CHAPTER 3

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROLE OF THE INSPECTORS FROM 1884 TO THE APPOINTMENT OF THE FIRST LABOR MINISTER OF EDUCATION, 1905

Introduction

This chapter examines the development of the role of the inspectors in the Education Department of South Australia under pressures of varying intensity from the legislature and the inspectors' superiors, from the inspectors themselves and from the teachers during the period from 1884 to 1905.

The period from immediately after the 1881-1883 Inquiry to the appointment of Thomas Price, as the first Labor Minister of Education on 26 July 1905 and his reshuffle of the senior Education Department positions in December 1905, had several events that influenced the activities of the inspectors. The 1885 Education Regulations, the first gazetted for nearly five years,[1] made such radical changes,[2] according to the Inspector-General, in the Course of Instruction and examination of schools, that the results were not published and teachers' payments by results were not affected in 1886.[3] Teachers' Associations were active. The Education Gazette was first published in 1885. The death of Hartley occurred in 1896. The

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1885, p. 1.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1886, p. xiv.
3 ibid., p. 6.

South Australian Public School Teachers' Union (S.A.P.S.T.U.) was established in 1896.[1] The structure of the administration of the Education Department was changed several times.

Table 3.1 sets out some data on population, pupils, teachers, schools and Education Department structure and expenditure at the beginning of the period 1884 to 1905. It also provides a brief sketch of teacher-training facility for the period.

The first change to the structure of the administration was in 1892 when an Assistant Inspector-General, L.W. Stanton, was appointed.[2] From 1897 to mid-1902 the Education Department was controlled by a Board of Inspectors, with L.W. Stanton as Chairman and Inspectors T. Burgan and C.L. Whitham as Members.[3] On 30 June 1902, the Board of Inspectors was abolished and an Inspector-General appointed again. Stanton became Inspector-General, Whitham, Assistant Inspector-General, and Burgan, Senior Inspector.[4] Stanton was removed from the position of Inspector- General by Thomas Price, Minister of Education, on 9 December 1905 and became Secretary to the Minister Controlling Education and Secretary to the Education Department, First Class.[5] Price appointed Alfred Williams as Director of Education, M.M. Maughan, Chief Inspector of Schools, First Class, and demoted Whitham and Burgan to Inspectors of Schools, First Class.[6]

The numerical strength of the inspectorate, despite increase in the number of schools, remained much the same throughout the period. No immediate replacement was made for Inspector W.L. Neale when he left to become Director of

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 12, no. 120, Oct. 1896, p. 120.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 8, no. 63, Jan. 1892, p. 18.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 13, no. 123, Jan. 1897, p. 1.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1903, p. 11.
5 Education Gazette, vol. 22, no. 231, Jan. 1906, p. 1.
6 loc. cit.

TABLE 3.1

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT DATA 1884[1]

S.A. POPULATION		312,781
GROSS SCHOOL ATTENDANCE		42,758
IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS		n.a.
IN PROVISIONAL SCHOOLS		n.a.
PERCENTAGE ATTENDANCE		58.6
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS		452
PUBLIC		227
PROVISIONAL		225
NUMBER OF TEACHERS		1000
HEAD TEACHERS		242
ASSISTANTS		125
PUPIL TEACHERS		228
MONITORS		72
SEWING MISTRESSES (part time)		111
PROVISIONAL TEACHERS		222
ADMINISTRATION	INSPECTOR-GENERAL SENIOR INSPECTOR 5 INSPECTORS SECRETARY	
BOARDS OF ADVICE		67
EXPENDITURE REVENUE AND LOAN		£114,557
COST PER CHILD INSTRUCTED		£ 2.13.7
TEACHER TRAINING FACILITY	The Training College, sometimes called the Teachers' Training School, had courses in higher mathematics, modern and classical languages, literature and science in this period. Physics and Chemistry could be taken at the University of Adelaide by the trainees.[2] The 1885 Education Regulations upgraded the pupil teacher system to a four years' apprenticeship for over 14 year olds and set down the entrance requirements, the instruction to be given by the head teachers and the examinations to be passed. Entry to the Training College was limited to pupil teachers who had passed the fourth year examination and to persons between the ages of 20 and 35 years with at least six months' teaching experience.[3] Provisional teachers were obliged to attend Training College or any approved school for one month prior to appointment.[4] In 1900 the Training College in Grote Street became the Pupil Teachers' School, and the University Training College began with a departmental Superintendent of Students in charge.[5]	

SOURCES: 1 Blue Book of South Australia - 1884 in S.A. Parliamentary Papers, 1885.
Statistical Register of South Australia, 1884 in S.A. Parliamentary Papers, 1885.
S.A. Parliamentary Paper no. 44, 1885.

2 B.K. Hyams, op. cit., 1979, p. 28.

3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1885, Education Regulations, pp. 8, 9.

4 B.K. Hyams, op. cit., 1979, p. 48.

5 ibid., p. 56.

Education in Tasmania, nor for Assistant Inspector Gold when he returned to teaching.[1] Neither was there a replacement for Inspector Plummer who died on duty.[2] It was this death that gave the Government the opportunity to make the drastic changes in the administration in December 1905. In 1905 there were seven inspectorial districts with the Assistant Inspector-General in charge of the Central District. The senior inspector and the five inspectors were in charge of the other districts.[3]

Although the numerical strength of the inspectorate changed little, there was change in its composition.[4] Soon after the completion of the 1881-1883 Inquiry, Alexander Clark, who had been Headmaster of the Grote Street Model School and had given such telling evidence in his own right and on behalf of the Headmasters of Model Schools to the Inquiry, was an addition to the inspectorate available to Hartley.[5] The death of Inspector Hosking in 1888 left a vacancy in the inspectorate that was filled by the appointment of J.T. Smyth, B.A.,B.E.,[6] who had been brought from Melbourne to be the Headmaster of Norwood School. He fitted Hartley's pattern of appointing senior headmasters as inspectors and was also a university graduate. His evidence as a headmaster to the 1881-1883 Inquiry had been particularly critical of the hurried nature of inspections and examinations and the lack of demonstration lessons and advice by the inspectors.[7]

Inspector Dewhirst, in his 76th year, wrote his last annual report in 1891[8], with a gentle rebuke from Hartley at its

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1906, p. 7.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 21, no. 228, Oct. 1905, p. 154.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 21, no. 219, Jan. 1905, p. 21.
4 Where no reference is cited the information came from S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/92, Register of Classified Officers, Education Department.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1885, p. xi.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1890, p. xiv.
7 See above, p. 85.
8 S.A.P. Paper, no. 43, 1891, p. 1.

shortness.[1] Another senior Headmaster, I. Plummer, a non-graduate, replaced him on 1 July 1891. In 1892, Inspector Stanton was promoted to the position of Assistant Inspector-General, but continued to inspect schools. Assistant Inspector Gamble helped with inspections from 1893 before resigning in 1897. W.L. Neale was appointed inspector from the ranks of the senior headmasters in 1894. He developed an interest in the "new education"[2] and reported in a way that lifted the sights of the teachers.[3] He used his annual report to advocate reform in Government and departmental policy.[4] After twenty years as an inspector, Whitham, on the grounds of ill-health, took leave to travel to England. He left a collection of lantern slides for use as teaching aids in the schools.[5]

Following the death of Hartley, the first woman inspector, Blanche McNamara, was appointed. She contributed a gentle pressure to the development of the role of the inspectors by inspecting gracefully and helpfully and carrying out her special duties of supervising the Training College, the Advanced School for Girls and twenty-five of the largest city and suburban schools until her death in 1900.[6]

Inspector C.B. Whillas, after 29 years as a head teacher and headmaster, replaced Inspector Gill who resigned in 1899 after a short term as inspector. A. Martin was appointed inspector on 1 January 1900, after 24 years as head teacher and headmaster. Mrs. Alice Hills, B.Sc., Inspector and Instructor in Domestic Economy advised for an equally short term in her special field. M.M. Maughan, who figured prominently in the

---

1 ibid., p. xiii.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1897, p. 16.
3 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/67/2, Inspector's Register, Norwood School, Inspection, 16-21 April 1901.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1897, p. 17.
5 Education Gazette, vol. 11, no. 108, Oct. 1895, p. 111.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1898, p. 19.

changes at the end of 1905, joined the inspectorate in 1901. W.J. McBride was the last to join the inspectorate in this period in mid-1905.

The quality and the supply of teachers was still a problem. By the end of the period the number of provisional teachers had doubled that in 1884. Though the number of pupil teachers had halved, the number of monitors had more than doubled. Many of these monitors had charge of classes of children in schools.[1] The bulk of the provisional teachers had a very meagre training period in a school, though the training and education of the pupil teachers had progressively improved. Nevertheless in 1905 pupil teachers and provisional teachers made up more than half the full-time teaching service, omitting monitors.[2] Even though the University Training College had its highest number, 67, of students in its first and second year courses, the number of trained teachers from that source would barely replace the losses, for instance of young and promising teachers to other states.[3] These students performed satisfactorily at the University examinations, but even so, 11 failed to pass a subject.[4] On the more positive side, the headmaster of the Pupil Teachers' School reported that the pupil teachers had a genuine interest in teaching.[5] In addition the Minister reported that one inspector and two teachers had graduated B.A. in 1904, while three teachers gained B.Sc. degrees.[6]

The period, 1884 to 1905, dealt with in this chapter was generally a time of economic depression, unemployment and economy in public service spending. The Governor in opening

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1906, p. 28.
2 ibid., p. 6.
3 ibid., p. 26.
4 loc cit.
5 ibid., p. 28.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1905, p. 7.

Parliament in 1885 spoke of a general depression,[1] and at the opening of Parliament in 1902 referred to a long and continued drought, a low wheat yield and low prices of metal which led to a deficit, public service retrenchments, reductions in salaries and compulsory retirement of those over seventy years of age.[2] Despite the financial stringency more land was opened to settlers necessitating more schools.[3] However, Government funds were needed for capital works, other than schools, such as water storage, railways, harbours, roads and telegraphic communication. Federation in 1901 did not assist the State's finances. However, the opening of the Adelaide to Melbourne rail in 1887 provided better travel and communication facilities for South Australians, including teachers and inspectors attending conferences and summer schools.[4]

There were frequent changes of Government and of Ministers of Education, who involved themselves more with departmental administration than they did before the 1881-1883 Inquiry.[5] Until the Labor Party was represented officially, members of the South Australian Parliament were mainly conservatives, liberals, or independents. Up to the 1890s the labour movement limited its political involvement to endorsing independent candidates who had already decided to stand for election. However, in 1891, three United Labor Party members were elected to the Legislative Council. They contributed in that year to the passing, with a majority of one, of the free education bill.[6] It was not until 26 July 1905 that South Australia had a Labor Government.

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Governor's Speech, 4 June 1885, col. 1.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Governor's Speech, 3 July 1902, p. 4.
3 See Table 3.1, p. 96 and Table 4.1, p. 151.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1902, p. 26.
5 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 12 June 1883, col. 121; 20 July 1898, p. 176; 28 Aug. 1901, p. 239; 7 Aug. 1902, p. 312 and 23 Aug., 1904, p. 310, provide examples of ministerial involvement.
6 P. Cook, "Education and the labour movements in South Australia, 1890 - 1910" in B. Condon (ed.), Selected Papers in the History of South Australian Education, vol. 4, Hartley C.A.E., 1981, pp. 5, 15.

Education bills, motions, requests for returns, petitions, debates on disallowance of Regulations, and questions gave Members of Parliament, city or country, supporters of secular or denominational education, voluntaryists or supporters of free education, the opportunity to air their views on the activities of the inspectors. These debates on education matters were always wide ranging whether on bible-reading, compulsory attendance or free education. An Education Bill on the recommendations from the 1881-1883 Inquiry dealing mainly with school fees, boards of advice, bible-reading, compulsory education, and bonuses to private schools coupled with their inspection and examination was introduced, debated and withdrawn[1] in the 1883 - 1884 Parliament. It was re-introduced on several occasions and withdrawn again in 1889.[2] A Bill for free education was introduced in several sessions of Parliament and finally received assent on 14 October 1891.[3] In 1903 Education Regulations on reduced salaries for teachers were disallowed and the Government agreed to prepare a new set.[4] Requests for returns, on such questions as: How many Inspectors were Headmasters and what was their length of service in schools?, provided material for subsequent debates.[5] A motion to charge fees for tuition above the compulsory standard was carried in 1893.[6] These are a few examples of educational matters raised in the Parliament in this period that gave opportunities to Members to debate the inspector's function.

Parliamentarians, representing the people as they did, showed great interest in the activities of the inspectors as they worked, after the 1881-1883 Inquiry, under successive administrations. Members of Parliament, too, were aware of the

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 15 Feb. 1884, col. 2009.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 3 Dec. 1889, col. 1795.
3 Act no. 507 of 1891. An Act to further amend the Education Act, 1875, assented to 14 Oct. 1891.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 8 Oct. 1903, p. 553.
5 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 6 July 1897, p. 129.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 15 Nov. 1893, col. 2807.

economic, social and political conditions under which the inspectors had to work and develop their role. They knew of the other enterprizes competing with education for public funds. They knew what the electors wanted from the inspectors. They read the inspectors' annual reports and learnt of their concerns. They learnt, too, what the teachers wanted of the inspectors from the S.A.P.S.T.U. and from The Education Gazette.

Pressures for the Development of the Role of the Inspectors from the Legislature and Superiors

The South Australian Parliaments, from the first debates on the recommendations resulting from the 1881-1883 Inquiry to the activities of the first Labor Government in 1905, dealt with legislation that had some impact on the role of the inspectors. With education bills being repeatedly introduced and rejected and Regulations frequently challenged, Members of Parliament had many opportunities to record their views on the role of the inspectors, for whom there was great respect in the Parliament throughout this period.[1] In addition to the changing parliaments, governments and ministers, the inspectors were subject to the influence of a variety of superior officers. Hartley, cleared and supported by the findings of the Royal Commission, joined by an Assistant Inspector-General in 1892, continued his vigorous and demanding administration until near his death by accident in 1896. The Board of Inspectors endeavoured to administer the system under principles laid down by Hartley until it was disbanded.[2]

The Bill to give effect to the recommendations of the 1881-1883 Inquiry did not become law in 1883, and consequently

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 20 Aug. 1884, col. 701; Council, 27 Nov. 1890, col. 2169; Assembly, 31 Aug. 1892, col. 765; Assembly, 28 Sept. 1898, p. 563; Assembly, 13 Nov. 1901, p. 756; and Assembly, 22 Nov. 1905, p. 531, provide examples spread over the period.

2 See above, p. 95.

the revision of the Regulations was postponed.[1] However, in 1884, the draft of a new programme of instruction for inclusion in new Regulations was sent to the teachers in the public schools and to the six inspectors for comment and criticism.[2] Despite the opportunity for inspectors and teachers to comment, once the Regulations were approved by Parliament they became the official Government policy for the Inspector-General to implement through the agency of the inspectors.

The Education Regulations, 1885,[3] constituted a major revision of the Regulations. The statement of the inspectors' duties[4] was little changed from the 1879 Regulations, but there were concessions to teachers to withdraw from the inspectors' examination all pupils not enrolled for at least three months and, in the case of pupils in the Junior Division, for at least six months.[5] Inspectors, too, had the power to withdraw other children, if they considered that there were good reasons for so doing.[6] A new scale was shown of maximum marks attainable by each child in the examination in reading, spelling, writing, arithmetic, geography, grammar, composition, history and needlework for Fourth and Fifth Classes, with fewer subjects in lower classes.[7] There were additional marks for poetry, special lessons, discipline and order and drill.[8]

Regulation VI, B, 182[9] indicated that schools would be classified according to the proficiency of the pupils based on percentage of marks in the annual examination, class A for 85 per cent and above down to class F below 60 per cent.

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1884, p. x.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1885, p. x.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1885, Education Regulations.
4 ibid., p. 1.
5 ibid., p. 7.
6 loc. cit.
7 ibid., p. 8.
8 loc. cit.
9 loc. cit.

The salary bonuses were paid on these classifications; teachers in class A schools received £24 bonus for males and £16 for females; teachers in class E schools received £16 (males) and 12 (females), while teachers in class F schools received no bonus. Provisional teachers received five shillings extra for every per cent above 60 per cent.[1]

These Regulations indicated that the amount of teachers' remuneration depending on results had decreased since the introduction of payment by results on the inspectors' examination in 1876, and by the time the 1892 Regulations[2] were promulgated there was no obvious payment by results. However, the schools continued to be classified on the basis of proficiency of scholars and classifications were published in The Education Gazette. This classification had a bearing on the promotion of teachers, their self-respect and prestige in their community. Indeed, in 1893, the inspectors' conference announced that when teaching or management appeared to be unsatisfactory as judged by the proficiency of pupils, salaries were to be reduced or no increase recommended.[3]

In the 1885 Regulations there was a much expanded statement of the course of instruction commencing with optional Bible reading half an hour before 9.30 a.m. For each subject there was a statement of general principles followed by the content for each class, up to Class 5.[4] For instance, the general principles for arithmetic were: children should handle objects, mental should precede written arithmetic, concrete things should come before abstract ideas, and applications should be suited to the pupils' daily life and experiences.[5]

---

1 ibid., p. 10.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 8, no. 63, Jan. 1892, pp. 1-18.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 9, no. 75, Jan. 1893, p. 18.
4 The 1885 Regulations added Class 5. Previously the classes had been from Junior to Class 4. See above, p. 65.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1885, p. 5.

When debating such matters as Regulations that reduced the salaries of teachers before those of civil servants,[1] and amending the Education Act, 1875, in 1891 to provide for free education to the compulsory stage,[2] some Members of Parliament showed concern about the role of the inspectors. They believed that it was necessary to have inspectors for supervision in the schools and to assist and guide the teachers in achieving the aims that Parliament and the Inspector-General had set for them.[3] The inspectors, too, should have been consulted about the move to consolidate Fifth Classes[4] from different schools as an economy measure during a depression unequalled in the Colony.[5] They also expressed the opinion that the inspectors were brought to the city too frequently by Hartley whereas their leadership was needed in the country.[6]

The importance that the Members of Parliament attached to the inspectorial function was borne out by the rapidity with which they noticed in 1891 that the inspectors' annual reports were not attached as appendices to the Minister's annual report.[7] These reports were the inspectors' only opportunity for publicly stating their opinions,[8] which the Members obviously wanted to read. Again in the 1892 session of Parliament, Members questioned why the inspectors' annual reports were not tabled.[9] The reason given was that the reports appeared in The Education Gazette which was available to Members of Parliament.[10] The many references to inspectors' annual reports in Parliament showed that Members considered this

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 11 Aug. 1886, col. 690.
2 Act no. 507 of 1891 to further amend the Education Act, 1875, assented to 14 October 1891.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 20 Aug. 1884, col. 701.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 25 Aug. 1886, col. 820.
5 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 2 Sept. 1885, col. 692, 693.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 25 June 1891, col. 202.
7 ibid., col. 190.
8 loc. cit.
9 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 31 Aug. 1892, col. 765.
10 loc. cit.

reporting function of the inspectors was an important part of their role. Moreover they considered that the issues raised by the inspectors should be incorporated in Education Department policy. At least by bringing the inspectors' views to the notice of Parliament and of the Minister of Education, Members created a pressure to develop the inspectors' role and enhanced the chances of inspectors influencing policy. They were also realists and knew that unless the inspectors got Hartley's backing their suggestions would not be implemented.

It was important, too, that these reports should not be tampered with; they should convey the inspectors' own unencumbered ideas to the public. Hartley generally published the inspectors' reports without alteration, and publicly criticized them severely when he disagreed with them.[1] However, Inspector Dewhirst did complain in a letter[2] to the Royal Commissioners in 1882 that a table showing hours spent on inspection, journeying and reports was struck out of his annual report. This appeared to be an isolated case of tampering with inspectors' reports as was the case of suppression of a report in Victoria.[3]

Until the appointment of Stanton as Assistant Inspector-General in 1892, Hartley was the only officer in the

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1879, pp. xv, xvi. In his annual report, Hartley criticized Inspector Dewhirst for advocating lower standards in arithmetic and declared that "...his opinions are not shared by his brother inspectors".

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, pp. 230, 231.

3 R.J.W. Selleck, "The Strange Case of Inspector Robertson" in E.L. French (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1964, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1965, p. 88. Frank Tate, when an inspector had at least one inspection report censored. See R.J. Selleck et al. "The Directors - F. Tate, W.T. McCoy and S.H. Smith", in C. Turney (ed.), Pioneers of Australian Education Volume 3, Studies of the Development of Education in Australia, 1900-50, Sydney, Sydney University Press, 1983, p. 16. This practice was prevalent in England under Robert Lowe, and resulted in a Select Committee of the House of Commons on Education (Inspectors' Reports) being set up and reporting on it in 1864.

Education Department superior to the inspectors. Prior to the 1881-1883 Inquiry when he was a major influence in developing a firm role for the inspectors of examining pupils, policing Regulations and reporting to the administration, he had severe critics.[1] After the "mutual explanations"[2] and the removal of much misunderstanding resulting from the Inquiry, and when the Parliament realized what progress had been made,[3] Hartley's critics were fewer, and praise was heaped upon him for his many practical educational advances.[4]

In 1885 he began The Education Gazette, chockfull of detailed information on Regulations, courses, time-table, organization, discipline, teaching methods, examination papers, notes on decisions of the inspectors' conferences and useful hints and answers to teachers' queries. Through its columns the studies of pupil teachers could be supervised, drawing could be taught, and the result examination could be prepared for, with the precise marking procedures explained even for special and moral lessons.[5] The Education Gazette in this period was a useful vehicle for inspectors' articles on such matters as truancy[6] and the writing of Class 1 on paper,[7] as well as the topics of their addresses[8] at meetings of Teachers' Associations.

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1881, pp. xvi, xvii, contains Hartley's own admission of the widespread criticism. The Royal Commissioners quoted it in their Final Report, S.A.P. Paper, no. 27A, 1883, pp. x, xi.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27A, 1883, p. xi.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 30 Oct. 1884, col. 1517.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 21 Sept. 1887, col. 857; 30 July 1890, col. 679; 15 Nov. 1893, col. 2804; and 9 Sept. 1896, p. 399, provide examples from Parliament.
5 Education Gazette, vol. 12, no. 112, Feb. 1896, is a good example.
6 Education Gazette, vol. 1, no. 5, Aug. 1885, p. 28.
7 Education Gazette, vol. 3, no. 22, June 1887, p. 36.
8 Education Gazette, vol. 1, no. 1, 2, Jan., March 1885, p. 8.

Hartley prepared the Adelaide Primers and Introductory Reader and introduced the phonic and whole word method of teaching reading.[1] The Children's Hour, a monthly paper, was produced under his editorship in the early 1890s. He produced a series of arithmetic books embodying his ideas that the subject should be taught with concrete, practical examples within the child's experience.[2] The publications and information were helpful to teachers of limited background and appreciated by them.[3] They would have been even more valuable to teachers, according to Inspector Stanton, if they had read The Education Gazette carefully,[4] and adopted the methods shown in Regulations.[5] These publications, too, assisted the inspectors in their duties. They were ready reference points for the inspectors in advising teachers, and they helped provide the inspectors with better informed and prepared teachers to inspect. Thus Hartley's educational innovations had an impact on the inspectors' role.

In contrast to his liberal contribution to educational content and methods in the post-Inquiry period, Hartley was as demanding, restrictive and rigid as before the Inquiry in controlling the part that the inspectors had to play in achieving efficiency of the system. He left no doubt about what part of the inspection process was important to his administration. The inspectors were instructed to begin the inspection visit that involved the annual examination so early in the year with the result that the earlier preliminary inspection, with potential for advice and assistance to teachers, was not held or was rushed.[6] Inspectors, too, were

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 3, no. 22, June 1887, pp. 35, 36.
2 ibid., p. 37.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 3, no. 26, Dec 1887, pp. 75, 76, provides examples.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1890, p. 6.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1886, p. 5.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 43, 1891, p. 2.

instructed to omit preliminary inspections if the distance and expense involved were too great,[1] but the inspection for results was not to be omitted.

Confidential letters from Hartley to the inspectors revealed his rigid control of their activities in many ways[2] - in strict observance of Regulations; in examination arrangements and procedures; in his inspecting the inspectors' checking of rolls, registers, and time-tables; in his criticism of inspectors dealing too kindly with teachers' defects; in his criticism of inspectors being too liberal with praise of teachers' performances; in his resentment of inspectors' criticisms and his vindictiveness; in his insistence that public duties of inspectors must take precedence over private responsibilities; in his insistence that the inspectors' annual reports were important, yet time out of schools was not allowed for writing them; in his insistence that he was primus inter pares, yet his mistrust of his inspectors. Hartley certainly brought pressure to bear on the way that the inspectors' role was to develop; never did he complain that inspectors were not pursuing an advisory role.

Hartley, too, clandestinely thrust an assessing role on the inspectors by means of one of his confidential circulars.[3] He sought confidential reports on the practical teaching of all assistants, pupil-teachers, and of head teachers of less than three years' service, whereas previously the only official assessments of system, school and teacher had been the "percentage" from the result examination of the inspectors. It was not until 1885 that it was made public that reporting on

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1886, p. 1.
2 B. Condon (ed.), op. cit., 1976. Letters 101, 104, 217, 317, 102, 104, 199, 264, 151 from 30 Jan. 1884 to 5 Feb. 1890 provide examples in the order listed.
3 B. Condon (ed.) op. cit., 1976, Letter 100, 29 Jan. 1884.

individual teachers was part of the inspection process, when Senior Inspector Dewhirst in his annual report said,

> The most important and certainly the most arduous duty in connection with this first inspection, is that of noting and reporting upon the teaching of assistants and pupil teachers; and when I mention that I have between 20 and 30 assistants and between 70 and 80 pupil teachers in the schools of my district, whose excellencies or defects, peculiarities, manner, method, discipline etc. have to be summarised, condensed and described it will be perceived and admitted that the task is one of no light order.[1]

Main and Topp, the Victorian Commissioners, who enquired into colonial education systems in Australia, reported that it was known that the inspectors made recommendations to Hartley, on the teachers best qualified to fill vacancies, even though the skill and industry of most teachers were personally known to him.[2] There was no suggestion of official personal reports.

Hartley's firm resolve to provide a uniform and efficient system of elementary education available to all of the children of the colony of South Australia locked the role of his chief agents in this quest, the inspectors, into inspecting and examining, much of which was routine rather than professional, supervision or policing rather than leadership, and time-consuming fault-finding rather than helpful advising. Inspector Hosking still found it necessary to record that the late scholars had been marked with black ink at Hindmarsh Model School on 26 June 1884[3], as did Inspector Whitham at the Girls' Department of Norwood School on 28 February 1888.[4]

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1886, p. 1.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 5, no. 43, Oct. 1889, p. 94.
3 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/34/2, vol. 1, Register of Inspectors' Examination, Hindmarsh School.
4 Inspector's Register held at Norwood School.

The inspectors had another superior officer in Stanton, Assistant Inspector-General, from 1892 until Hartley's death in 1896. He carried a considerable inspecting load and had little obvious impact on the inspectors' role from his position. He had not changed the stance that he held as an inspector. His annual reports as Assistant Inspector-General dwelt on faults that he detected.[1] He wanted to take a backward step and examine children in history, geography and grammar individually instead of collectively as had been sanctioned by Hartley and the inspectors' conference.[2] After twenty years of inspecting he saw solid and appreciable advance in education but did not expect the same rate of advance to be maintained in the next twenty years.[3] Stanton was certainly not a man of vision, but rather a devotee to routine procedures.

Parliament was particularly active in debating educational matters - "education mania"[4] one Member called it - and in considering the activities of the inspectors during the period after Hartley's death, when the Board of Inspectors was in control of education. The Parliament continued its concern in these matters when Stanton ceased to be Chairman of the Board of Inspectors and became Inspector-General. Members were asking questions about secondary education[5] and were looking with envy at the "Superior Public Schools"[6] in New South Wales. At the same time they complained that it was scarcely possible, in these difficult financial times, to move a motion, which added cost to education, without bringing a hornet's nest about their ears.[7] They showed great interest in the University's offer to train teachers at no cost to the Education Department[8] - an offer which led to the establishment of the University Training College.[9]

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1896, p. 11.
2 ibid., p. 12.
3 loc. cit.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 4 Aug. 1898, p. 249.
5 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 5 Aug. 1897, p. 357.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 13 Oct. 1897, p. 592.
7 ibid., p. 590.
8 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 17 Aug. 1897, p. 421.
9 See Table 3.1, p. 96.

Throughout the period there was general acclaim for the work of the district inspectors. They were estimable people and good at inspecting,[1] yet some Members wanted to save money by reducing their numbers when ostensibly their duties were lessened by headmasters doing their examining of pupils.[2] Although some Members wanted the Regulation providing for free education in Fifth Class disallowed,[3] they acknowledged that it was the strong advocacy of several inspectors in their annual reports[4] that had the Regulation prepared and tabled in the Parliament by the Minister.[5] Perhaps Members displayed great confidence in the district inspectors, or rather lack of confidence in Stanton and the Board of Inspectors. They wanted the district inspectors consulted on matters of administration.[6] One Member asked the Minister of Education "... if he was an abject slave of the board of advice or the Board of Inspectors".[7] A Member pointed out that the S.A.P.S.T.U. wanted the inspectors in conference to make recommendations on teachers' salaries and appointments, and asked the Minister to get a report direct from the district inspectors.[8] However the Minister showed loyalty to the inspectors' superiors, the members of the Board of Inspectors, from whom he would get a report.[9] The same Minister of Education showed his authority over the Board of Inspectors by instructing that schools with average attendance over 40 were to have a Fifth Class,[10] whereas previously the average attendance required had been over 100. A former Minister of Education told the House in 1901 that he had got another parliamentarian to help him frame Regulations.[11] In

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Council, 26 July 1898, p. 50.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 26 Aug. 1903, p. 313. Also see below pp. 114, 115.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Council, 26 July 1898, p. 50.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1898, p. 10.
5 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 20 July 1898, p. 176.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 13 July 1898, p. 119.
7 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 3 Aug. 1898, p. 239.
8 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 27 Sept. 1898, p. 540.
9 loc. cit.
10 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 20 July 1898, p. 176.
11 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 28 Aug. 1901, p. 239.

the time of Hartley it was generally acknowledged that he prepared the draft Regulations, that, among other things, provided the official version of the inspectors' role. This points to Stanton's less powerful influence compared with Hartley's.

The general tone in the education debates was one of sympathy for the Ministers in having such an inept Board of Inspectors,[1] and not being blessed in having the late lamented Mr. Hartley as head of the system.[2] The members of the Board were all appointed on the grounds of seniority, and had not the spark in them to kindle enthusiasm.[3] They advised the Minister wrongly on information that he gave to the House,[4] and they did not accept sound advice from district inspectors.[5] When Stanton was Inspector-General, the Minister of Education exerted influence on the inspectorate. In the time of economic crisis, the inspectors' allowances were reduced,[6] as was the size of the inspectorate through no replacements being made, even though Members of Parliament declared that the success of the system depended largely on the supervision by the inspectors.[7] When Price became Minister of Education he showed his authority by declaring to Parliament that during the parliamentary recess he would take responsibility for re-organizing the "head of the Department";[8] members would have the opportunity to criticize his actions in the next session.

Stanton and his two colleagues on the Board of Inspectors declared their firm resolve to carry on the work of the Department on the same lines as their late chief, Hartley, had

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 20 July 1898, p. 178.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 28 Sept. 1898, p. 563.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 1 Nov. 1899, p. 749.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 22 Sept. 1898, p. 538.
5 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 20 July 1898, p. 178; and 10 Oct. 1900, p. 640.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 7 Aug. 1902, p. 312.
7 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 23 Sept. 1903, p. 458.
8 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 5 Dec. 1905, p. 959.

done.[1] This they had done, unwisely keeping to the strict letter of Hartley's policy.[2] However the Regulations, gazetted in December 1900,[3] did embody substantial changes and were generally received well in Parliament, despite a motion to disallow them which was defeated.[4] One Member of Parliament, displaying great faith in the inspectors, asked for a special report from their next conference, because of their reported "mingled feelings"[5] on the Regulations. A former Minister of Education told of many people who considered that there was too much inspection in schools; it was too minute, too time-consuming and too expensive.[6] It would be better for the inspectors to examine schools rather than pupils, and to give aid to teachers on methods of teaching.[7]

The 1900 Education Regulations under the Education Acts, 1875, 1878 and 1891, provided for a Sixth Class[8] in primary schools. However, it was the changes in inspections that loomed as important. As an experiment, a change had been made by exempting certain schools of recognized excellence from the detailed inspectors' examination, similar to what had been done in England, New Zealand and Western Australia.[9] The Minister of Education had said that the new inspection process was the logical outcome of what had been called the "new education".[10] By his comments the Minister had in mind here some of the ideas of the 'naturalists' associated with the "new education".[11] He

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1897, p. 12.
2 T.H. Smeaton, op. cit., p. 95.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 16, no. 170, Dec. 1900, p. 139.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 13 Nov. 1901, p. 756.
5 loc. cit.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 28 Aug. 1901, p. 236.
7 loc. cit.
8 Education Gazette, vol. 16, no. 170, Dec. 1900, p. 149, Regulation VI B, pp. 132-134.
9 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1901, p. 14. See also Education Gazette, vol. 17, no. 175, May 1901, p. 75.
10 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 28 August 1901, p. 240.
11 A.G. Austin and R.J.W. Selleck, The Australian Government School 1830-1914: Select Documents with Commentary, Carlton, Pitman Pacific Books, 1975, p. 193.

claimed that each child is

> ... a living soul possessing innate powers of assimilating to itself under proper guidance all that is necessary for the building up of a perfect human form and character from objects, materials and facts, by which it is surrounded in this life and world.[1]

This was rather a different view from those of the time who associated the "new education" with practical work in the curriculum such as handwork, science, nature study, drawing and physical drill.[2] The object was to relieve the district inspectors of some of their routine examination work, so as to give them fuller time to confer with teachers and give help where it was needed when methods were wrong or the work was done inefficiently.[3] It was thought desirable to make the head teachers do some of the work that had hitherto been done by the inspectors. Head teachers were requested to examine and mark for promotion the children in all classes below the Fourth.[4] The Board admitted that opinions of the inspectorial staff were divided on the whole question.[5]

> We feel assured that schools which have reached the highest standard of efficiency - and such are the ones exempted - will not deteriorate simply because the inspectorial work does not happen to deal in detail with every child and every subject as before.[6]

Although these exemptions from examinations gave the inspectors more time for helping teachers and reduced their routine work, it took from their direct control the means which caused them to be held in awe and in terror by the teachers. Examining was their real power; where they had reigned supreme

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 28 Aug., p. 240.
2 A.G. Austin and R.J.W. Selleck, op. cit., p. 192.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1901, p. 14.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1902, p. 13.
5 loc. cit.
6 loc. cit.

they had to share their authority with the head teacher - a vastly different thing from sharing it with the Inspector-General. Here was a first attempt at the reduction in the authority, prestige and standing of the inspectors, whether the Board of Inspectors realized it or not. This step which made the inspection process more professional and less routine, and made with the best of motives, reduced the authority of the inspectors, as it freed the teachers from some of the past inspectorial process, that had done more to stamp out the individuality of the teachers than anything else,[1] and gave more responsibility to head teachers.[2]

Norwood School was an exempted school for the whole of the period from 1901 to 1904. At the annual inspection, 27-31 May 1901, neither did the summary sheet of examinations appear in the Inspector's Register as this was now the responsibility of the headmaster, nor were the class sheets of results initialled by the inspectors. In 1902 the inspectors did conduct the annual examination of Fourth and Fifth Classes, while the headmaster examined Classes One to Three. The tone of the incidental inspection report of 23 to 25 February 1903 reverted to that of earlier reports, pointing out trivial errors or omissions in records. This may have been because Senior Inspector Burgan was smarting from the dissolution of the Board of Inspectors or because the school had "exempt" status. It was evident in the reports that the inspectors were conscious of the school's exempt status, but there was no evidence that the inspectors used the time saved for helping or conferring with teachers.[3]

The amendments to the Education Regulations in February 1905[4] reverted to full examination by the inspectors. There

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1902, p. 23.
2 ibid., p. 25.
3 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/67/1, vol. 1, 2 and 3, 18/67/2 and 18/67/3, hold the Inspector's Registers for Norwood School from 1897 to 1906.
4 Education Gazette, vol. 21, no. 220, Feb. 1905, pp. 33, 34.

were to be no exempted schools.[1] At their annual visit, the inspectors had to examine the school, either by testing every child in every class in all subjects, or by taking sections only of each class in any or all subjects.[2] The inspectors had to hold an annual detailed inspection, coupled with examination, of all schools which had been established for not less than nine months.[3] The head teachers were instructed to promote children from class to class on full examinations given twice a year, but the promotions were subject to revision by the inspectors.[4] No percentage of passes for the school was to be calculated by the inspectors,[5] but nevertheless they had to keep a careful record of the detailed results of every subject in every class that they tested in order to classify the condition of the school from "Excellent" to "Poor".[6]

At Norwood School the annual examination of 12, 16, 20 June 1905, was conducted under the amended Regulations whereby no school was exempt, no percentage would be shown, but a qualitative assessment would be given. At this last examination for Alfred Williams as Headmaster, the school was duly classified as "Excellent", to which Inspector-General Stanton penned the note, "very satisfactory".[7] The tone of this report and that of the incidental inspection in March 1905 was brighter than that of reports when the school had exempt status - the inspectors' authority had been restored.

The Legislature, the Minister of Education and Stanton, in their participation in preparing and allowing the 1905

---

1 ibid., p. 41. For discussion of the reasons for this policy change, see below, pp. 118-120.
2 loc. cit.
3 ibid., p. 33.
4 loc. cit.
5 loc. cit.
6 ibid., p. 34.
7 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/67/1, vol. 1, 2 and 3; 18/67/2 and 18/67/3, hold the Inspector's Registers for Norwood School from 1897 to 1906.

Regulations to become law, withdrew much of the freedom and trust that they had given to the exempted schools, and the freedom from routine examining that they had given to the inspectors. The reasons for cancelling the exemption system are difficult to find. In fact extension of exemptions from the inspectors' examination would have been in keeping with trends elsewhere. Inspectors in England and Scotland no longer examined every child.[1] Knibbs and Turner, New South Wales Commissioners who had studied education systems abroad recommended that inspectors should be professional advisers and friends rather than examiners.[2] Peter Board, Head of the Education Department in New South Wales, advocated less examination and abandonment of the "marks system",[3] with inspectors focusing attention on every facet of school life rather than on results.[4] Frank Tate, who at this time had just completed his term as inspector in Victoria's mallee country bordering South Australia, would surely have been in favour of exemption from the inspectors' examination, as he felt that he had done positive harm by using the prescribed tests.[5]

Locally there were many reasons why the exemption system should have been further extended as it had been since 1901 by the inspectors in conference. The S.A.P.S.T.U. had not spoken against this system that permitted the teachers to take part in the process previously reserved for inspectors, but deplored the return to a disguised result system showing "...stubborn faithfulness to the methods of antiquity".[6] On the grounds of expediency alone with a depleted inspectorate, the exemption system should have been extended.[7] It had given a new impetus

---

1 D.S. Bowmer, op. cit., p. 235.
2 ibid., p. 231, 232.
3 ibid., p. 236.
4 loc. cit.
5 R.J.W. Selleck, "Frank Tate: A Victorian Australian" in History of Education, vol. 5, no. 1, 1976, p. 64.
6 Education Gazette, vol. 21, no. 226, Aug. 1905, p. 131.
7 ibid., p. 130.

to true education[1] and it had lifted the functions of the inspectors to a more helpful plane.[2] Moreover these things had been done without added cost.[3] It had been the death-knell of cram.[4] Moreover, it was the Assistant Inspector-General, the other officer superior to the inspectors at the time, who was making these claims, which surely added force to the argument to extend the exemption system, as Inspector Martin[5] wanted it, namely to all schools. At the 1904 Annual Conference of the S.A.P.S.T.U., both Dr. Smyth, Principal of Teachers' College in Victoria, and Inspector W.L. Neale, about to leave South Australia for Tasmania, stressed that trust and freedom must be central to the inspector-teacher relationship[6] - a concept that was debased in the 1905 Regulations approved a few months after these speeches.

Within the inspectors' reactions there were possible reasons for the abolition of the exemption system. Inspector Plummer completely opposed it;[7] it was cheap and saved the cost of one inspector[8] - surely a good reason for the administration retaining it. Inspector Smyth claimed that it was a mistake to leave a school on the exempt list for too long.[9] Inspector Maughan declared that it was open to grave objections.[10] However, these reactions were countered by the remarks of the generally older and senior inspectors, who would have been little worried about loss of power. Senior Inspector Burgan saw exemption as a vital change to inspector-teacher relations in

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1903, p. 14.
2 loc. cit.
3 loc. cit.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1904, p. 13.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1905, p. 23.
6 Education Gazette, vol. 20, no. 214, Aug. 1904, pp. 119, 120, 121.
7 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1902, p. 21.
8 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1905, p. 19.
9 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1903, p. 17.
10 ibid., p. 25.

the right direction,[1] and agreed with the Assistant Inspector-General's assessment of it.

Regulations are political as well as educational administrative fiats. Indeed in their drafting, Ministers and parliamentarians had a strong hand in this period.[2] The Minister of Education should have been very much aware of the criticism by influential Members of Parliament that the inspectors did not carry a full load of work, particularly in examining, as they had before the exemption scheme.[3] One cited that, even though Inspector Clark had returned to the teaching service, Inspector Maughan could still be released from inspecting to canvass teachers about the superannuation scheme.[4] It is possible that the exemption scheme may have been cancelled in order to give the inspectors an added load of work more obvious to Members of Parliament and others. The Minister of Education nominally responsible for the 1905 Regulations may have actually been the culprit more so than Stanton. If this supposition is correct, Stanton's interest in cancelling exemption would have been in saving an inspector from possible retrenchment.

It is convenient here to consider the influence of Boards of Advice on the role of the inspectors. They were not part of the legislature but were created by the Parliament in the 1875 Education Act.[5] Members were volunteer groups of citizens originally appointed by the Minister of Education, but after 1892 were partly elected,[6] to exercise general supervision of a group of schools. They could scarcely be called the inspectors'

---

1 ibid., p. 15.
2 See above, p. 112.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 28 Aug. 1901, p. 236, and 26 Aug. 1903, p. 313.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 5 Aug. 1903, p. 179.
5 See above, p. 56.
6 Education Gazette, vol. 8, no. 63, Jan. 1892, pp. 2, 3.

superiors, though inspectors had to inform them of the date of their annual examination visit.[1] The Boards of Advice reported to the Minister,[2] whereas the inspectors, who would have preferred the Boards in their district to report to them,[3] reported to the Inspector-General. Checking applications for free education was one duty of the Boards, as was assistance in the enforcement of the compulsory clauses in the Education Acts. According to the inspectors they performed this latter duty badly.[4] Although there were 100 Boards of Advice by 1905,[5] they had no great impact on education. Some members did attend the inspectors' annual examinations. Some gave evidence to the 1881-1883 Inquiry, and some Boards provided annual reports of their activities for appending to the Minister's annual report. Indeed, in 1883 one Member of Parliament said that they had improved from "almost a sham",[6] "... were popular and useful to the cause of education",[7] despite having no power without reference to the Minister of Education.[8] In 1901, another Member of Parliament declared them "miserable failures".[9] Still yet another stated that their efforts had been depreciated by the press and by the Government.[10]

It was when delegates from the various Boards of Advice met in conference that, among other motions, there were motions seeking to reduce the inspectors' authority. Teachers should be able to promote pupils from class to class; promotion should not be the sole province of the inspectors.[11] Monitors should be

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1885, Education Regulations, p. 2.
2 ibid., p. 1.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1881, p. 5.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1880, p. 3.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1906, p. 7.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 10 July 1883, col. 431.
7 ibid., col. 432.
8 ibid., col. 431, 432.
9 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 28 Aug. 1901, p. 236.
10 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 26 Aug. 1903, p. 312.
11 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1893. An attachment gave notice of motions for a conference of Boards of Advice on 14, 15 September 1892.

appointed by head teachers, rather than wait for approval at the inspector's next visit.[1] There should not be frequent changes in the inspectors' method of examining schools.[2] A motion to provide for inspection of private schools was amended to "That the department has no right to inspect or interfere with private schools", and was carried.[3] The fate of other motions showed the conservative nature of the Boards and the dominance of country members at the conference. A motion to increase the number of days of compulsory attendance at school from 35 to 45 was defeated.[4]

It was a pity that this negative relationship developed between the inspectors and the local citizens on Boards of Advice. Inspector W.L. Neale said in his 1902 annual report that the American inspector was expected to meet local education authorities and confer with them on the work of the schools, and then to meet the parents to discuss educational principles, methods and ideals.[5] In the case of the South Australian inspectors, they rarely met members of Boards of Advice, except to consider complaints about teachers, and at no time did they discuss educational matters with them.[6] There is little doubt that the administration and the inspectorate missed a great opportunity to develop a public opinion on education. Consultation with the prominent citizens on Boards of Advice, who were privy to the inspectors' annual reports and had access to the Minister of Education, could have been an addition to the role of the inspectors that had the potential to promote the cause of education and in the process enhance the image of the inspectors in the community.

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 8, no. 72, Oct. 1892, p. 128.
2 ibid., p. 127.
3 loc. cit.
4 loc. cit.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1903, p. 18.
6 ibid., pp. 18, 19.

Pressures for Development of the Role of the Inspectors from the Inspectors Themselves

The inspectors were somewhat more active in influencing their role in this period. They used Teachers' Associations for advisory work, they used their annual reports to advocate change, they did some specializing and undertook administrative tasks.

Clark, when appointed inspector after the 1881-1883 Inquiry, immediately began to make his own unique contribution to the development of the role of the inspectors. He combined his skill as a teacher and his talents in music to become something of a specialist inspector in giving demonstration music lessons not only in schools, but also at Teachers' Association meetings and Saturday conferences.[1] This appeared to be the first specialization in the inspectors' role since Burgan had been specialist organizing inspector from 1876 to 1878.[2]

It was Clark, too, who, in his first year of inspecting, felt obliged to explain why the results in his district were higher than those achieved either there or elsewhere in former years.[3] The reasons that he gave were: the longer time he spent in schools in preliminary inspections giving "illustrative lessons"; he felt sure that the formation of Teachers' Associations had helped; and he admitted that:

> ...having had so frequently to go through the ordeal of an inspection myself my sympathies may have leaned somewhat to the side of the scholars and teachers, and as many of the public teachers know my methods of working, they may to some extent have been able to anticipate the style of examination.[4]

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 8, no. 65, March 1892, p. 51. At a Teachers' Association meeting, Clark actually examined three teachers for their certificates in music.
2 See above, pp. 77-79.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1885, p. 23.
4 loc. cit.

In these statements the new inspector had disagreed with some of the opinions that some of the older inspectors held so firmly about aspects of their role - that the manner and sympathy of the inspector did not influence results;[1] that the annual examination was not an ordeal but enjoyed;[2] that they had too little time to make the preliminary inspection an advisory visit.[3]

In their annual reports the inspectors sometimes exerted pressure to change their role or to leave it unchanged. Inspector Dewhirst commented on the impact on their role of the 1885 Regulations that the legislature and their superiors had given them to administer and check in the schools. He considered them harder for the scholars, still harder for the teachers and hardest of all for the inspectors.[4] He deplored, "a common, a bitter and almost despairing cry"[5] from the teachers that their work was never finished. The cause, he said, was the greater breadth and minuteness of instruction demanded under the new Regulations. This concern for the welfare of teachers disclosed that an element of pastoral care had developed in his role. On the other hand Inspector Clark reported that results in his district were the same in 1886 as in 1884.[6] These superior results in his district compared with those in other inspectors' districts were attributed by the President of the South Australian Teachers' Association to his better communication with his teachers.[7]

Under Hartley the contributions of these men to the development of their role was not great, except in dedicated application to routine examination of pupils and minute

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27A, 1883, Appendix to Minutes of Evidence, Miscellaneous, pp. 109, 110.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1880, p. 7.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1886, p. 1.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1885, p. 4.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1887, p. 3.
6 ibid., p. 24.
7 Education Gazette, vol. 2, no. 13, June 1886, p. 40.

inspection of schools and teachers' work. Hartley in the post-Inquiry period still kept a tight rein on the inspectors' activities.[1] Nevertheless there were some developments in their role which could be attributed to the inspectors themselves. They used Teachers' Association meetings to advance their advisory role and relations with teachers. The lively personalities among the inspectors used the meetings to demonstrate, advise and lift the sights of teachers,[2] while the more pedestrian inspectors were content to brief teachers on Regulations, examination and inspection procedures, and elaborate on the decisions of the latest inspectors' conference[3] - all matters that the country teacher particularly seemed to appreciate and enjoy.

The inspectors used their annual reports to advocate changes and innovation in education. As a Member of Parliament informed the House of Assembly, the annual report was the only chance that the inspectors had to express opinions to the public.[4] If their suggestions could be aired in Parliament there was a chance that the inspectors could influence government policy.[5] Inspector Whitham advocated teaching agriculture in the upper classes of all country schools.[6] He was rewarded belatedly when the Minister and Hartley arranged for school grounds to be extended to provide for agricultural plots.[7] Inspector Dewhirst advocated an Advanced School for Boys[8] and did see a Fifth Class added to primary schools in 1885. Inspector Burgan advocated Teachers' Associations for country teachers in his annual reports of 1879 and 1883 and saw

---

1 See above, pp. 108, 109.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 6, no. 47, April 1890, pp. 36, 37; vol. 8, no. 65, March 1892, p. 51; and vol. 11, no. 101, March 1895, p. 40, provide examples.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 7, no. 60, Sept. 1891, p. 100; vol. 8, no. 64, Feb. 1892, p. 34; and vol. 12, no. 115, May 1896, p. 65, provide examples.
4 See above, pp. 105, 106.
5 loc. cit.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1884, p. 18.
7 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 9 Sept. 1896, p. 401.
8 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1884, p. 4.

them flourish with the Minister's and Hartley's blessing.[1] Inspector Neale in advocating free books and materials for schools and noting the ill effects of fees for some pupils in Fifth Class, in his annual report for 1896 started with a disclaimer that he as a public servant had not the right to discuss or question government policy.[2] Nevertheless he was rewarded by seeing the Regulation abolishing Fifth Class fees withstand a challenge in Parliament.[3]

The inspectors, under Stanton as Chairman of the Board of Inspectors and as Inspector-General, gave the impression that they exercised greater freedom to bring about changes in their role, than under Hartley. They were more willing to depart from "the fixed line"[4] under Stanton than under Hartley. Stanton was a less powerful leader and the inspectors were less restrained with their criticisms and in airing views opposed to Stanton's,[5] a liberty rarely taken under Hartley for fear of reprisals.[6] Hartley, however, did adopt some of the inspectors' suggestions,[7] while Stanton rarely took up their suggestions for developing their role or improving the education system. For

---

1 See above, p. 78.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1897, p. 17.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 26 Oct. 1898, p. 533.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, q. 4741, p. 83. Inspector Dewhirst was not prepared to depart from Hartley's instructions. S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, q. 849, p. 40. Inspector Whitham explained that it was not in his power to make alterations in examining and inspecting.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1901, p. 20. Inspector Neale complained that there had been no material alteration of programme and no new tasks set for five or six years, suggesting a taste of "staleness". An impulse to the study of method and to enthusiastic experiment was needed.
S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1902, p. 21. Inspector Plummer opposed the official scheme of exemption from the inspectors' examination.
S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1903, pp. 17, 25. Inspectors Smyth and Maughan opposed Departmental policy.
6 B. Condon (ed.), op.cit., 1976. See letters 102, 8 Feb. 1884 and 104, 25 Feb. 1884.
7 See above, p. 125.

instance, Inspector Neale suggested that the promotion of teachers by seniority was not in the best interest of the system, and the "splendid exotic"[1] discovered at inspection deserved consideration for promotion. There is no evidence that the Board of Inspectors or Stanton accepted the challenge. Again, Inspector Neale inspired his teachers with a highly successful schools' exhibition, which not only provided funds for decorations and amenities for the schools in his district, but also introduced the "school journey" or excursion as an educational experience for children from small schools making the journey to Mt. Gambier. This innovation by the inspector was virtually abolished when the Board of Inspectors insisted that it should be held triennially instead of annually as Neale had wanted.[2] There appeared to have been little encouragement for the inspectors to develop a role as innovators. So here were frustrated pressures by the inspectors to develop their role in the face of constraints by the administration to maintain the status quo.

Inspector Neale also put forward the proposition that the inspectors did their best work as "managing teachers",[3] and consequently more time was needed for the "casual inspection",[4] despite the examination still being a necessity.[5] Neale did not see the inspectors as the all-knowing authorities but as the cross- fertilizers, the pollinators of teachers with ideas from other teachers whom the inspectors recognized as skilled in their profession. He saw the need for the inspectors to encourage teachers to experiment and to innovate. to him, the inspector should be an agent for change not just a conservator of the status quo.

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1898, p. 15.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1901, p. 20.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1897, p. 16.
4 loc. cit.
5 loc. cit.

The inspectors themselves did develop a more definite advisory role at incidental inspections when time permitted, and did some specializing according to the talents and personality of individual inspectors. Inspector Clark of his own volition extended his specialist advisory work in music beyond his own district. Inspector Blanche McNamara continued her advisory function, not with the subject of needlework, but with the methods of teaching it.[1] Mrs Hills, a specialist in Domestic Economy, was critical of girls having to follow the same general course as boys and in addition having to devote five hours to needlework and domestic economy.[2]

The inspection reports at Norwood School did not indicate greatly the improved advisory function. Although Inspector Clark assisted with the annual examination of 7 to 11 June 1897,[3] along with five other inspectors, there was no mention of his advising on music as he obviously did when assisting in country districts. Blanche McNamara's report[4] on the Norwood Girls' Department after the inspection from 26 to 28 January 1898, followed the general line. She did offer special advice on the teaching of needlework. She did not pretend to be all-knowing in her three short days of visits. Programmes, she said, were well drawn and followed "...as far as tested". She did not name a teacher, as did Whitham,[5] for an indiscretion in connection with records; she merely wrote "...with one exception". There was still a definite element of policing Regulations in connection with records, signing time books, and the like just as severe as in Hartley's day. Instructions were firmly given, and advice tended to be on trivial matters. And this was at a school getting percentages over 90 in annual

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1898, p. 20.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1902, p. 27.
3 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/67/2, vol. 2, Inspector's Register, Norwood School.
4 Inspector's Register held at Norwood School.
5 Inspector's Register held at Norwood School, Visit, 18 March 1897.

examinations. It was left to Inspector W.L. Neale at inspection from 16 to 21 April 1901, to provide a report devoid of carping criticisms of trivial defects, and giving a lift to the staff in a school "...of much diversity and many interests blended into a unity by one strong guiding personality.[1]

Another matter that was evident in the inspection reports at Norwood School in this period was that the personality of the inspector was a determinant in the nature of the report. Under Hartley the stamp of his genius was imprinted in all inspectors' reports, and individual personalities did not come through so clearly. However, under Stanton, there was a wealth of difference between Neale's reports and Whitham's reports. Neale's were from an effervescent personality and showed genuine interest in children's progress. Whitham's were fault-finding, concentrating on trivial defects, mercilessly naming teachers, from a personality that seemed more concerned with the system than with teachers and children. Inspector Clark's personality shone through his annual reports[2] (though not at Norwood School). These reports bore testimony to the evidence of the National Union of Teachers to the Bryce Commission in England in 1894. The union contended that the chief factor in any inspection was the personality of the inspectors. They should not only be just, cautious and accurate in habit of mind, but also be sympathetic, genial, courteous, and lovers of children.[3] Some of South Australia's inspectors, too, were taking notice of the health of children, reporting on it, and seeking conditions to alleviate problems.[4]

What the entries in the Inspector's Register did bring out was that the inspectors had generated tasks other than

---

1 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/67/2, vol. 2, Inspector's Register, Norwood School.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1885, p. 23.
3 E.L. Edmonds, The School Inspector, the International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962, pp. 120, 121.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1898, pp. 18, 19.

inspecting and examining. For instance, they inquired into complaints made by parents;[1] they had to make special visits to assess suitability of pupil teachers;[2] and they had to make hard decisions on parents' requests to keep children in Class V on the grounds that they could not afford to have them promoted to Class VI.[3] These tasks undertaken by the inspectors were of an administrative kind, some delegated to them by the Board of Inspectors or Inspector-General Stanton, others taken on of the inspectors' own volition.

During the time that Stanton was head of the Department, the inspectors continued to make up for skimpy incidental inspections by meeting their teachers on Saturdays.[4] They also continued to use Teachers' Association meetings to exercise their advisory role. However, they ceased to be Presidents of Teachers' Associations, perhaps by design, attended less frequently and gave fewer addresses. The Associations were affiliated with the S.A.P.S.T.U. and delegates' reports as well as addresses by the President or officers of the Union visiting the Association figured prominently in minutes of meetings.[5] The Union officers may not have usurped the usual advisory function of the inspectors at these meetings, but they certainly shared it with them.

The inspectors improved their relations with teachers by their self-imposed activities in Teachers' Associations. They

---

1 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/67/2, vol. 2, Visit, 4 August 1898, Inspector's Register, Norwood School.
2 ibid., visit, 30 April 1903.
3 ibid., Senior Inspector Burgan gave decisions on two letters from parents. One was dated 20 June 1905.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1904, pp. 22, 23.
5 Education Gazette, vol. 17, no. 185, March 1902, p. 55. At a meeting of the Hills Teachers' Association, A. Williams and A.H. Neale from the Union gave their impressions of the Victorian summer school.
Education Gazette, vol. 20, no. 211, May 1904, p. 72. Several meetings of Teachers' Associations were reported. No inspectors attended but Union delegates addressed the meetings.

also varied their roles in their association with the Public Schools' Floral and Industrial Society and the Public Schools' Decoration Society. These bodies provided opportunities for inspectors to specialize in organizing exhibitions, in providing expertise in music and art and in other ways to display a leadership role, besides enjoying camaraderie with teachers away from inspections and examinations.[1] Association with these societies led Inspector Clark into editing a book of school songs,[2] contributing articles to The Education Gazette,[3] and providing musical scores for The Children's Hour[4]. A positive relationship by the inspectors with Boards of Advice could have produced similar benefits to the role of the inspectors, at a time when some inspectors realized that their public relations role had been found wanting.[5] They had to do more to make the people realize that the schools were theirs,[6] and what better means to do this than the only symbol of local control, the Boards of Advice.

The inspectors, under Stanton, began raising issues about the inspectors' role that were being discussed overseas and so brought pressure to bear on the development of their own role. Hartley fed into the education system so much information, material and ideas, that overseas movements in education and those in other Australian colonies seemed not to be considered greatly by the inspectors nor to have impact on the inspectors' role, unless, of course, they came through Hartley. However, the situation was different under Stanton when the input of ideas from the head of the Department was minimal. There was world-wide discussion of inspections, examinations and the

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 8, no. 68, June 1892, p. 88, and no. 73, Nov. 1892, p. 147, show the composition and functions of these societies.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 8, no. 65, March 1892, p. 49.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 8, no. 68, June 1892, p. 87.
4 Education Gazette, vol. 12, no. 115, May 1896, p. 62.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1905, p. 15.
6 loc. cit.

inspectors' part in them. In England the comparative usefulness of inspections and examinations was being questioned, as, too, were assumptions about inspectors: whether there was one "right way" for successful schooling, and whether the inspectors knew it.[1] The Bryce Commission also reported that some modes of inspection were "official and administrative rather than educational".[2] In Scotland, the move was away from individual examination leading to changed duties for the inspectors, namely, more visits without notice and more opportunity for friendly conference and advice.[3] In South Australia the same issues were being raised and considered among the inspectorate.[4]

Although Stanton did not engage his inspectors in discussion of these movements and made only tentative attempts to introduce reform and then cancelled it, the inspectors were raising the issues from overseas and interstate in their annual reports. Inspector Whillas quoted from the revised instructions applicable to the Code of 1901 published by the London School Board of Education. The London inspectors would no longer hold examinations of individual scholars, but would judge the success of instruction by noting the conduct of children during ordinary lessons.[5] Inspector Neale, in his annual reports of 1902 and 1903, had compared the work in South Australian schools with the ideals of the "new education". He urged consideration of its fundamental principles, changed attitudes of inspectors and teachers, and development of a sound public opinion towards it.[6]

Moreover the inspectors heard or read reports of the addresses of interstate or New Zealand educators brought to South Australia by the S.A.P.S.T.U. Indeed some inspectors

---

1 E.L. Edmonds, op. cit., p. 134.
2 ibid., p. 136.
3 T.R. Bone, op. cit., pp. 119, 121.
4 Education Gazette, vol. 20, no. 214, Aug. 1904, p.111, and vol. 20, no. 216, Oct. 1904, p. 147.
5 S.A. Paper, no. 44, 1902, p.23.
6 S.A. Paper, no. 44, 1903, p.19 and 1904, p.18.

attended, as did some Union representatives, the Victorian summer schools for teachers and recommended their adoption in South Australia. Inspector Plummer could not help but contrast what the summer schools did for Victorian teachers, all certificated, and the short shrift that South Australia's 400 teachers in provisional schools got by an inspector visiting them for two days a year.[1] Other inspectors advocated summer schools and local conferences at which methodology, psychology, music, gymnastics, nature study and the like would be subjects of lectures and discussions.[2] They were the most effective and economical way for the inspectors to present the high ideal.[3] Their hopes were not realized under the existing regime, although Inspector Martin did get Stanton in his last year of office to approve of provisional teachers attending schools in large centres on Fridays to see up-to-date teaching methods.[4]

Inspector Neale was the first to suggest a variation in the inspectors' role to meet different circumstances. He claimed that, in sparsely populated South Australia, the very teaching ability, training or lack of it, and the character of the teachers as well as the conditions under which they worked determined the role that the inspectors used with them.[5] To the capable and enthusiastic but isolated teacher, the inspectors should carry the plans, methods and successes of other superior teachers to prevent narrowness and to give an impulse to experiment. This was the cross-fertilizer or pollination role of the inspectors. The young provisional teachers, untrained and inexperienced required sympathetic guidance and assistance in the elements of their profession. This pointed to the basic elements of the inspectors' advisory and pastoral care roles.

---

1 S.A. Paper, no. 44, 1902, p.21.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1905, p. 25; S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1900, p. 16.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1904, p. 19.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1906, p. 18.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1897, p. 16.

The dilatory teacher had to be stimulated and encouraged by the inspectors' examination and close inspection. Hartley did not allow for such diverse roles of the inspectors for different teachers. He contended that he had to legislate in the Regulations governing inspections and examinations for the "average"[1] teacher, who was usually limited in ability, knowledge, skill and energy. This was consistent with his drive for uniformity in examinations and inspections as well as in the treatment of teachers. Neale's pressure for change, however, was at least something for the inspectors to ponder in their varied relationships with teachers.

Despite all this evidence of thinking about their role in providing better education for South Australian children, the sincerity of the inspectors must be doubted in pressing for development of their role. A committee of South Australian inspectors was set up to review the report of the New South Wales Commissioners, Knibbs and Turner, on education in Europe and America and to produce a new curriculum for South Australian schools.[2] This, too, at a time when New Zealand had just produced a new programme of instruction, as had New South Wales, and Victoria had just produced a new curriculum and scheme of inspection.[3] Yet the inspectors could not find the time to prepare the curriculum and carry out their inspectorial duties.[4] Surely their priorities for education in South Australia were astray. At least the inspectors on this committee preferred their routine duties in schools to the creative work involved in developing a new curriculum at a time when the use of headmasters to undertake inspection duties was prevalent.

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 15 Nov. 1893, col. 2806.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1905, p. 19.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1904, p. 14.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1905, p. 19.

Pressures for Development of the Role of the Inspectors from Teachers

The avenues available to teachers to influence the role of the inspectors were the press, the Parliament, Teachers' Associations and the S.A.P.S.T.U. In this period from 1884 to 1905, the last two named seemed to be the most used. Some members of Teachers' Associations,[1] and, indeed, some Members of Parliament, in these difficult financial times, claimed that there was too much inspection and too many inspectors. The money spent on them would be better spent on other ways of making the service more efficient. Others from Teachers' Associations and the S.A.P.S.T.U., supported by Members of Parliament, wanted the district inspectors involved more in the administrative decisions of the Department.[2]

There, too, was a greater tendency since the 1881-1883 Inquiry for the administration to consult teachers and to place them on committees with inspectors where they were in a position to influence inspectors. In 1884, Hartley (or the Minister) sent the draft of the new Course of Instruction to teachers and inspectors for criticism before it was included in Regulations.[3] In 1902, the Minister appointed a committee, which included inspectors' and teachers' representatives, to reclassify the schools.[4] In 1903 he planned another such committee to consider teachers' salaries.[5]

Teachers' Associations used the inspectors and were used by the inspectors. Hartley published an article on Teachers' Associations in The Education Gazette, explaining what they should do and what they should not do. They should have no

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 23 Sept. 1903, pp. 450, 458.
2 See above, p. 112.
3 loc. cit.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 5 Aug. 1903, p. 178.
5 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 8 Oct. 1903, p. 553.

political object nor air petty grievances.[1] Without mentioning inspectors, he suggested that the teachers should use for talks those people "... engaged in the same great work".[2] The Teachers' Associations provided a springboard for teachers' criticisms of the inspectorate, particularly by the city association, the South Australian Teachers' Association,[3] but occasionally from a country association,[4] for the teachers, as members of an association, were not constrained as they would have been in the schools. W.J. Young, in his presidential address to a meeting of the South Australian Teachers' Association, hinted that some inspectors enjoyed their restrictions - their boast was that they desired to be a perfect machine to gauge exactly the work of each teacher by "one uniform, unerring, cast iron standard".[5] Young said that some teachers thought so little of what the inspectors did in their advisory role, that, if teachers examined and promoted their own pupils, it would render the office of inspector of schools no longer required. He disagreed, but wanted inspectors to assist teachers, to make their teaching more effective, and to gauge the efficiency of the schools by what they observed at the time rather than by any hard and fast line of examination.[6] At the same time he hinted that the quality of the inspectorate had to be improved.[7]

The Teachers' Associations also provided a setting away from the inspection and examination climate, in which cordial relations could be developed between teachers and inspectors. They also gave inspectors opportunities to adopt an advisory role and a leadership role, and to boost teacher morale. Inspectors had been aware of the necessity for as much time as

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 1, no. 4, June 1885, pp. 20, 21.
2 ibid., p. 21.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 5, no. 39, May 1889, p. 41.
4 Education Gazette, vol. 8, no. 69, July 1892, p. 100.
5 Education Gazette, vol. 5, no. 39, May 1889, p. 41.
6 loc. cit.
7 loc. cit.

possible for conferring with teachers particularly in times of change of courses, standards and examination procedures.[1] They were aware, too, of teachers' desire to have that contact, but there was litte evidence that they did it at inspections. Nowhere in the inspectors' reports at Hindmarsh School and Norwood School during this period was there evidence of inspectors' helpful discussions with teachers or of staff meetings.

Whatever the reasons for the relative neglect at inspections of the inspectors' advisory function - lack of funds, too few inspectors, too little time, or the great importance that the administration (and inspectors) placed on the annual examination and policing of records - teachers invitations to inspectors to speak at Teachers' Association meetings did provide opportunities for inspectors to exercise their advisory role, a special part of their duties,[2] even "the heart of the matter".[3] What is more, some of the addresses were published as articles[4] in The Education Gazette, thus adding a further development to the inspectors' role. The teachers through their Associations had provided incentives for the inspectors to develop their role, which some inspectors accepted fully and showed up as leaders.[5] So, although the pressure for development of the inspectors' role came from teachers through their associations, the administration and the inspectors themselves also had a hand in this development.

Valuable as these gatherings were for teachers and inspectors, they were held infrequently and attended voluntarily in relatively small numbers by teachers, some of whom had

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1885, p. 23.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 43, 1891, p. 2.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1900, p. 19.
4 See above, p. 107.
5 Education Gazette, vol. 8, no. 68, June 1892, p. 86. A motion was passed thanking Inspector Clark for his untiring efforts and interest in the Maitland Teachers' Association.

started them in the country in 1885 to discuss the new Course of Instruction.[1] One inspector held a discussion at one meeting on why Teachers' Association meetings were not a greater success.[2] When all was said and done, The Education Gazette could communicate to teachers all that the inspectors could do at meetings on such matters as the inspectors' conference, Regulations and annual examinations. Indeed the articles in The Education Gazette from world authorities would probably be more enlightening than local inspectors' addresses, and, in any case, inspectors' annual reports were included in The Education Gazette so that their criticisms (not their helpful advice) were brought more immediately under the notice of teachers.[3] Moreover teachers could ask questions and make suggestions through its open column and teachers' column just as easily as at an association meeting. In fact, an article on how to pass a good examination was published at the request of a Teachers' Association.[4]

Nevertheless, despite shortcomings, the Teachers' Association meetings provided opportunities for inspectors to meet, confer with and advise teachers in an environment different from the normal inspecting and examining setting, albeit an environment with a semi-official atmosphere.[5] The opportunity was there for inspectors to enhance their standing in the eyes of the teachers, whose attendance at the meetings

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 1, no. 4, June 1885, p. 20.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 11, no. 101, March 1895, p. 39.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 8, no. 70, Aug. 1892, p. 103.
4 Education Gazette, vol. 11, no. 110, Dec. 1895, pp. 133, 134.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1886, pp. xi, xiv. The Teachers' Associations got Hartley's and the Minister's blessing in their 1885 annual reports and were treated as though they belonged to the Education Department. They held meetings in schools, out of school hours, and minutes of their meetings were published in The Education Gazette. Teachers' Associations existed in England in 1853 and appeared to be treated in much the same way, being encouraged by the authorities to accept grants-in-aid to establish teachers' libraries. See E.L. Edmonds, op. cit., p. 41.

indicated that they were crying out for help from the inspectors, and wanted encouragement and recognition.

The S.A.P.S.T.U. had initially been well disposed to the Education Department and to the inspectorate and there had been much cooperation; its executive meetings and annual conferences, usually planned to get community support for education, were always fully reported in The Education Gazette. Moreover at the annual conferences, the Minister of Education, the Inspector-General and usually one or more of the inspectors were invited to speak at the gathering attended by such dignitaries as the Governor, the Premier, Federal Ministers and Professors of the University. Moreover the Union did a service to South Australian education by inviting such people as Frank Tate, Director of Education in Victoria, to address public meetings.[1] These visiting speakers were able to provide teachers, inspectors and the South Australian community with a different view of the role of the inspectors and their importance to the education system, and so raise the sights of the inspectorate and the teachers' expectations of the inspectorate. Moreover Union officials, usually senior headmasters, showed their professional approach at meetings of affiliated Teachers' Associations by addressing teachers on such matters as the Victorian summer schools[2] and the teaching of poetry.[3] Such matters had previously been largely the province of the inspectors. In addition, when teachers wanted advice and help they tended to approach the Union and not the inspectors.[4]

The S.A.P.S.T.U. enjoyed a good relationship with the inspectorate, even though the President said of a former president, when he was appointed inspector of schools, that he "... had gone over to the enemy".[5] The executive of the Union,

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 20, no. 214, Aug. 1904, p. 121.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 18, no. 185, March 1902, p. 55.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 20, no. 215, Sept. 1904, p. 140.
4 Education Gazette, vol. 20, no. 216, Oct. 1904, p. 148.
5 Education Gazette, vol. 16, no. 169, Nov. 1900, p. 123.

besides deputations to the Minister and to the Inspector-General, arranged to meet the inspectors in conference and reported in The Education Gazette on one occasion that the inspectors were in sympathy with the Union with respect to certain parts of the curriculum.[1] The important part that the inspectors and, of course, the Union played in education was available for all teachers to read. The inspectors, too, in the affiliated Teachers' Associations were explaining and interpreting ministerial and departmental actions to teachers.

In his presidential address at the 1904 conference of the S.A.P.S.T.U., Alfred Williams, who was also Headmaster of Norwood School, congratulated the Department on the exemption scheme that released some of the schools from the tyranny of the inspectors' examination.[2] He expressed the hope that the old system of individual examination by the inspectors would soon be entirely replaced by a system more rational, more stimulating and inspiring to inspectors, teachers and pupils.[3] However, Williams, President again in 1905, deplored the cancellation of the exemption scheme and the return to the past, making inspectors examining machines, bound hand and foot by the system, instead of being free as educational experts to shape the ideals and methods of the young teacher.[4] Williams had quoted Thomas Price, Premier and Minister of Education, in his address[5], and no doubt Price had in mind Williams's assessment of the effect of the cancellation of the exemption scheme on the inspectors' role and on the education system when he dramatically removed Stanton from the position of Inspector-General, demoted Whitham and Burgan, promoted the relatively junior Inspector Maughan to the position of Chief Inspector, and promoted Williams from Headmaster to Director of Education.[6]

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 20, no. 209, March 1904, p. 53.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 20, no. 214, Aug. 1904, p. 111.
3 loc. cit.
4 Education Gazette, vol. 21, no. 226, Aug. 1905, pp. 130, 131.
5 ibid., p. 129.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Council, 5 July 1906, p. 5.

The Union's reaction to Stanton's backward step in the development of the inspectors' role brought about a reorganization of the inspectorate and indeed new roles for the inspectors under a changed administration.

Conclusion

The changes desired in the inspectors' role, in the period 1884 to 1905 depended on the source of the pressure. Changes sought were for more searching examination of pupils or for less examining; for the inspectors to be leaders in their districts and not just tools of the central administration; for closer looking into records and detection of errors or for less fault-finding and more help and advice for teachers; for conferences and summer schools to develop teachers or for cutting the cost of the whole inspectorial function; for more notice to be taken of the suggestions of inspectors in their annual reports in generating policy or that inspectors should keep to their prescribed tasks of examining and inspecting; for more time, less rush, and more freedom so that inspectors could inspire teachers to better achievements, provide more pastoral care for them, and develop a more sympathetic relationship with them.

For the whole period, 1884 to 1905, the Parliament was generally well disposed towards the inspectors, except for the expenditure that they caused. The Parliament was interested in the inspectors' reporting role, appreciated their advocacy of ideas in their annual reports and wanted their suggestions incorporated in departmental policy. The Members of Parliament wanted a greater share in administrative decisions for the inspectors and their conference. Nevertheless the parliamentarians and the Ministers of Education by reducing salaries of teachers and by not filling vacancies for inspectors, made the inspectors' task in the schools more difficult.

In the period from 1884 to Hartley's death, the inspectors' role changed little from that developed before the 1881-1883 Inquiry. The inspectors were still mainly engaged in examining pupils, policing Regulations and reporting to the administration. Hartley did add confidential assessment of teachers to their role. The teachers encouraged the inspectors to advise and lead them at Teachers' Association meetings. The inspectors themselves generally accepted this advisory and leadership role at Teachers' Association meetings to make up for the limited advising that they did at incidental inspections. They also adopted a different stance as organizers, specialists and friendly cooperators with teachers away from examinations and inspections at the Public Schools Floral and Industrial Society and the like. Hartley's advances in supplying materials, readers, arithmetic text books, and The Education Gazette, assisted the inspectors in carrying out their tasks in that they inspected better informed and better prepared teachers, and they could use The Education Gazette as a vehicle of communication.

It was Hartley who introduced the inspectors' conference which had a bearing on the way in which the inspectors' role developed. The inspectors' conference certainly gave authority to the inspectorate to recommend fines, changes in salary, promotion or demotion of teachers. Hartley as editor of The Education Gazette always published, as though they were the inspectors' decisions, the features of the annual inspectors' examination for the year ahead and also notes on the inspectors' conference thus enhancing their authority in the eyes of the teachers. Nevertheless he also published, as coming from the inspectors, such decisions as in the examining of writing the inspectors would have the power to call for the book preceding the one actually shown.[1] Surely a decision not likely to engender in teachers faith in the judgment of inspectors, but

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 7, no. 54, Jan. 1891, p. 6.

rather to illustrate the smallness of their thinking and the degeneration of the annual examination, as in Victoria, into a battle of wits between teachers and inspectors with children used as more or less willing conscripts drilled in the direction most likely to produce results.[1]

There is ample evidence in Hartley's confidential letterbook to show that he castigated his inspectors on the way that they performed their role in examining and inspecting, but no evidence that he ever criticized them for adopting an inadequate advisory role.

Hartley relentlessly kept the inspectors' role firmly centred on examining and inspecting in his firm belief that this was the way to get an efficient system, improved standards, justice to teachers and children, and value for money for the Colony.

Although the role of the inspectors in 1905 was substantially as Hartley had started and continued it, there were developments during the period. There was much debate by inspectors, Teachers' Associations, the S.A.P.S.T.U. and in Parliament on inspectors' examination issues, such as individual or collective examination; examination of all pupils or a sample; the teacher or inspector to promote pupils; and exemption for schools from the inspectors' examination or not.[2]

Although the Board of Inspectors quoted from papers on the world-wide discussion of inspections and examinations and the universal condemnation of the English system of examination,[3] in practice its members did little about it. When they did venture

---

1 R.J. Selleck, op. cit., 1965, p. 58.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 22 Nov. 1905, pp. 827-829. Most of the matters referred to here were raised in Parliament in this debate.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1902, pp. 13, 14.

to experiment, by freeing schools of proven achievement from the inspectors' examination and freeing inspectors from routine examining, the good work was undone by Stanton and his supporters. Stanton fell back to the position, that New South Wales had adopted, of trying to perfect an elaborate machinery of examination and thus lower the high office of inspector to that of an examining machine instead of freeing the inspectors for the work of organizing, inspiring and testing the educational activities in the schools.[1] At the time, the inspectors were reporting the adoption of the new education principles in the schools, and advocating a cross-fertilization role instead of the all-knowing authoritarian role for themselves, and conferences and summer schools of the Victorian kind for teachers. They were thwarted in that Stanton did nothing about their suggestions and indeed re-imposed their examination and inspection role in all its severity. Moreover some members of the inspectorate when offered a creative role in development of curriculum preferred to continue their routine inspecting and examining role.

The inspectors themselves, did bring about changes in their role, more so under Stanton's loose control than under Hartley's over-powering leadership. Nevertheless, even under Hartley, the inspectors shared some of the responsibility for the development of their role of routine examining, detailed policing of Regulations and censorious reporting as well as the development of their more positive leadership and advisory role in the Teachers' Associations. Under Stanton, inspectors, including the first woman inspector, depending on their own initiative, personal commitment and special talents, did develop a more definite advisory role and specialized in various ways in helping teachers particularly when assisting other inspectors. There was an endeavour, too, on the part of the inspectors to meet the hopes and expectations, particularly of the provisional

---

1 loc. cit.

teachers, that they would not only suggest, but show in a practical manner, how to overcome difficulties and amend defects.[1] They also used the inspectors' conference to change their role mainly in trivial detail in conducting inspections and the annual examination. Some of them were partly responsible for retarding the placing of the inspectors' role on a higher plane when they supported Stanton when he cancelled the exemption from the inspectors' examination for selected schools. Throughout the period, the inspectorate, because of its negative relationship with Boards of Advice, missed a great opportunity to expand its role to one of liaison with the local citizens. Again, the hand of the centralist, Hartley, could be seen as a factor in creating this poor relationship. A study of the inspectors' reports on Norwood School revealed that the inspectors assumed some duties of an administrative kind in hearing complaints, making decisions on parents' requests for non-promotion of their children, and checking pupil teachers for suitability for teaching.

Teachers' cordial relations with inspectors at Teachers' Association meetings, more so than their criticisms emanating from them, helped to develop the inspectors' advisory role and leadership role. From 1896 the teachers' impact on the role of the inspectors came mainly from the S.A.P.S.T.U. with which the Teachers' Associations were affiliated. The Teachers' Union was able to raise the sights of the inspectors by exposing them to the concept of the modern inspector, expounded by prominent educators from outside the State. The Union, too, was able to criticize not so much the inspectors as the system that constrained them from inspiring teachers by tying them to routine examining and detailed, unimaginative inspecting.

Hartley, using a subtle combination of intimidation, persuasion and inspiration, had developed the predominant role of inspectors of examining pupils, policing of Regulations and

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1901, p. 24.

of detailed reporting according to a rigid formula.[1] Moreover, Hartley did this when the conditions in the schools, the quality of the teachers and the standards of achievement demanded such supervision, if an efficient and uniform standard of education was to be achieved throughout the Colony. Stanton finished his term as Inspector-General with a policy of detailed inspection coupled with examination, when the signs from most inspectors, from the Parliament, from the teachers and their Union were that schools would benefit by some freedom from inspectorial inquisition and that teachers wanted encouragement, advice and help from the inspectors.

During this period, 1884 to 1905, under the various forces at work, the inspectors' role developed to some extent in a variety of ways, including examiners of teachers and pupil-teachers, confidential assessors of teachers, advocates of reform, district leaders, judges of complaints about teachers, welfare officers and advisers to teachers. Nevertheless the predominant role remained of examining pupils, policing Regulations and reporting to the administration, laced with the underlying notions of accountability, standards, and value for money in accordance with the fundamental principles laid down by Hartley earlier. The appointment as Director of Education of Alfred Williams, the chief critic of departmental policy on examinations and inspection, by the Minister of Education, Thomas Price, augured well for changes.

---

1 W.T. Lucas, "The Role of the Inspectorate as an Agent of Inservice Education in South Australia 1875-1896", unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Flinders University of South Australia, 1976, pp. 35, 37.