon became obvious. The material which follows is a description of the struggle in NSW over this issue with the department and a description of the internal union struggle over appropriate tactics.

On August 16, 1971 a Conference was held between the PSB, the Education Department and the NSWTF.[6] The Board wanted to know why a directive to refuse inspection had been made while the report of the Working Party was still to be presented, since no negotiations could go on while a ban was in operation. Dickinson (for the PSB), stressed that the NSWTF was asking its members to 'disobey lawful instructions'. He called it 'industrial blackmail'. Note here the presence of the PSB which the department had earlier argued was concerned with 'working conditions' not with the question of inspection.

After an executive meeting, the NSWTF advised the PSB that it would not withdraw the direction. The PSB called the union's bluff and on August 20, notified the Industrial Registrar of a dispute regarding inspections.[7] The executive met on August 24 and decided to recommend to Council of August 27-28 that action be suspended and considered again on October 9.[8]

A compulsory conference was called between the PSB and the NSWTF. However, before the compulsory conference was called, fifty five members of Manly Boys High School had held a meeting to discuss their actions over the impending inspection. It was resolved by a majority vote that the school staff would abide by the resolution of the union Council and refuse inspection. They conveyed this decision to the senior inspector. [9] This seemed to have precipitated the compulsory conference. During this conference, Ludeke



(counsel for the PSB) made much of the fact that this action would affect the promotions of teachers and their 'prospects'. He also suggested that this action might 'set to nought' the inquiry on inspection which was being conducted. He made the point that the union had withdrawn its representative from this inquiry and the tone of the communication was that Federation was being obstructive on all counts. Sweeny (counsel for the NSWTF) argued that the Manly Boys High School example illustrated the depth of feeling of teachers on the issue of inspection. They were prepared to act even though they were aware of its personal and adverse consequences. He then read the Executive recommendations to Council ... that the action on inspection be suspended. There was a time problem arising as school holidays were beginning that day. Sweeney agreed to Ludeke's request to advise members of the decision to suspend action on inspection.[10] However, Council did not make a decision on executive recommendations. A special Council meeting was called for Monday, September 13. The PSB seems not to have been informed by the union of this delay until it enquired about two conflicting reports in the media and was obliged to phone the union.[11]

It seems strange that such an important item was so low on the agenda that it was 'not reached' at the regular council meeting. It could suggest that debates in Council were very long because of factional disagreements. The general secretary assured the Secretary of the PSB that it was first on the agenda of the special Council and, 'having regard to the voting at the executive meeting the officers are confident that Council will approve the Executive decision.' The letter stressed that Manly Boys High teachers would be advised of the decision. The letter ended 'the officers are confident that in these circumstances the inspection referred to in your letter will be able to proceed in the normal manner.'[12] Special Council carried the resolution recommended

by executive and teachers were notified.[13] However, four teachers at Manly Boys High School, Ashton, Powel, Howes and Clarke, 'refused to submit themselves for inspection while school inspection was taking place.'[14] Of these, Ashton had led the long debate in council against suspension of action on inspection.

At this school the usual weeklong inspection was prolonged into the second week. The school underwent a full school inspection as was prescribed every six years. The arrangements were that eleven inspectors with different specialties would remain in the school for a week. They were to inspect the school as a whole, the departments and all the teaching staff in the classrooms. [15] Besides this, two subject masters, the English master and the history master had requested inspection for consideration for placement on promotions list 3. The four teachers who refused inspection were supervised by these two teachers. They were then not merely resisting school inspection but their involvement in the personal inspection of teachers seeking consideration for promotion. Opposition to this practice had been explicit in union policy since 1965.

During the inquiry that resulted from the refusal of inspection by the four teachers and the subsequent charging of these teachers under Section 37 of the Teaching Service Act, the counsel for the NSWTF asked Wotherspoon, an inspector who had been called in for the second week, if this long inspection was usual: 'Did you, together with your panel of fellow inspectors, decide that your authority was being questioned in this school by a certain group of people and were you determined to have a show down with them.'[16] This certainly seems a reasonable explanation of the inspection extending into the second week. Some inspectors in the second week were new which suggests an unplanned decision to stay longer.

The Manly Boy's High incident requires further examination to understand the implication of the dispute for union tactics. Of the four teachers who refused inspection, Ashton, Clarke, Howes and Powell, three were fined \$50, and one, Powell, \$30. [17] All were young teachers in assistant (i.e. not promotions) positions. Though the staff of Manly Boys High[18] requested the union executive to take state-wide action, it decided in favour of full legal support.[19] Whether by design or natural legal practices, the actions of the lawyers during the departmental enquiry were in danger of further denying the four teachers their right of protest on inspection. In his effort to get the four off the charge, the union lawyer tried initially to argue that no order had been adequately given, i.e. that they had not taken action. Ashton was forced to state that he had refused inspection and would do so again.[20]

The action by these four teachers highlights a move towards school action or even individual action rather than mass action directed by the union centre. Debate at Annual Conference 1967 on working conditions had centred on this issue.[21] The consensus at that time seemed to be that the first step for a member was to get the support of the school staff for any action. This is reflected in the 1971 directive to schools on inspection in which the first step, on being advised of an impending inspection, was for NSWTF members to meet and decide on action for the implementation of policy. However, the directive continued that teachers whose colleagues did not indicate their preparedness to implement policy could act alone in refusing inspection and receive the full support of the Executive and Council. The staff of Manly Boys High had followed these guidelines.

Further evidence for the growing willingness of schools to take action alone is found throughout 1968.[22] The argument has been put that if a general

strike was not called in November, 1968, the NSWTF would have faced a series of individual actions. That the Executive feared this loss of control is demonstrated in the constant call for unity from the president. [23] Added evidence for the changes in the type of action being used by teachers to press their demands is found in 1972. The directions which teachers refused were varied and were not confined solely to the metropolitan area nor to the secondary area though action was greater amongst these teachers. The central concern was the departmental staffing policy. At one time 1000 teachers had been notified of intention to bring charges against them.[24]

The NSWTF was under threat. A 'Fighting Fund' was set up to provide assistance to members who suffered financially as a result of taking action within the terms of Conference or Council decisions.[25] The government responded by refusing to allow the Department of Education to deduct union contributions.[26] Many teachers also signed a petition asking that contributions to the fund be voluntary rather than from a general increase in contributions.[27] The executive advised a 'reconsideration' of the fighting fund. It had sought legal opinion from Mr N. Wran Q.C. who advised that Trustees or officers were not empowered to pay strike pay because of Rule 7 in their industrial agreement which said no member should take part in an illegal strike.[28]

At the same time the NSWTF was having a bitter struggle with the PSB over the provision of relief staff. The dispute was before the NSW Industrial Commission. The PSB stated a determination to proceed with an application for deregistration of the NSWTF which caused the union to suspend direct action.[29] Action was later re-introduced and a state wide stoppage planned, then withdrawn. However, the Board on November 7, 1972 indicated that it had made application for cancellation of the registration of the NSWTF as an

industrial union. It was not until November 3, 1973 that the full bench of the State Industrial Commission decided by a majority of 2 to 1 to dismiss the application.[30]

The NSWTF obviously faced enormous difficulties during this period. Individual members were being charged. Its ability to help them financially was legally questionable. It had now to set up the machinery to collect members' contributions and suffer a probable fall in membership. It had to face the threat of loss of right to apply to the Industrial Commission for salary awards and the possibility that any group of teachers could seek registration under the Industrial Arbitration Act. The consequences for the union of individual refusal to obey departmental directives was massive. Yet this seemed to be the way ahead for a growing section of the active members. The changes in membership of Council during 1971/2 were numerous. Many of the old tacticians had gone.

Ashton stood for the position of Deputy President in 1972. He ran on a ticket with others who supported an attempt to change the tactics of the union from one which espoused direction from the executive to one which required members to take individual action on policy laid down at Conference and supported by Executive. They were defeated but the 1973 Executive is now legendary. It is known as the '9:8 executive' with the old guard 'left' having a majority of one.

From the evidence presented there were two struggles taking place; one between the department, the PSB and the union, the other within the union, over the question of union tactics. These two struggles met head on in the tactics used by the department and the PSB against the union, i.e. in the charging of individual union members under Section 37 and

application for de-registration of the union.

The union correspondence with the PSB on the inspection issue demonstrates the union executive's desire to show the Board that everything was alright, that it had control of the situation and of members. The Board and the Department dealt traditionally with the union hierarchy as manager to manager rather than as manager to spokesperson for the members' wishes. School based action by members challenged the control which the union executive had in industrial decisions and its relationship to the government, the department and the PSB. The employer brought out the heavy artillery.

The problem was, however, that there were some issues, of which inspection is one, over which it would be impossible to mobilise all the membership at one time and in which the traditional tactics (deputations, media campaigns) were either not working or were inappropriate. Action on the issue of inspection had an extra problem for the union since it jeopardised not only the activists' career but also those of other members.

#### **NSW Inspection and supervision.**

The natural progression from discussion and action on the question of inspection to discussion of the hierarchy of decision making within the school had already been seen in union resolutions of the late 1950s. At Annual Conference 1972 the Educational and Professional Committee was directed to promote discussion of what came to be called 'Democracy in Schools'. This included teachers', students' and parents' rights and responsibilities. A seminar organised by the union included papers by teachers, a student and a parent.[31] A policy endorsed by Annual Conference 1973,[32] recommended 'alternative and democratic structures', emphasised school autonomy and the participation of teachers, students and parents in the formulation of school policy and

organisation. The parent role remained one of consultation at the school level.

Before this policy was endorsed Ashton again put the principle of democracy in the school to the test. This caused a split in the union. In 1972 he refused to hand over note books from his sixth form classes and to fill in the lesson register as directed by the master. He was suspended under Section 37 of the Teaching Service Act. After an involved confrontation when he returned to take his classes while still suspended, the police were called in by the principal and he was charged under section 50(1) of the Summary Offences Act.[33] He defied union executive direction to comply with regulations and was denied legal aid. The strength of opposition from some Executive members is evidenced by their threat to use the Summary Offences Act to remove Ashton supporters handing out information to Councillors entering the headquarters of the union and in the refusal of legal aid. The former action is curious for the union was simultaneously vigorously fighting the use of the Act against unions, in particular, its use against one of its own organisers during a lunch time meeting at a school.[34]

Ashton won an appeal to the Crown Employees Appeal Board against his suspension. The judgment stated that he had 'misconceived his position as an employee' and he was given a final opportunity to 'recognise the authority of the subject master'.[35] The Summary Offences Act was later dismissed on a technicality. The 'win' was therefore of a questionable nature.

There are two possible causes for the hostility of the executive, besides the fact that he was not seen to be following a union policy though this was a matter of contention.[36] First, Ashton had acted alone, which threatened the notion of unified union action controlled by the centre. Second, he took action

against the hierarchy within the school and not the usually designated 'enemy' the inspector, the government, the PSB. Those whose orders he refused were also members of the union. In spite of talk about democracy in the school in the following year, and objection to certain actions by supervisors since 1963[37] the hierarchy of positions was not seriously challenged in union policy until the 1976 Annual Conference adopted its 'Policy of the Future'.[38]

This policy stated that the school was 'the nucleus' of the education system and that teachers, in the future, must accept collective management and responsibility in school government. It proposed that necessary administrative positions for coordination within the school and liaison with the department, be filled by teachers elected by the teaching staff and be of limited period with the right for re-election. These teachers should receive time for administrative functions but no extra salary.

Since this policy is designated 'future', the union continued to demand the introduction of assessment panels for promotions positions with union representation but to little avail. By 1980 in NSW only teachers who were seeking placement on a promotions list or whose efficiency was brought into question by the principal, an inspector or a director were inspected. Principals of schools reported on teachers who were on probation for the award of the teachers' certificate, teachers entering the service from another authority, re-employed teachers and untrained teachers. They also completed the teacher assessment review schedule for all members of staff not seeking promotion. Teachers were marked either efficient or not efficient.

The issue of inspection has lost whatever impact it had. One possible reason for this could be that there are, with falling enrolments, very few promotions positions available to teachers and they have decided it is not worth the



effort. Conversely everyone is competing for very scarce rewards and fears to 'rock the boat'. From observation it would appear that the second is a more accurate suggestion.

### **Principals and power.**

As the presence of the inspector in schools diminished and became concerned only with the promotion of teachers, the powers of the principals have been increased and efforts have been made to reinforce their functions of staff supervision. This has already been demonstrated in the department's action in handing over some of the inspection function to the principal in 1971.

In 1978 the Acting Director General, Buchan, sent out a document entitled 'Managing the School'. [39] It noted that employers and parents were seeking accountability of teachers and administrators in their management of education. This made it necessary to provide 'guidance' about management, the school curriculum and school planning and procedures. Throughout the document the role of the school executive is stressed. It reinforces the line of authority between the school executive and the department, where previously the line had been through the inspector. Though there is mention of teacher participation in discussions of policy and curriculum formation, the final responsibility is placed on the principal. It laid stress on the development of statements of aims and objectives for the whole school and for specific curriculum areas and on documentation of evaluation of school programs and pupils. These documents were to be available from the school executive, regional director or inspector of schools.

From evidence of deputations by the union to the department and memoranda from organisers, it is clear that the document was used by many principals and executive staff to reinforce their power over curriculum in the school and to

give them access to the classrooms of subordinates. Careful overseeing was claimed to be needed to fulfil the role of 'accountability'. Inspectors demanded demonstration of such supervision in their assessment of candidates for promotion.[40]

The emergence of other documents on 'Executive Restructure' [41] continued this move towards greater powers for principals in school, in 1978. In the restructuring proposal for secondary schools, principals were given the power to propose specifications for senior teacher positions and could act as consultants for appointments. They could also select and appoint members of staff to 'posts of responsibility'. This would mean that a principal could decide what the duties in the school should be and then organise the structure of the school hierarchy to his/her own model. In the structure presently prescribed the executive was centrally appointed with little scope for school variation. The new proposals made the school more able to respond to particular situations or 'community needs' but the major decisions were left in the principal's hands.

For the union the department's proposal to eliminate the principle of seniority posed industrial problems. Appeals on the criterion of merit would force the union into either giving legal representation to all contenders (a costly business) or to prejudge the case by assisting the member whose case appeared to be sustainable or to give no legal assistance. The last mentioned would deny members a basic function of membership. The seniority principle allowed the union to distance itself from judgment about 'good teachers'. However, with the growth of diversity in schools central appointment on seniority becomes problematic. Different subject combinations and different philosophies in schools may require rethinking the methods of appointment of teachers and executive to schools.

At 1979 Annual Conference the union rejected the department's restructuring proposals but, until saved by an amendment (which kept the Policy for the Future alive) was heading towards an endorsement of a policy which retained the old hierarchical structure and over-ruled the 'Policy for the Future' developed three years earlier. Opposition to the department's proposals came from two sources: those wanting to retain the present executive structure and those wanting radical reform who found the department initiative unworkable.

Though the democratic sentiments in the Policy for the Future are obvious, it should not be overlooked that these came at the start of a decline in the availability of promotions positions. Declining enrolments which were to cause the closure of some schools in the early 1980s had halted the growth of secondary schools. It is noteworthy that another change in the demographic features of the school population had earlier brought about changes in the hierarchical structure of the education system and subsequently had an impact on teachers' organisations. Mitchell demonstrates the changes in enrolment patterns in the first two decades of the century, particularly the growth of staffed schools, i.e. schools with a principal (formerly head master/mistress) and assistants, and the decline of small, one-teacher schools. These structural changes meant that most teachers were 'assistants'. At the same time these assistants were being better trained in a special pre-service institution. The result was the growth of a militant group of assistants who were involved in the establishment of the NSWTF.

How the NSWTF will respond to the demographic changes in the 1980s is still not decided though by the late 1970s it was clear to most members that for many reasons the hierarchical structure within schools was presenting problems. In 1978 the President, Barry Manefield, in urging members to attend the seminar on Democratic Schools spoke of the long wait for promotions.

positions. It must have been clear to the department as well as the NSWTF that he did not speak idly when he stated that 'the present system is breaking down and must be changed.' [42] By 1980 'forced transfers' because of falling enrolments were a constant subject of Council discussions. Falling enrolments also caused the reclassification of schools which affected the promotion of teachers. These demographic changes and their associated question of restructuring have, by the late 1980s, highlighted some of the divisions within the union, particularly the division along gender lines.

#### **Women and promotion.**

In 1977, 57 percent of all teachers in NSW were women. In the primary/infants division 70 percent of teachers were women. In the secondary division 45 percent of teachers were women. However, only 40 percent of the promotions positions in primary/infants schools were occupied by women and 18 percent in the secondary schools. Women teachers were more likely to be under 25 years old (52 percent women, 31 percent men) and to receive under \$15,000 per annum (96 percent women, 76 percent men).[43]

In the primary and infants' restructuring proposals, the most controversial change proposed was the introduction of common lists of eligibility for promotion for primary and infants' teachers. In the prevailing structure those women teachers who chose to teach in infants' schools could not become principals of primary schools. Though on the surface the restructure seemed to offer more to infants' (women) teachers, they were the most opposed to the proposals for it eliminated the one area which women teachers controlled. As well, it was proposed that the principal could apply to the regional director for a senior teacher with 'certain expertise' (decided by the principal) and the position could be advertised throughout the state.

Commenting on the proposals, the Senior Vice President, Barbara Murphy, noted that because many women had broken service to bear and raise children the system of seniority did not favour them. However, she rejected the suggestion that the introduction of a system of appointment by merit would redress this situation as the Technical College experience was not positive. The power for the principal to nominate criteria for the executive of the school would, she believed, work against women for principals were generally men (over 80 percent of promotions positions were men) who held traditional attitudes.[44] Women teachers were thus trapped between the criteria of merit and seniority, neither of which promised equality. The outcome was that the principle of seniority remained in both primary/infants and secondary divisions. However, infants' school mistresses were given access to the position of principal of the primary school. The director general 'placated the primary male lobby' by allowing primary teachers access to the List 3 (mistress) jobs.[45]

Besides the pressure from demographic factors already mentioned, the restructuring shows the influence of both the arrival of the Anti-Discrimination Act, NSW, in June 1977 and a review of NSW government administration. The latter had argued in 1977 that 'the appointment to and promotion within the administration should be solely on the basis of merit'.[46] It is the activities of the NSW Anti-Discrimination Board that I wish to discuss now. To attempt to understand the tangled web of gender and promotion in NSW we must extend the exposition into the early 1980s.

In 1978 the union had its first real test of the problems of seniority and women. Executive endorsed a proposal from the Department of Education's Anti-Discrimination Committee which recommended the removal of discrimination on the basis of sex in the appointment of principals to single sex

high schools. Three women subsequently appointed to girls' high schools were challenged by men more senior on the promotions list. The department cancelled the women's appointments.

The women approached the union for the matter to go to the Industrial Commission. The union did not support them on the grounds of the earlier executive decision to remove discrimination in single sex schools. The women took action in the Supreme Court and won. The men were to be found positions in regional offices with principals' salaries but they decided to challenge again. Both the men and the women approached the union for support. As the men were senior to the women they were given support and the case went back to the Supreme Court. The men won. The department was ordered to pay costs as it was considered that it was its inept handling which created the problem. [47]

Clearly, if the removal of discrimination against women was the basis for the department's proposal and executive endorsement, it had back fired. The few avenues open to women for promotion in girls' schools were likely to disappear with this new 'equality'. The principle of seniority remained sacred to the union and overshadowed any principle of affirmative action for women.

In 1979 a report from the Anti-Discrimination Board on secondary promotions recommended a change to the system of seniority which favoured those whose 'mobility' allowed them to move to country areas to take up promotions positions and achieve accelerated promotions. This procedure had been used by the department as an incentive to staff isolated rural areas. The 1979 Annual Conference adopted, after fierce debate, a policy of affirmative action for women, including the Anti Discrimination Board's recommendation. The policy drew opposition from several country associations during 1980 but a proposal to

delete the section on seniority was defeated at Annual Conference.

In 1981, in conformity with the requirements of the NSW Anti-Discrimination legislation, the department's Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) unit commenced its Management Plan and after a comprehensive study proposed changes similar to those recommended by the Anti-Discrimination Board and the union.[48] The union appeared now to have the ideal opportunity to implement part of its affirmative action policy. The department clearly outlined the planned changes to all schools and the reasons behind them. It showed in fact that in 1982 the average mobility rate for women was 7.4 percent, for men 32.2 percent.[49] The media was informed of the imminent changes.[50] However the department had at the same time called for submissions in response to its plan and two sections of the union vehemently opposed it, some country (mostly male) teachers and principals.[51] Pressure for urgent implementation of the plan was coming from the Anti-Discrimination Board. The union resolved to support the plan but was demanding that the whole question of staffing schools be examined. In this move it was joined by the 1983 State ALP Conference. A working party was established.

From here it becomes clear that though the union was trying to separate the two issues, the discrimination against women and the problem of staffing isolated rural areas, these were being joined by the principals on the working party and its chairperson, the department's Director of Industrial Relations, Des Brady. The emphasis was on staffing. Brady dominated the working party and was of the view that the real reason for the underrepresentation of women in promotions positions was not immobility but their failure to apply for positions. He presented a personal report to the Minister and was supported by him. The union withdrew from the working party. The Minister, Cavalier, was described by the union's chief protagonist in the affirmative action issue,

Barbara Murphy, as 'an aggressive male chauvinist, well known for his anti-female activities within the ALP',[52] a view shared by many female and some male members of both the union and the Labor Party. He made provocative statements, 'Women want it both ways', and 'I've heard it all before in the ALP'[53] He had in fact made equally provocative statements about his readiness to 'take on' the union from the moment he received the portfolio. It was seen by many as a testing ground for the young, 'left' Minister in a right wing dominated Labor government. His appointment at a time when affirmative action was taking hold in the largest state union, with a majority of female members is notable.

The outcome was the decision by Cavalier not to implement the EEO policy to which the Labor Party was committed. He was made bold perhaps by a surprise election of three right wing candidates as senior officers to the union (president, deputy president and senior vice president) in late 1983. Among the reasons given for this change was membership dissatisfaction with the union's affirmative action policy on promotion and changes to the superannuation scheme which removed some disadvantages for broken service. Funding by right wing groups outside the union was also suggested.

The effect of the minister's decision was that the government could continue to hold out the carrot of promotion to staff isolated schools rather than offer adequate salary and conditions incentives at a time when rural teachers and parents were seen as a powder keg with explosion imminent.

Another effect was remarked upon by Barbara Murphy. Beside the fact that women remained disadvantaged in promotion those teachers who treated their families 'in a more cavalier fashion, are rewarded with promotion'.[54] If we develop this idea we could suggest that positions of authority and influence in



schools (principals) were likely to be held by those who had demonstrated a marked degree of male chauvinism in their progression up the hierarchy, those perhaps whose wives' prospects of employment had been sacrificed to their own ambition. Commitment to non sexist curriculum, and school practices could be less than optimal. It is not surprising then, that such opposition for affirmative action came from principals.

The bitterness of many male correspondents to the union journal on this subject must, however, be seen in the light of the appalling conditions many rural teachers experienced. Their fear that, with scarcity of promotions positions and low resignation rates because of teacher unemployment, they would be stuck in isolated areas was very real. The general problem of staffing was used to obscure the gender inequalities. But the obscuring is done in such a complex way that it draws upon the division between male and female teachers. The tangled web of mechanisms of central control which hinge on assessment for promotion and struggles centring on gender are obvious. They are however difficult to untangle and therefore it is difficult for teachers to seize upon the mechanisms of their repressions.

#### **Victoria - Inspection and Promotion.**

The 1969 Annual General Meeting of the VSTA carried unanimously a resolution directing all secondary teachers to refuse to be inspected and assessed for promotion purposes by the Board of Inspectors of Secondary Schools (BISS). The arguments used against inspection were that it was 'inefficient', 'unprofessional', and 'inappropriate'. [55] The tactic used, was that it was not legal, an interpretation offered by the Crown Solicitor[56] The BISS had no legal status to be the body which decided fitness for promotion. The Committee of Classifiers, was the only body legally constituted under the

Teaching Service Act to appoint permanent teachers to vacancies and nowhere was it stated that the BISS should advise them. This Committee consisted of a union representative, the nominee of the Director of the Division and a chairperson appointed by the minister.

The VSTA was attacking the central control over teachers through the system of assessment for promotion. This was quite a different tactic to that of the NSWTF where the only place permitted the inspector was the assessment of persons requesting promotion. Though countless proposals for inspection by panels were made from 1970, the NSWTF kept a place for a departmental member. The legal status of the inspector in both NSW and Victoria seems to have been that of the delegated representative of the Director General. In NSW he had the power to determine promotions on the evidence of reports of inspections [57] but not in Victoria where the Committee of Classifiers held that power. The tactic in NSW was, as previously demonstrated to limit the powers, control the criteria for inspection for promotion and control who became an inspector, not withstanding continual cries for the removal of the office.

The decision to refuse inspection was not a sudden move. The VSTA had attempted during the 1950s and early 1960s to negotiate changes to the inspection procedures, without challenging the system.[58] It had proposed a more radical change during the late 1960s. Following accreditation as a teacher, salaries would automatically rise with special allowances for a particularly defined responsibility for which any teacher could apply. In this 'one class' system appointments to these positions would be made by the Committee of Classifiers 'on the basis of application, references and interview.' [59]

The most outstanding feature of the VSTA's attempt to change the system

during the 1960s was the number of authorities it approached, the number of interested parties and the complexity of the chain of command. All could theoretically have made change under the existing law. The minister could have exercised his ultimate powers, the department had power to abolish inspectorial assessment and the Classifiers could have disregarded such assessment.

To circumvent the need for the BISS in the 1969 policy, the VSTA proposed that up to three referees, nominated by the teacher, submit references concerning the teacher's aptitude for promotions directly to the Committee of Classifiers. The VSTA noted that its procedure was not perfect but could function within the present classification system. It was a compromise position from the earlier proposal for a 'one class' system.

The TTAV produced a similar policy to the VSTA in 1979. It included the demand that the Committee of Classifiers 'advertise relevant positions stating clearly the nature of the duties and the responsibilities associated with each type of post' - after consultation with each school and the Department of Technical Education. [60] The schools would thus have input in the job requirements and conditions and the criteria used by the Classifiers would become public knowledge.

Many high school branches refused entry to schools by inspectors though some teachers were hostile to the policy and wanted to have a choice of either inspection or references. The reference system functioned successfully however until late 1973 with the Committee of Classifiers accepting as evidence of aptitude for promotion either references or the assessment of the BISS[61] At that time the Director of Secondary Education, Mr A.E. Struhan, directed his nominee on the Classifiers Committee to support for principal class positions

those candidates who had been assessed by the BISS. [62] In 1974 the Classifiers Committee promoted to principal only those teachers who had BISS assessment. [63] The VSTA described the Committee's action as 'victimization'. Stop work action was taken by neighbouring schools when one school refused inspection. Protests against 'victimisation' included two one-day, state-wide strikes and a four-day strike. Various regions had strikes of from two to three days and there was a city march and demonstration outside Parliament (not in school hours). Letters were sent and meetings were held with appointees who had used BISS assessment to have them 'speak out against the injustice'. [64]

The movement back to BISS Assessment by the department in 1974 had been accomplished chiefly by the provocative appointment of Mr A. Clark as chairman. He was President of the VTU in 1971 and 1972 and described by the VSTA as 'one of the most conservative presidents' they had ever had. [65] He voted continually with the secondary division representative. Impending chaos over appointments for 1976 forced the director general to undertake negotiations with the VSTA though the continued hostile actions of a new Director of Secondary Education, Mr R. Francis and Clark threatened to undo these negotiations.[66]

In 1975 a compromise position was finally reached with the minister and director general which introduced State Aptitude Assessment Panels (SAAP). These consisted of the principal, the director's nominee and a teacher selected by the applicant from a group of teachers elected by the staff. The procedure was by interview and panel discussion. The applicants had the right to present any evidence they felt applicable, including other teachers or persons from outside the school, to testify to their suitability. The SAAP reported to the Committee of Classifiers in consensus (majority) and individually. [67]

There were continual problems with this situation, most notably the fact that the nominees of the Director of Secondary Education (an inspector) took charge of the interviewing procedure. The principals were usually given the role of chairperson which seems to have limited their participation in the interviewing situation. [68] The teacher members often felt they were underlings.[69] One applicant stressed that the teacher member of the panel must act if the compromise was to be effective in VSTA terms.[70] Since the applicants did not receive a copy of the reports they were left at a disadvantage in preparing for an appeal to the Tribunal. Despite all this the VSTA viewed the panel compromise as the end of inspection. All that was necessary was the replacement of the 'outsider' to make the short term policy on promotions acceptable.

It should be noted here that in 1974 the Annual General Meeting of the VSTA resolved that the staff executive in a school should be elected.[71] This move was the result not only of the recent actions of the Committee of Classifiers to reintroduce inspection for principals' positions but also of unsuccessful agitation by the union over a period of some seven years to have the class structure in teacher classification abolished. As well, mooted changes in the structure and powers of school councils which would give greater power in school management to parents and pupils as well as teachers, made it necessary for the union to put forward a new direction.

The staff executive policy called for the staff not only to elect the executive but to decide on curriculum areas to be covered by the school and relevant time allocations for these areas. Staff in these areas should then decide on the duties and responsibilities of elected teachers. The appointment of teachers to a school should also be made, on the recommendations of staff executive, by an elected school council on which staff, parents and students

were equally represented.

This local responsibility for appointment was a much more radical move than the NSW Policy for the Future, particularly the involvement of parents and students. It suggests also that the experience of experimentation in school curriculum and organisation was forcing some teachers to consider the necessity to appoint staff with philosophies and styles to match school based policy. Like NSWTF policy it proposed time rather than monetary allowances for elected executive positions.

Again, as in NSW, in spite of this policy for radical changes in school executives, the union continued to work for a solution to the immediate problem of selection of candidates for promotion. However, a movement towards school based appointments was introduced by the department in conjunction with the introduction of SAAP panels in 1975. School staff were given the job of electing teachers annually to Special Duty Allowances (SDAs). This was in line with the sentiments found in the 1974 document 'The Teacher and School Administration' discussed in the previous chapter which stressed both the need for flexibility in management structure and the professional desires of teachers.

The SDAs were introduced in both post-primary divisions but not in the primary division. The VTU tried to prevent the passing of the Bill which introduced the allowances by writing to members of Parliament. [72] The union claimed that it had not been consulted and that the Bill contained several anomalies. It is unclear whether SDAs were ever considered for the primary division. If they were, union hostility prevented the move. The VSTA also suggested that opposition from the Tribunal had necessitated legislation for the provision of SDAs.[73] The government member of the Tribunal was another

former president of the VTU, Mr Jack Baker.

The conservative nature of the VTU during this period is evidenced both by the actions of its former presidents (and the use made of them in the education bodies to curb the more militant VSTA and TTAV) and by the continuation of inspection in both school evaluation and assessment of teachers for promotion in the primary division. From the early 1970s the VTU did adopt a new policy on inspection which proposed that teachers have a choice of method of assessment but it was largely a choice of how many inspectors.

[74]

The technical division, on the other hand, became the most flexible. By 1975, appropriate evidence for the Committee of Classifiers, Technical Division, to appoint an applicant to a position could include a) references forwarded directly to the committee by appropriate referees selected by applicants; b) current recommendations for promotion by the Board of Inspectors; c) evidence of special academic qualifications and/or experiences related to the advertised position; d) evidence of appropriate achievement.[75]

Because of the powers which had historically been placed in school councils in technical schools, the appointment of school principal involved the school council from 1975. A list of those applicants who were eligible for the position was sent to the president of the school council. An ad hoc committee of the council was formed which included an elected teacher. This committee could interview applicants and return to the Committee of Classifiers a list of names in order of preference. [76] Thus, technical teachers, by demanding that references other than inspectors be used by the Committee of Classifiers as evidence of suitability, and by their presence on an ad hoc committee of school council, could have considerable influence on principals' appointment to schools.

In 1977 the issue of inspection erupted again in the high schools with the unexpected circulation of a document by yet another new Director of Secondary Education, Mr. T.J. Ford. He proposed a choice for teacher assessment for promotion. To the SAAP panel was added the BAAP and the PAAP. The BAAP (Board Aptitude Assessment Panel) consisted of two inspectors and the principal. The PAAP (Professional Aptitude Assessment Panel) consisted of at least two inspectors. Note that the word professional is used for the panel of inspectors. Ford's contempt for the notion of peer assessment had earlier been demonstrated by inviting teachers in a circular to 'have their work recognised' by assessment by inspectors.[77]

The elimination of teacher representation was seen by the VSTA as a breach of the agreement reached in 1975 between the Director General and the union. It called on members to ensure that only the SAAP was used. Threatened stop work in 1977 prevented the operation of the panels and the Director General, Shears conducted a survey of teachers to test the reaction to the alternative panels. The VSTA urged members to participate since a boycott would give the department cause to suggest that the union was out of touch with members. It was a risky decision since many teachers were non members or members of VAT. The union also believed that Shears would back the Director of Secondary Education whatever the result of the survey. Of the 13,291 eligible to vote, 8,554 teachers voted. One thousand were disenfranchised by principals' failure to follow instructions carefully in returning the poll. [78] This survey showed that 74 percent favoured a SAAP only system. [79] The Director General decided on January 30, 1978 that all three panels would be in use. On February 21, 1978, 4,000 members attended a Melbourne stop work meeting over the proposed panels. On February 24, 1978 the Minister threatened to withdraw the leave with full pay condition of the union President and to stop



deduction by the department of union fees from salaries.[80] The panels came into operation from March 1978. Twenty five schools took stop work action.[81]

The matter was not resolved until late in 1978 when an agreement was reached between the VSTA and the Department of Education that BAAPs and PAAPs would be discontinued in 1979. In this agreement the union won some gains and lost others. The leaders considered the wins great enough to concede the losses. SAAPs would be the only form of aptitude assessment. The applicant would receive a full report. This would make preparation for appeals to the tribunal easier and allow the applicant to decide whether to be reassessed in the following year (for SAAP reports were valid for only two years). A consensus report was to be given and no provision was made for a minority report. This provision had formerly been mostly used by inspectors.[82]

The loss was that the agreement allowed for classroom visitation by the panel at the applicants request. This was described as the 'soft underbelly' of the agreement in the VSTA journal.[83] From the start of the campaign to remove inspection the tactic had been to keep inspectors out of the classroom. There was a chance that they would now return as panel members. The VSTA feared that pressure would be put on applicants to request classroom visitations. They succeeded, however in obtaining a stipulation that there would be no indication on the form as to whether a classroom visit was made by the panel.

Summing up the inspection and promotion scene in Victoria, by the end of the period under examination we find the two post-primary divisions had modified the use of inspectors considerably. The secondary division used a panel system for assessment of suitability for promotion. Teachers had representation on the

panels and the procedure was by interview and reference. The technical division teachers could include references, recommendations by the Board of Inspectors or any other appropriate evidence in their applications to the Committee of Classifiers. Primary School teachers were still under the inspectorial system.

Both the 1973 and 1977 incidents in Victorian High School Divisions demonstrate that there were conflicts within the Victorian Education Department. The divisional head may, as in the first instance, make use of the complexity of structures to undermine agreements made at other levels of authority. It was also possible in Victoria for the employer to play off one union against another. For example, the appointment of Clarke and Baker to key controlling mechanisms made use of a known hostility between the VTU and the VSTA and the struggle over coverage of secondary teachers at this period. These appointments may, however, on occasion create problems for the employer. It is possible for the union to detect the struggles occurring within the employers ranks and to negotiate with the party which appeared to have the most power.

Conversely, as the number of controlling bodies grow, the more difficult it became for the union to find one of them which would make a change. Note the number of bodies which the VSTA approached in the late 1960s in its attempt to reform the inspection system. In NSW, the question of inspection was deemed as the responsibility of the Department of Education yet the PSB entered the area when teachers actions made it an issue in dispute. This complexity or diffusion of powers within what we could label 'the employer' can leave the union running in circles trying to find the party to confront with their demands. Yet, this diffusion of powers may offer the union a chink in the employer's armour. The VSTA made use of this when it directed members

to send references on their ability to take positions of administration to the Committee of Classifiers.

If we return to the technical division there is further evidence for the suggestion that the diffusion of powers can affect teachers favourably. The powers of the school council gave teachers the chance to participate not only in the assessment procedures for promotions positions but also to participate in the selection of people who actually fill those positions in schools.

### **Towards democracy in schools.**

In NSW we noted the move towards a reinforcement of the school executive following a curbing of the inspectors' involvement in schools. In Victoria this option was more problematic. Victorian high schools and technical schools had demonstrably more diversity in curriculum and school organisation by the mid 1970s. There were community schools, mini schools, schools within schools, HSC oriented, alternative Form 6 oriented, general studies, integrated studies, vertical and horizontal organisation. Many schools evolved methods of decision making which involved school staff in an effort to make these diverse programs work. The hierarchy within the schools was unsuitable for the kind of responsibilities individual teachers were being asked to take. The governments move to Special Duty Allowances in 1975 and the added power given to School Councils in 1974 was a response to this diversity. In NSW in 1978, the department, faced with a similar but less extensive problem, concentrated its efforts on enabling the principal to decide on the composition and organisation in the school. In Victoria, the new procedures for assessment of aptitude for executive positions had already undermined to some extent the power of the principal.

Accounts of school decision making at a VSTA seminar[84] in 1976 suggest

that in some instances the school staff were unaware that they were making radical changes in the school administrative structures. Need led to a haphazard development of non-formalised procedures. In some cases the principals took the lead but in others the initiative came from the staff, especially if the principal was ineffectual or in continued conflict with a united staff. Thus, if there was no direction from the principal or too much direction from the principal, the staff may look to other sources for direction, one of these being a committee of their own members. This development may be further dependent on the career expectations of the staff within the school. A school with a large staff turnover, with few teachers intent on 'settling' may be more open to a democratic solution.

Principal initiated staff participation in decision making seems to have required agreement with the staff. A former president of the VSTA and school principal attempted to introduce democratic procedures but with little success.[85] The staff resented the extra time involved on committees. There was distrust of him as a 'union man' pushing his own policy.[86] Senior teachers resented the fact that they were deprived of positions of authority which the department said were rightfully theirs and were joined by teachers who anticipated such positions of power in the future.[87]

A pattern of evolution towards more teacher involvement in school decisions can be seen in Victorian technical schools. In 1973 the TTAV organised a seminar, 'Democracy in Education.' It included discussion of Principals' responsibility and legal powers, the powers of the Department of Education and control of curriculum. The last topic was presented by Ruth Hoadly, the President of the Victorian Council of School Organisations (VICCSO). The President of the Victorian Federation of State School Mothers' Clubs (VFSSMC) also participated formally.[88]

The union had earlier questioned the practice of separating school administrators from classroom teachers and rewarding the former with higher status and salary.[89] In submissions to the Australian Schools Commission it stressed the development of school autonomy and the need for funding for inservice training to achieve this. [90] Within the technical division teachers had more control over the administration of the school from the mid 1970s through their representation in the selection of SDA positions and in the selection of principals by school councils.

If the time of the NSWTF conference 'Democracy in Schools' is remembered it can be seen that the issue of democracy in schools was present officially in unions in both states from 1973. Parent involvement in school decisions was discussed. VTU members were, however, most reluctant to change both the career structure of teachers and to involve parents. [91] The VTU generally remained untouched by the ideological climate of the late 1960s and early 1970s which favoured participation by the client and teachers in school decisions. How far the VTU was reflecting all primary teachers' views is, however, questionable. In Chapter Six which examines the Victorian restructure of school councils there is evidence that the union was out of step with the desires of many members.

### **Conclusion.**

The system of inspection was a major way in which centralised control was implemented in the classroom. As Geoff Reid, the president of the VSTA noted in 1972, underlying this was a principle that a small group of well qualified administrators directed, trained and inspected the large group of untrained, ill qualified teachers.[92] The education acts of the second half of the nineteenth century organised education on public service lines. 'The separation between

the Professional Division of the Public Service (Departmental heads, i.e. the policy makers) and General Division (the policy implementers) was retained in the teaching group by the separation between the Professional Officers (Departmental heads, Inspectors, Training College Lecturers) and the classified teachers'. [93]

When both states attempted to remove the inspector from the school, this move was tied to the provision of a period of standard pre-service training for teachers. In NSW the provision of a Teachers' Certificate gave public recognition to the fact that the argument that teachers needed constant supervision which amounted to continual training was no longer tenable. The introduction in the 1960s, of untrained staff into the secondary schools weakened the arguments against the need for inspection by an outside person. In Victoria, the campaign by the VSTA for control of entry to the occupation was closely tied to the campaign to abolish inspection of both schools generally and of teachers suitable for promotion. It gave grounds for the argument that peer assessment was a valid form of evaluation because the teachers could claim academic qualifications to carry out that task. With pre-service training the distinction between those who had knowledge, i.e. the inspectors, and those who did not have knowledge i.e. the teachers, was more difficult to maintain.

Differences between the primary and post-primary action over inspection are clearly visible, particularly in Victoria. Folk knowledge within teachers' unions has always stated that primary and infants' teachers are 'more conservative', less likely to take militant action. Evidence of industrial action in both NSW and Victoria seems to support this. In NSW in 1970 the push towards inspection change of the most radical nature came from the secondary area and was modified within the union. In Victoria, the post-primary unions developed more radical policy and action. Reasons usually offered for such phenomena are

the higher 'feminisation' of the primary/infant division, pre-service training in authoritarian and departmentally controlled institutions for shorter periods of time and the 'in loco parenti' nature of the work. Three year training in more autonomous Colleges of Advanced Education plus the women's movement in the 1970s should, in this interpretation, be changing the 'conservative' nature of primary teachers in the 1980s. The unsatisfactory experience of affirmative action in NSW suggests that the links between gender discrimination and the control asserted by promotion practices are complex. They may require women teachers to move beyond the demand for equality within the present promotions structure.

It may be significant that the secondary teachers' claim to the control of a body of knowledge is more easily sustained than primary teachers. Reid [94] notes that from 1905 the secondary teachers in Victoria were lumped in with the professional officers until the numbers became too large. At this point it would seem some other rationale had to be made between those who made policy and those who implemented. In both NSW and Victoria secondary teachers have tried to have their status based on knowledge and training recognised in salary margins (discussed in Chapter Two).

Inspection took two forms: inspection of schools and inspection of teachers to assess their suitability for appointment to positions of responsibility within the school i.e. promotions positions or to be certified as teachers. If inspection was the major way in which centralised control was implemented in the classroom, by the 1970s its function in the system of promotions was a key element. It not only gave the field officer access to schools so that he could monitor and make 'accountable' but became a method of 'quality control'. Classroom visits by inspectors became the focus of attack in both states. Reid, VSTA president argued in the journal in 1972; 'Thus the state, through its

Board of Inspectors attempts to invade the classroom and imposes its authority ..[95] In NSW it was in this area that the union tried to redefine the criteria for inspection for promotion, to change the relationship between the supervisor and the teachers. They had little luck in keeping inspectors from classroom visits for promotion purposes. The secondary unions in Victoria were successful in first presenting references and then through compromise in showing aptitude through an interview situation. They turned it into a job application procedure.

Unions, tactics and options. The tactics used by the unions differed. In the period of staffing crisis the VSTA used its control of entry campaign to push the government into provision of training to preserve their status as workers who had control of a body of knowledge. The difference in attack on the actual practice of inspection for promotions positions in NSW and Victoria is also attributable to the differing legal status of the bodies in control of education. The existence of the Committee of Classifiers offered the Victorian unions a point of leverage. This was however, only taken up by the secondary unions. By taking strike action the union faced the paradox of being accused of using 'unprofessional' action and being obsessed with notions of professional status.

During the early 1970s the NSWTF had difficulty accommodating the kind of action necessary. Geared to central control and mass action, it resisted individual or school based action suitable for campaigns over issues where not all schools were affected at the same time. The tactics available to teachers through their unions are partly determined by the immediate situation and partly by the particular history of the union. The proclivity to united action of the NSWTF was challenged but met the hostility of the executive which although it was antagonistic towards the minister, the department and the PSB



separately and at times together, had an established way of proceeding. It met them management to management. When this pattern was broken, the union was seen to have challenged the 'rules' and was threatened with deregistration. Although there was hostility to union policy by some VSTA members, the main opposition came from the VTU. In NSW the monolithic nature of the union kept the battles within the union. There was less opportunity for a particular section of the union e.g. secondary teachers, to take action. The slogan 'union is strength' needs careful examination.

The action over control of entry and inspection caused great division in the high schools of Victoria and there were certainly teachers who saw the use of the strike as unprofessional behaviour. There was however an ambiguity about the issue which could attract both those who wished to improve their status and become like doctors and lawyers and those who were ideologically committed to removal of schools and teachers from the conformity of a centrally controlled curriculum.

In this chapter and the two preceeding chapters we have examined the issue of central control and its implementation through systems of inspection. The struggle for greater participation in the decisions which affect teachers' classroom practices and occupational structures has been between teachers' unions and the system of legally constituted bodies which control education in the states. However, the interests of parents has also been raised. They surfaced as an interested party in NSW in the establishment of the Education Commission and in the question of accountability through School Review Boards in Victoria. In both instances the teachers' unions (or at least in Victoria the one most involved in the struggle with the formally recognised central power) had to accommodate the parent organisation's wish to be involved in any decisions on new structures. In both instances teachers' unions and parent

organisations sought some recognition of their respective interests and had to recognise the interests they shared in changing the centrally controlled bureaucracy.

In one area the parents seem to be silent, that is, on inspection for promotions. Teacher's employment and career structures largely remained a struggle between the employer and the teachers and their unions. There has been a distinction between the industrial, i.e. related to teachers' careers as teachers and the professional, i.e. related to what teachers do in classroom. Paradoxically the assessment of teachers was stated to be not an industrial matter (and therefore the duty of the PSB) by the NSW Departmental Working Party in 1971. Parents in Victoria wanted to participate in decisions on school evaluation but were not considered on promotion inspection panels in either state. In NSW parents' representatives on <sup>the</sup> Education Commission have within their responsibilities both industrial and professional concerns but at the school level parents have not sought representation in assessment of teachers for promotions. The one exception to this non involvement in career structures was the provision for the school council to participate in the selection of a principal but again not in the assessment of aptitude.

The VSTA did look towards parent involvement in teacher appointment in its School Executive Policy of 1974. This could suggest that they had less fear of parent involvement when staff were involved in school decisions rather than when an externally appointed executive holds the power. We must then ask why the NSWTF did not seek such parent involvement in its Policy for the Future. This policy did not propose that the school be responsible for appointment of any kind, because, it is argued, there was less diversity between schools in curriculum and organisation. As well, parents were not involved at the school level as in Victorian school councils. The results of previous

struggles by teachers and by parents led to different possibilities for action. At the same time they constrained the union in new ways. for example, it was now necessary for the Victorian union to take into account the powers of school councils in future strategies. The development of new constraining factors may affect the employer's options. In NSW the departmental document 'Managing the School' and the proposals for 'executive restructure' sought to reinforce the power of the school executive, particularly the power of the school principal, over curriculum and school organisation. School executive could have provided the central authority with a new 'agent' now that many of the functions of the inspector had been curtailed.

By 1975 in Victoria, however, the creation of Special Duty Allowances (SDAs) had recognised that curriculum innovation had shifted more responsibility onto teachers which the traditional hierarchical structures and allocation of time and money did not reflect. These SDAs had to a limited extent undermined the power of the central employer to prescribe the school administration. Because the positions were elected the principals powers were also somewhat diminished, though not to any great extent.

In both states the notion of elected school executives with time rather than salary reward became union policy (though not in the VTU) but its reception by teachers was less than enthusiastic. The appearance of these policies, with their demand for recognition of the rights of teachers in school decision making, could be seen as a response to the growing demands of parent organisations to have parents involved in education. In Victoria, the policy was developed when the powers of the school councils were under review. In NSW the policy followed an unsuccessful attempt by the department and the minister to introduce a form of school council and the recognition by the union that parent organisations were a determined contender for a place on the proposed

Education Commission. It is the interests of parents in the control of education at the school level which is examined in the following chapter.

- 
1. NSW Department of Education, Report of the working party on inspection and advisory services, Sept., 1971.
  2. NSWTF circular to schools, 4 Aug., 1971, NSWTF Inspection files.
  3. NSWTF Annual Conference, inspection and promotion resolution, Dec. 1970, NSWTF Inspection files.
  4. STA Professional Committee, inspection recommendations, 18 Dec., 1970, NSWTF Inspection files.
  5. R.O. Bell, Principal, Clovelly Public School, to Gen. Secretary, NSWTF, 8 July, 1976, NSWTF Inspection files.
  6. NSWTF report of conference with PSB and NSW Department of Education. 16 Aug., 1971, NSWTF Inspection files.
  7. E.H. Cameron, Secretary, PSB, to the Industrial Registrar, 20 Aug., 1971; Cameron to L.Lancaster, Gen.Sec., NSWTF, 20 Aug., 1971, NSWTF Inspection files.
  8. NSWTF Executive recommendations, 24 Aug., 1971, NSWTF Inspection files.
  9. Transcript of compulsory conference between PSB and NSWTF, 26 Aug., 1971, NSWTF Inspection files.
  10. *ibid.*
  11. E.H. Cameron, Secretary, PSB, to L. Lancaster Gen. Sec., NSWTF, 2 Sept., 1971, NSWTF Inspection files.
  12. L. Lancaster, Gen. Sec., NSWTF, to E.H. Cameron, Secretary, PSB, NSWTF Inspection file.
  13. NSWTF, circular to all schools on Inspection, 15 Sept., 1971, NSWTF Inspection files.
  14. E.H. Cameron, Secretary, PSB, to L. Lancaster, Gen. Sec., NSWTF, 22 Sept., 1971, NSWTF Inspection files.
  15. NSW Dept. of Education, transcript of inquiry under Section 37, subsection 4 of the Teaching Service Act 1970, of Ashton, Clark, Powel and Howes, Oct., 1971, NSWTF Inspection files.
  16. *ibid.*, p.7 (Powel).

17. A.C. Buchan, Director of Secondary Education, to G.L. Ashton, 27 Oct., 1971, NSWTF Inspection files.
18. Manly Boys High School, resolution of meeting, 1 Nov., 1971, NSWTF Inspection files.
19. NSWTF, Executive resolution, 21 Sept., 1971, NSWTF Inspection files.
20. NSW Department of Education, Transcript of inquiry, op. cit., p. 18 (Ashton).
21. NSWTF Annual Conference Report 1967, in Education, 7 Feb., 1968.
22. Education 11 Sept., 1968 p.129.
23. President's address to Annual Conference 1967, in Education 7 Feb., 1968, pp. 2-3; President Writes, Education 6 Nov., 1968, p. 168.
24. NSWTF Gen. Sec., to B. Williams, Federal Sec., Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Association. 24 Nov., 1972, NSWTF ACSPA file.
25. NSWTF Annual Conference Report 1971, in Education, Jan., 1972.
26. Education, 28 June, 1972, p.120.
27. *ibid.*
28. N. Wran, QC, to Gen. Sec., NSWTF in Education, 28 June 1972, p.136.
29. See Education, 12 July, 1972, p.137 and p.152; 6 Dec., 1972, p.285.
30. Education, 21 Nov., 1973, p.32.
31. NSWTF report of Democracy in Schools Seminar, Oct. 1973, in Education, 21 Nov., 1973, p.328.
32. NSWTF Working conditions pamphlet, 1984, NSWTF Working Conditions file.
33. Education, 31 May, 1972, p.102.
34. See Education, 29 March 1972, p.60; 12 April 1972, p.61.
35. Crown Employees Appeal Board, G.L. Ashton, V, Director General of Education, reproduced in Education 28 July, 1972, p.168.
36. Education 28 July, p.146.
37. M. Kennett, Gen. Sec., NSWTF, to H.S. Wyndham, Director General of Education, 4 June, 1963, NSWTF Inspection files.
38. NSWTF Policy of the future, 1976, in Working conditions pamphlet, 1984, NSWTF Working Conditions file.
39. NSW Department of Education, Managing the school, April, 1978, NSWTF Library.

40. NSWTF deputations to Minister for Education, May 1979, June 1979; Penny Young, memo. to all officers, Aug. 7, 1979; Jenny George, Acting Gen. Sec., NSWTF, to Mr Finlay, Regional Director, North Coast, Oct. 23, 1979, NSWTF Inspection files.
41. Department of Education, Executive restructure in NSW high schools, Oct., 1978; Executive restructure in NSW primary schools, Dec., 1978, NSWTF files.
42. President Writes, Education, 16 July, 1978, p.230.
43. Review of NSW government administration - directions for change. Interim report (Wilenski Report), Nov., 1977, p.194.
44. Education, 4 June, 1979, p.195.
45. B. Murphy, 'The gentle are of leapfrogging', Education, 10 Sept., 1984, p.15.
46. Wilenski Interim Report, op, cit., p.5.
47. Vic Bauris, legal cases committee, in Education, 14 March, 1978, p.82.
48. Department of Education, Transfers and accelerated seniority, Jan., 1983.
49. Department of Education, Perspectives, Feb., 1983.
50. Daily telegraph, 5 March, 1983.
51. B. Murphy, 'Transfers and accelerated seniority - a history', Education, 10 Sept., 1984, p.14.
52. B. Murphy, 'The gentle art of leapfrogging', Education, 10m Sept., 1984, p.15.
53. *ibid.*
54. *ibid.*
55. VSTA pamphlet 'Inspection' 1970, p.2, VSTA files.
56. VSTA pamphlet 'Inspection', 1970, p.6. See also extract from legal opinion, Dr C.L. Pannan, on some points of the Teaching Service Act, in the same document, p.22.
57. NSW The teaching Service Act, 1970, Section 49 (1)(2).
58. VSTA pamphlet: 'Inspection'. 1970, p. 11.
59. *ibid.*, p.10.
60. TTAV pamphlet: Inspection Policy, Nov., 1970, TTAV files.
61. B.G.Blood, Teachers' rep. on Committee of Classifiers Secondary teacher, No. 1, 1975, p.10.
62. Secondary teacher, No.1, 1978, p.10.

63. ibid.
64. Secondary teacher, No. 1, 1975, p.11.
65. ibid.
66. See Secondary Teacher, No. 9, 1975, pp.3-9 for a reproduction of the letters and memoranda which passed between, Mr Thompson, Minister for Education, Mr Clarke, Chairperson of the Committee of Classifiers and the VSTA.
67. Committee of Classifiers, memorandum to secondary teachers, 1 May, 1975, VSTA files.
68. Secondary teacher, No. 15, 1975, p.5.
69. Secondary teacher, No. 16, 1975, p.7.
70. Secondary teacher, No. 15, 1975, p.5.
71. Secondary teacher, No. 8, 1977, p.7.
72. Secondary teacher, No. 9, 1975, p.8.
73. G. Reid, Secondary teacher, No.9, p.8.
74. Teachers journal, April, 1973, p.5-6.
75. Committee of Classifiers, Technical Schools Division, Information Circular, 1975/2, TTAV files.
76. Committee of Classifiers Technical Schools Division Information Circular 1975/1. p.1 Principal Appointments During 1975, TTUV files.
77. Circular T.76/1589 in Secondary teacher, No. 1 1978, p.9.
78. Secondary teacher, No. 2, 1978, p.2.
79. ibid.
80. Secondary teacher, No. 3, 1978, p.2.
81. Secondary teacher, No 5, 1978, p.2.
82. Secondary teacher No.2 1979, p.13.
83. Secondary teacher, No.2 1979, p.13.
84. VSTA seminar 'Staff Executive', 1976 in Secondary teacher, No. 18, 1976, pp.6-12.
85. B. White, Participation in decision making in a Victorian state secondary school, Unpublished M. Ed. thesis, Monash University, 1980.
86. ibid., p.93.

87. *ibid.*, p.80-81.
88. TTAV seminar 'Democracy in Education', June, 1973, TTAV files.
89. G. Tickell, Associate news, 10 April, 1970, pp.10-11, 22 May 1970; pp.9-10.
90. TTAV submission to the Australian Schools Commission. Oct., 1974; April, 1977, TTAV files.
91. Dr L.W. Shears, in Teachers journal, Oct., 1974, pp.456-7. See also Ruth Hoadly, President, VICCSO, *ibid.*, p.468 and reply from Lyell F. Reeves, Teachers journal, Dec., 1974, pp.465-6.
92. Geoff Reid, President of VSTA Secondary teacher, Sept. 1972, p.13.
93. *ibid.*
94. *ibid.*
95. *ibid.*



## 6: ARTICULATING INTERESTS: UNIONS AND PARENTS

The Ehrenreich's have argued that the professional-managerial workers, which include teachers, exist 'as a mass grouping in monopoly capitalist society, only by virtue of the expropriation of the skills and culture once indigenous to the working class.'[1] Education of the working class did not begin with the introduction of state legislation though we may say that education for the working class began with legislation. The introduction of compulsory education can, however, be seen as both resistance and accommodation to industrial capitalism by the working class.

Compulsory education offered, for some, a way out of their exploited position. But if, as Bourdieu has argued, education is controlled and enforced by the state, 'legitimate' knowledge and know-how are recognised by the dominated classes and the knowledge and know-how they effectively command is devalued.[2] The history of the introduction of compulsory education is a history of struggle, particularly a struggle to define the cultural model which apprehends and interprets the society. In Australia it involved struggles between a landed 'gentry' and merchants, church and state, and the working class. [3]

The preceding chapters have examined chiefly the struggles between the teachers' unions and the employer in its many forms, minister, department, Teachers' Tribunal and Public Service Board (PSB). In each chapter, however, the interests of one other group, parents and especially the parent organisations, have exerted influence over teachers' unions. In NSW the parent organisations sought representation on the Education Commission. In Victoria, they demanded consultation on the matter of school reviews. This suggests that the struggles present in the installation of compulsory education continue. This chapter

examines the unions' deliberation on the issue of parent involvement in schools during the 1970s. Though the unions have in their various policies on democracy in the schools and community involvement, made statements about the rights and responsibilities of clients (students and parents), the place of parents in schools became a major subject in unions in 1973. In NSW the debate centred around the introduction of school councils; in Victoria over the restructuring of the composition and function of councils.

At the school level the relationship between teacher and client has for the most part involved the exclusion of the client from any decision making processes. For teachers there is a certain ambiguity in even identifying the client. Is it the student or the parent? If students are perceived as the teachers' clients, their legal status as minors places teachers in a position of authority. The teacher may, in this case, be in competition with the parent in deciding the school experiences deemed necessary for the student. The notion of 'compensatory' education for a 'deficient' working class implies such a relationship between teachers, students and parents. The teacher interprets the life experiences of the child and applies suitable remedies.

If the client is seen as the parent, this position is somewhat more tenuous and the teacher must find other grounds on which to rest his/her authority. Since the law requires all children to attend school for a certain number of years, the clients have no choice but must avail themselves of the services provided. The law itself thus establishes a relationship between the teacher and the parent at the school which is less than a free association. The state departments have further constrained this relationship between the teacher (professional) and the parent (client) by requiring them to send their children to designated schools through the practice of 'zoning'. The state does not usually enter the school and make its interests visible to students and parents

directly. It is the government school principal who mediates their relationship with the state. A directive to the school may, however change organisation within the school which affects individual children. The loss of a teacher in the school because student numbers have fallen below a staffing formula or the withdrawal of ancillary staff, counsellors or relief staff may bring to notice the interests of the bureaucracy beyond the school.

In examining the relationship between the parent and the school, Connell, et al, [4] drew attention to the different relationship between 'ruling class' parents and the non-government schools which their children attended and working class parents and the government school. The former characteristically see teachers in their schools as 'their paid agents.'[5] This view is the product of their ability to influence the school and their greater wealth, power and education than teachers. They buy an education service in the market of independent schools. In government schools the clientele are predominantly working class. Teachers are better educated and have higher salary and more authority. The clients are related to these schools not by the market but 'through the state via a bureaucracy.'[6]

In government schools, opposition to teachers' interests could come from the employer in the form of directives and regulations usually passed through the inspector and the school principal. Opposition could also come from the students themselves in the forms of behaviour teachers encountered in the classroom. Parents traditionally have lacked an avenue through which to channel their interests either at the school level where there is no history of effective parent involvement in educational decisions or on a wider collective level. This is in spite of the presence in both states of parent organisations at the school level and the existence of federations of these bodies at the state level. Parents' involvement in schools has been limited to the collection of

funds. State federated bodies' activities have mirrored this in demands for funds from state and federal governments.

At the commencement of the period examined, the situation of parents at the school level was slightly different in Victoria because of the existence of school councils. However, parents lack of real power was very similar in the two states. In Victoria, two Sections of the 1872 Education Act empowered parents to have considerable involvement in education. Section 14 stated that parents could summon before a Justice any parent who failed to send a child to school. Parents thus had the job of 'watch dog' to ensure that education reached the masses. Section 15 defined the power of a Board of Advice on which parents and citizens were to be represented. The Board could suspend any teacher for misconduct, visit and report on the condition of the school and its needs, comment on its management and recommend scholarship grants to children with exceptional ability. [7]

The Boards of Advice were abolished in the 1910 Education Act and replaced by school committees which had no real power. Though the committees could report to the minister, the Act contained no requirement for the minister or any officer of the Department of Education to even read or act on these reports.[8] School committees came, in practice, to be responsible for grounds and maintenance. They usually consisted of 'two members nominated by the Mothers' Club together with any other eight to twelve persons elected for a period not exceeding four years by the parents of the pupils attending the school.' [9]

In secondary schools there were advisory councils consisting of five school parent representatives nominated by the Mothers' club, five representing local municipal councils, the district inspector and five members nominated by the

district inspector or the principal 'to represent the leading interests of the district'. [10] Technical school councils were similar to the above but included members nominated by the minister on account of their interest in and knowledge of technical education. [11] Neither committees nor councils had teacher representation.

The Victorian Council of School Organisations (VICCSO) represented the primary school committees and high school councils at the state level. The Technical Schools Association of Victoria (TSAV) represented technical school councils. Parents were also represented at the state level by the Victorian Federation of State School Mothers Clubs (VFSSMC), (lately renamed, Victorian Federation of State School Parent Clubs).

NSW had no history of school councils. At the school level, provision was made for Parents and Citizens (P&C) Associations and Mothers' Clubs which had largely fund raising activities. At the state level these formed respectively the Federation of P&C Associations and the Federation of Infants' School Clubs (later the Federation of School, Community Organisations). At the national level parent organisations are represented by the Australian Council of State School Organisations (ACSSO).

Outside of these formal associations, individual parents meet the school, usually in the form of the Principal, when their child has broken regulations. Formal parent/teacher meetings are usually brief and inform parents of those features of schooling deemed necessary by the teacher rather than the parent. Generally, the subjects of any parent/teacher discussion to do with school policy, e.g. sex education, are also decided on by the school rather than instigated by parents.

In theory, of course, the parents' interests are thought to be represented

through the Minister for Education appointed from an elected government. This assumes that parents could influence education through the ballot box. In schools, parents usually have little with which to bargain to press a demand from the government sector of education except withdrawing their children from it. This option was open to few parents for it means entering the private school sector at considerable financial cost. From the 1960s, the entry of the federal Liberal-Country Party coalition government into the funding of state education and the provision of some funds to the non-government school sector made this option for parents a proposition to be more carefully considered for those who could afford it.

#### **Federal involvement and parents.**

In 1969 the Labor Party committed itself to a policy for funding non-government schools on the basis of 'needs'. When it came to office in 1972, it set up an enquiry into education, the result of which was the establishment of the Schools Commission which advised the federal Minister for Education on the implementation of the 'needs' based policy for funding both the government and the non-government sectors administered by the Commission.

The reasons for federal intervention into state education and particularly the funding of the non-government sector are complex. However, the argument that it involved the wooing of the Catholic vote by the coalition government in the 1960s and by the Labor government in the 1970s is often presented and suggests that some motives must be sought outside the education area. It has also been noted that the introduction of state-aid had implications for the pattern of education delivery in the government and non-government sectors.

Teese argues that during the 1960s the state took on a new role as the main supplier of non compulsory schooling, that is, schooling for those who had

passed the age of legally required attendance. The state thus 'undermined' the socially exclusive nature of higher secondary education and threatened the traditional users. The introduction of large amounts of money into the non-government schools beginning in the mid 1960s by the coalition government and continued by the Labor government, restored the pre 1960 pattern, i.e. 'the once traditional role of the private sector as the main supplier of non compulsory schooling is returning'.<sup>[12]</sup> This type of argument is expressed by members of unions in both states and in the ATF. The term often used to express the movements of students into non-government schools and the associated government funding of the non-government school is the 'privatisation of schools'.<sup>[13]</sup>

With the introduction of funding by governments to non-government schools (state aid) from the late 1960s, government school parents found that their avenue of influence was also open to the non-government school sector. Even in their limited avenue of participation - demand for resources - their activities were now in competition with the interests of parents in the non-government sector. This fact was at first overshadowed by the euphoria of the moment.

In both states the demand for federal government funding by government school parent organisations and teacher unions had a long history. Teachers' unions in both states hailed the arrival of federal funds as a major victory. Their response to the introduction of state aid was surprisingly quiet, especially during the introduction of the Labor government's 'needs' based policy in 1972. Only the NSWTF had policy against all state aid but it was preoccupied at the time in the struggle with the department and the PSB discussed in the previous chapter.

Parent organisations throughout the states hailed the recommendations of the

Interim Committee of the Schools Commission Report (Karmel Report)[14] as a major breakthrough. The Australian Council of State Schools Organisations (ACSSO), claimed influence in the Karmel Report's recommendations for community involvement in schools.[15] The recommendations that parents be involved in Education Centres and be part of in-service training offered the first really solid steps for parents into the areas of policy in education. As well, the Karmel Report gave encouragement to parent groups through its emphasis on the 'openness of a school to parents.'[16] The sentiments expressed in the Karmel Report and subsequent reports by the Schools Commission gave support to those government school teachers and parents who laid claim to greater participation in school decision making. This was perhaps a compensation for their emerging contest for resources with the non-government schools which the Karmel Report also heralded.

The liberal ideology of participation of the late 1960s and 1970s can be seen not only in many teachers' desires to participate in school decision making but also in many parents' desires to participate as well. Both these desires to participate in institutions which affect their lives, one as an employee the other as a legally defined client, challenge the traditional structures of those institutions. They challenge the notions of central control and at the same time cause both parties to examine the nature of their relationship.

For teachers the nature of their relationship with the employer is made more ambiguous both by their striving to participate in decisions on the school practices and the introduction of the parents as a recognised interested party. Centrally prescribed curriculum and organisation in schools required teachers to be responsible to the employer and provided teachers with a defense against any objection to school practices by the client. It provided teachers' unions with a visible (if at times complex) central opposition to their interests which



in turn shaped the type of action in which the unions' engaged. Movement away from central prescription required teachers to stress their training, knowledge and expertise in education, i.e. their legitimate claim to be regarded as professionals and to be given the appropriate autonomy. These claims could continue to distance the teacher from the client. The client's lack of training and knowledge is implied in such an argument, though it is directed at the central employer.

Yet, in their attempt to provide a rationale for their actions in schools, teachers were forced to stress the need of the client and their ability to identify the needs both of the client and the community. Two ways are open in this scenario. Teachers may claim that their academic training and knowledge gives them this ability or they may argue that their actions are directed by the expressed desires of the clients; parents and students. The latter demands a recognition of the client's ability to articulate their needs and an examination of the ways in which the client's of the school can be heard, i.e. the processes and/or structures in which the school employees and the clients meet.

For the unions and the parent organisations, the notion of parent participation crystallised in the issue of structures at the school level for parent involvement. What is outlined now is the way in which the various interests were articulated on the issue of school councils in government schools during the 1970s. Though we could claim many factors common to both states: the interested parties were the same (the unions, the parent organisations, the departments and the governments both state and federal), each had a history peculiar to their state. As well, in each state, the immediate situations within which the struggle took place differed.

## Parents and teachers in NSW.

When Willis became Minister for Education in June, 1972, he inherited a relationship between the NSWTF and his government which could hardly have been worse. The union had supported the Liberal Party's bid for power in 1965 because of its promise to establish an education commission. It then reneged on its promise. The NSWTF was engaged in a bitter struggle with the PSB and the Director General over the provision of relief staff. The department had ceased deducting union fees from salary and members were being charged under Section 37 of the Teaching Service Act 1970 and the Summary Offences Act. Deregistration of the union was threatened and caused huge internal divisions within the union over whether to keep taking action over issues of staffing or whether to lie low while the threat remained.

In January 1973 the NSW State Cabinet accepted a plan to allow the community to have greater participation in educational decisions. In May a document was published on regionalisation and community involvement in schools.[17] In the foreword, the Minister for Education, Willis, stated that the paper contained the proposals arising from 'a detailed study' made by 'a committee of educationalists.' Individuals and organisations were invited to make written submissions to a small panel for assessment. Firm proposals were to be submitted to Cabinet by the end of the year.

The real authors of the document (hereafter called the Consultative Paper) were not disclosed, though Van Davy, the Secretary of the NSWTF Ad Hoc Committee, suggested that its proposals were linked to a tour of New Zealand to examine school councils in that country, by the Director General, Buggie and the education member of the PSB, Gleeson.[18] Both were very much 'the opposition' in the aforementioned dispute between the union, the PSB and the

Department of Education. The NSWTF response was to reject the proposals as it saw them as curbing the powers of teachers.

The Consultative Paper was in two parts - the first, 'Background to Change', aimed to show that a centralised department is no longer appropriate for decisions on what schools should teach. Schools now had 'new purposes', 'use more flexible programmes of learning experiences' and 'function with reduced central constraint' but had 'an increased obligation to be responsive to pupil, community and system needs.' [19] The central concern of Part I of the Consultative Paper was with community involvement in curriculum - in making it 'acceptable to the consumer.'

Part II, the proposed action, offered very little community involvement in curriculum or educational programmes. A State Office would be 'concerned with the broad statements of policy' and 'central monitoring' of the system.[20] A Regional Board of Education 'for which school councils would constitute the electoral college', would make reports and recommendations to the director 'on matters concerning the needs of schools in the region and the functioning of school councils.'[21]

In the school councils, a small group of parents, plus the principal and a representative of the school teaching staff would 'advise' the school principal and the Regional Education Board concerning the needs of the school, including the educational programme. Their major power would be in management of school property and funds for equipment and maintenance. [22]

In some ways these proposals for control over funds for equipment and especially over the employment of non-teaching personnel could have constituted involvement in 'educational' decisions within the school but this was seen as not arising from the proposals of Part I of the Consultative Paper. There is a

discontinuity between the reasons for change and the proposals. There is also difficulty in separating the provision of resources and the implementation of curriculum in the way envisaged by the document. The power of the school council over resources could be seen as a sinister and a covert way of giving control of curriculum to a small group. In theory they would have the power to prevent the implementation of a programme by stopping funds without having to fully and publicly confront the educational implications or to consider educational issues in answering requests for resources. Put simply, the council could keep any debate on purely financial terms and prevent debate on educational issues since the former was its only legitimate area of control. There was clearly a similarity between the proposed functions of the school council and the functions of the PSB at the state level. The PSB was charged with the responsibility for ensuring a proper standard of efficiency and economy in education, but the NSWTF saw this was intrinsically connected to educational/philosophical issues.

Three parts of the proposed restructuring would have greatly affected the employment conditions of teachers particularly in promotions positions.

1. It was suggested that 'it would not be contrary to the concepts underlying these proposals for school councils to be involved in decisions in the appointment of principals, and for principals to influence the appointment of staff'.[23]

2. Infants' departments were to be regarded as part of a school.[24] The mistress would not automatically be represented on a council. Given the high proportion of male principals, women would not have been well represented on councils unless they were the nominated teachers' representative.

3. 'Regional offices would be responsible for placement, transfer and

determination of eligibility for promotion for all staff within the region and they are seen, at least in the long term, as employing authorities of teachers'.[25]The document also rejected the notion of an education commission thus pouring salt on old union wounds.

Alarm within the union at the prospect of a non-centralised employer was quickly voiced. The President of the union, Childs, stated: 'With our present centralised system it is possible for Federation to effectively assist and defend teachers. This process would be infinitely more complicated if the proposals outlined in this report are carried into effect.' [26] Fuel for the belief that the centralised system was under attack came from Mr G. Gleeson, PSB member and widely rumoured as one of the authors of the Consultative Paper. He had questioned whether, within the next decade, a highly centralised department, taking responsibility for assessment, appointment and promotion of some sixty thousand teachers would be feasible.[27] Local or regional employment threatened the career structure of teachers, particularly seniority as a criterion for appointment to promotions positions and mobility to take up positions in other regions. This threat to the career structure together with the problem of strategies for defending members in a decentralized employment situation were the first rallying points in criticism of the Consultative Paper.

The notion of the teacher as an expert in education was clearly challenged by the Consultative Paper in the rationale, if not in the suggested restructuring. Willis had elsewhere stated that the community should have more say in education because of its 'expertise'. [28] The fact that an anonymous 'committee of educationalists', which did not include union representation, had prepared the proposals for a change of structure in education was itself a challenge to the union's notions of itself as a professional organisation and to individual teachers' notions of professionalism.

R.J. Cahill, a union councillor wrote that the document, The Community and its schools had come 'out of the blue', and had 'been handed down to us' with 'no regard for our professionalism as educators.'[29]

Two types of arguments developed within the union in criticism of the Consultative Papers' proposals. The first was that the wrong type of people would gain power in the school, those 'whose business, social and political status would be enhanced by membership.'[30] This would perpetuate and intensify educational inequalities. Evidence was presented for this argument from American and New Zealand experiences,[31] the latter, after a 12 day study tour of that country by the Deputy President of the NSWTF, Neil Pollack, and Van Davy, Secretary of the Ad Hoc Committee mentioned earlier. [32] Davy was a prominent member of the 'new left' on council, later a member of Executive and in 1974 Senior Vice President and Deputy President in 1976. He was also prominent in action to improve education in 'disadvantaged' schools in the inner city areas. The other members of the study tour were the Presidents of the NSW Federation of P&C Associations and the NSW Federation of Infants Schools' Clubs. This joint study tour itself highlights one of the ambiguities in the union's arguments and allies. The research officer of the union, Mel Adams drew attention to the fact that P&C Associations in NSW were themselves evidence for the capture of parent organisations by the middle class even in working class areas.[33]

The second argument was that the Consultative Paper was an attempt by the coalition government to use the popular appeal of 'community involvement' to improve its falling image as a vigorous party in the education area. The proposals would produce administrative structures which would 'help solve this government's political and financial problems' and 'shovel traditional (departmental) areas of inefficiency, and thus criticism, on to that section of

the parents having a vested interest in administration.[34] Accompanying this argument was the notion that the proposals were a 'bid by the government to establish buffers at the school level against mounting agitation for improved staffing, buildings and equipment.'[35] Given the state of relations between the employer (in all its forms) and the union these are predictable responses. The department, the PSB and the government could take some of the pressure off themselves by the transfer of some administrative and financial responsibilities on to councils. It would also weaken the union's attacks, as the union would have to find a new way of responding to what appeared to be localised problems.

From two of the proponents of these arguments came alternative proposals. Mel Adams, research officer and convener of a sub-committee looking at community involvement in schools, wanted to include in school councils all those who worked in schools including cleaners, clerical assistants, teachers and students and 'mothers who help in the canteen.' He did not think that any union proposal should be prescriptive but neither did he think the innovation should be opposed altogether by the union.[36]

Davy proposed that community involvement had nothing to do with 'administration, finance, salaries, working conditions, promotions of teachers' but was concerned with 'the modification and even development of curricula to meet the social needs of the community.'[37] Such involvement would free the control of curricula from the 'bourgeois crippled ethic of the business dominated, university dominated, curricula authorities, and place it correctly in the hands of the practitioners and consumers, i.e. teachers, parents and students.'[38] To this end, he proposed an alternate structure for school, regional and state levels, which included the provision of school committees. Neither proposal met with success in Council.

In June 1973 Council declared itself 'opposed to the concept of formal decision making structures for the management of school-community relationships.'[39] Davy continued to press for real changes in the conception of schooling and the forging of 'greater links with other socialising agencies', in order to provide 'equal life chances for children from all types of social backgrounds.'[40] The arguments were accepted but the union committee placed its emphasis on the 'voluntary basis' of parent-teacher relationships. The union was unable to offer an alternative proposal for structured parent involvement. A seminar on, 'The Community and its Schools' recommended complete rejection of the document but did propose immediate negotiations with the parent organisations to draw up a 'meaningful document on community involvement.'[41] The joint visit to New Zealand by the union and parent organisation representatives was part of this effort. The seminar managed to turn the argument back to a call for an education commission.

In September 1973 the NSWTF sent a submission in response to the Consultative Paper. In the preface the NSWTF clearly took the view that teachers know what ought to be taught but, in a strange twist, community participation became yet another cry for resources, especially human resources from the community. The union advocated 'drawing on people with skills and expert knowledge in a wide variety of manual, cultural, intellectual and artistic fields, suitably paid and invited into the education programme by the professional teacher' (my italics). [42] The submission accused the department of not being concerned about decentralisation but of further guaranteeing 'strong central control.'

The parent organisations, the Federation of Parents and Citizens Associations and the NSW Federation of Infants' School Clubs, were also very opposed to the



proposals of the minister's Consultative Paper. The NSWTF stressed in their submission that the Consultative Paper had limited parents' roles to 'undertaking the housekeeping duties of the Education Department.'[43] The parent organisations agreed with this interpretation. At the same time the Consultative Paper was somewhat vague as to the position of these established organisations if school councils were established. Like the union, the parent organisations were hostile at not being consulted in the preparation of the Consultative Paper. The union had a strong ally in opposition to the proposals. They presented a joint submission with the NSWTF. This paper called for an education commission and teachers employed by a central authority.[44] Both of these proposals were teacher centred rather than parent centred.

The parent organisations also joined with the union in rejecting the composition of the Review Panel which was to assess the submissions. Its members were appointed by the minister and contained only one teacher and one parent. It consisted of the Director General of Education, J. Buggie as chairman; B.S. Backhouse the immediate past President of the Federation of P&C Associations; L.H. Childs, the President of the NSWTF in 1972-73; W.F. Connell, Professor of Education, Sydney University; and G. Gleeson, Member of the PSB. Two members were therefore the rumoured authors of the Consultative Paper. The union president explained that he had accepted the invitation to join the panel as it was extended on a 'personal basis'.[45] He was a 'moderate' who had stepped into the presidency during 'left' factional struggles.

The recommendation of the Review Panel which probably most affected its subsequent reception was that school boards should be 'quite distinct and separate in function from the parent organisations'[46] This virtually assured that those organisations would remain hostile to any proposal. The Federation

of P&C Associations urged the minister to reject the Panel's recommendations. It claimed that the proposed composition was not conducive to 'democratic participation by parents, teachers or students'; the functions of the Board confined it to a 'minor administrative' not a 'significant educational role'; 'it separated and subordinated those parents and other organisations who are already committed to involvement in education.' [47] However the decision by parents to reject the recommendations of the Panel was not unanimous. Some P&C Associations felt it represented a 'foundation stone.' [48]

As with the teachers, some members of the parent organisations were arguing for radical changes in education. Shirley Berg of the Federation of Infants' School Clubs stated: 'Schools should be allowed freedom to choose their own texts, courses and teaching methods and so meet the requirements of their pupils.' [49] Berg also questioned public examinations when she noted that meeting the 'requirements of the standardised examination' was not the same as being 'educated'. [50] It does seem, however, that the Federation of P&C Associations in particular was not willing to participate in school councils. It was not until 1982 that their Annual Conference made a definite commitment to such a move. [51]

On the other hand some teachers and parents may have been willing to experiment with school councils. One school at Bathurst set up an 'Interim Board' with advisory functions which caused considerable distress in the union officers and Council since it went against Council decision not to support school boards. Bob Sharkey, Secretary (Organisation) of the NSWTF, visited the school. He met a hostile staff who accused the union of orchestrating telegrams in opposition to their action without giving full information to members of the true Bathurst position, of using blackmail in the threat to seek the support of other unions.

Sharkey's report of the visit, however, confirmed many of the union's fears of school councils. The five parent members were all decidedly middle class: a lecturer from a College of Advanced Education; an opthalmic surgeon; the manager of the National Bank; a solicitor; and one woman, a retired 'medical practitioner now involved with home duties.' [52] Though all had children at the school, there was some suspicion that two members had other children at private secondary schools. This, in the union's estimation, demonstrated a lack of commitment to public education. The fact that the principal dominated both a meeting between teachers and Sharkey and an Association meeting, did not enhance his contention that a real attempt at school-based decision making was in progress.

Following the visit by the union officer, the 'Interim Board' changed its name to the 'Committee for Community Involvement.' Their stated aim was to investigate community involvement rather than to put it into practice and to prepare a report for the school by 1975.[53] The school principal had also objected to the implication that the action was going against the Federation of P&C Associations' policy. The latest P&C journal had carried an article seeking parent participation in school Boards. At its 1974 Annual Conference the Federation of Parents and Citizens' Associations of NSW had adopted a policy supporting 'the concept of real community involvement in education.' [54] Both the parent organisations and the teachers' union were, therefore, making a distinction between the concept of community involvement and the Willis-Buggie proposals.

School principals argued most vehemently against school councils or boards. The more radical section of teachers which wanted major changes in education, argued against the specific proposals of the government. A strange alliance

was thus born. Principals argued that school councils would diminish their power and so opposed the proposals. The more radical activists feared that, in fact, the principals would gain power. One commented that it was a strange situation because 'you did not want to tell them (the principals) for they might have supported the proposal.'[55]

The importance of the issue for the union is found in the fact that it became the 'Topic' (i.e. voted by branches to be the major issue for consideration) at the 1974 Annual Conference. Executive decided that the draft resolution for discussion at Annual Conference on the topic should be drawn up by the Ad Hoc Committee and the Illawarra Branch which had earlier presented a negative report on community involvement. The views of the Ad Hoc Committee for Community Involvement were by no means uniform but the involvement of the Illawarra Branch tipped the balance towards a hard line opposition. The Executive's part in instigating this hard line approach could be implied by their inclusion of the Illawarra Branch in preparation of the draft proposal.

The Minister for Education tried in December 1974 to woo the parent organisations back to his proposals by asking them to take the initiative to form school councils. He stated that a special meeting of all financial members of the schools' P&C Association and of any Mothers' Club, other parent body and ex-student association could decide whether a school council was to be formed. [56] The Inspector of Schools (Community Involvement) addressed P&C meetings, public meetings and press conferences. He implied that schools which established a council would be more likely to receive money from the Schools Commission. The union was quick to show the fallacy of this rumour.[57] In a change of tactics in February 1975, the Director General, Buggie, stated that it was the principal's responsibility to convene a special

meeting of parents and citizen bodies to determine whether a council was desired.[58] NSWTF Council decided that principals were not to call such meetings and kept close watch for any defection.[59]

The Federation of P&Cs decided not to reject the new proposals of the minister 'out of hand' though they still gave them only 'conditional support'. To make the point that P&C Associations were to become the parent power within the school they demanded that representatives on school councils must remain 'responsible to and recallable by their electors.' [60] This situation would have greatly enhanced the power of the association within the school, particularly as they rejected the fund raising and maintenance roles and demanded a role in 'objectives, content and financial allocation for education.' [61] Perhaps in deference to their former involvement with the NSWTF and in acknowledgment of the reality of the situation they insisted that parent and teacher groups should share the responsibility for establishing a council in their school and deciding the form it should take.[62]

They suggested to affiliates that if their particular school was implementing NSWTF policy of complete opposition to the establishment of school councils, an informal parent-teacher body might be possible. It was left to each affiliate to decide what was possible or desirable in its particular school.[63] Nothing happened.

By 1976 with the election of a Labor government in NSW committed to the establishment of an education commission, the energies of the parent organisations had been swept along with the current of the union's search for an acceptable structure. They had, however, established a right to a place on such a central body by their alliance with teachers in opposition to the coalition government proposals for school councils. The incoming Labor

government was clearly committed to parent group representation on an education commission. The issue of school councils was effectively killed for the remainder of the 1970s. The exercise was doomed from the start. The timing was disastrous and assured teacher union rejection. The exclusion of the established parent groups in the Review Panels' report ensured their hostility.

#### **Parents and teachers in Victoria.**

In Victoria, school councils changed as a result of the Education (School Councils) Act, 1975. Though the initiative for change came from the government, the parent organisations, particularly VICCSO, were able to respond quickly because they had anticipated the change and had a well formulated policy. This quick response was the result of several factors. First, there was a rumour of decentralisation from the early 1970s. Second, in 1972 the passing of the Education (Youth, Sport and Recreation) Act, 1972, had given school councils the power to employ workers and organise programs for both recreation and community education in schools using special subsidies. These stimulated VICCSO into review of the current composition and function of committees and councils in schools and it formulated a set of principles for school councils.

The VTU had opposed VICCSO's overtures to look at possible changes to council regulations. [64] On the other hand, the Victorian High School Principals Association (VHSPA) did enter into dialogue with VICCSO prior to the formation of VICCSO policy on the constitution, powers and duties of councils.[65] This discussion became more crucial with the passing of the Education Youth Sport and Recreation Act, 1972. The VHSPA was forced to examine the powers of school councils in their relationship to principal's powers in matters of community use of school property. Paradoxically it was from the strong Principals' Branch of the VTU that VICCSO received an overwhelming

rebuff for every one of its propositions. These propositions included a single council structure for all schools and elected membership by staff, parents and secondary students. Petit[66] draws attention to the difficulty faced by VICCSO in determining the role of the principal and 'the nature of council duties.' The roles of principals and councils were, he states, 'complementary but distinct.' From the reaction by the VTU principals it is also clear that they perceived the possibility that 'complementary' roles could easily become conflicting roles. The VTU also claimed a particular fear of giving principals voting rights which would force them to align with particular sectional interests in the council. Teachers and students also, it was argued, should not become partisan.[67] VTU members were given no chance to reply to VICCSO propositions. The decision was made by the principal-controlled executive.

A third factor which made the parent organisations more prepared in their response to government initiative was changes within some schools in Victoria which had given principals and staff in high schools a measure of control over curriculum. This followed the initiatives of the Director General of Secondary Education, Mr R. Reed, in setting up the Curriculum Advisory Board (CAB) in 1966. The CAB was of central importance in encouraging and supporting teachers in determining their own courses and methods in schools. At the same time the VSTA was actively campaigning for greater control over teachers' working conditions, particularly for control of entry to the occupation, smaller class size and elimination of inspection. The parent groups' pressure for more control at the school level has to be seen in the light of these changes which loosened central bureaucratic control.

The **school** council organisation, VICCSO, was not alone in its call for parent participation. Joan Kerner, President of VFSSMC from 1972 to 1977, President of ACSSO from 1975 to 1978 and parent representative on the

Australian Schools Commission in 1973, had continually called for teachers, parents and students to have a voice in school administration and policy. Kerner quoted a report from the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) to argue that parents must be involved in 'the actual process of decision-making on the educational objectives for their child's school.' [68] A joint statement from VICSSO and VFSSMC set out the principles upon which school councils should be constructed, in particular, the belief that the functions of administration and education philosophy could not be separated and that representatives on the council should be elected and include teachers. [69]

The preparation of the Statement of Principles by parent organisations coincided with the production of a document on the same subject by the Director General of Education, Dr. L. W. Shears. [70] A major stimulus behind its production was the Assistant Minister for Education, Mr. B. Dixon. He was also Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation and was responsible for the Youth, Sport and Recreation Act (1972). Councils appear to have been reluctant to use the powers in the Act because of the grey area of liability between their responsibility and that of the school principal.

The Sheers' document was singularly out of step with the joint statement by VICSSO and VFSSPC which emphasised the belief that the functions of administration and educational philosophy could not be separated. [71] He attempted to separate administration from educational philosophy by proposing two bodies, an administrative council of parents who could be either elected or nominated and a School Education Committee of parents, teachers and senior students nominated by the principal which advised the principal on school programs. As in NSW, the fact that parent and teacher groups were not consulted in its preparation, added to the negative reaction. As well, the



exclusion of teachers from councils was not calculated to win their support.

The Minister for Education, Thompson, demonstrated a similar disregard for the finer points of negotiation. He called a meeting of teachers' unions, principals' organisations, parent organisations, departmental representatives and the Minister of Youth, Sport and Recreation. He presented them with the Director General's blueprint for the restructuring of school councils but gave them only fifteen minutes to read it. [72] He stated that he would introduce legislation in the current session of State Parliament and attempted to gain the consensus of the groups present. He was not successful. The result was, as in NSW, to drive the teacher and parent organisations together in their opposition to the proposals.

The group known as the 'five orgs' (five organisations) was formed comprising the VSTA, VTU, TTAV, VICCSO and VFSCMC. However, this did not lead to instant agreement or even continued united action in the months that followed. Part of the problem was that except for the parent organisation, none of the interested parties had well formulated policy on the issue. The VHSPA which had been in consultation with VICCSO, backed VICCSO in its argument that school councils should advise the principal and staff on general educational policy; a duty which high school councils currently held. Petit[73] notes that the Department of Education was also unprepared for the changes to the councils.

The teachers' unions had some difficulty preparing a united policy.[74] After some hesitation, the TTAV joined with the VSTA in endorsing the idea of elective representation on councils. The VTU remained opposed to certain critical elements of the proposals favoured by the parent organisations and the two post-primary unions. Petit points to the crucial fact that the primary

division, unlike the post-primary divisions, had not had a period of 're-examination' of the school curriculum 'in the light of the local community's needs with the implication of consultation with parents.' [75] To this we could add that the primary division had not challenged the relationship between the principal and teachers at the school. The inclusion of teacher representatives on councils challenged the power of the principal.

The VTU was also extremely wary of school councils with an educational role. It was prepared to grant the councils only an administrative role but was opposed to the inclusion of the power to give advice on general educational policy. The body which offers 'advice' on educational matters, it claimed, should not also 'control the purse strings.' [76] The parent groups, on the other hand, contended that 'a school council with significant administrative authority needs an educational role if it is to act intelligently and effectively.' [77]

The outcome was an interesting alignment of interests. After various compromises, [78] the parent organisations and the post-primary unions came to agreement. The VTU, whose executive was principal-controlled, remained a stumbling block for achieving complete unity for teacher unions and parent organisations and continued to argue against change in the composition of councils and a nominated education committee. The former was to be merely a funding body for the implementation of decisions taken by the principal. They agreed, however, on the composition of the councils as including students, parents, teachers. The separate principals' organisations (Primary Principals' Association and VHSPA) formed an opposing group which was not prepared to relinquish any powers which the principal currently held in schools. The VHSPA took the position that teacher participation was to be optional for councils and to be by nomination of the minister not election by school staff. [79] The technical and primary school principals opposed staff and student representation

as well. The Technical Schools Association of Victoria which represented Technical School Councils supported the principals' views. [80] Within the departments the Director of Technical Education supported the technical principals' opposition to staff representation on councils. As we can see the representation of staff on councils was a problem for principals and some senior administrators.

The meetings with the minister have become folk legends within the teachers' unions and parents' organisations. [81] First it became obvious that the purpose of the meetings and the style in which they were conducted were unsatisfactory to the teacher and parent representatives. At the first meeting the minister failed to 'comprehend' the representative nature of the participants and that they could not accept his proposals without direction from their organisations. Later the parent and teacher groups challenged the representative nature of the principals' organisations e.g. the Primary Principals' Association had only 120 members. They also opposed the introduction of a representative of the Inspectors Institute and the State Council for Technical Education. Petit interprets the introduction of these representatives as a reinforcing of the department's 'point of view.' [82] The five organisations tried at the final meeting to force the issue to a vote, thus challenging the minister's interpretation of the meetings as purely consultative. He blocked the voting procedure. The 'five orgs' representatives walked out. [83]

In June 1974 the Acting Premier, Thompson and the Acting Minister of Education, Dixon proposed a new formula for changes in the powers and structures of school councils. The formula offered four choices 'to permit schools to choose the form of government they desire from a set of alternatives.' [84] In fact, it gave a choice between the various options

favoured by the interest groups.

By offering all these alternatives in council composition the competing interests were pacified. The parent groups and the TTAV and VSTA favoured the second alternative, a form of council with elected parents, teachers, co-opted members of the community and, where appropriate, elected students with an advisory function on educational matters.

Before the change in councils began, the VTU Primary Principals' Branch again took the lead in the union when the Executive and Council about-faced and declared the union totally opposed to teacher representation on school councils and against school councils having even an advisory role in school curriculum. [85]

The VTU and the principals' organisations favoured the third option which resembled the dual structure recommended by the Director General, Shears, in November 1973, thus aligning themselves with the administration. In recognition of the fact that many principals, teachers and parents were not willing to make changes, the first option did not impose any new structure, thus avoiding major disruption through protests or industrial action. The fourth option allowed any form of council agreed to by the school council, school Principals, staff, parents and members of the community.

The division between the VTU Executive, Council and the members soon became apparent. Primary schools 'overwhelmingly' rejected the VTU suggestion for a council without teachers and an advisory education committee and, in the main, opted for a form of government suited to their own needs. [86] The Council then changed its policy to one which accepted teachers on school councils which had power to advise on school policy. [87]

The hostility to change was not limited to primary school principals. The secondary principals in their role as ex-officio secretaries of high school councils were able to influence school council members, many of whom seemed loath to upset a comfortable arrangement by holding elections. The VHSPA criticised VICCSO representatives at meetings with the minister for not faithfully representing the opinions of school councils. [88]

The VSTA and the TTAV advised teachers to use the new possibilities offered by the school councils. The VSTA, in 1974, also began to consider the possibility of involving school councils in staff selection. This was the 'ideal', if 'teachers rights and conditions can be reasonably preserved'. [89] The union suggested a procedure of interviews by 'a panel chosen by and from the school council to consist of equal parent and teacher representation with a chairman selected by the council and acceptable to the majority of the staff.' [90] This resembled the selection procedures already in operation in the technical division. There appears to have been some discussion by the Primary and High School Divisions that this procedure should be extended to the high schools and primary schools and by mid 1975 both VICCSO and the VFPMAC had adopted policy for involvement in the selection of principals. [91] These proposals were in complete opposition to the position taken by the NSWTF where any school council involvement in staff selection or appointment was vehemently opposed. The VTU and the TTAV were however concerned that councils not be given the power to employ teaching staff. [92] This distinction between employing, selecting and appointing is an important one to which I will return in Chapter Eight.

The legislation for school councils [93] was written in a very loose form. This was the work of the parent groups who wanted 'enabling' legislation so that schools could choose what seemed most likely to be accepted and from

which a structure of parent involvement could evolve. [94] The Council was to give advice to the principal and staff on educational matters. It was also given the power to spend the annual maintenance grant and the right to enter into contracts for approved building work and to appoint ancillary staff. Parents were given encouragement to actively participate in school activities by by a further piece of legislation, which provided workers compensation for volunteers who assisted in state schools. [95]

The following table shows the type of council chosen by the various divisions.[96] The response rate in the various categories were: primary schools, 40 percent; high schools, 50 percent; technical schools, 48 percent.

Table 6.1

Form of Council chosen by schools.

	Primary	%	High	%	Technical	%
ALTERNATIVE A (Maintain existing structure)	860	49.4	29	11.2	0	0
ALTERNATIVE B (Mostly elected)	46	2.6	15	5.8	0	0
ALTERNATIVE C (Mostly nominated)	20	1.2	2	0.8	0	0
ALTERNATIVE D (Own choice)	816	46.8	213	82.2	86	100
TOTAL	1742	100.0	259	100.0	86	100

Eighty percent of all members on councils were elected representatives of parents with the highest proportion found in primary schools. In 37 percent of primary schools, all members were parents or community people elected by parents apart from the principal. Seventy five percent of secondary schools and 40 percent of primary schools desired teacher representation on councils. Thirty three percent of members of primary councils were women. In high schools this fell to 28 percent and 17 percent in technical schools (including women teachers). Persons categorised as professional or self employed represented 60 percent of high school membership, 70 percent of technical school membership and 40 percent of primary school membership. This includes teacher members. [97]

The part of the legislation which seems to have given parents more involvement was that which gave councils the power to spend the annual maintenance budget. As one parent activist (and council member) Jennifer Beacham, wrote:

The budgeting has been more important ... in ensuring that our advice is taken seriously. Every financial decision is an educational one, so the setting of our budget guidelines in November of each year has been significant in determining priorities and is increasingly recognised by teachers as the time for long-term planning. [98]

Three out of four councils reported that they were satisfied with their involvement in budget preparation. Paradoxically, the most positive response came from the primary schools. Notwithstanding Petit's observation that there had been no major 'reexamination' of curriculum in primary schools, parent involvement has traditionally been better in primary than in secondary schools. From the early 1970s mothers particularly were active in reading programs, in art and craft and in supervision of excursions and recreational activities.[99] This use of 'mother labour' in primary schools is itself an area which deserves

further investigation. Here I must be content with the observation that it is unpaid and an extension of women's domestic/child rearing labour in the home.

In secondary schools the segmentation of the school into subject areas makes it more difficult for parents to comprehend the schools' activities. This specialisation reinforces the idea of the particular expertise of teachers. As well the size of the budget which councils must handle is much larger for secondary schools. Controlling \$60,000 dollars for a primary school is a much less daunting task for a group of part-time administrators than controlling \$300,000.

### **Parents and Principals.**

In both states the initiative for formation or restructuring of school councils came from the government. Though their arguments were couched in the liberal ideology of 'participation', there were immediate advantages to the political parties in office at the time and to careers of particular ministers. It was, in both cases, tied to proposals for regionalisation which meant, in effect, administrative decentralisation. In NSW raising the issue of community involvement also had the possibility of an electoral pay-off. As the NSWTF argued, the proposals, if implemented, might have refocussed the union's hostility onto the schools and away from the government, the department and the PSB. The need for administrative restructuring in Victoria was partly the result of the ambitions of the Deputy Minister and his need to facilitate his other role as Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation.

The tactics of the employer in both states were similar. Both governments wished to rush the proposals through Parliament. The ministers and the chief departmental officers were aligned, a proposal was presented to other interested parties and they were asked to respond. In both states poor preparation and



timing by the the government put parent organisations and teachers' unions 'off-side' and thus forced an unexpected alliance given the issue. The initial proposals separated administration from the educational policy and in this, showed a total lack of awareness of deliberations by the parent organisations.

It is here that the similarities begin to breakdown. In Victoria it was the parent organisations which, because of their already formulated policy, were able to influence the teachers' unions. The parent group, VICCSO, anticipated the arrival of the proposals for school councils and had its own policy well formulated. This, in part, was because proposals for regionalisation had preceded the proposals for changes in school councils. In NSW the teachers' union seems to have been the most powerful interest. Part of the difference between the parent organisations could, of course, be explained by the fact that councils already existed in Victoria. VICCSO had an established set of council functions and composition upon which to base changes.

The partitioning of the teachers into separate unions and the existence of principals' associations allowed particular interests to be clearly heard. From this point considerable similarities in the views of some of the parties were able to be recognised. The parent organisations could find allies among the post-primary organisations. VICCSO was also able to see what kind of accommodations to its initial policy would have to be made to get support from the teachers' unions.

What becomes most obvious in the Victorian situation is the separation between the interests of the principals and their staffs. It would seem to be because the principals had their own association that the VSTA was able to support the parent organisation. The VTU came under the control of principals in its response. In NSW the interests of the principals also played a major part

in directing the union's response, albeit with some strange radical bed-fellows. But, because of the principals' resistance, the radicals were not able to gain support for an alternative proposal for parent involvement. They were limited to joining the principals.

What can be seen from this is that treating teachers as a unified body as much of the literature does both within the functionalist or the structuralist paradigms, is nonsense. Teachers are continually struggling within their union for a dominant position from which they can effect the union's policy. The struggles are not just between factions with different philosophical allegiances but are also between the differing interests of members generated by the system of education itself, essentially its hierarchical structure. It may be that having principals in the union and expecting them to have similar interests to teachers is as odd as having inspectors as union members, a practice long discontinued. Principals are the link between the employer and the teachers and may share more of the interests of the employer than those of the employee. The VTU drew attention to the ambiguous position of the principals in discussing their place on the school councils. 'The principal attending a committee (council) meeting must consider his (sic) role as the representative of the Department and therefore has a role conflict if seen to be giving a staff viewpoint.' [100]

The alignment of parties in the issue of school councils in Victoria demonstrates the principals' perception of this common interest with the employer. It was the principals who opposed the representation of school staff on councils. The VHSPA and the principal dominated VTU supported the option which was similar to the original proposal from the Director General. It separated the administrative and educational functions. The parent groups and the post-primary unions supported the option which gave educational powers to

parents, teachers and secondary students.

Just as principals were the link between the employer and teachers, they were the mediator between both the central bureaucracy and the parent and the teachers and parents. It was not uncommon for parents to be required to consult the principal first before having contract with the classroom teacher. For some teachers, principals may be seen as a buffer between the central bureaucracy and parents. Yet, there is room for a commonality of interest in opposition to the 'gatekeeper' roles of the principal to develop between some teachers and parents.

Having some say in the selection of the principals for schools has become policy for all the parent organisations. This recognises the key position they hold not just in deciding school policy but in determining the degree of participation of parents in schools and the quality and quantity of contact between parents and classroom teachers. This key position is not due merely to the whim of particular principals, to their attitudes about their power and responsibility within the school. The states, through legislation continue to make the teachers and in particular the principals, the people legally responsible for the children in the school. Gil Freeman, a leader in the Victorian teachers' attempts to introduce changes and Principal of the Sydney Road Community School in 1973, commented: 'What teacher under this pressure will easily let an "outsider" share in the decision-making of the school.' [101] The presence of school councils does not remove the principal's legal responsibility for children. Though this legal requirement may be a handy weapon for principals (and teachers) to resist parent involvement, it can not be dismissed as wilful obstruction without foundation.

What is demonstrated in the school council issue is not just the key role of

principals in the struggle for greater parent participation in schools but the way in which the promotional hierarchy in schools becomes intertwined in the unions' reception of the idea of parent participation. The tactics used by both parents organisations and teachers' unions in their respective struggles for greater control of what happens in schools are also constrained by consideration of methods of appointing and promoting teachers. In NSW the initial Consultative Paper touched a raw nerve in its threat to discontinue the centralised system of staff appointments and promotions. If the school was given a say in the choice of principal and through him/her in the choice of staff, the seniority principle was threatened. As well, the union would no longer be facing one employer in disputes and its ability to get members to act on union decisions may have thus been made more difficult. Teachers with a track record of union activity may not have been acceptable to some school councils.

Though the NSWTF continually argued against the separation of administrative and educational/philosophical practices in deliberations on parent participation it kept separate those administrative practices which involved the employment of teachers and their career structures. The recognition of parent interests by teachers leads not only to examination of how their interests are to be heard but also to an examination of what are those interests. Are they, for example, to be involved in the employment of teachers, in decisions on teachers' career paths, in school practices and curriculum? We have seen in previous chapters the difficulty in separating the teachers' conditions of employment from educational issues, despite frequent resort to contrasts of 'industrial' and 'professional' concerns. In NSW the antagonism between the union and the PSB was partly the result of such a difficulty. If movement away from central control of education includes a recognition of the clients' interests, the problems of deciding what are 'industrial' or 'professional' concerns

are now found in the school.

The Victorian government proposals for restructuring school councils did not offer the threat of decentralised appointment and promotion of staff. It was, indeed, the VSTA which made suggestions in the direction of local selection of staff, again with an awareness of the wishes of the parent organisations. In Victoria the secondary unions were able to join the parents in supporting a change in school councils partly because councils were already in existence and the VSTA saw them as a way to gain greater teacher involvement in school decision making. The compatibility between the promise of reconstructed councils and union policy on school executive restructures was obvious to many active members. The VSTA once again was willing to make use of what was available to further its own end.

It could be argued that there was greater recognition of the parents as allies in changes which the VSTA sought in schools: in curriculum and organisation; in teacher involvement in school decision making. School autonomy demanded a break with the central authority and an acceptance of responsibility to a new authority at the local level. School councils, if they involved both teachers and clients, were a buffer against the prescriptions of central authority.

It was argued in the last chapter that the system of promotions was the mechanism through which central control of education is maintained. The policies and actions of the Victorian secondary unions suggest a greater awareness of this mechanism and a willingness to search for solutions which will give teachers greater control in the classroom and in their practices which control their employment. This includes both the mechanisms for selection of candidates for school executive and the appointment of executives to schools. In the latter of these, the Victorian post-primary unions seem also to have

come to terms with the fact that for teachers to have greater control, they must recognise the right of the clients' representatives to share this control. Stepping away from central control may necessitate new strategies for union action, some of which, as the NSWTF rightly perceived could be opening up new areas of struggle. These must be weighed against the possible gains for teachers' interests.

This chapter, however, has argued that there are two separate functions which concern teachers' unions. First, there is the question of who should employ teachers. Unions in both states were concerned that there should be a central employer. Second, there is the function of selection and appointment of staff to schools. The NSWTF continued to resist any local selection and appointment. This issue has not caused as much hostility from the Victorian secondary unions. Central employment, however, is seen to offer teachers more protection in salaries and conditions. At the same time the separation of the functions of employing and appointing may present difficulties, particularly in the questions of who dismisses.

### **Professional parents.**

Two large questions stand out in the examination of school councils. First, who are the parents who compose them? Second, how shall they be heard? In NSW and Victoria the voice of parents became synonymous with the already established parent organisations. In NSW the failure of the Review Panel to recognise them as a special interest group was crucial in the death of the school council initiatives. The category 'parent' had been captured by a particular group. The NSWTF members drew attention to the fact that parents who would seize control of school councils would be business and professional people. They pointed to the present composition of P&C Associations to

demonstrate this middle class bias. Paradoxically this parent organisation made an excellent ally in rejecting the proposals. It is important to keep in mind that, though the unions may have policy on general parent involvement, their dealing, as unions, are with the parent organisations. They meet usually at the executive level. The policies developed by both parties may affect the relationship at schools between teachers and parents but it is through the articulate members of the parent organisations that the parent view is mediated in discussion with governments, departments and unions.

The middle class bias of the parent organisations was acknowledged by Joan Kerner, President of VFSSPC, 1972-7, and President of ACSSO, 1975-78, who noted that they remained composed of middle class parents for whose children, schools 'facilitate success' In her view,

broadening access to power for working class parents, for whose children schools structure relative failure, is barely within the focus of existing parent organisations (in reality as distinct from rhetoric), let alone within our competence as we are currently structured. [102]

Kerner further noted the derogatory term 'professional parents' was often employed by teachers to describe parent activists. She was here not so much referring to the occupational position of parents but of the need for parents to learn the language within which educational debate took place and the organisational skills necessary to take part in the fray.

One has to become bloody professional in terms of one's access to political and organisational skills and intellectual understanding to get a chance to empower parents. Yet, after ten years as a "professional" parent there is no way, still, I could write a paper, like most of the professionals at this Conference. [103]

This statement acknowledges the problem of parents' abilities to understand the language of education.

This inability may be a limiting factor in parental participation. It may in

fact be the method by which teachers and principals are able to distance themselves from parents even those who are fluent in English language. This mystification is a barrier which may operate through parents' lack of knowledge of the structures and procedures of the Department of Education and through the language which teachers use to describe their aims, goals and practices in the classroom. The impetus to break the barrier must, it seems, come from the teachers. On the other hand, the parents' organisations may, as Kerner suggested, be able to use their professional access to 'create a space' for all parents to 'increase their understanding and their power to influence schools and systems.'[104]

The problems in developing real participation continue when we ask how they should participate. Parent participation was translated by the employer of teachers in both states into a search for a mechanism through which this participation could take place. This was resisted by the NSWTF who clung to the idea of an informal association between parents and teachers at the school level. It seems difficult, however, to activate new relationships between the teachers and the client (parent) without visible signs which legitimate the client's claims, such as legislative mechanisms to allow parent involvement (e.g. in school councils). Such formal structures become necessary particularly if parent involvement is seen to include the right to participate in deciding who should teach in schools. The presence of formally constituted mechanisms for representative participation does not necessarily have any bearing on the relationship between the individual teacher and parent but it may create a 'space' for the development of a new relationship. That is, it may cause both parties to reevaluate their obligations and rights.

As well, the fact that there are levels of struggle involved, at the school, at the state and at the federal level, needs to be borne in mind. It is at the last



two mentioned that struggles for resources take place in competition with the private sector of education. These struggles for resources are enmeshed in struggles over the formation of the aims and objectives of education and find definition in the ordering of budget priorities. The fund raising function of parents in state schools has a long history, as has their joint campaigning with teachers' unions for state and federal finance. It is only through the presence of parents on formal structures like school councils, the NSW Education Commission and the Australian Schools Commission that there has been recognition, albeit very limited, of their legitimate role in deciding how those funds will be spent. However, the competition for funds with the private education sector in a time of government cut-backs in public sector expenditure, place both teachers and parents in danger of returning to cries for resources with little energy left for the real struggle over how they should be spent.

Formal mechanisms also develop their own internal dynamics which could mask any conflict of interests between the groups represented. The interests of middle class parents who become representatives may, in fact, match those of teachers. Working class parents would be ill equipped to cut through such a consensus made strong by the very appearance of parent representatives. Finally, separating those formal structures of participation in educational decision making which will give teachers and parents real participation and those which merely integrate them, at the leadership level, into institutionalised joint bodies controlled by the state is also problematic. The danger of this at the state (Education Commission) and federal (Schools Commission) level is very real.

1. B. and J. Ehrenreich, 'The professional-managerial class', in P. Walker (ed), Between labour and capital, Boston, 1979, p.74.
2. P. Bourdieu and J. Passeron, Reproduction in education, society and culture, London, 1977, p.42.
3. M. Anderson, Ideology and compulsory education, B.A. (Hons) thesis, Macquarie University, 1979.
4. R.W. Connell, D.J. Ashenden, S. Kessler, and G.W. Dowsett, Making the difference, Sydney, 1982.
5. *ibid.*, p.128.
6. *ibid.*, p.133.
7. Education Act, 1872, (Victoria) Clauses 14,15.
8. Education Act 1910, (Victoria).
9. Dept. of Education, Vic., Public notice to parents, teachers, citizens, 'The reorganisation of school councils', 1974, (VFSSPC files).
10. *ibid.*
11. *ibid.*
12. R. Teese, 'The growth and decline of Victorian gov't secondary schools, 1954-1981' in Melbourne working papers, 1982/1983, p.155; also Teese, 'The social function of private schools'; Fromin and Teese, 'Public finance and private schools ...' in Melbourne working papers, 1980.
13. S. Marginson, 'Privatisation of Australian schools', Australian teacher, Sept., 1982, pp.19-26.
14. Schools in Australia: report of the interim committee for the Australian Schools Commission (Karmel Report), Canberra, 1973.
15. School bell July. 1973.
16. Karmel Report, op. cit., see pp.10, 11,13, 14
17. Dept. of Education, The community and its schools: a consultative paper on regionalisation and community involvement in schools, Jan., 1973.
18. Education, 21 Nov., 1973, p.330.
19. The community and its schools, op. cit, p.11.
20. *ibid.*, p.12.
21. *ibid.*, p.13.

22. ibid., pp.14-15.
23. ibid., p.15.
24. ibid., p.14.
25. ibid., p.12.
26. Education, editorial, June 20, 1973.
27. cited by F.C. Clarke, The community and its schools - a response, 1973, p.1, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
28. Sydney morning herald, 24 Jan., 1973.
29. R.J. Cahill, letter to the editor, Education, 15 Aug., 1973, p.217.
30. V. Davy, NSWTF ad hoc committee, 3 Aug.. 1973, NSWTF Community Involvement file
31. M. Adams, 'Some further comment on "The community and its schools"', 21 June 1973, p.2, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
32. Education, 21 Nov., 1973, p.330.
33. Adams, op. cit., p.2.
34. Davy, op. cit., p.2.
35. Clarke, op. cit., p.6.
36. Adams, op. cit., p.3.
37. V. Davy, 'Some ideas on an alternative structure re community involvement', undated, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
38. ibid.
39. NSWTF Council resolution, June, 1983, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
40. Davy, 'Some areas of discussion', Sept., 1973, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
41. Decisions of seminar on 'The community and its schools', 11 August, 1973, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
42. NSWTF submission to the review panel on 'The community and its schools', Sept. 1973, p.1, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
43. ibid., p.1.
44. A joint submission to the Minister for Education on 'The community and its schools', 1973, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
45. Education, 10 Oct., 1973, p.266.

46. The community and its schools: report of the review panel, appointed by the Minister for Education, Sydney 1974, p.10.
47. Federation of P&C Associations, resolutions from special council meeting, 13 July, 1974, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
48. Report to affiliates of the Federation of P&C Associations on resolution endorsed by Annual Conference, 1974, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
49. S. Berg, 'Parent participation and involvement in education - The government of our schools', circa 1974, in the author's possession.
50. *ibid.*, p.4.
51. Federation of P&C Associations, Annual Conference resolutions, 1982, in the author's possession.
52. R. Sharkey, report on visit to Bathurst, 20 Nov. 1974, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
53. Statement from staff of Bathurst Demonstration School in memo. to all officers, 28 Nov., 1974, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
54. Federation of P&C Associations, executive resolution endorsed by Annual Conference, 1974, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
55. Van Davy in interview, Nov. 1983.
56. E. Willis, Minister for Education, press statement, 18 Dec. 1974, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
57. NSWTF circular to councillors, 1975, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
58. Mr Buggie, Director General, memorandum to principals, 4 Feb., 1975; School Councils Series No. 1, 'Setting up school councils: the principal's right' 11 Feb. 1975, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
59. NSWTF circular to councillors, 1975, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
60. 'Policy statement' Parent and citizen, Sept., 1976.
61. *ibid.*, 1976.
62. T. Cohen. President of the Federation of P&C Associations, to affiliates, 12 Feb., 1975, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
63. T. Cohen, President of Federation of P&C Associations, to affiliates, 12 July 1975, NSWTF Community Involvement file.
64. Teachers journal, Aug. 1972, p.250.
65. Petit. 'Strategies and educational change: the Victorian schools councils debate.'School and community news, Vol 4, No.1, March, 1980. p.3.
66. *ibid.*, p.5.

67. Teachers journal, Aug., 1972, p.251.
68. Educational magazine, Vol. 30, No. 6, 1973, p.6.
69. School bell, Feb-March, 1974, p.1.
70. Dr. L.W. Shears, Director General of Education, Some thoughts on the community and the school, 9 Nov. 1973.
71. School bell Feb-March, 1974.
72. VSTA, Special notice, 3 July, 1974.
73. D. Petit, op. cit., p.8.
74. Associate news, 20 Apr., 1974, **cited in Petit, op. cit., p.9.**
75. Petit, op. cit. p.9.
76. VTU, 'Policy and recommendations on proposed new structures and powers of parent bodies in school government', 1974, in The primary school as a community centre, Nov., 1973, App. 2, p.62.
77. VICCSO pamphlet cited in above p.43.
78. VSTA, Special notice, 1 April, 1974.
79. VHSPA, memo., Nov. 27, 1973, cited in Petit, op. cit., p.10.
80. *ibid.*
81. Jennifer Beacham, in interview 1982.
82. D. Petit, op. cit., p.12
83. J. Beacham, in interview, 1982.
84. L.W. Shears, Director General, memo to all school principals, staff and chairman of school councils or committees, June 25, 1974, VTU files.
85. Teachers journal, Oct, 1974, **p.453.**
86. Teachers journal, 10 June, 1975, p.5.
87. Teachers journal, 8 July, 1975, p.4.
88. Secondary teacher, July, 1974, p.9.
89. VSTA special statement, May 1974, VSTA files.
90. Secondary teacher, No. 8, 1975, p.10.
91. D. Petit, op. cit., p.18.
92. Teachers journal, 9 Dec., 1975, p.24.

93. Education (School Councils) Act, 1975 (Victoria).
94. Colin Thorpe, School bell, July/Aug, 1976.
95. Education (Volunteer Workers Compensation) Act, (Victoria) 1979.
96. School councils, Feb., 1979, p.2.
97. *ibid.*, pp.2-3.
98. J. Beacham, The Victorian experience, 1979, in author's possession.
99. J. Beacham, Discussion paper, Queenscliff Seminar, Aug. 1975.
100. Teachers journal, Nov., 1973, **p . 256.**
101. Educational magazine, Vol. 30, No. 6, p.11.
102. J. Kerner, Equalising power: the role of the parent organisations, C.1981, p.7, in author's possession.
103. *ibid.* p.6.
104. *ibid.*

## 7: CURRICULUM POLITICS

This chapter examines some of the union activity which focused on the issue of curriculum during the 1970s. It has become part of educational folk lore that it was a decade of change - marked by the introduction of school-based curriculum, of innovations in school organisation and curriculum content, of growing awareness of the need for the school to be responsible to its immediate community. The analysis is confined to secondary education and is principally concerned with the question of curriculum development and student assessment or examination. The assumption is that the method of assessment is a crucial measure of who controls the curriculum.

There has been no major reorganisation of secondary curriculum in either state during the period 1965-1980 in the sense that a complete new structure has been introduced. Rather those changes which have occurred have been a series of reforms to the existing organisation. In NSW there had been a complete reorganisation of secondary education in 1962 but it was not until the end of the period that a series of reports on overall restructuring began to emerge in quick succession in both states.

In NSW, the report from the select committee of the Legislative Assembly on the School Certificate (McGowan Report) in 1981 [1] was followed by Future directions of secondary education [2] a discussion paper prepared by the Director General, Mr Swan, in consultation with Dr K. McKinnon, Vice Chancellor of the University of Wollongong and former Chairman of the Schools Commission. In Victoria the reports were much wider in reference than secondary education and commenced with a Ministerial Statement on the 'Aims and objectives of education in Victoria'[3] in December 1979, followed by a 'Green Paper' on Strategies and structures for education in Victoria in May 1980 [4] and a 'White

Paper'[5] on the same subject late in the same year. A report was prepared for the Victorian Department of Education by the consultative group, P.A. Australia, in September, 1981, on the Rationale and definition of the proposed organisation structure. [6] Three other reports were presented by the Organisation Reference Group convened by the Minister of Education, A.J. Hunt and the Minister for Educational Services, N. Lacy, between 1980 and 1982. [7]

Although concerned with the whole system of Victorian education, the reports, in their deliberations over central, regional and school responsibilities, all had the potential to influence the increased professional responsibility which had been delegated to schools and teachers with regard to curriculum during the 1970s.

Most of these reports were received outside the time period of this study. However, the McGowan Report which began its investigation in 1979 marks a turning point in the provision of secondary education and the beginning of sustained debate within the NSWTF of the nature of secondary education, a debate which has divided prominent activists within the union particularly on the subject of core or common curriculum. It has also moved across the state borders in the 1980s using the ATF and the publication, The Australian teacher, as a forum. To a large extent the entry of the federal government into state education has strengthened the national union of teachers which has a representative on the Schools Commission and lobbies for teachers' interests in the political arena (The ATF spent some \$750,000 on a publicity campaign supporting Labor's education policies in the 1982 federal elections). Common experimentation in the late 1970s, cut-backs in funding, attacks on government schools and similarities between state governments' counter moves following gains by teachers in the area of curriculum decision making have also fostered the debate on curriculum between the states.



## **Federal influences.**

Before examining the states' activities in this area, it is necessary once again to note that during this period a new interest in the provision of education emerged. During the latter half of the 1960s Federal government funding began - first with the Liberal Coalition providing service facilities and libraries in secondary schools (both government and non-government) and finally moving after 1973 to a more direct form of influence on school organisation and curriculum with the Labor government's 'needs' based policy. The 'needs' policy embraced both government and non-government schools. This followed the report of the interim committee for the Australian Schools Commission (Karmel Report) in 1973 and the establishment of the Australian Schools Commission. [8]

The Karmel Report and the establishment of the Schools Commission offered two things to schools and their teachers - first, resources and second, support for a number of philosophical notions about the purpose of schools and appropriate organisation of schools. General recurrent and building resources were made available plus special funding for 'disadvantaged' schools, special education, teacher development and innovative programs. The report spoke of 'equality of opportunity' and recommended schools compensate for 'unequal out of school situations'. It favoured 'diversity' and encouraged school based experimentation rather than 'centralised manipulation of changes.' [9]

The report and the establishment of the Schools Commission were welcomed by the unions in the halcyon days of the coming to office of the federal Labor government after an absence of twenty three years. [10] The commitment to funding of non-government schools concerned the NSWTF but the union was uncommonly quiet publically in 1973 and hailed the report as a 'major

breakthrough by Federation, the result of a thirty year campaign for federal funds.[11]

To what extent the Karmel Report was itself responding to initiatives within the teachers' unions is difficult to judge. The unions have traditionally been seen as having strong connection with the Labor Party though none are affiliated and NSWTF had campaigned against the state Labor Party education policies in a state election in 1965. The NSWTF claimed input into the disadvantaged schools recommendations through that section of its members involved in the Inner City Education Alliance. The rise of the convenor of this alliance, Van Davy, into the position of Senior Vice President in 1974-75 and Deputy President in 1976-77 - gave the Disadvantaged Schools Program prominence in the union.[12]

By specifically tagging funds the federal government was able to exert some influence on the curriculum and organisation of schools. Even in 1971 the NSW Minister for Education, C.B. Cutler voiced concern that 'this (federal) aid is operating along Commonwealth decided priorities rather than those decided by the states which are best able to determine their own needs and priorities.'

[13]

The non Labor states of NSW and Victoria were reported as being uncooperative with the Labor federal government and showing open resentment of the Commission's policy of rewarding direct teacher initiatives through the innovation's grants.[14] Within the Innovations Program, money was available for more flexible school settings, for example, open plan teaching, team teaching and integrated day programs.

One thousand and twenty three schools in Australia were declared 'disadvantaged' by 1975. There is, however, a strong note of disappointment in

the Schools Commission Triennium Report, 1976-78, that there was a preoccupation with equipment, buildings and additional staffing rather than 'imaginative and well planned projects'. [15] By the end of the decade the federal programs were emphasising the notions of 'Choice and Diversity'. [16] The notion was quickly captured as a slogan by the supporters of the non-government school sector in their case for continued and increased government funding. The notion lent itself to the laissez faire, small government sentiments expressed by people who advocated a voucher system in which parents 'cashed' in the vouchers at the school of their choice. [17] The notion became entangled in the debate over appropriate curriculum in government schools, particularly the tension between school based curriculum and examination of curriculum. It raised questions about the concept of 'zoning' i.e. the practice of requiring students to attend their neighbourhood school rather than making schools compete in an education market in both New South Wales and Victoria. [18]

The movement of emphasis from questions of 'disadvantage' and 'innovation' to questions of 'choice' highlights the economic, political and ideological changes occurring during the decade. By 1979 when the Schools Commission 'choice and diversity' program became established, education was being blamed for youth unemployment. Government schools were accused of allowing standards to fall. The two sectors, government schools and non-government schools, were in competition for government funds. The term 'privatisation' of education was being used by teachers' unions to describe the movement of students to non-government schools. [19]

On the other hand, the expression of the notion 'choice and diversity' also highlights the changes that had occurred within the government school systems during the decade. A prominent Victorian activist, Bill Hannan, noted in 1980

some of the 'gains'. The relationship between teachers and pupils had 'softened', partly as a result of reduced class sizes; there had been a growing recognition of the fact that 'the school by its very nature disadvantages certain groups'; teaching was better, partly as a result of improved teacher training but also because of 'greater involvement of teachers in curriculum planning'; the curriculum had been shaken up by 'shuffling subjects, revising courses, introducing new studies and changing school organisation'. As well the practice of testing had been set 'back on its heels in many places.' [20]

#### **NSWTF - Curriculum reactions.**

In New South Wales the chief influence on secondary school organisation and curriculum during the period 1962-1980 was the so called 'Wyndham Scheme' implemented in 1962 following the report of a committee appointed to survey secondary education in NSW in 1957.[21] The chairman was Dr H.S. Wyndham, Director General of Education, NSW. The main theme of the Report was 'comprehensive' coeducational secondary education rather than 'selective' single-sex secondary education.

Prior to the introduction of the Wyndham Scheme, secondary education was stratified into selective 'academic' high schools, technical and home science high schools, intermediate high schools and junior technical and home science secondary schools. In some country areas special post-primary classes were attached to primary schools. Population growth and the accompanying growth of new suburban areas made the continuation of this stratified system unworkable in the 1950s. New areas on the perimeter of Sydney were already being supplied with comprehensive but not coeducational high schools before the Education Act (1961) introduced the Wyndham Scheme.[22]

The NSWTF claimed considerable influence on the Wyndham Report. There

was a history of association with the Chairman.[23] The recommendations have a noted similarity with the scheme for secondary education endorsed by the union's Annual Conference in 1944.[24] The recommendations also resemble the 1946 proposals from the Board of Secondary School Studies. These early proposals suggest that the ideas contained in the Wyndham Report were not just a response to the pressure of a post war growth in the secondary area. Finally, the union was involved in the 'manoeuvres' by the Minister for Education and the department to introduce the reforms in spite of Cabinet procrastination.[25]

The Education Act, 1961, extended secondary education from five to six years and divided those years into two stages, years seven to ten and years eleven and twelve. It established two statutory Boards, the Secondary Schools Board responsible for the first four years, and the Board of Senior School Studies (BSSS) responsible for years eleven and twelve. These Boards determined curriculum and authorised the granting of Certificates (School Certificate and Higher School Certificate respectively). The union nominated four of the 20 (later 22) representatives on each Board. The Director General or his nominee was chairman of both Boards. Courses for the School Certificate were available at three levels: Ordinary, Credit and Advanced. Separate syllabuses were approved by the Board at each level. Though the report envisaged giving schools more responsibility for the adaptation of curriculum to 'the needs and capacities of their pupils and to the conditions of a particular school' [26] there was a tension between this philosophy and the provision of an external examination at year ten.

In the implementation of the Wyndham Scheme many of the original reports' recommendations were either distorted or eliminated. For example, the Report favoured a 'period of exploration' in the first year of secondary education

before decisions on the type of curriculum were made by either pupil or teacher.[27] The interests of the statutory Boards and the Universities intervened and the first year of high school became part of the streaming process oriented towards academic subjects.[28] Secondary education in the 1960s settled into a system based on a compulsory core curriculum of five subjects, a hierarchy of several levels within subjects, a distinction between elective and non-elective, examinable and non examinable subjects and a rigid 'lock-step' progression.

The period following the introduction of the Wyndham scheme is most notable for its disorganisation and the continued cry from the NSWTF for provision of resources to implement the regulations. It is in this period that the union developed a reputation for being preoccupied with resources at the expense of educational or professional issues, i.e. concern over curriculum. The immediate situation of ever increasing student numbers, inadequate or non existent school buildings, large classes and a shortage of teachers and ancillary staff account for much of this preoccupation. The relationship between the faltering aims of the Wyndham scheme and the lack of resources is also clear.

In 1966 the NSWTF was waging a struggle over expected staff shortages in 1967. Several hundred casual 'specialist' teachers (music, art, etc) were employed. These lacked the academic, specialist or professional training required for a Specialist Conditional Certificate. As well, principals were advised to combine subject groups at more than one level and to increase the total size. They were also 'advised' that their Anticipated Organisational Return Form would be 'penciled through' and returned if they did not comply. The Public Service Board (PSB) asked Principals to review their existing staff to see whether they could use any teachers of music, art, physical education, manual arts, home science and needlework to undertake some teaching in those

areas where the greatest demand for additional staffing lay, in English, History, Languages, Mathematics, Science and Commerce. [29]

The staff shortage meant a down grading in status of specialist subjects because untrained teachers were to be used though the Wyndham scheme had an ideology of parity between subjects. In some schools the electives were severely restricted or even eliminated and the PSB's request suggests that teachers be used on 'more important' subjects. Staffing thus effected the choice of subjects available to pupils and favoured certain subjects.

Though there has been no major reorganisation of secondary education in NSW, since 1962, there has been considerable revision of the methods of assessment, of both the School Certificate and the Higher School Certificate, and the introduction of courses devised by particular teachers or schools and 'approved' by the Boards. Two documents were also produced during the first half of the 1970s. The first, The aims of secondary education (1974)[30] originated in a request from the Boards to the Department's Directorate of Studies. The second, Base paper on the total curriculum - Years 7-10, (1975)[31] was a discussion paper prepared by the Board of Secondary Studies. They present a view of the philosophy coming from the department and the Boards during the first half of the 1970s but especially that of the Director of Studies, Dr W.J. Vaughan who was the department's prime mover in the area of curriculum. The Director General, either through personal choice or pressure of other duties after the 1970 Education Act delegated more of the PSB duties to him, was absent from the curriculum debate and in his absence Vaughan was able to pursue his own interests.

The 'aims' paper noted changes which had occurred in the society since the Wyndham Report in 1957. It listed a 'knowledge explosion'; changes in the

number and composition of the secondary school population ('wider range of interests and abilities'); changes in the relationship between school, home and community; and occupational changes which required students to be 'highly adaptable.' [32]

Generally, the paper appears to have been grappling with the necessity to provide central guidance on curriculum while allowing the principal, teachers, students and parents the 'initiative and responsibility for aims and programs'. [33] It culminates in a stress on the 'individual'[34] and a recognition of 'difference'. Educational aims become a question of developing the personal qualities of 'perceptive understanding, mature judgement and responsible self direction and moral autonomy.' [35]

In a section headed 'Time Allocation' the paper called for greater 'flexibility' and proposed distinct units of study which would allow 'extension studies for those with particular interests and remedial or 'catching up' studies for those with particular needs.'[36] This suggests a movement away from the 'lock-step' approach as well as greater diversity between schools. The paper noted trends towards revision of existing school subjects and the introduction of new subjects, units or areas of study or interdisciplinary studies which 'might well be encouraged further'. [37]

The 'aims' paper states on several occasions that the time was right for innovation, particularly given the phasing out of the School Certificate Examinations (external). [38] The whole tenor of the paper was somewhat speculative as if waiting for a response. The union did not respond positively to any of the possibilities offered to schools by the very general aims or in suggestions that there be 'greater flexibility in time allocations'. [39] A general meeting of the Secondary Teachers Association of the NSWTF



condemned it unanimously as 'repetitious, lacking in logical development and so cluttered with irrelevant material that it can only be described as incoherent'. Its aims were 'university oriented' and a radical departure from the Wyndham report.[40] It was seen as a means of enabling brighter students to advance more quickly.

As the 'aims' paper noted, two changes were occurring in the secondary system, first in the area of assessment and second in the move towards school devised courses. In 1968 the basis of the School Certificate awards was changed to a composite score giving equal weighting to school assessment and to external examinations. A new level was examined as well. This 'modified' level was to cater for students who could not cope with the 'ordinary' level. The credit level became a superior result of the ordinary level.

From 1971 the Secondary Schools Board was searching for alternative procedures to replace the external examination. [41] In 1973 the 50/50 system of assessment was replaced by a 75/25 system which placed greater weight on the school assessment. In that same year the Minister for Education announced that the external School Certificate would be abolished in 1975 and replaced by 'moderator' tests, i.e. reference tests were used to prescribe each school's pattern of School Certificate grades. This move had the support of the Labor shadow Minister for Education, Mr E. Bedford, who welcomed the abolition of the education 'lottery'. [42] From 1975 the moderating procedures were in action.

The move towards school-based courses quickened in 1973 when teachers and schools were asked to put forward courses and methods of evaluation to be approved by the Boards. In the senior years (years 11 and 12) these were to 'cater particularly to the needs of those students who are not oriented towards

further study at the tertiary level.' [43] By 1975, 800 courses had been submitted of which 87 percent were approved.[44] The courses were wide ranging and a section were religious education studies presented by non-government schools. Others were concerned with sociology, psychology, government, citizenship and conservation issues. Those rejected included courses on typewriting, woodwork and first-aid whose subject matter was deemed to be 'skill based' and those which were at this stage insufficiently prepared. [45] Students results were to be shown on the Higher School Certificate but assessment was undertaken by the school. The courses would not therefore form part of the selection for tertiary entrance. The large number of courses proposed suggests the need for schools to find suitable courses for the increasing number of students staying on to years 11 and 12, many of whom were not destined for university, and a willingness of teachers to broaden the curriculum.

The introduction of approved studies in the senior years formed part of a larger reform of the Higher School Certificate in 1975. It replaced 'levels' of study with 'units' of study. It was an attempt to change the courses from a basis of 'depth' of study to a basis of 'time' spent in study. Students would not be under pressure to take higher level (depth of study) courses which carried more marks. This reform was first mooted in 1969. In 1970 an investigation by the Department of Education found that restructuring would require a twelve and a half percent increase in staff in the senior years. The idea was shelved. [46] It resurfaced in 1972 with a proposal that 'syllabuses be covered in part by private study, not necessarily teacher supervised'.[47] This 'faceless' teaching alarmed the Secondary Teachers' Association which convened meetings of union representatives on BSSS syllabus committees and deputations with the Director General early in 1973.[48] The restructuring was postponed until 1975

but trials were conducted in some schools. [49] These trials pointed to timetabling problems and a narrowing of choices in subjects. As well, the universities were slow to determine and state clearly their matriculation requirements.[50] The BSSS, however, persisted.[51] The union continued to object to the staffing implication of 'faceless teaching'.[52] This feature seems to have faded under union pressure and the union finally 'welcomed' the restructure of secondary curriculum in 1975. [53]

In the restructuring the pressure on students to take higher level courses which carried more marks was removed, but was replaced with a statistical method of scaling the students' examination results which was hard to comprehend. It was now extremely difficult for students, teachers and parents to decide which units of study would give the best results. The criticisms and blunders became so obvious in 1976 that a new statistical arrangement was used in 1977, but the mystification remained. The chairman of the BSSS, the Director General, Buchan, in reply to criticisms, stated that the procedures would be too complicated to explain to most people but 'you don't throw your television out the window because you don't understand how it works'. A Research Officer for the union, Stan Heuston, replied: 'If Mr Buchanan's future depended on his TV not breaking down, he would want to know exactly how it worked.' [54] From 1977 onward the Higher School Certificate was awarded on assessment which was 50 percent internal and 50 percent external.[55]

Adding to the complications of the 'unit' organisation was the fact that expressions of dissatisfaction with the Certificate and its procedures continued. After a particular outcry from sections of the ethnic communities over the disadvantage of some candidates for whom English was a second language, a special review panel was set up in 1979 to examine the procedures. The practice of 'loading' to make candidates comparable in terms of their respective

levels of general performance was seen as a major problem.

The panel of inquiry recommended several fairly minor changes including the provision that candidates not proficient in English be 'excluded from the calculation of between-subject loadings using iterative procedures.' [56] In general, the panel recommended a closer look at the consequences of some of the procedures, more feed-back to the schools and increased efforts to explain as simply as possible the aims of the examination and the procedures employed, to teachers, parents, candidates, the general public, and the examiners themselves.' [57] It called, in fact, for a major public relations exercise.

Within the union there was no real questioning of the purpose of the examinations. Along with the general public, it was caught up in the problem of understanding the procedures. Union attention was focussed more on the years 7 to 10 and the School Certificate. This was in spite of the fact that with more students remaining at school for the senior years, the purpose of the Higher School Certificate, that is, as gateway to tertiary institutions had been for some time a matter for contention. In 1975, the Secondary Schools Board produced its discussion paper on the years 7 to 10. This coincided with the abolition of the external School Certificate and the introduction of moderator tests. It proposed a 'basic course of broad education embracing each of the following areas of learning: a) language, b) mathematics, c) science and technology, d) arts (art, craft, music) and e) physical education.[58]

It stated that the Board's syllabuses 'increasingly will be statements of aims rather than statements of content.' [59] It envisaged a greater need for 'co-operation and co-ordination' in all subject areas but stopped short of 'total integration' at this time in years 7 and 8.[60] In years 9 and 10 greater specialisation or extension or 'catching up' would be provided as well as

continuation of the basic course of broad education.[61] The most radical proposal was that every pupil leaving school at any time should be given a 'comprehensive formal statement of achievement from the Secondary Schools Board or the school, acting as agent of the Board.' [62]

The major cry from the union was lack of time to discuss the paper.[63] A Secondary Teachers' Conference in July 1976 noted that interdisciplinary courses would mean a marked increase in preparation and assessment time. The staffing formula for schools would need to be more flexible. In a cautious vein it stated

that syllabuses in the subject areas (should) retain sufficient knowledge content to ensure that children are not deprived of necessary social knowledge and skills to enable them to understand society and develop their critical faculties.[64]

In conclusion it 'welcomed the Base Paper and its gradual introduction at schools discretion.'[65] The union executive adopted all of these conference resolutions except the last.[66] Thus, in spite of the conference's fairly cautious 'welcome', the Base Paper was not favourably received by the union. The Paper did imply a breaking down of subject barriers and greater teacher initiative in curriculum development and assessment. The latter was union policy but subject barriers were somewhat sacrosanct in NSW. Union action at this point could have been crucial in moving union policy from the conference floor to the schools. One union activist complained that once again the union had shown its 'inability to take the initiative on educational issues' and was reacting, not acting. She set out a list of things the union should demand including more time, federal money for more in-service courses and practical support for pilot schemes. She suggested that implementation given certain conditions was a better tactical move than outright rejection.[67]

The next major modification to the School Certificate came in 1977 when

only English and Mathematics were to be moderated. The Minister for Education stated that the continuation of an external influence in these subjects was to allow for continued evaluation of literacy and numeracy.[68] The union objected to this continued moderation [69] as it had objected to the moderating procedures since their introduction.[70] One of the NSWTF representatives on the Board of Secondary Studies, 1970-76, Bill Myles, was, however, concerned at reports that some teachers were pressing for the return of external examinations though the phasing out had been in line with union policy.[71]

What becomes evident in this instance is the use made by the union of its representatives on the statutory Board. Armed with union policy, (during the period most representatives were councillors and one a member of executive) the representatives had a clear mission. The union had, by 1977, three elements in its policy: first, assessment to be made by the teacher; second, curriculum diversity within schools; third, state wide currency or comparability on the School Certificate. The last was the most contentious area. Encouraging the first two areas while fulfilling the last was a dilemma. The union solution was to develop standardised tests which would be available to teachers on request. This library or 'item bank' of tests would be held by the Department's School Certificate Development Branch. Teachers could send in proposed courses and evaluation procedures to be rated if they so desired. [72]

A section of the membership questioned rank and file commitment to this policy. Scone High School carried out its own survey in late 1977. The response was low but they contended that Annual Conference was out of touch with members' feelings on the matter. [73] Letters to the Editor of the union journal called for the union to survey members on the question of School Certificate assessment.[74] The research officer, Stan Heuston, was called upon by various metropolitan associations to explain (i.e. defend) union policy at

association meetings. [75]

The question of external examinations was not confined to debates within the union by 1978. The Liberal state opposition leader, Peter Coleman, stated that if returned to power the Liberal Party would reinstate the procedure of 50 percent external examination and 50 percent internal teacher assessment.[76] The NSW Federation of Parents and Citizens also favoured a return to this procedure for 'core' subjects. [77]

The Executive Director of NSW Employers' Federation, Mr John Darling, stated in the media that 'public examinations are the only way to measure a child's ability. They are also the only proper check on teachers. This is probably why the Teachers' Federation is opposed to them.' [78] On the other side, the Schools Commission Report of 1978 was in favour of more freedom for schools.[79] An inquiry in Queensland had also favoured retention of its school-based assessment. [80] An article in the Catholic Weekly referred to external examination as a 'great evil'.[81]

Amid this debate the Labor Minister for Education, Bedford, announced that he would recommend a return to some kind of external examinations.[82] This was in complete opposition to his position in 1973 when, as opposition spokesperson on Education, he had questioned the need for even a moderator. [83] It was after this that the Minister for Education and state caucus decided to set up the select Committee of Parliament to examine the whole issue. The outcome of this action became known as the McGowan Report.[84]

The McGowan Report supported the union's cry for the elimination of the School Certificate.[85]. It proposed school based assessment[86] and provision of a certificate whenever the student left school. This certificate would present a profile of achievement in each semester course undertaken in secondary

school.[87]. In this it echoed the proposals of the 1975 Base Paper. All courses were designed in semester units.[88] 'Major subject areas' followed a sequence.[89] Other courses for students needing mediation or 'about to enter the work force' or who had 'special' talents or interest were not normally part of the sequences.[90] All students were to be free to select either mainstream, academic courses or specific purpose courses.[91] Courses and evaluation were to originate with a 'central authority' or be developed by the school and approved by a central authority.[92] Students who failed courses would have the opportunity to repeat or to take a parallel course.[93] Brighter students could accelerate.[94]

Continuing this central monitoring feature, the report suggested the inclusion of a 'basic skills' test to be attempted by students and included on their record of achievement.[95] The report made no recommendations for additional resources[96] and proposed that schools be dezoned, i.e. students would no longer be compelled to enter their local schools.[97] These last two features of the report assured it of a rough reception by the union. The suggestion of a 'basic skills' test was seen as a bow in the direction of the 'falling standards' or 'back to basics' lobby. The union had already rejected national standards testing.

What became clear during the union debates over the report was that syllabuses from the Boards had become so general and non-prescriptive that many members feared that the presentation of courses and assessment procedures to a central authority held the danger of restricting the present freedom. Once approved there would be little room for variation.[98]

The concept of 'failure' was rejected. This, some members claimed, would push working class students out of the mainstream into alternative courses of



little real value. It would result in more deeply entrenched 'streaming'. This fear of streaming opened heated arguments within the union on the subject of 'core' or 'common curriculum' or 'relevant' curriculum. Working class students and girls in particular could, it was claimed, be allowed to self-select into courses which denied them access to knowledge.[99] In the interchanges between factions one group, those who held to the need for some common curriculum, were labeled 'reactionary', 'hardline academics' and they retaliated by claiming that the 'relevant' curriculum group were 'soft options .. free schooler trendies'.[100]

It was the so-called 'reactionary group' which began a careful examination of the economic, social and political climate within which the McGowan report was received and compared it to the period in which the Wyndham Report was received.

The Wyndham Report and the education scheme which followed, it was argued, was received in a period of economic expansion; 'post war boom'; 'demand for educated and skilled workforce'; 'beginnings of federal education funding'. There were 'rising expectations', secondary education was viewed as the right of all to develop their 'individual potential'. Social democratic ideas of 'equality, democracy, citizenship and community' were favoured. When the McGowan report surfaced the economy was in a period of contraction. Unemployment was high. There were public sector cuts, and federal funds for education were being directed towards the non-government schools. Education was being used as a scapegoat for unemployment. There was an accompanying 'ideology of the private sector' and a 'mythology of choice'. There was pressure from the 'back to basics lobby' and 'relevance' was being defined as job-preparation.[101]

To a large extent the union was caught in a classic 'catch-22'. To reject McGowan appeared to favour traditional academic curriculum. To accept McGowan was to risk continued 'streaming' of students in a system which now legitimated this procedure under the name of 'relevant' or 'appropriate' curriculum; to risk the growth of super schools and specialist schools and, at the other end of the scale, of dying schools.

The media was quick to note the virtues of the McGowan Report, particularly for the 'talented students' who would progress more quickly.[102] An editorial in the Sydney Morning Herald stated that by opposing the key recommendations of the report the government school teachers 'confirmed their image of being industrially militant and educationally reactionary'.[103] It saw the objections by the union to the 'central monitoring system' as proof that teachers were determined 'to see that only their interests prevail within the school system'. Objection to the concept of failure was interpreted as a refusal to give 'full and frank reasons why a student had failed' and 'only teachers who are not doing their job properly can object to this'.[104]

The union, in its continued negative reaction to proposals coming from the Department and Boards during the early 1970s had developed a 'reactionary' reputation on educational matters. It had lost the initiative to shape the meaning of the rhetoric of education in that period when 'diversity', 'equality', 'relevance', 'choice' were first being supported by the prevailing ideology of the late 1960s and early 1970s. By the time the McGowan Report arrived the terms had been captured and their meaning defined in the economic and ideological climate of a recession. The so-called 'reactionary' faction recognised the changed climate but seemed unable to respond in any creative way that would redefine the meaning of appropriate curriculum or 'diversity' in curriculum.

Part of the problem was the unwillingness of the union to encourage individual schools to experiment in school organisation in the 1970s. Though individual teachers seem to have made use of the less prescriptive syllabuses, the organisation of schools remained as it had since the 1961 Education Act.

One large experiment in curriculum and school organisation must be mentioned here, though it began officially in June 1980. The Entrance High School Principal introduced a vertical semester system for the whole school, in which all subjects were allocated the same amount of teaching time and had equal weighting in the curriculum. Students progressed only after they had mastered the course. 'Bright' students could go ahead or take additional electives. There was a core of subjects; English, Science, Maths, a Social Science subject and one elective. The similarity between this experiment and the McGowan report should not be lost as it influenced the Report. [105] The experiment lasted only two years. The major problem seems to have been the inflexibility of working conditions' regulations, rather than the department's curriculum requirements. For example, for the scheme to work, teachers taught in the classroom for twenty seven and a half periods per week. Department regulations said they should teach twenty nine and two thirds periods including sport. This divergence from regular teaching came at the same time as the union was campaigning for a reduction of teaching periods. Lest the school be seen as a precedent it was told to follow regulations. The scheme then found itself up against a battle between union policy and government regulations on the subject of 'integrated sport', i.e. sport timetabled throughout the week rather than in one afternoon. When some teachers decided to follow union policy the scheme terminated though it was taken up by some non-government schools whose working conditions (or lack of them) allowed it to proceed.

Leaving aside the question of the educational merits of the Entrance High School experiment, its failure shows the complexity of 'industrial' and 'professional' concerns. To the principal, the union was the villain in the piece but one could also look to the department's refusal to allow the experiment its optimum chance using twenty seven and a half periods per week. One wonders, however, at the union's failure to support the experiment and use it in its campaign for reduced teaching periods at this point. This would, however, have needed cooperation from the principal and staff to take 'industrial' action rather than 'professional' action.

What must be kept in mind is that the union was fearful that in a time of government cost cutting, the scheme was being used as a precedent by the department to erode working conditions. This example demonstrates, however, the difficulty faced by teachers and schools throughout the period to make substantial changes in organisation in the face of a department and union locked in combat over conditions and resources.

#### **VSTA - Curriculum actions.**

Victoria presents a more complex picture because of the existence of two divisions in the post-secondary area. From the mid 1960s some Victorian high schools and technical schools were concerned with experiments in school organisation and curriculum content, particularly after the formation of the Curriculum Advisory Board in 1966. There was no overall change to the secondary system as found in NSW after the implementation of the Wyndham scheme but rather a search by individuals to find new ways.

Some major changes in the education system did occur, however. In 1964 the Victorian Universities and School Examinations Board (VUSEB) was established. Its authority resided in the statutes of the universities of Victoria.

It was limited constitutionally and financially to the conduct of university entrance examinations. Nevertheless, the Board had considerable powers to influence the curriculum of all secondary education through its examination functions. In 1968 the Intermediate external examination (year 10) was abolished. From 1973 the leaving external examination at year 11 was also dropped. In 1976 the VUSEB was replaced by the Victorian Institute of Secondary Education (VISE). In the Technical Schools Division, the number of school years was raised to five and an alternative year 12 program known as the Tertiary Orientation Program (TOP) was made available. It is the relationship between the curriculum changes in Victoria and these organisational changes which is to be examined.

The suggestion for the establishment of the Curriculum Advisory Board came in 1966 from Mr R.A. Reed who became chief inspector in 1963. This position was retitled Director of Secondary Education from 1967. Reed retired in 1970. The membership of the Curriculum Advisory Board was diverse. It included departmental representatives; representatives of the parent organisation (VICSSO); the three teachers unions (TTAV, VSTA, VTU); the Catholic Office of Education; the Incorporated Association of Registered Teachers; the government High School Principals Association (VHSPA); the Headmasters' and Headmistresses' Association; and the faculties of education at Melbourne, Monash and La Trobe Universities.

Reed stated in his original proposal for establishment that the purpose of the Curriculum Advisory Board would be 'to examine the first four years of secondary education and to define the principles on which curriculum organisational and teaching methods should be based.' [106] In a later circular to schools he noted that the Board 'was never intended to be an authority for prescribing syllabuses for courses of study or for conducting examinations.'

There is general agreement that Reed wanted changes, that there was an open offer to schools to take more control of their own curriculum. What was in doubt was the amount of support for curriculum reform from the department generally. The assistant Director of Secondary Education, Satchel, was in sympathy but on his death in 1970, Reed was virtually alone. When Reed retired there was no powerful ally for those teachers who wanted school-based curriculum and organisational change.

At the same time there can be no suggestion that the move to curriculum reform was only Reed's idea. This would deny the VSTA discussion which had taken place since the early 1960s. But Reed's imprimatur did make possible some action and the voice for change became louder in the union. Curriculum Seminars had been held by the VSTA during the early 1960s and guidelines for curriculum policy had been set down by 1965.

A central figure in the union's debate over curriculum was Bill Hannan. He had put curriculum on the union agenda through the VSTA Metropolitan Group and as convenor of the VSTA curriculum subcommittee during the 1960s, Hannan became a member of the Curriculum Advisory Board at its inception. Crucial to Hannan's activities was his position as editor of the union journal, the Secondary teacher. His editorial policy was approved by the VSTA Executive and Committee. Articles questioned the 'competition', the sorting and sifting role of schools, the valuing of the traditional academic curriculum above all else.[108] Whole issues of the journal were devoted to curriculum. [109] Twice (in 1970 and 1974) compilations were made of curriculum articles which had appeared in the journal. Until the mid 1970s 'Curriculum' was a regular feature of each journal issue. The President, Bruce McBurney acknowledged Hannan's

contribution to VSTA curriculum policy in 1971.[110] Hannan was not alone in questioning school practices though the group of curriculum activists within the union was small and the union itself did not include all secondary teachers.

The VSTA's approach to the subject of curriculum should be noted. The union issued a statement in April 1968 which stressed the need for curriculum diversity but it did not have policy which stated what schools should do. The main thrust of the policy was to establish 'broad preconditions' for development. The curriculum policy was seen as linked to other policies which stressed the autonomy of teachers or the 'professional' role of teachers such as 'control of entry', the abolition of inspection and the abolition of public examinations for pupils.[111] This approach to curriculum is visible throughout the 1960s and 1970s in union policy and teacher action.

This union method of proceedings was reflected in the activities of the Curriculum Advisory Board. A steering committee within the board was given the task of establishing the aims and purposes of the first four years of secondary education. This proved to be impossible as did its search for the 'basic tasks' of education. With more than a gentle push from the VSTA representative, Hannan, the Steering Committee moved towards policy on 'learning conditions'. [112] His interest in the relationship between curriculum content and school organisation shines through. He stressed that 'whatever happens one thing is certain: the new curriculum will be as flexible as diverse, and as open to change as it can reasonably be made.'[113]

The statement on 'learning conditions' included examination of 'homeroom' organisation rather than continual change of rooms and teachers, non streaming, the effect of examinations and competition and the need to develop a better approach to the parent-teacher relationship. The VSTA Committee applauded

this move away from aims and into specific practices. [114]

In 1968 the CAB circulated to schools a report on 'Conditions of Learning and Principles for Curriculum and Course Construction' and a 'Report of a Trial at Moreland High School'. The VSTA was involved in the preparation of these reports. Both the union and Reed stressed that these reports were not prescriptive. However, there was evidence that the department was trying to 'form a generally agreed policy' and 'impose a new uniformity based on consensual approval.'[115]

One of the first innovations in schools to emanate from this debate over curriculum and school organisation was the introduction of 'general studies'. This approach altered the subject divisions (discipline boundaries) and class organisation in the first four years. Children were generally graded on age rather than 'ability' and taught by a small team of teachers who also provided disciplinary action and pastoral care. The subject matter came from three sources: the traditional subject areas as interpreted by the teachers; current concerns of the community; and the interests of the students themselves. [116] The weight placed on each of these sources varied from school to school.

Generally these experiments suffered from lack of funds and often ran up against school regulations. The workload on teachers taking part was enormous since they wrote their own material and were often required to teach their specialty in the senior classes.[117] There was no uniform introduction of general studies into schools. Many schools did not participate though Reed seems to have had a grand plan that by 1970 every school would be introducing changes.[118]

Though the VSTA was concerned with staffing and its effect on the ability to implement changes in organisation and curriculum, there was not the emphasis



on resources which was found in the NSWTF. The barriers to curriculum reform were 'mostly in people's minds - teachers' minds especially but also students' and parents', a journal article stated. It argued that fear of missing out on the rewards offered to the successful few was the most conservative force in the system.' Fear of change and of loss of authority prevented reform more than 'too many students, inadequate buildings, too few good teachers, no ancillary staff and not enough money.' [119]

Another reason for a lesser emphasis on resources was the kind of educational experiences being advocated by the small group of curriculum innovations in the VSTA. Hannan argued against 'enclosed paradises', large lavishly equipped self contained schools and for smaller secondary schools with access to general public facilities which would open the school to the community. [120]

Between 1968 and 1969 thousands of visitors passed through Moreland High School, the first experimental school, to see what was happening. It is difficult to say how many changes were made in Victorian schools as a result of this interest. The changes actually documented are not many. By late 1969 the Journal could report that 'thirty or forty High Schools have radically altered their organisation, their teaching methods and to a lesser extent their curriculum - content and their institutional values'. [121]

What is clear from the article (author unstated but probably Hannan) is that the flexibility in organisation and variety in teaching and learning methods were viewed by those directly involved as opening the way to changes in curriculum content. The bulwarks of traditional subject empires were beginning to shake in schools with more flexible organisation. At the same time that these innovations were beginning to occur the external Intermediate Certificate was

abolished. This gave teachers a greater freedom to experiment with the first four years of secondary education from 1968.

By 1970 Hannan and another activist, Gill Freeman, were pressing for the establishment of an even more radical form of school organisation, the community school. If the idea of a community school grew from the flexibility of a general studies program which blurred subject divisions, it also grew from the questioning of other forms of organisation, particularly assessment. What we see is a progression from general studies programs to more radical departures from the normal organisation of schools into sub-schools, mini-schools and community or open schools and also a progression from reorganisation of the first four years of secondary education into an attempt to reorganise the final two years of secondary education.

In 1968 the VSTA examined the pattern of retention at high school and concluded that more pupils were staying on to complete the fifth year. It therefore should be considered as a stage of 'general education' and should not be connected so closely to the specialised matriculation course in sixth year. Pupil retention figures thus drew attention to the control exerted by the requirements of the universities over the secondary curriculum and the urgent need for change, for 'room to manoeuvre'. [122] The Victorian Universities and School Examination Board (VUSEB) controlled public examinations. Its membership shows the control of examinations and therefore curriculum by the universities. In 1970 there were 43 Board members, twenty represented the universities. Although the Board abolished the Intermediate Certificate in 1968, from 1967 it more openly controlled the first five years of secondary education by stipulating the requirements for entry into the sixth (matriculation) year. [123]

There was, however, some limited room for schools to develop their own curriculum. High schools were divided into Class A schools and Class B schools. The VUSEB approved a subject after examination by a member of the Board of Inspectors of Secondary Schools (BISS). Approval was given for a limited period of time. Internal examinations were given in Class A schools. There appears to have been little advantage taken of this limited freedom [124] but it does point to a potential space within which teachers could move.

During 1970, following VSTA policy, Morwell High School and a single teacher from Balwyn High School refused inspection for Class A approval. The Board discontinued approval. Bill Hannan, this time in his capacity as teacher member of the Board, resigned from the Board. Approvals were later given following a second visit conducted in the way previously indicated as suitable by staff and modification made to the inspection system from 1971. [125]

From the late 1960s the VUSEB was examining the assessment in years eleven and twelve. Reed was proposing that secondary education should be removed from the grip of external examinations. In 1970 the VSTA called for the abolition of the HSC by 1975 but the problem facing the union was how then to select students for tertiary institutions. Hannan found a simple solution. He proposed a ballot.[126]

By 1974 the union was trying to implement its 'Open Admission' policy. Embedded in the policy was a wish to free secondary curriculum from university constraint but also a wish to remove the vocational orientation from universities, to redefine universities as public education. This would involve a separate licensing system for those professions from which the public needs protection, e.g. doctors, lawyers, engineers, accountants, and 'so on.[127] Behind Hannan's move to 'open' universities was a question of the whole purpose

of education in the society and most particularly, the notion of 'merit' which not only sorted and sifted students into a hierarchy but which controlled curriculum by defining correct knowledge.

It was at this point that he departed from many teachers who sought only to find a 'fairer' way to distinguish those who 'merited' reward or to give everyone a greater chance to succeed within the existing definition of education. He was accused by one member of proposing something that went 'contrary' to the whole tenor of VSTA policy over the years. The Association had been 'trying to raise the status of secondary teachers to that of a profession' by control of entry but now this professional status was jeopardised by 'avoiding the professional responsibility of certifying or standing by the quality of the product of our professional endeavours.' [128] For proponents of this argument, teacher assessment of suitable candidates for universities was the most 'professional' option, an option which Hannan strongly opposed. The differing meanings which the VSTA campaigns (control of entry, inspection, school based curriculum) had for members is obvious from the debate which raged around 'Open Entry' to tertiary institutions. Where such campaigns should be leading teachers and the role of education in forging a more egalitarian society came more closely into focus when the pinnacle of the graded system was challenged.

The argument against open universities generally concentrated on a fear of 'unqualified' or 'untrained' practitioners (particularly surgeons) and arguments about 'efficiency'. From the tertiary institutions themselves, the VSTA's mentor, Doug White, worried that 'open entry' could 'encourage people to believe more firmly that the availability of the goodies of higher education makes them good'. [129] He proposed that 'professionalism' itself should be attacked and drew attention to the possible strange alliance between those who 'want qualifications to count for more, the professionals, and those who want to abolish hierarchy

and the entrance form of division of labour, the radicals'.[130]

The debate over 'Open Entry' did not cause all schools to boycott HSC but it did result in some changes. Sydney Road Community school had presented a small number of candidates in 1972 and 1974 for the HSC. In 1975 they began to approach a number of Colleges of Advanced Education to see if they would receive students without the Certificate. An arrangement was finally made with Prahran College of Advanced Education and other colleges were contacted and possible ways for students to present themselves for admission negotiated. School based year 12 programs were in operation from 1976 under the title 'Schools Sixth Form and Tertiary Entrance Certificate' (STC). However, by 1979 only eleven schools used this form of certification.

The outcome of the changes which began in the mid 1960s and ended with some schools presenting alternative year 12 programs, boycotting HSC and negotiating entrance to some tertiary institutions was the replacement of the VUSEB with the Victorian Institute of Secondary Education (VISE) in 1976. It did not become fully operational until 1980. Rather than just being responsible for conducting university entrance examinations VISE was concerned with all students 'irrespective of their anticipated destination and irrespective of the stage at which they leave school'.[131]

The stated reasons for the change to VISE were: that the VUSEB did not have the constitutional powers to meet the changes in secondary schools; more students were remaining in years 11 and 12 and the HSC was being used as a 'screening device' for entry to various forms of tertiary training and employment as well as university entrance; and increasing numbers of 'mature age' students were seeking HSC qualifications. 'These circumstances called for a wider basis of assessment for the provision of information and guidance and

wider consultation with the sector's "education community" and the "world of work".[132]

WISE was quick to point to the error of those who saw its establishment as 'synonymous with suggesting that a pattern of assessment based on external examinations should be abandoned.'[133] WISE remained uncommitted to any form of assessment but stressed that 'smooth transition' and 'careful analysis' would be needed in the transition period. However, it stressed the need for schools and teachers to participate in curriculum development and assessment. To this end it proposed two groups of subjects: Group 1 subjects retained external syllabus prescription and external examination. The provision was made for some school devised component and assessment. Group 2 subjects were to be totally devised and assessed within a single school or group of schools. These subjects would not be assessed with numerical marks but expressed descriptively or through letter grades.[134]

It is, of course, possible to see the formation of WISE as a counter move to the ten years of activity by some teachers and their union, an attempt to re-establish control. It must be conceded, however, that the rules of central constraint had to be considerably modified as a result of that same action.

#### **Technical schools - a special case of curriculum.**

The history of technical school education in Victoria is one of considerable unrest, of opposing views on the nature of technical education, the degree to which it should be vocational education or general education. The existence of a separate division of technical education in the post-primary area is at odds with the general rhetoric of comprehensive education, of equality of opportunity, which prevailed in the post World War II era.

The area is confused by the changing nature of the relationship of the secondary area to the tertiary technical area (colleges). The 1960s and early 1970s saw the field of technical education divide itself into roughly three strands; Colleges of Advanced Education, Technical Colleges and Technical Schools. The sorting out process was long and confused as the various post-secondary institutions scrambled for their appropriate level of qualifications in degrees, diplomas and certificates. The hierarchy of the workplace dictated the levels of knowledge and the status of the awards to cater for professional, sub-professional, technician and tradespeople. The junior technical schools were historically feeder schools into the senior schools (colleges). From the mid 1940s the junior technical course was four years with an internal examination at the third year and an Intermediate Technical Certificate at the fourth year with some external papers for scholarships and endorsement for entry to diploma courses in the senior school.

The length of years in the junior school grew in effect by taking some of the diploma courses of the senior school. The impetus to lengthen junior school years came also from industry which began to require applicants to have post-matriculation qualifications. Entry to universities was possible for some diplomates from the senior schools (colleges) who met VUSEB requirements.

Though there was considerable innovation in school organisation in the 1960s,[135] tension over the appropriate nature of secondary education in technical schools can be seen from the late 1960s. The new Director, E.T. Jackson, stressed in his initial statements the vocational orientation of technical schools. However, he encouraged schools 'to adopt more individual and more experimental approaches to education programs.'[136] During the early 1970s, however, support for a more diversified curriculum came from the assistant Director (later Director) Len Watts. He was described as an 'educationalist' by

the TTAV activist, Gerry Tickell.[137] As in the high school division there was then a senior administrator who was viewed as a potential ally on some matters by the union. The very small size of the division may also have made experimentation with curriculum and organisation possible. As well the technical schools had a history of some participation by the community. This, Tickell argues, made it easier to get support. Another possibility offered for technical school experimentation was the lack of firm directive, 'not so much by design as by default'.[138]

The first TTAV Annual Conference in 1968 resolved to press for a common core curriculum to allow students to transfer to the high school system. Technical schools were to extend to form six. Programs at forms five and six were to be diversified to provide courses leading to all tertiary institutions together with pre-vocational training.[139]

There was evidence that technical schools were not attracting students because they led to technical training only. Between 1958 and 1967 technical school enrolments rose by 90 percent, high school enrolments by 166 percent. Between 1963 and 1967 Form 6 (high school) enrolments rose by 60 percent.[140] Clearly it was in the technical school teachers' interests to push for an equal number of years of schooling and for the prospects of tertiary education to be made available to technical as well as high school students if the division was not to dwindle away. The other real possibility was that they would remain the holding place for those children of unskilled or semi-skilled workers and perpetuate their limited opportunities for education.

From 1969 the need for the provision of six years of secondary schooling and entrance to the tertiary field through technical schools became more obvious. Students who transferred to high schools to gain tertiary entrance were not



doing well.[141] As well, the technical tertiary scene itself was changing. There was fear that the Leaving Certificate offered by technical schools would no longer guarantee a place in an advanced college diploma course.[142] The union was also conscious that it had the potential to offer general education, something different from the academic matriculation courses. This factor could aid the division in the competition for students.[143]

Conversely, all the curriculum and organisational changes taking place in high schools also meant that they would now be more in the market for the traditional non academic clientele of the technical schools. This fact was acknowledged by the convenor of the TTA V Education Committee, Gerry Tickell in 1967.[144] The union also had to respond to other proposals for educational restructuring surfacing in the community. The Victorian Labor Party Education Policy was for comprehensive high schools. The 1968 Conference of the TTA V adopted the Education Committee's report supporting comprehensive schools. Both of these proposals would change the nature of the relationship between the two divisions and have an affect on the technical schools intake of students.

The technical Division finally introduced a Tertiary Orientation Program (TOP). This sixth year program was seen by teachers as both a way of qualifying for entry into the tertiary area and as a general year of schooling. By the late 1970s, however, the technical schools' experimentation in more general education, in school based curriculum and in access to all tertiary institutions was under attack. First it was proposed by the department that regional rather than school based programs should be formed. Second the Victorian Institute of Secondary Education (VISE) stated in 1978 that there was 'good reason for for TOP courses to receive VISE certification if the accreditation requirements set by VISE are met, and if the institutions involved so wish'.[145] This alternative

year 12 would, in this event, have come under the central curriculum controlling body. The TTAV saw VISE as set up to 'monitor' courses offered in high schools and increasingly under university control. It was a move rejected by the union but favoured by the department.[146] Third, it was proposed that the number of students who could participate in TOP should be limited and the program be focussed more tightly on tertiary entrance requirements rather than general education.[147]

What was the purpose of TOP? By 1979 the department was redefining TOP as a TAFE access program which would give suitable students preparation for tertiary studies. Was it also to be a general year of education free from the restrictions from tertiary institutions? A later departmental draft made provision for exit year 11 students to enter TOP if they could demonstrate that their needs would not be met in existing courses at high school. However, the number of technical schools which could offer TOP was limited and annual application to offer TOP was necessary. The program could only be offered if 'appropriate resources' existed. It continued to be pushed by administration towards the sole purpose of tertiary access rather than having a multiplicity of purposes. The union was searching for a way to expand the program at a time of government cut-backs and growing popularity of the program with students. Studies showed that its graduates performed very well in the first year of tertiary study.[148] The task of the union was not enviable as it resisted the centralising forces.

The TTAV set up a TOP teachers committee to formulate its own policy. It made use of some of the recommendations of the Kangan [149] and Partridge [150] Reports to demand the provision of a variety of avenues to meet the educational and vocational needs of increasing numbers of people.[151] The union's other tactic was to draw attention to the changes in departmental

policy statements in the 1960s and 1970s.[152] Greater emphasis was now placed on literacy, numeracy and 'better preparation of students for transition from school to work' demanded by the unidentified 'community' in the departmental policy in 1978.[153] Even so, the policy contained many avenues which could be taken up by the union. Tickel drew attention to the tactical need to justify programs in terms of the department's policy statement if teachers were to continue to participate in curriculum development at the school level.[154]

### **Conclusion.**

**People.** The differences in activity between the two states in curriculum is enormous, yet in examining the union activities during the period it becomes evident that only a few union members were prominent in this area at the union level. There is a danger in Victoria especially of arguing in terms of personalities. Certainly Hannan as journal editor was in a unique position to emphasise curriculum and school organisation from the late 1960s.

In NSW curriculum was not a large issue in the union journal until the arrival of the McGowan report. There was no crusader in secondary curriculum as prominent as Hannan. In both states there was an opportunity to take up a challenge from a highly ranking department officer. Reed's method of approach in suggesting the formation of the Curriculum Advisory Board rather than Vaughn's method of presenting a paper for discussion may have been more profitable for the union since it encouraged more participation.

**Tactics.** In NSW the union was preoccupied with establishing generally agreed policy and a uniformity of action. The VSTA policy encouraged schools to take the initiative. It allowed changes to evolve. The NSWTF shied away from organisational changes usually stating that the resources were not available.

Victoria favoured organisational changes and saw these as a way into changing curriculum content. The traditional subject areas were challenged in these reorganisations. The fact that not all secondary teachers were members of the VSTA could have been an important contributing factor in its tactics. There was no chance of getting united action for union policy in all high schools. This reality prevented a striving for uniform action.

A danger with this approach was, as Hannan stated in 1980, the introduction of teacher-based rather than school-based curriculum. This, in turn, could 'masquerade as adapting to the needs of the local community'.<sup>[155]</sup> Involvement of the community in curriculum and organisational changes remained virtually uncharted waters for most schools in both NSW and Victoria.

Although the Victorian activists did not have a clear picture of what their final aims for education would or should be, they believed that the results of certain practices were unfavourable for working class children. They moved the union further towards questions of aims of education by concentrating on the practices, streaming, compartmentalising knowledge and assessment. The proposals to boycott the HSC and to ballot for tertiary education brought aims and purposes into sharp focus. It was here that many participants in earlier innovations began to drop out. Some were still trying to make reforms within the system. The question of 'professional' responsibility of teachers to these students' was raised. Were teachers putting students chances within the meritocracy at risk by boycotting the HSC? The boycotters ran the risk of sacrificing some students for a more revolutionary change to the education system. However, the schools who tried alternative procedures for entry to tertiary institutions were schools which did not usually gain results to make this entry possible. They were the cracks or disjunctures in the system of meritocracy.

The challenge to education practices was great even though it involved only a small number of schools. The education system had to respond - and respond it did in the establishment of VISE which attempted to draw all the mavericks under its net of a central accrediting system. The greatest response came in the form of the series of proposals for complete reorganisation of the education system starting with the Green Paper in 1980.[156] As Hannan noted there had been a 'shaking-up' of curriculum which came from the schools not the centre. This, he said, was 'one reason why the Green Paper gets in such a sweat over core curriculum'.[157]

**Timing.** The late 1960s and early 1970s offered a climate for the words 'School based curriculum', 'diversity', and 'choice' to be taken up by the unions. By the end of the 1970s 'choice' and 'diversity' were being used to promote systems which divided children into government and non-government schools and which attempted to stream curriculum into curriculum suitable for tertiary entrance students and those who were not.

This was perhaps much more evident in NSW and must point to the fact that the link between tertiary and secondary education was never seriously challenged in that state even though education became 'comprehensive'. Some Victorian schools, on the other hand, went through a series of challenges - subject areas, streaming, assessment and finally entrance to tertiary institutions.

Even they, however, faced difficulties because they were now competing for funds and reputation with the non-government school sector. Most importantly, they were now competing with governments, media and industry for the allies they needed in their current battles, that is, the so-called community. To debunk the conservative propaganda and place their interpretation of the

education crisis before the community required well researched information.

- 
1. Report from the select committee of the legislative assembly upon the school certificate (McGowan report). NSW, 1981.
  2. Future directions of secondary education, prepared by D. Swan and K. McKinnon for the Minister for Education, NSW, 1983.
  3. A.J. Hunt, MLA, 'Aims and objectives of education in Victoria' (Ministerial statement), 12 Dec., 1979.
  4. Victoria. Parliament, Green paper on strategies and structures for education in Victoria, Melbourne, 1980.
  5. Victoria. Parliament, White paper on strategies and structures in Victorian government schools, Melbourne, 1980.
  6. Department of Education, Victoria, The rationale and definition of the proposed organisation structure, Melbourne, 1981.
  7. The Organisations Reference Group, Ministerial review of education policies. First Report, Oct., 1980; Second Report, December, 1981; Third Report, Feb., 1982.
  8. Schools in Australia: report of the interim committee for the Australian Schools Commission, (Karmel Report), Canberra, May, 1973.
  9. *ibid.*, p.12.
  10. Teachers journal. July, 1973, p.269.; ATF guide to the Karmel Report in Education, 26 Sept., 1973, pp.256-7.
  11. Education, 4 July, 1973. p.1.
  12. Pre-election pamphlet, 1973, in Van Davy's personal diary, 1973.
  13. The Hon. C.B. Cutler, MLA, 'Problems of educational administration', in Public administration (Aust), Sept., 1971, p.202.
  14. Ray Costello, President of ATF and teacher representative on Schools Commission, Education, June, 1974. p.91.
  15. Australian Schools Commission Report, Trienium 1976-78, 1975, p.62.
  16. Schools Commission/State Education Departments, Choice in education and sources of present administrative practice, Discussion Paper No.1, Canberra, June, 1980.
  17. D. Petit, 'An introduction to major issues in the choice and diversity project', in Choice in action: studies in change in Victoria, Choice and Diversity Project, Sept., 1981. p.3.

18. Bill Hannan, The Australian teacher. Feb., 1983, p.6.
19. S. Marginson 'The privatisation of Australian schools', supplement to The Australian teacher, No. 2 Sept., 1982.
20. Bill Hannan, 'What's happening to curriculum', in Who owns the curriculum, Report of the curriculum conference for parents and teachers, Monash University, 16-17 Aug., 1980. (Special publication by VTU, TTAV, VSTA.)
21. Report of the committee appointed to survey secondary education in NSW (Wyndham report), NSW, 1957.
22. N. Cooper, research officer, NSWTF, Research Report, 'The comprehensive high schools in the 1980s,' Annual Conference, 1981, NSWTF files.
23. B. Mitchell, Teachers, education and politics, St Lucia, Queensland, 1975, p.129.
24. *ibid.*, p.190.
25. *ibid.*, p.191.
26. Wyndham Report, *op. cit.*, p.105
27. *ibid.*, p.71.
28. N. Cooper, *loc. cit.*
29. NSWTF pamphlet, 'Secondary staffing 1967 - Federation replies to the PSB', 1966, NSWTF files.
30. Directorate of studies, Department of Education, The aims of secondary education, March, 1974.
31. Secondary Schools Board, Base paper on the total curriculum - years 7-10, Apr., 1975.
32. The aims of secondary education, *op. cit.*, p.5.
33. *ibid.*, p.8.
34. *ibid.*, pp.11-12.
35. *ibid.*, p.13.
36. *ibid.*, p.25.
37. *ibid.*, p.26.
38. *ibid.*, for example, pp.24-25.
39. *ibid.*, p.25.
40. Cited in J. Mackay and M. Mullins, Education, 23 May, 1973, p.121.
41. NSW Department of Education Annual Report, 1971.



42. Extract from Parliamentary Proceedings, 11 Sept., 1973, cited in Education, 24 Oct., 1973, p.295.
43. BSSS, memorandum to principals, Circular No.8, 13 July, 1973, NSWTF BSSS files.
44. BSSS, memorandum to principals, Circular No. 16, 1975, NSWTF BSSS files.
45. *ibid.*
46. Education, 11 April, 1973, p.89.
47. BSSS to Syllabus Committees, cited in Education, 11 April, 1973, p.89.
48. *ibid.*
49. Education, 10 July, 1974, p.208.
50. *ibid.*
51. BSSS circular No.22, 1973, NSWTF files.
52. Education, 10 July, 1974, p.208.
53. J. Frederick, BSSS representative, Report to NSWTF Council, in Education, 8 June, 1977, p.196.
54. S. Heuston, Education, 22 June, 1977, p.222.
55. Education, 2 Feb., 1977, p.19.
56. The Higher School Certificate in NSW, report of the review panel to the Board of Senior School Studies, 24 Jan., 1980, p.34.
57. *ibid.*, p.17.
58. Base paper on total curriculum, *op. cit.*, p.1.
59. *ibid.*, p.2.
60. *ibid.*, p.3.
61. *ibid.*
62. *ibid.*, p.4.
63. NSWTF Annual Conference resolution, Annual 1975 in Education, 28 Jan., 1976, p. 4.
64. Education, 21 July, 1976, p.73.
65. *ibid.*
66. *ibid.*

67. J. Nisbet, in Education, 10 Sept., 1975, p.304.
68. E. Bedford, Minister for Education, cited in Education, 16 Mar., 1977, p.71.
69. NSWTF Annual Conference resolution, 1976, in Education, 2 Feb, 1977, p.10.
70. Report of Secondary Teachers Conference, 3 July, 1976, in Education, July 21, 1976; E.G. Earley, President Secondary Teachers Association, to BSSS, cited in Education, August 15, 1973, p. 216.
71. Bill Myles, Education, 22 June, 1977, p.245.
72. Education, June 21, 1978, p.228.
73. Education, 15 Feb., 1978, p.37.
74. D.G. Whatham and 16 others, Education, 11 Oct., 1978, p.379; Bourke High School, Education, 22 Nov., 1978, p.450.
75. Education, 21 June, 1978, p.228.
76. Education, 24 May, 1978. p.164.
77. NSW Federation of Parents and Citizens, Annual Conference resolution, 1979, cited in Education, 22 Oct., 1979, p.408.
78. Sun Herald, 19 Aug., 1979.
79. Australia - Schools Commission Report, Canberra, April 1978.
80. Select committee on education in Queensland, First Interim Report, 1978, cited in Education, 22 Oct., 1979, p.407.
81. Catholic Weekly, 23 Sept., 1979.
82. Sydney Morning Herald, 5 Sept., 1979.
83. NSW Legislative Assembly debate, 13 Sept., 1973, cited in Education, 22 Oct., 1979, p.409.
84. NSW Parliament, Report of the select committee of the Legislative Assembly upon the School Certificate (McGowan report), 17 June, 1981.
85. *ibid.*, Recommendation 1, p.109.
86. *ibid.*, Recommendation 17, p.115.
87. *ibid.*, Recommendation 2, p.109.
88. *ibid.*, Recommendation 5, p.110.
89. *ibid.*, Recommendations 10, 11, p.113.
90. *ibid.*, Recommendation 12, p.113.
91. *ibid.*, Recommendation 26, p.117.

92. *ibid.*, Recommendation 3, p.110.
93. *ibid.*, Recommendations 18, 19, 20, p.116.
94. *ibid.*, Recommendation 23, p.116.
95. *ibid.*, Recommendation 36, p.122.
96. *ibid.*, Recommendations 28, 29, p.117.
97. *ibid.*, Recommendation 39, p.123.
98. See D. Ferguson, "Discussion document - McGowan Report", in Discussion Papers - The McGowan Report, Secondary Teachers Conference, 13 Mar., 1982, p.18-19, in author's possession.
99. M. Hourihan, Lecturers Association NSWTF, 'The McGowan Report and the educational needs of girls', in Discussion papers. op. cit., p.20-23.
100. A. Junor, Open debate, Vol. 1, p.1. (Paper produced by the 'Common Curriculum' group.) in author's possession.
101. A. Junor. 'Wyhdham to McGowan', in Discussion papers, op. cit., p.25. See also J. O'Brien, 'Vale Wyndham'; J. Poulos, 'The McGowan report - a response', in above.
102. Sydney Morning Herald, editorial, 7 Oct., 1981.
103. Sydney Morning Herald, editorial, 16 Mar., 1982.
104. *ibid.*
105. Sydney Morning Herald, 1 Apr., 1982.
106. R.A. Reed, Chief Inspector, memorandum to schools, May 1966. VSTA files.
107. R.A. Reed, Director of Secondary Education, circular to principals, 'Curriculum Revision', Dec., 1968, VSTA files.
108. Secondary teacher, July 1968, pp.16-18.
109. Secondary teacher, Oct., 1971.
110. Secondary teacher, Oct., 1971, p.2.
111. B. McBurney, President, VSTA, Secondary teacher, Oct., 1971, p.3.
112. Secondary teacher, Oct., 1971, p.5.
113. Secondary teacher, May, 1967, p.25.
114. Secondary teacher, April, 1968, p.8.
115. *ibid.*, p.7.

116. B. Hannan, Secondary teacher, July 1970, p.29.
117. N. White, Curriculum Advisory Board, Secondary teacher, June 1970, p.13.
118. R.A. Reed, Director of Secondary Education, circular to principals of all secondary schools, Dec., 1968, VSTA files.
119. Secondary teacher. Nov-Dec, 1969, p.7.
120. B. Hannan, Secondary teacher, Oct. 1971, p.5.
121. Secondary teacher, Nov-Dec, 1969, p.7.
122. Secondary teacher, July, 1968, p 17.
123. ibid., p.14.
124. Secondary teacher, July 1968, p. 14.
125. B. McBurney, 'The Class A approval dispute' Secondary teacher, Oct., 1970, p.8.
126. Hannan, 'A scheme to be rid of the HSC', Secondary teacher, April, 1972, pp.10-12.
127. B. Hannan, 'The ballot', Secondary curriculum, Special VSTA publication, 1975, pp.155-6.
128. D. Laird. 'Confessions of an ex-balloter', Secondary curriculum, op. cit., p.159.
129. D. White, 'Not the end of the affair', Secondary curriculum, op. cit., p.168.
130. ibid., p.169.
131. VISE, General information statement - Information Bulletin, No. 2, June 1977, VISE file, External Studies, TAFE, Vic.
132. Professor Kwong Lee Dow, Chairman of the Governing Council of VISE, C,1977, VISE file, External Studies, TAFE Vic. 1977.
133. Policy statement on curriculum and assessment in year 12, Supplementary VISE News, March-April 1978, VISE file, External Studies, TAFE, Vic.
134. ibid.
135. Associate news, 28 July, 1968, pp.5-8.

136. E.T. Jackson, Director of Technical Education, Interim policy statement, Sept., 1969. Held by G. Tickell.
137. G. Tickell, in interview, 1982.
138. Associate news, 23 July, 1979, p.15.
139. Associate news, 18 Mar., 1968, p.4.
140. Associate news, 26 Nov., 1969, p.6.
141. A. Crisp, TTA V Education Committee, Associate news, 26 Nov., 1969, p.6.
142. *ibid.*
143. *ibid.*
144. Associate news, Sept., 1967, p.4.
145. Policy statement on curriculum and assessment in Year 12, Supplementary VISE News, March-April, 1978, VISE file, External Studies, TAFE, Vic.
146. Associate news, 23 July, 1979, p.10.
147. *ibid.*
148. L. Maclean, Associate news, 14 Oct., 1979, p.11.
149. Australia. Committee on Technical and Further Education, TAFE in Australia; report on the needs in technical and further education (Kangan Report), Canberra, 1974.
150. Education Department, W. A., Post-secondary education in Western Australia (Partridge Report), Perth, 1976.
151. L. Maclean, Associate news, 14 Oct., 1979, p.11.
152. B. Bradshaw, Associate news, 23 July, 1979, pp.18-19
153. Technical Schools Division, Curriculum policy statement, 1978, reprinted in Associate news, 28 July 1979, p.16. .
154. G. Tickell, Associate news, 23 July, 1979, p.15.
155. B. Hannan. 'What's happened to the curriculum?', Who owns the curriculum?, op. cit., p.9.
156. Victoria. Parliament, Green Paper on strategies and structures for education in Victoria, Melbourne, 1980.
157. B. Hannan. 'What's happened to curriculum?' op. cit., p.9.

## 8: CONUNDRUMS AND STRATAGEMS

To discover the different patterns of control over education it is imperative to look at the patterns of control over teachers. Clearly, teachers have some autonomy in the execution of their work but it is severely limited. What has been observed in the preceding chapters is the ways in which this degree of autonomy has been used by teachers and their unions and their collective response to specific limitations in struggles over inspection, parent involvement and control of curriculum.

Throughout this study it has become evident that teachers and their unions experience a number of dilemmas which appear on closer inspection to be more appropriately named conundrums. They are faced with choices between representative roles and adversary roles on bodies which determine wages and conditions; in deciding if an issue is an industrial or a professional matter, an administrative concern, or an educational concern. As state workers are they accountable to the client or to the central bureaucracy? If they act on certain issues, will they be perceived as militant or innovative? Are they workers or professionals? Is it possible to be autonomous within a bureaucracy? It is within these dilemmas that teachers' struggles take place. Sometimes the poles are real, i.e. mutually exclusive, sometimes they are ideological illusions which the unions have queried. Yet even these ideological illusions are compelling; are themselves constraints manifested in practices. If it was, for example, impossible to clearly separate industrial and educational matters, the force of the institutional context was to try to polarise them. This chapter provides a distillation of some of these conundrums and their effect on various union strategies. Some are crucial strategic tensions which apply externally in the division of labour within the society and affect the teachers' unions in their

relationships with the broader labour movement, with political parties and particularly with the state. The distillation is therefore followed by a more general commentary on the relationship of professionals and workers to the state.

#### **Bureaucracy and autonomy.**

Grace has spoken of the movement towards 'invisible and diffused' control rather than visible and centralised control.[1] One particular form of control highlighted in this study fits his observation. Constraints are established by the hierarchical structure of authority within schools and the processes by which teachers climb the career ladder, i.e. inspection.

Within the sociology of professions there has been considerable interest in the problem of compatibility between professionalism and bureaucracy. If, by bureaucracy, we mean the hierarchical structure of authority and control of knowledge within the occupation, a central consideration in Poulantzas' analysis of bureaucracy,[2] the importance of this feature is justified. It has proved to be a key point of tension for teachers and their unions, particularly once those in higher levels of authority could no longer easily claim to have possession of more knowledge. The career structure of teachers has however continued to be a powerful form of central control over teachers. Its effects are far reaching. It fragments teachers' unions as the evidence of principals' opposition to various proposals makes clear: for example, in the issue of teacher representation on school councils in Victoria and in the issue of affirmative action for the promotion of women to school executive in NSW. It allows for the most persistent form of surveillance by the central employer through assessment procedures. In NSW we saw the use made of promotion incentives in staffing schools in isolated rural areas, thus perpetuating inadequate facilities

in rural areas. It is linked in a very complex way to the persistence of gender inequalities within the occupation which, in turn, aid in the continuation of gender inequalities within the society generally.

In Chapter Five, the analysis of the promotions system within the school highlighted the need for a fuller exploration of the place of gender in the hierarchy when examining teachers' relationships to each other. Promotions positions are overwhelmingly held by men, yet women compose more than half the teaching service. This has been common knowledge for a long time, yet recent attempts to introduce affirmative action for women are only now beginning to uncover how gender works as a mechanism to sustain the general hierarchy of positions of authority within schools. Grace noted that it is only to teachers who challenged the invisible forms of control that they became visible.[3]

The control exerted generally by teachers' career paths is quite visible to many teachers. This is borne out by union policy to remove inspection and to have an elected school executive. At the same time failure to act upon the latter policy by teachers and, in NSW, the failure to obtain even the measure of peer assessment found in Victoria, cannot solely be attributed to employer resistance. It suggests that for many the relationship between present mechanisms for assessment and appointment to promotions positions in schools and limitations on teacher autonomy is obscured. What I am arguing is that there is a difficulty for some teachers in separating their perceived right to receive the rewards in salary and status which promotion bestows and the control such recognition and reward exerts on all teachers.

The Director of Secondary Education in Victoria used this notion of the right to be recognised by external examiners when he argued in favour of assessment



by inspectors rather than peers.[4] It was seen in the reluctance of teachers in some schools to support participation in school decision-making. The possibility of one day having authority in schools acted as a brake on experiments in staff participation. At the same time, the Campbell Report, in its account of the morale of teachers in Australian state schools, noted that 'Principals emerge as the key sources of dissatisfaction and low morale.'[5] The school experience may thus generate both antagonism to the hierarchy in the school and the desire to become part of it.

This 'earned right' of some to make school decisions is bolstered by the sheer time involved in implementing democratic procedures in schools. Constant meetings before and after school are likely to lead to the cry that those paid to administer the school should do it! This time factor has been raised in NSW in the area of primary curriculum development. Should teachers in a school be proud of the fact that they have worked several weekends to produce a curriculum? Should this job not be left to specialists who have both the expertise and the time?[6] Here we see not just notions of authority but of specialisation being drawn upon. Time and specialist knowledge become woven together. It is not surprising, then, that teachers are reluctant to explore further the area of time consuming democratic structures in school management. Gaining release from face-to-face teaching in primary and infants schools has been a hard battle for the unions with few gains, as has the battle for less teaching periods in secondary schools. Though it is clear that teachers are being asked to spend more time in curriculum development, the departments are reluctant to make use of the availability of unemployed teachers to reduce class sizes or period loads. A national survey of teachers conducted by the ATF in 1982 found that teachers were working an average of 10.5 hours per week on teaching-related functions outside paid working time.[7]

The effects of hierarchical structures do not end here. Assessment of teachers for promotions positions has been an area in which neither employers, unions nor parent organisations has proposed the involvement of the client (student and parent). The appointment, transfer and promotion of teachers has been the most resistant to client input, particularly in NSW. 'Career paths', and particularly the teacher's suitability to walk them, were seen as the concern of the central employer and teachers. Thus the hierarchical structure of schools is, if we accept the Ehrenrich's contention that professionals expropriate the skills and culture of the working class,[8] a central mechanism for continuing this appropriation in education. Parents have no place in deciding what is 'good' teaching and these decisions give rise to positions of authority in schools. This avenue of control over teachers and education systems generally is tied to the ambiguities in the notions of industrial and professional issues. It is these that are now discussed.

#### **Industrial, professional or innovative?**

There is a great deal of confusion in the use of the words 'industrial' and 'professional' as used by unions, employers and the community at large. Applying the labels often given by the unions themselves to two of the unions discussed, we find the NSWTF was designated 'industrial' and 'militant' while the VSTA was 'professional' and 'militant'. The terms themselves require some investigation. The activities which were generally designated 'militant' in Victoria were union action on control of entry to the occupation and refusal of inspection, that is, central surveillance of the worker. These areas were more in keeping with notions of professional autonomy. In NSW they often form the basis for a defensive counter claim that the VSTA is 'elitist' and the claim is accompanied by a reminder of the VSTA's origins in a dispute over salary margins. The VSTA's first strike in 1965 was, however, over salary increases, a

straight industrial issue.

The militant action in NSW since 1968 is generally seen as mass stoppages or, in union parlance, 'refraining from duty', though NSW has also had individual members refusing to obey certain regulations. With some exceptions these actions, both mass and individual, have been concerned with a particular type of condition - salaries, class size, extra duties. The distinction between 'industrial' and 'professional' action seems to rest then on a basis of the type of work conditions against which the union is demonstrating resistance.

There is even here a finer distinction that should be made on the notion of industrial or professional action. When the NSWTF had its first strike in 1968, it was my view as a teacher at that time that the action succeeded (i.e. was supported by 80 percent of members) because the teachers themselves placed emphasis on the issue of conditions in schools rather than salaries. Palmer, confirms this observation when noting that many who are basically opposed to strike action found direct action for school betterment compatible with a professional conscience: 'If we don't do something about it, who will?'[9]

The provision of standardised training as a necessary basis from which to claim the right to determine the work process was discussed in Chapter Four. It was used in NSW, after the demand for a Teachers' Certificate was granted in 1943, to argue against inspection practices. Militancy about the control of entry in Victoria was coupled with an attack on the inspection system. The control of entry campaign can also be analysed as more than just a measure to keep out untrained staff, and thus give leverage for more teacher autonomy. It was also an attempt to remove the reasons for a certain type of hierarchy within the schools. Those who were trained had advantages for promotion. Untrained teachers were expected to perform the same work in the classroom.

They were, in one sense, outside the established hierarchical structures.

The distinction between what is a 'professional' concern in the sense that teachers were trying to take on the attributes of professionals, and what is an 'industrial' concern, that is, the concern of teachers as workers, is certainly difficult to decide in this example. In the short run, control of entry is about conditions and salaries within an already agreed upon system of rewards and statuses. In the long run it is about having some control over the work process. The latter is both an attribute in the professional 'model' and an aspiration in arguments for workers' control generally. Autonomy for professionals is, however, implied from the other traits in the professional 'model'; particularly, an esoteric knowledge base, the provision of training, adherence to a code of ethics and altruistic service. Thus the notion of professional autonomy may be distinguished from notions of workers' control in that it rests heavily on capturing and controlling knowledge and appearing to be exempt from capitalist relations of production. For teachers, then, attempts to have control over this work process are linked to their relationship to knowledge.

The other example of militant behaviour in Victorian secondary schools during the 1970s is found in the issue of inspection discussed in Chapters Five and Six. Once again this can be viewed as an issue of control over conditions (methods of surveillance) but control over conditions in this case is closely related to control over curriculum, over content and method, that is, over 'professional' matters. Professional now refers to the job content and practice (that esoteric knowledge base), industrial refers to conditions (salaries, leave, appeals, promotions and so on).

Are distinctions such as these able to be made in the occupation of teaching

without considerably obscuring what is actually going on? There is an eerie feeling that we are close by some of the problems found in structuralist theories which tried to distinguish certain 'levels' of analysis: between, say, the economic identification of teachers, their own subordination and their ideological function for capital. It is not just a problem experienced by theorists but a problem experienced by teachers' unions and by the parent organisations as they try to establish rights to participate in decisions about education and decide what are teachers' concerns and what are educational concerns. It also explains the problems for those who set themselves the task of trying to decide whether associations of teachers should be described as unions or professional associations.

The terms 'militant' and 'innovative' were both used to describe the VSTA during this period and were generally referring to actions over different areas. Teachers were called 'militant' when they made efforts to change working conditions of all types and 'innovative' when the concern was school organisation and curriculum. The area of school education presents a difficulty in making the distinction between the production process and the decisions on what the final product should be, i.e. what should be taught or as Young and Whitty put it: 'What counts as education.'[10] Decisions on methods and practices in schools, including those on how teachers will relate to each other and to the children become part of the knowledge passed on. Even if we try to make a distinction between educational practices (including policy) and 'industrial' concerns the problem remains. Wages, classifications, promotions, entry qualifications, working conditions (hours, number in class, sick leave and study leave provisions, holidays, job security, independent avenues of appeal and so on), all have a bearing on what children will learn and how they will learn it. It is clear that such a distinction cannot blindly be made and pointing to the

impossibility of such a distinction has been a union tactic in both states to gain resources and improved conditions.

In Chapter Six the problem of distinguishing between teachers' concerns and educational concerns arose in the issue of parent involvement. Parent groups wanted involvement in both administration and in the aims and policies of the school. The proposals from the employer were viewed as confining the parents to administrative tasks and not supportive of real involvement. Paradoxically the Victorian experience in school councils suggested that involvement in school budgets gave parents on the councils a large input into school practices, again highlighting the difficulty in separating administration from the classroom practices of teachers. The problem in separating administration of the school and administration of teachers; employing, ~~assessing~~, promoting, and ~~dismissing~~, poses even greater difficulties for here we return to teachers' own interests as workers.

What has become clear, is that within the government system, notions of professional autonomy, struggles by teachers' unions to break from some of the central control of their work process and education policy cannot be assumed to further the distance between the teacher and the working class client. The central control of teachers through a strict 'up line' system of responsibility (centrally appointed and promoted school executive, inspectors and directors) is more likely to create such distance. For efforts by teachers to move away from the central employer to be successful, teachers and their unions may need to re-examine what they mean by 'professional' accountability to the client. In the present economic climate this involves recapturing the word 'accountability' in union proposals for future education which challenge its usage in official enquiries and proposals as a mechanism for greater central control.

In this study, however, parents became synonymous with 'parent organisations' and parent involvement became formal involvement in school councils. The experience in both states suggests that parent involvement has so far been largely confined to the middle class. It is this class which predominates in the parent organisations because they have the skills and knowledge. Parent involvement is not however confined to these formal arrangements. Parents work in many schools, particularly primary schools. And the workers are usually women. In some schools they take on tasks for which teachers are paid, for example, physical education programs, reading programs or playground duty. This unpaid 'mother labour' within schools is an area requiring further investigation. It raises again the question of the relationship between gender and schooling, between state provision of resources and voluntary labour in a period of public sector financial constraints and, for teachers' unions, the question of the relationship between untrained (unpaid) workers and trained workers in schools.

#### **School-based curriculum and central monitoring.**

It is also difficult to assess where teacher action is merely 'tinkering with what is' and where it becomes a step in a sequence of change with a potential for not just alternative practices but oppositional practices.[11] The VSTA's experiences in curriculum and organisation suggest that there are some forms of 'tinkering' in school practices which may lead to questions about what counts as education. Some action highlights contradictions within the system and shows relationships between, say, curriculum and the way teachers are employed, particularly methods of appointment and promotion.

Movements away from centrally prescribed curriculum, into different types of school organisation can lead to schools espousing different aims or philosophies

about the purpose of education and the practices which will achieve these aims. The arbitrary placement of teachers and particularly those in positions of authority (principals, subject masters/mistresses) becomes more problematic. A school may develop a particular philosophy and attached practices with which an incoming teacher or principal may disagree. If parents are involved in developing these aims, the central control of teachers' appointments may cut across this school based decision making. The arrival of a new principal may mean that continuity is lost and the whole school philosophy (aims, policy, practices) has to be renegotiated at the school level or negotiation may stop if she desires. It is notable that the Victorian post-primary unions moved further towards parent involvement in staff selection and appointment as school curriculum and organisation became less prescribed. The hierarchy within the school (system of positions of responsibility) is, as noted earlier, also challenged by the removal of prescribed curriculum. This is first seen in the problem of school inspection by government field agents and their observation of teachers supervised by the candidate for promotion. Supervision within the school itself becomes problematic with child-centred practices.

As the activities of the inspector became difficult to maintain while acknowledging the diversity in schools, the central employer attempted to place more accountability on the principals, particularly in NSW. They took on some of the inspection duties particularly in the area of teacher assessment. If the principal is heading towards the role of the central employers' agent, it makes their position within the teachers' unions more ambiguous. This is aggravated by the movement within the unions towards policies which call for elected school executive. Such policies have not been implemented with any real success but they can be seen as a natural progression of successful action for recognition of standardised training. As well, they follow from notions that not



all students needs are the same and that the individual teacher has the ability to recognise and meet the needs of her/his students. Executive positions take on the feature of coordination of the school or particular departments in it, rather than supervision which implies greater educational expertise by the supervisor.

What must also be considered in the VSTA's more successful action against inspection and in curriculum innovation, is the fact that the VSTA's very 'elite' nature, its recurrent stress on being professional, may have offered it some double edged opportunities. Professionalism challenges hierarchies within the work place at the same time as it establishes a distance between practitioner and client. Notions of professionalism reject central imposition of curriculum. However, once practitioners try to develop curriculum they must examine their aims much more critically. More importantly if the autonomy is to continue, the aims must be acceptable to the clients, new allies must be made to enable resources to be gained from the state and to resist counter claims to 'proper' knowledge and practices from sections of the universities, industry, the private school sector. To a large extent this step was not made in Victoria until it was too late.

The NSWTF was even more tardy. Its major discussions on curriculum did not begin until the early 1980s. By then much of the rhetoric about 'relevant' curriculum and 'diversity' had been captured by those who saw education as a scapegoat for youth unemployment, or who wanted, in a time of economic constraint, to halt the increase in the education bill. Recent (1984) decisions to change the formula for staffing NSW secondary schools are evidence of the latter. Staffing entitlements are to be calculated on the total enrolment of students (year 7-10 and year 11-12) rather than the number of enrolments in each year. This was done in the name of 'flexibility', however, the department

admitted that some schools would lose staff.[12]

If those tinkering with the system which have radical potential were to resist the economic, political and ideological shifts of the late 1970s, such 'innovation' needed strong support from both the client and teachers. Young and Whitty point to the opening given to the plausibility of arguments from the far right for a return to 'old standards'

to teachers and parents confronted with little understood 'new methods' and secondary reorganisation, often imposed without their cooperation, and without the resources that might make new arrangements viable, such fears have the merit of appearing to offer a solution to the gradual breakdown of what they generally recognised school to be about.[13]

In the present economic climate in NSW the union seems caught in a battle to defend access to a competitive academic curriculum, against proposals which allow students to 'choose' alternatives though the competitive academic stream is still valued. They find themselves with strange bedfellows from the far 'right' in opposing departmental proposals for the reorganisation of secondary education. In this climate the need to examine access to what counts as education becomes more difficult. Conversely, this climate may offer what Connell, et al, term 'teacher purchase' in these alternative courses which students 'choose'. The content of alternative courses may still be able to be defined by both teachers and clients but they will have to struggle to be heard in the current economic and political context.

The question of 'alternative' courses as they are developing needs careful examination however, for what is becoming clear is that the proliferation of alternative fields of study, e.g. human rights, peace studies, women's studies, environmental studies, aboriginal studies, which though highlighting the need for these issues to be included, may result in their being marginalised. The struggle by some teachers within the union to keep existing subject areas is not

confined to reactionary teachers and must be viewed as a tactic to reclaim the categories of knowledge already in existence rather than presenting 'alternative views' in separate courses or as seeing these 'new' areas as quite separate from say history, economics and so on.

At the present time, the greatest dilemma for the unions is how to question what counts as knowledge in the society and, at the same time, guarantee that all children will have access to knowledge in the face of government cost cutting measures and proposals which stream children away from certain areas of knowledge.

The Victorian experience demonstrates the ability of the education system to develop new procedures which can accommodate alternative practices as well as areas of knowledge. The Victorian Institute of Secondary Education (VISE) now has a much wider field of interest than entrance to tertiary institutions, though of course, the former body (VUSEB) also affected the whole of secondary education in a less direct way. VISE appeared at a time when external examinations had been removed from year 10 and after alternative programs for year 12 (HSC) had developed. The central controlling mechanism is not confined to external examinations and accreditation of courses is extended to the whole range of pupils regardless of their destination.

The McGowan Report in NSW pointed in the same direction. Though external examinations for year 10 students were not favoured in the Report, a central body was proposed which accredited courses and methods of evaluation. What I am arguing is that as external examinations (which Grace viewed as part of the 'invisible and diffused control over teachers' [14]) became more difficult to enforce in the light of teacher action for autonomy and notions of particular needs of students, a new form of curriculum control developed. This

new 'hidden' control has incorporated a form of teacher participation. Teachers may no longer be sent a prescribed syllabus but a central body ensures that their hours of curriculum development are 'acceptable' to some externally defined criteria. For the NSWTF the history of their negative reaction to departmental proposals since the Wyndham report in 1957 leaves them with a credibility gap when they now point to the implication of proposals for secondary reorganisation. Demonstrating their potential for an increase in the streaming of students into academic courses and non academic courses must now be heard above departmental cries of choice and diversity and claims of teacher participation in the development of such courses.

#### **Strategies I: Central or decentralized action?**

Though in both states there have been similarities in the areas in which struggle with the employer took place there have been notable differences in the tactics used. The distinction between 'industrial' matters and 'professional' (educational) matters has posed problems for the NSWTF in its relationships with the employer, indeed in even identifying the employer in relation to the particular issue. In NSW the union continually voiced opposition to the division of tasks between the PSB and the department. The union wanted representation on a commission which had both an employing function and an education policy-making function. The Victorian teachers' unions fight for more control over educational policy in the post-primary area was located at the school rather than in struggle for a central body on which they were represented. The Victorian post-primary unions found representation on the Tribunal (largely concerned with industrial matters) unsatisfactory and demanded, by the late 1970s, a clear distinction between the unions and the employer in negotiations on salaries and conditions. The NSWTF was beginning in 1981 to discover the anomalies of employee representation on an employing

body and the difficulties that body has in being the central educational policy adviser to the minister.

The NSWTF seemed less able to make use of opportunities for union action in areas which would have challenged central control in the late 1960s and early 1970s, because it was still fighting the legacy of the central bureaucratic organisation of the union itself. By the time it had got itself into a position where it could use a more decentralised form of tactics, many of the opportunities had passed. The economic boom and liberal ideology of the late 1960s was replaced with unemployment, inflation and attacks on government education. United action again seemed preferable to individual school action in this hostile climate.

On the other hand, the two post-primary unions in Victoria had been better able to make use of the opportunities of the late 1960s and early 1970s. The Victorian secondary teachers' unions, the VSTA and TTAV, took advantage of the contradictions within the education system. The VSTA found a legal flaw within the allocation of duties relating to the inspection of teachers and teachers were able to refuse assessment by inspectors for promotions positions. The VSTA took advantage of the interest in innovation of the Director of Secondary Education and had an active role in the Curriculum Advisory Board. Particular members were, for a time, able to influence its deliberations.

The TTAV saw and used the anomalies between departmental documents on curriculum and departmental practices even in the late 1970s. They also made use of the fact that there was some room for school based curriculum development in technical schools because of the rather anomalous position of a technical division continuing in an era of comprehensive education. The NSWTF generally has taken a negative stance against proposals from the department

and has had difficulty in taking from the proposals elements which may have given teachers greater control over curriculum and practices in schools.

The actions of teachers and their unions did not pass unnoticed. Counter forces were continually at work. But there were gains. Some teachers in schools had a taste of possible alternative organisation and curriculum development. Documents were produced which gave legitimation to alternative teaching practices. These could be used as 'ammunition' in confrontations with centralising forces. As the unions pressed for more autonomy in school, the need for allies became more obvious. Arguments about distinctive community needs to support school based curriculum necessitated some examination of the school communities. Teachers' statements about community needs and their actions can produce contradictions or anomalies which parents and students could investigate. It is the possibility of these contradictions as teachers struggle for more autonomy which suggest we must temper the contention by Finn, et al [15], and others that their actions automatically 'distance them from parentdom'.

When we come to the question of why the Victorian-post primary unions appear to have produced more effective responses in issues of control, the history of the unions themselves are important. For the VSTA the ambiguity of the notion of professional action has been noted but the size of the union, its single interest, the ability to separate from the hierarchy (i.e. the principals) are all possible reasons why the VSTA's response was more effective on issues of control. The fact that the basic unit of the union was the school rather than a sectional interest group or geographic area may also have allowed greater flexibility. Against all conventional union wisdom the low rate of union membership could also contribute to a more radical stance by some members. If there is no possibility of united action it may seem reasonable to act as a

'ginger' group.

The changing economic and political climate in the late 1970s did not favour the earlier tactics of the VSTA. Teacher activists were burnt-out and replacements were few. The Victorian unions began moving towards federation from the late 1970s in a bid to use a united front against worsening relations with the government particularly over the Tribunal. The limited gains of teachers were under massive attack when a new Liberal Minister for Education, Alan Hunt, took office in 1979 and, as Bessant notes, 'announced his determination to take on the teachers' unions.'[16]

The ability to make use of the possible also involves the particular relationship between the union and the employer. In NSW there was a long established way of proceeding between the union executive and the employer in all its forms. It involved central direction from union executive to members. When this established practice was threatened by individual member action or school action, the union was threatened with deregistration. It should also be noted that the issues over which action was occurring were beginning to include surveillance by both the inspector and those in promotions positions in schools. Mallet has argued that 'struggle' becomes 'institutionalised' when unions

agree to put forward only demands which can be integrated into the system (wages, fringe benefits, possibly the length of the working day) but do not touch either the control of the work conditions (productivity, work rhythms, distribution and scale of pay for different jobs, hierarchical system in the firm, use of fixed capital) or the management of the firm (control of books, markets, production costs, research contracts, goals of production).[17]

It is not difficult to substitute educational matters into these categories. Mallet further argues that struggle over issues that can be integrated into the system is also characterised by the delegation of power from the masses to the union apparatus.[18] Mallet was, of course, addressing a particular historical

period in France. He noted that the unions of the middle strata had in France and Italy been used for years by governments 'as instruments of stabilisation.'[19] This practice had now 'failed as their members had been 'led' into conflict with capitalism. At the same time this had liberated the revolutionary potentialities of labour unionism because the middle strata unions were now no longer a buffer between the labour movement and capitalist class.[20] These unions of students, teachers, civil servants, had developed as 'parasites of labour unionism, borrowing the essential mechanisms of conflictual participation ...' In the Australian example what is being argued is that the NSWTF was more 'institutionalised' than the VSTA though it has the reputation of being 'industrial' and 'militant' and has a longer history of formal links with the general union movement. The effects of the integration of a 'middle layer' union of state workers such as teachers, require careful consideration. It is not just their relationship with the employer (the state) which is at stake but their relationship to their clients.

The cry for an education commission not only demonstrates the centralist tendencies of the NSWTF over a long period of time but allows us to develop this argument. Panitch in his interpretation of corporatism argues that trade unions have been integrated 'within the network of policy making apparatuses linking the state executive with private corporate management.'[21] We can stretch Panitch's argument to state workers and clients and see the Education Commission as a particular form of corporatism on which are representatives of the interested groups in education.

This contrasts with the one-to-one relationship between interest groups and the state 'normally constitutive of pressure group politics.'[22] It is not argued here that there can be a straight correspondence between the kind of incorporation of trade unions and private corporate management of which he



speaks and state bodies which incorporate state workers and their clients. Panitch was particularly concerned with state economic intervention. The classic example of this in Australia is the prices and incomes 'Accord' established by the incoming Labor government in 1982. However it is argued that there is a new kind of state intervention established in those bodies which bring together representatives of unions, clients, departments and industry: a particular form of corporatism in state provided services. The state thus has considerable control over the groups which are, as Panitch argued in his discussion of state economic intervention, 'employed as agencies of mobilisation or administration of state policy.'[23]

Contradictions soon arose when the union representative (de facto if not de jure) joined education administrators, parents and industry and tertiary institution representative on this 'institutionalised joint body.' How does a union respond to decisions by the Commission with which it disagrees? Does teacher representation on the employing body affect the response of the Arbitration Commission? Contradictions were also in evidence in that other joint body at the federal level, the Schools Commission. In this instance the non-government school sector was formally represented. Joan Brown, the parent organisation member of the Commission, has noted that initially (1975) the government's guidelines stated the amount of money 'within which the Commission could order its own priorities in accord with its own triennial report.' These guidelines became increasingly prescriptive.[24] By 1981 the federal government was directing both programs and money. The question of representation on state bodies thus presents problems for teachers' unions not just in matters of employment, as in the Education Commission or the Teachers' Tribunal, but also in matters of education policy. Government school teachers' unions and parent organisations are placed in a peculiar position when their representatives are

required to make policy recommendations which concern the distribution of government funds to non-government schools. Most importantly, the state is actively orchestrating the relationship between its workers and their clients in new forms through these institutionalised bodies.

## **Strategies II: Making friends and influencing people.**

There is also the problematic relation of the state employer and political parties, in particular the unions' relationship with the Labor Party, both because of individual member's allegiance and because of the unions' use of tactics to influence elections both at the state and the federal level. None of the unions examined is officially associated with the Australian Labor Party though their correspondence of interests has at times been assumed. Given Bennett's[25] argument that the Labor Party in Australia has traditionally shown no real interest in state education, as distinct from say Britain, one would have to ask why this assumption has been made. Such a relationship between the Labor Party and other professions is not assumed. Rather, the convergence of interests between the Liberal Party and established professions, such as doctors or lawyers is assumed. A possible reason for this difference in relationship to the Labor Party would be the class origins of teachers, though the notion that teaching still provides a path of working class mobility is somewhat contentious [26] and in any case this very mobility may diminish prior allegiances. The fact that teachers, as state workers, may expect a commitment from a Labor government to support the public sector generally seems reasonable though as the evidence shows this expectation has not drawn the unions into affiliation.

None of the unions have directly campaigned for a particular party at least until the 1980s, though all have indirectly sought to persuade both members and the public generally to vote in a particular way at state and federal elections.

The distinction between campaigning for a particular party and showing the inadequacies of one party's education policy and behaviour in government is often very fine. This is true also for campaigns at the federal level by the ATF. Though affiliates' constitutions prevented them from supporting a particular party, the ATF ran television commercials in 1972 featuring Bob Hawke. Keeping to the letter of the law, the ATF argued that he spoke in his capacity as President of the ACTU not as a prominent member of the Labor Party.

If we looked at the period examined in the two states, the state governments which the unions faced show considerable differences. In 1952 a Labor government was formed in Victoria. It lasted until 1955 when the Labor Party split and the Democratic Labor Party was formed, allowing the Victorian Liberals to begin their record breaking run in Victorian politics from 1955 to 1982. Throughout the period under discussion, therefore, the Victorian teachers' unions were confronting a one-party government which succeeded in isolating both the Country Party and the Labor Party. The Premier, Sir Henry Bolte, reigned from 1955 until his retirement in 1975. He presented a willing target for teacher animosity stating that they could 'strike till doomsday' [27] in 1966 and in 1968 when refusing retrospective payments to an award made the famous remark: 'We haven't got it, so they won't get it.' [28]

In NSW the union did not face the same government over the entire period. Two changes occurred, the first in 1965, the second in 1976. These changes also demonstrate that there is a difficulty in assuming a continuous, unambiguous relationship between teachers' unions and a Labor government. We have already noted in Chapter Two that within the unions themselves there are many factions, one of which may revolve around allegiances to other political parties, e.g. the Communist Party. The promise of the establishment of an education

commission in 1965 seduced the union into a brief affair with the Liberal-Country Party coalition. The fickleness of the coalition sent the union back to Labor Party support in the 1971 elections.

The decision by the NSWTF not to support the Labor government in the 1965 elections highlights one of the problems in the relationship between the union leadership and the party. This is the difference between the party and the government. People who are allies in the formation of policy and the struggle to bring a party to power face a different set of relationships when that party becomes the government. The union could continue to make demands but the former allies now have real power to accede to them or to deny them. This problem is more noticeable in the relationship between the Labor Party and the teachers' unions where teachers' unions may be involved in Party policy making.

There may, of course, be a conflict of interests even at the party policy stage. Though the Labor Party was sympathetic to the unions' demands for federal money in the late 1960s, the party also wanted votes. The unions had to settle for the 'needs' policy which gave a new legitimation to government responsibility for both the public sector education and private sector education. At the same time the policy supported more teacher involvement in decision-making in government schools and some incentive to parents to participate in schools. It is difficult to see alternate union tactics. In 1972 the alternate to a 'needs' based policy was a coalition government with a per capita funding policy and less money for everyone.

The continued provision of state aid by the Labor government has had far reaching effects on the provision of state education and on union tactics. Teese's argument that 'the once traditional role of the private sector as the

main supplier of non compulsory schooling is returning', has been mentioned.[29] What is evident in the material presented in Chapter Six is that some tactics taken by teachers' unions against state aid may, in fact, be counter productive and leave them arguing from a position which runs counter to their interests as expressed in union policy. The state aid question has led the NSWTF, particularly, into arguments supporting tighter central control and larger schools both of which run counter to the other arguments for more autonomy at the school level and their opposition to government school closures because of falling enrolments. Opposition to certain types of organisation and curriculum in the small alternate schools which mushroomed in the 1970s may mean that small, alternate schools in the government school sector have difficulty justifying their existence.

Teachers' unions, particularly the NSWTF which has a policy of complete opposition to all state aid, face the possible outcome that they reinforce not only the wealthy established non-government schools but also blur the differences between the schools which exist in that sector. Any real examination of the different class origins of the clients in wealthy private schools and many Catholic systemic schools is lost. The opposition to state aid has brought about an alliance between the wealthy private schools and the Catholic hierarchy which controls the systemic schools whose clients are similar to those in government schools.

The union tactic of complete opposition to the interests of non-government schools encounters the ideology of capitalist society, chiefly notions of pluralism and free choice reinforced by both Liberal and Labor Party policy and action. The interests of the non-government sector are articulated through this ideology. By denying these arguments, the unions run the risk of appearing to want only their professional interests heard, of seeking to dominate the course

of education in society.

The articulation of teachers' interests through the tactic of influencing political parties also takes place within this ideology. Their claims to the government's, in this case the federal government's, ultimate or prior concern with public education is met by both the electoral realities which face a political party, i.e. they are courting certain sections of the electorate to obtain office, and the ideological frame of free choice and a plurality of interests within which this struggle takes place. That this 'choice' is not available to all sections of society or that the interests of the two sectors are in conflict is obscured by this ideology. It is difficult for teachers' unions to challenge such ideological beliefs.

An area which clearly needs to be examined further by both teachers' unions and by those involved in the study of education is that other group of teachers, those in non-government schools. It becomes imperative in the light of the phenomenal growth of the Independent Teachers Association and the changes which have occurred in the relationship between the state and the non-government school sector during the 1970s. The problems in reaching out to the Catholic systemic teachers and parents by the government school teachers' unions, even without the deep ideological reservations which are found in the NSWTF, are enormous but the government school unions appear to be backed into a corner without a tactic to resolve what has become a major confrontation between the two sectors.

#### **Professionals and the state.**

The period studied showed an increasing use by unions of arguments which hinged upon teachers' relationship with the client. As state workers teachers were not only facing the particular form of bureaucratic structure

characteristic of the civil service generally but became increasingly involved in the dilemma: to whom are we accountable? Though ultimately responsible to the minister, the nature of the occupation and a liberal ideological climate suggested that they were also responsible to the client. This factor was recognised by the employer during the 1970s, particularly in the attempt to devolve some administrative responsibility to regions and to schools and in the search for an appropriate mechanism for parent participation at all of these levels in both states by the 1980s. These moves were, as the unions suggest, to a large extent masking attempts to curb the unions or to facilitate the needs of political parties or the incumbents of particular ministries.

The state has shown great reluctance to relinquish its central role in education, established formally with the introduction of compulsory education. As medical and legal professions have increasingly come to depend on government funding for training of practitioners and for hospital facilities, the state has, on the other hand, been reluctant to become involved in the actual relationship between the practitioner and the client. Here it is useful to examine briefly the relationship between medical practitioners and the state. Even though the same arguments of accountability for client welfare and accountability for public funds could be argued, the state is less cautious to be seen intimately involved in peoples' minds than in their bodies and perhaps their property. There it appears to stand back and let the client and the practitioner function within fairly broad regulations. It makes education compulsory but it has difficulty in making medical treatment compulsory, in for instance, making inoculation against certain childhood illnesses compulsory. It is necessary for a parent to give written consent for a school medical examination to take place but mass IQ testing required no such consent.

The difficulties of state intervention into medical practice can be seen in

the current (1984) attempts by the federal Labor government to implement a system of national medical insurance. Opposition by many doctors has highlighted both the strength of their own organisation, the Australian Medical Association (AMA) and the deep divisions within the medical hierarchy which made it difficult for the organisation to speak for the whole profession. Why has the privatised relationship between the medical and legal practitioner and the client remained while the development of a similar relationship between teachers and their clients been countered by the state with arguments for central accountability?

We could fall back to a consideration of the function of education in society and, with Althusser, argue that it is an ideological state apparatus through which the ruling class exercised its ideological hegemony. We would still, in this case, have to ask why the practice of teaching takes place under tight central control while the practice of medicine and law, equally avenues for hegemony, takes place in apparent autonomy of the practitioner. Why is ruling class hegemony best served by tight central control over education which runs counter to those ideological notions which exist in law and medicine; of freedom and choice for clients and professional autonomy for practitioners? These notions also assist ruling class hegemony. The state upholds them and is careful to preserve them even when the unequal delivery of services force it to intervene lest the contradictions of capitalism become too obvious. Legal aid services and national medical insurance have not, as some critics of the latter presently argue, 'nationalised' those systems. The notion of choice is, of course, currently large in the rhetoric used by governments in the defence of its relationship with non-government schools and in the legitimisation of latter day streaming mechanisms. Autonomy for practitioners in the occupation is hedged by arguments for quality control.



This notion of quality control exercised by the state takes a very different form in medicine. It rests largely on initial training and registration, both controlled by the professions themselves. The doctors right to practice is largely threatened only by client complaint or, in some cases, by the complaint of fellow practitioners. The Registration Board may step in, as may the state in criminal proceedings. Market forces, or notions of choice, form the main regulatory force of quality control. Parents may also 'choose' other schools for their children but they must go outside the recognised state system to do so. Inside the state system, the state, not the client, continues the role of 'quality control' with its surveillance of practices.

This, it may be argued, is because the work involves children who must be safeguarded against practitioners, yet, with few exceptions, the state allows parents to monitor a medical practitioner's care of their children, as it does the actions of teachers in non-government schools. Parent monitoring in government schools has been actively discouraged in departmental regulations as much as in teacher action. The proposals to open schools to parent scrutiny in the 1970s, kept parents essentially to what became known as 'housekeeping' tasks.

The state becomes involved in doctors' medical procedures to the extent that it subsidises the cost of some drugs and, in so doing, limits the numbers to be dispensed at one time. Variations require explanation on the usage, that is, the medical procedure. Prescribing patterns of individual doctors can be traced through pharmacists' records of dispensing. Once the state became involved in insurance schemes for clients, however, the question of 'overservicing' or fraudulent claims became an issue. Its concern was essentially with the financial side of medicine rather than with procedures, though, in this instance, it does move towards questioning the doctor's ability to decide what the client

needs. Through the forms required for reimbursement, the state can obtain a pattern of how the doctor practices.[30] The Medical Benefits Schedule which sets payment for length of visit may affect the way the doctor practices, indeed, the interest that the doctor may have in certain procedures which require longer consultation or regular visits over a period of time may be discouraged. A doctor whose practice presented an 'abnormal' profile may be asked to explain or the practice may become less financially rewarding. This may, of course, be tied more to established conventions of 'specialisation' in medicine and the accompanying hierarchy among doctors which the state is facilitating.

The hierarchy within the medical profession has taken the form of specialisation rather than outright administrative control over other practitioners. Within hospitals, similar bureaucratic structures to those in schools are found but they involve the doctors in controlling not their colleagues but the members of another occupation; nurses. Control over colleagues in the form of bureaucratic hierarchies is limited to those of a junior status employed by the hospitals and is essentially the continuation of training. Dominance of the medical profession over other health workers extends, however, beyond the occupation of nursing. Willis has drawn attention to 'the progressive differentiation of labour in health care provision as specialisation of health work tasks has occurred.'[31]The hierarchy which has developed is, he argues, organised along class and gender lines and has been achieved partly by 'state patronage' of medicine. 'The state has intervened primarily by the provision of statutory registration legislation..' [32] which has aided the subordination, limitation or exclusion of competitors, such as chiropractors, optometrists and midwives, thus maintaining the dominant structural position of medicine.

The introduction of state medical insurance in NSW also threatened to change the specialist doctors' relationship to patients in hospitals, particularly the distinction between those who could pay for services and those who could not. Traditionally, 'honorary' doctors have not charged poor patients but have set their own fees for service for private patients. Thus, use of hospital facilities for private patients was paid for in charity work. The state, in setting an overall fee for service, not only threatened this lucrative financial arrangement but also the paternalistic nature of the altruistic relationships between doctors and some patients.

Though the setting of fees does not 'nationalise' medicine, it does highlight the fear of some doctors that the relationship between the state and doctors could change. The state has taken on some of the characteristics of the employer. The nature of most doctors' present relationships with the state as employer is found in the fact that for doctors a 'strike' in hospitals takes the form of resignation.

At the same time an honorary doctor rostered for duty in a public hospital who refused to attend a seriously ill patient may face possible deregistration and fines of up to \$10,000. [33] Such a case would go before the profession's Investigating Committee established under the Medical Practitioner's Act. The doctors ability to 'strike' is therefore limited by state law which incorporates notions of ethics. Striking teachers may face suspension and ultimately dismissal from their employer (the state) but they would not lose the legal right to teach outside the state system.

Teachers' unions, in all their struggles for more autonomy, have been fearful of any move away from central employment by the state for it offered them a defence against market forces, that is, their clients having the right to hire

and fire. Victorian teachers' unions made a distinction between selection and employment of teachers in the school council issue. Certainly, the alternatives to being employed by the state are somewhat different for teachers and doctors. Non-centralised employment may mean being employed by the clients rather than being self employed as most doctors are. Here we are also meeting the distinction made by Connell, et al, of the way private school parents relate to education through a market and the way government school parents relate to it through the state, via a bureaucracy.[34]

The collective interests of medical and legal practitioners through their associations are also perceived as 'different' from those of teachers' unions by other workers' unions. Militant tactics by doctors to keep their traditional client/practitioner relationship have further isolated the Australian Medical Association (AMA) from the union movement. Struggle towards more teacher autonomy did not have this effect. Involved in the recent doctors' dispute is however their perceived aim to dismantle the national medical insurance scheme. There is then a distinction in the responses of the labour movement generally between the states' right to control financial arrangements in the delivery of services and the workers' right to control their work processes and relationships with the client. There is an expectation within the labour movement that the state should provide the means by which clients have access to services.

For teachers as state workers, is there a tension between notions of autonomy and the need to have the state continue to provide adequate salaries and resources in a time of public sector cutbacks in finance? Two tendencies in the states' relationship with education were identified by unions from the late 1970s. One was the reassertion of central control mechanisms. The second was captured in the word 'privatisation' which was seen as part of a broader

trend to shift costs from the state (public costs) to the individual/family (private costs). To a large extent, then, teachers' struggles for more control of policy and practices in schools takes place amid a growing need to demand the state's commitment to education and public services generally.

#### **Workers and the state.**

The teachers' unions have moved closer into association with the formal labour movement while, at the same time, aspiring to more autonomy. In NSW the union has taken a public position of close association and co-operation with the trade union movement - particularly in its affiliation with the NSW Labor Council and the ACTU. It has also a long history of association with other public service associations. Mitchell argues that for members and indeed for the union itself the effects of the affiliation with other trade unions was probably not of great consequence.[35] However the union has at times called for help from the union movement. For example, in its fight against the Summary Offenses Act and in its battle against deregistration.[36] In Victoria this was not the case except for the TTAV.[37] However, all three unions have now affiliated to the Victorian Trades Hall Council and the ACTU via the ATF.

We could argue as do Ozga and Lawn [38] that teachers are being proletarianised and that this accounts for the unions' move into closer association with the labour movement. In practice this formal association has meant closer association with other public sector, 'white collar' unions in the face of the severe government cut backs. In 1981 the Public Service Association, the Professional Officers Association, the Health Research Employees Association, the Police Association and the NSWTF had a joint salaries campaign operating under the banner of the Labor Council of NSW.[39] They sought to restore the relativities in salaries to that of 1974. They claimed

that the public sector workers had suffered losses during the period of wage indexation from 1975 to 1981, that their purchasing power had dropped since 1974. The NSWTF argued that a ten percent work value increase granted in May 1981 had been applied to a depressed wage. It also sought to restore relativities within the service. It stated that members on higher salaries (principals) had been more adversely affected by plateau indexation than lower salary rates. '... claims for altered relativities (within the service) are to be determined by the unions deliberate decision not the vagaries of indexation.'[40]

The economic downturn had affected the public sector unions. Members bore the brunt of increasing cuts in government expenditure. The State Secretary of the Health and Research Employees Association noted that employees were being expected to shoulder ever increasing workloads.[41] Thus both in economic terms and working conditions, the period demonstrates a worsening of the position of public sector (white collar) workers to the point that they recognised a commonality of interest across a fairly wide field. The salaries campaign moved across traditional professional barriers and joined teachers to those low level white collar workers in schools, clerical assistants and teachers aids. At the same time the argument for relativities both between industries and within the service reinforced the hierarchies within the school and draws on wage differences historically experienced between sectors, differences particularly between 'mental' and 'manual' labour.

The most chronic source of intensification in mental labour has, as Larson [42] points out, been work overload. This has a strange twist to it for teachers as it is caused, in part, by their aspirations to more autonomy in curriculum development and participation in general policy making for schools. Lack of time for research and preparation may send teachers back to relying on departmental suggestions, borrowing from other schools or using

commercially packaged kits. The last of these possibilities does not seem to be widespread but the upsurge in the use of computers in schools from the early 1980s may change this.

Questions of deskilling and specialisation i.e a more advanced division of labour, are complicated by curriculum and school organisation changes and by departmental and teacher action which threaten traditional subject areas. General or integrated studies may lessen specialisation. At the same time the NSWTF in particular has been worried that breaking down traditional subject areas in the name of 'flexibility' may lead to less staff being placed in schools in cost cutting exercises, teachers being required to teach in areas for which they have no qualifications and losing touch with their own specialist areas. Conversely, specialisation has increased in the development of areas such as English language teaching to non English speaking students, community language teaching to non English speaking students, early childhood education and specialist education for children with specific physical or emotional problems. Many of these specialisations grow from a concern to acknowledge the particular needs of sections of the community. Some, like languages, are caught in fierce debates over 'national identity' and notions of 'multiculturalism'.

Other forms of specialisation have arisen from changes to less centrally prescribed curriculum. The unions have generally demanded teacher secondment to 'consultancy' and 'advisory' positions. These positions recognise not only changes in curriculum development but changes in the role of inspectors of schools. Home-school liaison is another area of specialisation still in infancy. It is interesting to note that it developed generally in so called 'disadvantaged' areas. The duties of that older specialisation, school counsellors, who provided the psychological testing on which streaming into ability groups largely rested, have also been somewhat shaken up by changes in school organisation and

general questioning of IQ testing.

The oversupply of teachers in times of high unemployment may also generate a feeling among them that they are 'like' other workers, that is subject to the same economic downturns. Teachers do, however, continue to compete in a distinct region of a compartmentalised labour market. From the late 1970s the morale of teachers generally has been low as they watched the value of their salaries fall and their workload increase. But as Larson notes 'the economic and organisational dimension of alienation are real for many, if not most educated workers, but this sense of increasing loss is still relative.'[43]

On the other hand, teachers' unions associations with the ACTU and the state bodies has meant that education is highlighted as a concern of the formal labour movement as is the government tactic of reducing expenditure on areas which most affect the working class. Mobilisation of state workers around those larger political demands suggested by Wright [44] ('better social services or smaller classes in schools, for client and consumer participation in the management of state services') within these formal expressions of the labour movement present difficulties nonetheless. Not only would it require commitment from teachers themselves but also the ability to crash through the preoccupation with purely economic demands exhibited by these formal bodies. Panitch's notion of 'Corporatism' seems particularly appropriate to the actions of these bodies in their dealings with the federal Labor government.

### **Epilogue.**

The dilemma of teachers' unions association with the Labor Party is demonstrated further in the federal sphere in the 1980s. In the 1983 federal election the ATF spent some \$750,000 in a publicity campaign supporting Labor's education policies. The party promised extra money to government



schools and a phasing out of funding to the wealthier private schools. The Hawke Labor party was victorious.

Despite a strengthening of this policy at the 1984 ALP National Conference, the Federal Minister for Education, Senator Ryan, did not withdraw aid from any schools and the grants to the government schools' sector was much lower than anticipated by the teachers' unions from the party's pre-election campaign promises. Ryan stated 'we didn't think taking everything into account, that (withdrawing aid) would be a constructive step to take.'[45] The 'everything' was generally interpreted as the expected federal elections in late 1984 and the need to keep the private school sector favourably disposed to a Labor government. The government school sector, particularly the teachers' unions were not seen as a force to be reckoned with. The media quoted 'government sources' as claiming 'there was very little the teacher unions could do, since it was highly unlikely they would openly support the coalition's education policies.'[46] Thus, with a Labor government in power the unions' bargaining power through the ballot box is curtailed.

In Victoria the unions' use of the ballot box in the 1980s has been more successful. The series of reports on the reorganisation of state education, including a corporate management plan prepared by a consultancy firm, instigated by the Liberal Minister for Education was followed by the Education Service Bill, 1982, which gave to the minister the power to determine teachers' salaries, condition, appointment, promotion and classification. At the same time, in restructuring the education system, he demolished the three teaching divisions. Though the restructuring was done 'under the banner of more power to the regions', [47] it was clearly a move to rein in the powers of the senior departmental administrators and reaffirm ministerial control.

These attempts by the Victorian government to tame the teachers' unions was halted by a change of government. All three unions actively supported the Cain Labor Government in 1982. The VTU supplied \$100,000 and gave personnel resource support. The VSTA gave \$50,000 and the TTAV gave \$10,000 and \$1,000 to union branches in seven marginal seats. In return they received a commitment to various union proposals, for example, a new industrial relations system, smaller class sizes, reduction of face-to-face teaching hours, preference for unionists in employment and central employment for TAFE teachers. In the face of the complete breakdown of relations with the Liberal government and low teacher morale, the unions appeared to have nothing to lose.

To a large extent they have not been disappointed though the initial 'honeymoon' period of 1982 soon faced the realities of dealing with a government as opposed to a political party. The Cain Government backed away from removal of state aid from wealthy non-government schools. It introduced a three tiered system in the organisation of state education based on the school, the region and the central body. The Teachers' Tribunal was abolished in April 1982 and a new system of negotiation for wages and salaries was introduced in the form of the the Victorian Teaching Service Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. With it came the requirement that only one union should be recognised for collective bargaining in state education. The Teachers Federation of Victoria was formed.

In NSW relations with the Labor government began to deteriorate in 1978 when, during a state election campaign, the union called a strike to draw attention to deficiencies in funding government schools. In 1985 relations with the government are at an all time low. The 'teacher bashing' is led by the Minister for Education, Cavalier, a member of the left Labor faction. There is virtually no communication between the Minister and the union. As with the

Victorian Liberal Minister, he announced his determination to curb the union on taking office. In his first communication with the union he stated that he had 'won a wager' with a former Minister for Education that he would receive 'a hostile resolution from your executive in quicker time than he did'. [48] He has continued to make hostile statements to the media.

The fundamental strategy of the Federation leadership is to create in the minister a figure of odium ... That is why I didn't spend so much as a moment avoiding the inevitable end ... I merely saved everybody's time. The minister is no longer a spectator responding to the demands of the clamorous. [49]

In his plan not to talk to the union he has placed more responsibility on the department for 'middle level' management and in his words 'the minister and his senior officers will take care of policy making and senior management.' [50] Note that no mention is made of the Education Commission which in law is his chief adviser as well as the employer of teachers. He has threatened to fire teachers who refuse transfers following the introduction of a new staffing-formula and has set in motion a review of the procedures for assessment of teachers' performance in schools and mechanisms used to dismiss or discipline teachers whom Cavalier has referred to as 'malingerers in the staffrooms.' [51] Inspection of teachers may again become a major issue for the union. Ministerial response to criticisms by individual union members suggests a return to the regulation which required teachers, as public servants to refrain from criticism of the department. [52] Action by parents at schools to prevent loss of staff has been described by the Minister as a 'stunt' [53] and parents have been forcefully reminded that the 'Golden age of spending on education is over, never to return.' [54]

While relations between the union, the department and the minister reach a point reminiscent of the disastrous relationship with the then Liberal government in 1973, Legislation for School Councils is set to go before

parliament in 1985. This time it is supported by the parent organisations and the union, through the latter is rather quiet about the matter.

In spite of recommendations from the Anti-Discrimination Board and the Department's Equal Employment Unit, affirmative action for women teachers in the area of promotions has been stifled. Within the union the relationship between women and men teachers has worsened as the decade progresses, culminating in attacks on the Annual Women's Conferences by men from both left and right factions during 1984.

The media commenced the 1985 school year with a massive onslaught on government schools and particularly teachers. The Melbourne Age [55] ran an article headed 'Teachers as the new censors', in which it deplored a decision by the 1985 ATF Annual Conference to press education authorities to ban literature supplied by the South African Embassy. It used arguments of 'academic freedom' and the right of students in a democracy to 'form their own judgments and opinions on specific issues.' It also criticised 'the most dangerous of all curriculum preoccupations of the Left, "peace studies".' It drew attention to the affiliation of teachers' unions, singling out the VSTA and the NSWTF, with various peace bodies 'variously at odds with Western democratic alliances.'

The Australian took a similar line under the front page heading 'the lies they teach our children' and noted particularly that the Sam Lewis Peace Prize, awarded by the NSWTF with the approval of the department, was named in honour of a former Communist Party leader of the union. Syllabuses, it claimed, were 'deeply hostile to Australia, to the U.S., to capitalism, to industry, to Christianity.' [56] Environment studies, peace studies, sex education, human rights, Aboriginal and multi-cultural studies (studies in which 'national pride is assaulted') had little intellectual value, were inaccurate or departed

from traditional values. Both the Age and the Australian cited overseas 'research' to back their claims; the Age using British material, the Australian using American material.

The Bulletin [57] in its annual tirade against government education, seized on the 'core' or 'common' curriculum debate within teachers' unions and the opposition of many left union leaders to current departmental proposals for reorganisation. Headed 'kids winning schools Tug-o-war, Left-right pull together in battle for standards?' the article quoted at length from conservative university academics and called for the removal of 'politically motivated' multicultural studies and 'biassed' peace studies.

There appears from these example to be a new form of attack on government schools. In the late 1970s, the line of criticism was first to blame teachers for youth unemployment. This was accompanied by argument of falling standards and cries for a return to the 'basics'. Following this was a spate of comparison between the government and non-government schools. These still continue[58] but it is now the content of what is being taught which is mentioned and the political motivations of teachers which forms the basis of criticism. The point made earlier of the danger of alternative or separate course, e.g. peace, Aboriginal, environmental studies, which fail to recapture and redefine the content of categories of knowledge already in existence is affirmed by this attack. Teachers in these courses and the courses themselves are presently very vulnerable.

These attacks on the government education systems come at the same time as proposals to reintroduce university fees, [59] and proposals to introduce a means test for dole recipients aged 16 and 17 and reduce payments for 18 to 20 year olds. [60] These proposals follow review of youth policies in Australia

by the OECD committee [61] and the report of an enquiry into Labour market programs.[62] In this climate it is little wonder that teachers' unions are experiencing despondency.

Connell has stated that the way workers in the semi professions employed by the state 'jump', the degree of autonomy they can establish 'and what they do with it, are going to be very important in deciding what is the actual role of the state in the current economic trough.'[63]

Finding a space to jump or the energy to jump may prove difficult.

- 
1. G. Grace, Teachers, ideology and control, London, 1978, p.215.
  2. N. Poulantzas, Classes in contemporary capitalism, London, 1975, pp.271-281.
  3. Grace, op.cit., p.218.
  4. Circular T.76/1589 in Secondary teacher, No. 1, 1978, p.9.
  5. Retention loss and morale of teachers in Australian state schools (Campbell Report), p.74, cited in Secondary teacher, no. 8, 1975, p.12.
  6. S. Baines, 'Curriculum development Vs teachers working conditions', Education, 7 Nov., 1983, p.10.
  7. The Australian teacher, No. 2, Sept., 1982, p.11.
  8. B. and J. Ehrenreich, 'The professional managerial class', in P. Walker (ed), Between labour and capital, Boston, 1979, p.17.
  9. N. Palmer, 'Which way for teachers?' Outlook, Dec., 1968, p.102.
  10. M. Young and G. Whitty, 'Perspectives on education and society' in M. Young and G. Whitty (eds), Society, state and schooling, Barcomb, Lewes, 1977, p.51.
  11. G. Whitty, 'Sociology and the problem of radical educational change' in M. Young and G. Whitty (eds), op. cit., p.51.
  12. Education. 10 Sept., 1984, p.3.
  13. M. Young and G. Whitty, 'Perspectives on education and society' in M. Young and G. Whitty (eds) op. cit., p.5.
  14. Grace, op. cit., p.218.
  15. D.Finn et al, 'Social democracy, education and the crisis', in Cultural studies No.10, on ideology, Birmingham, 1977, p.170.
  16. B. Bessant, 'A gamble pays off', The Australian teacher, No. 1, June 1982, p.7.
  17. S. Mallet, Essays on the new working class, St Louis, 1975, p.207.
  18. ibid.
  19. Mallet, op. cit., p.210.
  20. ibid.
  21. L. Panitch, 'Trade unions and the capitalist state', New left review, No. 125, Jan-Feb., 1981, p.22.
  22. ibid., p.24.

23. *ibid.*
24. J. Brown, 'The Australian Schools Commission - a dead duck', Education, 26 Oct., 1981, p.15.
25. D. Bennett, 'Education: back to the drawing board', in G. Evans and J.R. Reeves (eds), Labour essays, 1982, Richmond, Victoria.
26. See D.D. Anderson, R. Brown, P.J. Fensham and P.P. Powel, Students in higher education: a study of their social composition since the abolition of fees, ERDS Report, No. 23, Canberra, 1980.
27. Herald, 19 March 1966.
28. Sun, 4 Dec., 1968.
29. R. Teese, 'The growth and decline of the Victorian government secondary school', in Melbourne working papers 4, 1982/3, University of Melbourne, p.155.
30. See unidentified letter to editor Medical practice, Dec., 1984, for an example.
31. E. Willis, Medical dominance, Sydney, 1983, p.201.
32. *ibid.*, p.202.
33. Sydney Morning Herald, 19 Feb., 1985.
34. R.W. Connell, et al, Making the difference, Sydney, 1982, p.133.
35. B. Mitchell, Teachers, education and politics, St Lucia, Queensland, 1975, p.161.
36. Education, 12 July, 1972, p.152.
37. P. Noyce, Secondary teacher, March 1973, p.1.
38. J.T. Ozga and M.A. Lawn, Organised teachers, London, 1981.
39. See Education, 9 Nov., 1981, pp.12-13.
40. *ibid.*
41. *ibid.*, p.11.
42. M. S. Larson, 'Proletarianisation and educated labor', Theory and society, Vol. 9, No. 1, Jan., 1980, p.166.
43. *ibid.*, p.170.
44. E. O. Wright, Class, crisis and the state, London, 1979, p.240.
45. Sydney Morning Herald, 16 Aug., 1984.
46. *ibid.*



47. B Bessant, 'A gamble pays off', op. cit., p.7.
48. R. Cavalier, Minister for Education, to V. Bauris, Gen. Secretary, NSWTF, 3 May, 1984, NSWTF files.
49. Sydney Morning Herald, 29 Jan., 1985.
50. ibid.
51. Sydney Morning Herald, 31 Jan., 1985.
52. R. Cavalier, Minister for Education, to Ms Scorrano, published in Education, 28 Jan., 1985, p.6
53. Bega District News, 3 Oct., 1984.
54. Telegraph, 5 Dec., 1985.
55. Age 22 Jan., 1985.
56. The Weekend Australian, 2-3 Feb., 1985.
57. The Bulletin, 29 Jan., 1985.
58. see Business Review Weekly, 25 Jan, 1985, p.26-27.
59. Financial Review, 14 Nov., 1984; The Australian, 21 Jan., 1985.
60. Sydney Morning Herald, 21 Jan., 1985, 24 Jan., 1985.
61. OECD, Manpower and social affairs committee, Review of youth policies in Australia, 12 Nov., 1984.
62. Report of the committee of enquiry into labour market programs (Kirby Report), Canberra, Jan., 1985.
63. R.W. Connell, Which way is up?, North Sydney, 1983, p.264.

## Select Bibliography.

### 1. Archival and interview sources.

#### (i) Archival.

##### New South Wales Teachers Federation.

The records held by the Federation at 300 Sussex Street, Sydney, are filed in three ways; Association files, Subject files and Individual files.

Subject files were used almost exclusively. For example:

Inspection file, I3.

Community involvement file, C39.

Education Commission file, E5.

##### Victorian Teachers Union.

Records are held at 335 Camberwell Rd, Camberwell, Victoria.

##### Victorian Secondary Teachers Association.

Records are held at 35 Elizabeth St, Richmond, Victoria.

##### Technical Teachers Union of Victoria (formerly Technical Teachers Association of Victoria).

Records are held at 57 Keele St, Collingwood, Victoria.

#### (ii) Interviews.

The following people provided personal reminiscences by interview and in some cases provided documents.

##### Victoria

Jennifer Beacham  
Robert Bluer  
Gill Freeman  
Bill Hannan  
Phil Harrington  
Jan Mackenzie  
Rod Moran  
Phil Noyce  
Helen Smith  
Charles Smith  
Marge Smyth  
David Petit  
Ian Spaulding  
Gerry Tickell  
Colin Thorpe

##### New South Wales

Greg Andrews  
Mary Boland  
Ray Cavenagh  
Toti Cohen  
Van Davy  
Sol Encel  
Jim Hagan  
Stan Heuston  
John O'Brien  
Pam Smith  
Roby Tidswell

## 2. Newspapers and periodicals.

Associate News.....1968-1977  
(renamed TTAV News).....1979-1980  
Education.....1960-1985  
High School News.....Sept 1968  
Parent and Citizen.....1965-1980  
The School Bell.....1965-1980  
The Secondary Teacher.....1965-1981  
The Teachers journal.....1965-1980  
VAT.....1982-1983

The Age.....21 Mar 1980; 31 Mar 1980;  
11 Sept 1980; 22 Jan 1985.

The Australian..... 2-3 Jan 1985; 21 Jan 1985

The Bega District News.... 3 Oct 1984  
The Bulletin..... 29 Jan 1985  
Business Review Weekly... 25 Jan 1985  
The Catholic Weekly.....25 Jan 1979  
The Daily Telegraph..... 5 Mar 1983; 5 Dec 1985  
The Financial Review.....14 Nov 1984; 2 Jan 1985;  
21 Jan 1985; 1 Feb 1985.  
The Herald.....19 Mar 1966

The Sun..... 4 Dec 1968

The Sun Herald.....19 Aug 1979

The Sydney Morning Herald 5 Sept 1979; 7 Oct 1981;  
16 Mar 1982; 1 Apr 1982; 9 Aug 1984; 29 Jan 1985;  
30 Jan 1985; 31 Jan 1985.

## 3. Parliamentary and other official sources.

Commonwealth.

Schools in Australia: Report of the Interim  
Committee for the Australian Schools Commission,  
(Karmel Report), AGPS, Canberra, 1973.

Committee on Technical and Further Education, TAFE  
in Australia; Report on the Needs in Technical and  
Further Education. (Kangan Report), AGPS,  
Canberra, 1974.

Schools Commission Report for Triennium 1976-78.  
Government Printer, Canberra, 1975.

Official Year Book of Australia - 1977-78. AGPS,  
Canberra.

Schools Commission/State Education Departments,  
Choice in Education and Sources of Present  
Administrative Practice. Discussion Paper No 1,  
June 1980.

OECD Manpower and Social Affairs Committee, Review  
of Youth Policies in Australia. 12 Nov., 1984.

Report of the Committee of Enquiry into Labour  
Market Programs. (Kirby Report), AGPS, Canberra,  
Jan., 1985.

Victoria.

Board of Enquiry into Certain Aspects of the State  
Teaching Service. (Southwell Enquiry), Government  
Printer, Melbourne, 1971.

Hunt, A.J. (MLA) 'Aims and Objectives of Education  
in Victoria', (Ministerial Statement), 12 Dec.,  
1979.

The Organisations Reference Group, Ministerial  
Review of Education Policies, First Report.  
October, 1980; Second Report. December, 1981;  
Third Report. February, 1982. Government Printer,  
Melbourne.

Victoria, Parliament. Green Paper on Strategies and  
Structures for Education in Victoria. Melbourne,  
May, 1980.

Victoria, Parliament. White Paper on Strategies and  
Structures for Education in Victorian Government  
Schools. Government Printer, Melbourne, 1980.

Victorian Department of Education, The Rationale and  
Definition of the Proposed Organisation Structure.  
(Prepared by PA Australia), Government Printer,  
Melbourne, 1981.

Western Australia

Advisory Committee on Post Secondary Education,  
Post-Secondary Education in Western Australia;  
Report of the Committee on Post-Secondary  
Education Appointed By the Minister of Education.  
(Partridge Report). Perth, WA, Jan., 1976.

New South Wales.

Report of the Committee Appointed to Survey  
Secondary Education in NSW. (Wyhdham Report),

Government Printer, Sydney, 1957.

Education Gazette. 1 May 1957; 1 April 1965.

Report of the Panel of Inquiry on the Establishment of an Education Commission in NSW. (Rydge Report), Government Printer, Sydney, 1969.

New South Wales Department of Education, Report of the Working Party on Inspection and Advisory Services. Government Printer, September 1971.

New South Wales Department of Education, Annual Report, 1971.

The Community and its Schools: A Consultative Paper on Regionalization and Community Involvement in Schools. Government Printer, Sydney, 1973.

Directorate of Studies, Department of Education, Aims of Secondary Education. NSW, March, 1974.

NSW Department of Education, The community and its schools. Report of the Review Panel Appointed by the Minister for Education. Sydney, 1974.

NSW Department of Education, Community Involvement in Education: School Councils, Formation, Composition, Functions. Information Booklet No 2, Sydney, 1975.

NSW Department of Education, Community Involvement in Education: What is Community Involvement? Information Booklet No 1, Sydney, 1975.

NSW Secondary Schools Board, Base Paper on the Total Curriculum - Years 7-10. April, 1975.

Review of NSW Government Administration - Directions for Change. (Wilenski Report) Interim Report, Nov., 1977.

Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly Upon the School Certificate. (McGowan Report), Government Printer, Sydney, 17 June, 1981.

Working Party for the Establishment of an Education Commission, Interim Report. Government Printer, NSW, 30 Nov., 1976.

Working Party for the Establishment of an Education Commission, Second Interim Report, Government Printer, NSW 5 Oct., 1977.

Working Party for the Establishment of an Education

Commission, Final Report. Government Printer, NSW,  
19 April, 1978.

The Higher School Certificate Examination in New  
South Wales. Report of the Review Panel to the  
Board of Senior School Studies, 24 January, 1980.

Future Directions of Secondary Education in NSW.  
Prepared by D. Swan and K. McKinnon for the  
Minister for Education, NSW, Government Printer,  
NSW, 1983.

#### 4. Parliamentary Acts.

The Common Schools Act 1862 (Vic.).

Education Act 1961.

Teaching Services Act 1970 (NSW).

Education (School councils) Act 1975 (Vic.).

Education (Volunteer Workers Compensation) Act 1975 (Vic.).

Education Commission Act 1980 (NSW).

#### Articles and Books.

Althusser, L. Lenin and philosophy. Monthly Review  
Press, London, 1970.

Anderson, D.S. New Patterns of Teacher Education and  
Tasks. OECD Paris, 1974.

Anderson, D.S., Boven, R., Fensham, P.J. and Powell,  
J.P. Students in Australian Higher Education, ERDC  
Report No 23.

Anderson, D.S. and Vevoorn, A.E. Access to  
Privilege. ANU National University Press,  
Canberra, 1983.

Anderson, M. Ideology and Compulsory Education. B.A.  
(Hons) thesis, Macquarie University, 1979.

Austin, A.G. Australian Education: 1788-1900.  
Pitman, Carlton, Victoria, 1972.

Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology.  
Professions Symposium. 9(3) pp.29-63.

Bannister, H, et al 'Media Definitions of Education  
and Work: Gaining Consent in the Social Crisis',  
in D. McCallum and A. Ozlins (eds), Melbourne  
Working Papers. Department of Education,  
University of Melbourne, 1980.

- Barber, B. 'Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions'. Daedalus, no. 4. Fall, 1963, pp.669-688.
- Barcan, A. A History of Australian Education. Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1980.
- Ben-David. 'Professions in the Class system of Present-Day Societies'. Current Sociology 12.
- Bennett, D. 'Education: Back to the Drawing-Board', in G. Evans and J. Reeves (eds), Labor Essays 1982. Richmond, Victoria, 1982.
- Bernstein, B. 'The Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge', in M.F.D. Young (ed), Knowledge and Control. Collier Macmillan, London, 1971.
- Bernstein, B. Class, Codes and Control. vol. 1, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1971.
- Bessant, B. and Spaul, A.D. Teachers in Conflict. Melbourne University Press, Victoria, 1972.
- Blake, L.J. (ed) Vision and Realisation. A Century of History of State Education in Victoria. vol. 1, The Government Printer, Melbourne, 1973.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. Schooling in Capitalist America. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1976.
- Boreham, P., Pemberton, A. and Wilson, P. The Professions in Australia. University of Queensland, 1977.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. Schooling in Capitalist America. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1976.
- Bourdieu, P. Outline of a Theory of Practice. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1977.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J. Reproduction in Education and Culture. Sage Publications, London, 1977.
- Braverman, H. Labor and Monopoly Capital. Monthly Review Press, New York, 1974.
- Bucher, R. and Strauss, 'Professions in Process', American Journal of Sociology. 66 Jan., 1961, pp.325-34.
- Burnham, J. The Managerial Revolution. The John Day Company, New York, 1941.

- Caplow, T. The Sociology of Work. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1954.
- Carchedi, G. 'The Reproduction of Social Classes at the Level of Production Relations', Economy and Society. vol. 4, no. 4, 1975, pp.361-417.
- Carchedi, G. 'The Economic Identification of State Employees', Social Praxis. 3(1-2), pp.93-120, 1975.
- Carchedi, G. 'The Economic Identification of the New Middle Class', Economy and Society. vol. 4, no.1, pp.1-86. 1975.
- Carr-Saunders, A.M. and Wilson, P.A. The Professions. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1933.
- Churchwood, L. 'Reform or Revolution, The Search for a New Strategy', Meanjin Quarterly. Dec., 1970. pp.533-540.
- Cleverley, J.F. The First Generation: School and Society in Early Australia. Sydney University Press, University of Sydney, 1971.
- Connell, R.W., Ashenden, D.J., Kessler, S. and Dowsett, G.W. Making the Difference. George Allen and Unwin, North Sydney, NSW, 1983.
- Connell, R.W. Which Way is Up? George Allen and Unwin, North Sydney, NSW, 1983.
- Cutler, C.B. 'The Problems of Educational Administration', Public Administration. (Aus), Sept., 1971, pp.201-209.
- Daedalus, 'The Professions'. no. 4., Fall, 1963.
- Derber, M. 'State Government Management Union Relations in Victoria and New South Wales', Journal of Industrial Relations. vol. 19, 1977. pp.366-387.
- Durkheim, E. Professional Ethics and Civic Morals. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1957.
- Ehrenreich, B. and J. 'The Professional-Managerial Class', in P. Walker (ed) Between Labor and Capital. South End Press, Boston, 1979.
- Ely, J. Reality and Rhetoric: An Alternative History of Australian Education. Alternative Publishing Cooperative, Sydney, NSW, 1978.



- Etzioni, A. (ed) The Semi Professions and Their Organisation. The Free Press, New York, 1969.
- Eysenck, J. The IQ Argument. Library Press, New York, 1971.
- Fielding, A.G. and Portwood, D. 'Professions and the State - Towards a Typology of Bureaucratic Professions', Sociological Review, vol., 28. no.1, 1980, pp.23-53.
- Finn, D., Grant, N. and Johnson, R. 'Social Democracy, Education and the Crisis', in Cultural Studies No. 10: On Ideology. Birmingham, 1977.
- Foley, J. 'Media Representations: A Documentation of the Strategies Employed in the Treatment of Education By the Print Media', in H. Bannister and L. Johnson (eds), Melbourne Working Papers. Department of Education, University of Melbourne, 1981.
- Ford, G.W., Hearn, J.M., and Lansbury, R.D. (eds) Australian Labour Relations - Readings, (3rd edition) Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1980.
- Freidson, E. Professional Dominance. Atherton, New York, 1970.
- Frickstay, J.M. 'Collective Bargaining, Conciliation and Arbitration in Victorian Wages Board', Journal of Industrial Relations. December, 1976, pp.309-325.
- Friere, P. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Penguin, Harmondsworth, England, 1972.
- Fromin, F. and Teese, R., 'Public Finance to Private Schools: the Argument of the Karmel Report and later policy', in H. Bannister and L. Johnson (eds), Melbourne Working Papers. Department of Education, University of Melbourne, 1981.
- Galbraith, J. K. American Capitalism: The Concept of Countervailing Power. Rev. ed. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1956.
- Game, A. and Pringle, R. 'The Making of the Australian Family', in A. Burns, G. Bottomley and P. Jools, (eds), The Family in the Modern World. George Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1983.
- Gollan, R. Revolutionaries and Reformists, Communism and the Australian Labour Movement 1920-1955. Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1975.

- Goode, W.J. 'The Theoretical Limits of Professionalization', in A. Etzioni (ed), The Semi Professions and Their Organization. The Free Press, New York, 1969, pp.216-313.
- Gordon, R. (ed) The Australian New Left. William Heinmann, Melbourne, 1970.
- Gordon, R. and Osmond, W. 'An Overview of the Australian New Left', in R. Gordon, (ed) The Australian New Left. William Heinmann, Melbourne, 1970.
- Gouldner, A. 'The New Class Project Parts I and II', Theory and Society. 6(2) and 6(3) September and November, 1978.
- Gouldner, A. The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class. The Macmillan Press, London, 1979.
- Grace, G. Teachers, Ideology and Control. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1978.
- Grant, J. and Serle, G. The Melbourne Scene 1803-1956. Hale and Ironmonger, Sydney, 1978.
- Hagan, J. The History of the ACTU. Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1981.
- Halmos, P. The Personal Service Society. Constable, London, 1970.
- Halmos, P. 'Review of T. Johns on's "Professions and Power"', British Journal of Sociology. 24(1) pp.34-35. 1973.
- Halsey, A.H., Floud, J.E. and Anderson, C.A. Education, Economy and Society. Free Press, New York, 1961.
- Harries-Jenkins, G. 'Professionals in Organisations', in J. Jackson (ed), Professions and Professionalization. Cambridge, 1970, pp.53-107.
- Harris, K. Teachers and Classes: A Marxist Analysis. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1982.
- Haug, M. and Sussman, M.B. 'Professional Autonomy and the Revolt of the Client', Social Problems. 17(2) pp.153-161.
- Haug, M.R. and Sussman, M.B. 'Professionalization and Unionism', American Behavioural Scientist.

vol. 4, 1971, pp.525-541.

Higgins, W. 'Restructuring Australian Communism',  
The Socialist Register. 1974, pp.151-189.

Hince, K. 'The Victorian Wages Board System:  
Structure and Performance', in G.W. Ford, et al,  
(eds) Australian Labour Relations - Readings. 3rd  
edition, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1980.

Illich, I. Deschooling Society. Penguin,  
Harmondsworth, 1971.

Illich, I. 'The Profession as a Form of  
Imperialism', New Society, 25(571), 1973,  
pp.633-635.

Irving, T. and Berzins, B. 'History and the New Left  
- Beyond Radicalism', in R. Gordon (ed), The  
Australian New Left. William Heinmann, Melbourne,  
1970.

Jackson, J.A. Professions and Professionalization.  
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1970.

Jenks, C. et al, Inequality: A Reassessment of the  
Effects of Family and Schooling in America. Basic  
Books, 1972.

Jensen, A. 'How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic  
Achievement?', Harvard Educational Review, Vol 39,  
No 1, 1969, pp.1-123.

Jensen, A. Educability and Group differences.  
Harper and Row, New York, 1975.

Johnson, T. Professions and Power. Macmillan,  
London, 1972.

Larson, M.S. The Rise of Professionalism. University  
of California Press, Berkley, 1977.

Larson, M.S. 'Professionalism: Rise and Fall',  
International Journal of Health Services. Vol 9,  
No 4, 1979, pp.607-627.

Larson, M.S. 'Professionalization and Educated  
labour', Theory and Society. vol. 9, no. 1,  
Jan., 1980, pp. 131-175.

Legatt, T. 'Teaching as a Profession', in J. Jackson  
(ed), Professions and Professionalization.  
Cambridge, 1970.

Lieberman, J.K. The Tyranny of the Experts: How  
Professionals Are Closing the Open Society. Walker

- and Company, New York, 1970.
- Lieberman, M. Education as a Profession. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1956.
- Lortie, D.C. 'The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching', in A. Etzioni (ed), The Semi Professions and Their Organisation. The Free Press, New York, 1969.
- MacDonagh, O. A Pattern of Government Growth 1800-1860. Macgibbon and Kee, London, 1961.
- Mallet, S. Essays on the New Working Class. Telos Press, St Louis, 1975.
- Mannheim, K. Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1936.
- Mills, C. Wright. White Collar: the American Middle Classes. Oxford University Press, New York, 1956.
- Mitchell, B. Teachers, Education and Politics. A History of Organisations of Public School Teachers in New South Wales. University of Queensland Press. St Lucia, Queensland, 1975.
- Musgrave, P.W. The Sociology of Education, Methuen, London, 1972.
- Neil, A.S. Summerhill; a Radical Approach to Education. Gollianane, 1976.
- Ozga, J.T. and Lawn, M.A. Organised Teachers. Falmer Press, London, 1981.
- Palmer, H. 'Which Way For Teachers?', Outlook, Dec., 1968.
- Panitch, L. 'Trade Unions and the Capitalist State', New Left Review. No 125, Jan-Feb., 1981, pp.21-44.
- Parsons, T. The Social System. Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1964; C.1951.
- Parsons, T. 'The Professions and Social Structure', in T. Parsons (ed), Essays in Sociological Theory. Rev. Edn, Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1954, pp.34-49.
- Parsons, T. 'The School as a Social System', Harvard Educational Review. XXIX, fall, 1959.
- Petit, D. 'An Introduction to Major Issues in the

- Choice and Diversity Project', in Choice and Action: Studies of Change in Victorian Schooling. Choice and Diversity Project, Schools Commission, Victorian Education Department, September, 1981.
- Poulantzas, N. Classes in Contemporary Capitalism. N.L.B., London, 1975.
- Reimer, E. School is Dead: An Essay on Alternatives in Education. Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1971.
- Scott, W.R. 'Professionals in Bureaucracy: Areas of Conflict', in H.M. Vollmer and D. L. Mills (eds), Professionalization. Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1966, pp.264-275.
- Shaffer, B.B. 'The Idea of the Ministerial Department: Bentham, Mill and Bagehot', Australian Journal of Politics and History. vol.3, 1957, pp.60-78.
- Sharp, R. and Green, H. Education and Social Control. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1975.
- Sharp, R. Knowledge, Ideology and the Politics of Schooling. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1980.
- Spaull, A.D. (Ed) Australian Teachers. From Colonial Schoolmasters to Militant Professionals. Macmillan, Melbourne, 1977.
- Spaull, A.D. 'Teacher Unionism in Victoria', draft chapter for P. Warhurst (Ed) Victorian Politics - A Reader. (Copy held by author). Late 1981.
- Spaull, A. 'Towards a Theory of Australian Teacher Union Development', Unpublished paper, Melbourne, 1982.
- Sykes, E. 'Labour Arbitration in Australia', in G.W. Ford, et al, (eds), Australian Labour Relations - Readings. 3rd Edition, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1980.
- Tawney, R.H. The Acquisitive Society. (1920) Harvest Books, New York, 1946.
- Teese, R. 'The Social Function of Private Schools', in H. Bannister and L. Johnson (eds), Melbourne Working Papers. Department of Education, University of Melbourne, 1981.
- Teese, R. 'The Growth and Decline of Victorian Government Secondary Schools, 1954-1981', in R. Teese and G. Wickham (eds), Melbourne Working Papers. University of Melbourne, 1982/83.

- Veblen, T. Engineers and the Price System. Harcourt, Brace and World, New York, 1963.
- Vollmer, H.M. and Mills, D.L. (eds) Professionalization. Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1966.
- Walker, P. (ed) Between Labour and Capital. South End Press, Boston, 1979.
- Wettenhall, R.L. 'Administrative Boards in Nineteenth Century Australia', Public Administration. (Sydney) vol. 22, no. 2, p.257.
- White, B. Participation in Decision-Making in a Victorian State Secondary School. Master of Education thesis, Monash University, 1980.
- White, D. 'The Teaching Profession', in P. Boreham., A. Pemberton and P. Wilson (eds), The Professions in Australia. University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, Queensland, 1977.
- Wilensky, H.L. 'The Professionalisation of Everyone', American Journal of Sociology. 70, September 1964, pp.137-158.
- Wilenski, P. 'Labour and Bureaucracy', in G. Duncan (ed), Critical Essays in Australian Politics. Arnole (Aus), Port Melbourne, 1978.
- Willis, E. Medical Dominance. George Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1983.
- Willis, P. Learning to Labour. Saxon House, Westwood, 1978.
- Wilson, F.M.G. 'Ministries and Boards: Some Aspects of Administrative Development Since 1932', Public Administration. London, vol. 33, Spring 1955, pp.43-59.
- Wright, E.O. Class, Crisis and the State. New Left Books, London, 1978.
- Wright, E.O. 'Intellectuals and the Class Structure of Capitalist Society', in P. Walker (ed), Between Labor and Capital. South End Press, Boston, 1979.
- Wrong, D. 'The Oversocialized Conception of Man in Modern Society', in L. Coser and B. Rosenberg (ed), Sociological theory: A Book of Readings. 3rd edn, Macmillan, New York, 1964.
- Young, M. The Rise of Meritocracy. Penguin,

Harmondsworth, 1961.

Young, M.F.D. Knowledge and Control.  
Collier-Macmillan, London, 1971.

Young, M. and Whitty, G. Explorations in the  
Politics of Knowledge. Mafferton Books, Driffield,  
1977.