

CHAPTER 4

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROLE OF THE INSPECTORS FROM THE
 APPOINTMENT OF THE FIRST DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION (1906)
 TO THE END OF WORLD WAR I

Introduction

This chapter examines the development of the role of the inspectors in the period, beginning with the dramatic change in the administration of the Education Department of South Australia by the Price Labor Government and ending with the end of World War I. Pressures for change in the role came from the legislature, the Royal Commission on Education¹ that it set up, the 1915 Education Act² that it passed and the Regulations that it approved. There were pressures from the senior officers of the Education Department, namely two Directors of Education, Chief Inspectors, Assistant Chief Inspectors, the Superintendent of Primary Education and the Superintendent of Technical

1 A Select Committee on higher education and the University of Adelaide approved on 26 Oct. 1910 became a Royal Commission on 26 Jan. 1911 and on 21 Sept. 1911 had its powers extended to enquire into all branches of education. The first and second reports of the Commission dealt with financial assistance for the University of Adelaide and degrees in engineering. The Third Progress Report dealt with salaries of school teachers, medical inspection of school children, promotion of school children and the appointment of a lady inspector. This Parliamentary Paper, no. 27 was ordered printed on 15 Aug. 1912 and the Final Report, S.A. Parliamentary Paper no. 75 was printed in Aug. 1913.

2 Act no. 1223 of 1915 assented to 23 Dec. 1915.

Education. Pressures from the inspectors themselves came from an inspectorate of varied composition including assistant inspectors. Pressures from teachers came mainly through the S.A.P.S.T.U. which had access to the Minister of Education and the Director of Education, and from 1915, had The S.A. Teachers' Journal to communicate with the whole community.

The promotion of Alfred Williams, Headmaster of Norwood School and immediate past President of the S.A.P.S.T.U., to the position of Director of Education was momentous enough in itself. Accompanied by the demotion of Whitham, Assistant Inspector-General, and Burgan, Senior Inspector, to the ranks of inspector, "...without the slightest warning or official complaint,"¹ and the preferment of a relatively junior inspector, M. Maughan, another former President of the S.A.P.S.T.U., over the more senior inspectors to the position of Chief Inspector, it was a stunning experience for the inspectorate. Williams's ideals, interest in the "new education" and inservice training conferences, ill-health and death coupled with those of Price, the first Labor Minister of Education, left their marks on the inspectorate. Political manoeuvring and a particularly obstreperous Parliament delayed education legislation for several years. The establishment of high schools from 1908 affected the inspectors' role.

The 1910 - 1913 Royal Commission on Education made recommendations on the appointment and duties of inspectors. The pressures for change of the inspectors' role came not only from the Commissioners' recommendations and evidence of witnesses, many of whom were interviewed interstate, but also from debate on it in the Parliament and from the 1915 Education Act which was both delayed and influenced by the Royal Commission. What recommendations the Government adopted and did not require amendments to the Education Act were put into Regulations.² The witnesses to the Commission had different

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, p. 19.

2 Education Gazette, vol. 29, no. 315, Jan. 1913, pp. 25-50.

opinions about what inspectors should and should not do in schools, how and from where they should be appointed, and the influence of their personal characteristics, but there was unanimity about the importance of the inspectors and their value to the system. It was to them that the Director of Education had to look for the maintenance and improvement of the standard of education.¹

Continued prosperity until the drought and beginning of World War I in 1914 disadvantaged the inspectors rather than benefited them, because it added difficulty to the recruitment of good quality teachers. The inspectors suffered the restrictions of a war-time economy along with others during World War I, yet gained opportunities for patriotic effort jointly with teachers.

The 1915 Education Act, both delayed and influenced by the 1910-1913 Royal Commission on Education, embodied far-reaching provisions for compulsory attendance, for the appointment of superintendents of Branches of the Education Department, for a curriculum board, a teachers' classification board and an advisory council of education. It also added some duties for the inspectors, but also pushed them down in the hierarchy of positions. Other provisions resulting from the Act had some bearing on the inspectors' role. Provisional schools became public schools Class IX; pupils were arranged in eight grades instead of five classes; Boards of Advice gave way to School Committees and High School and Technical School Councils; private schools could be inspected on request; and incidentally the Minister Controlling Education became the Minister of Education officially.

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 75, 1913, p. xi. For the different opinions, see Minutes of Evidence, pp. 33, 43, 46, 52, 53, 134, 135, 137, 138, 142, 143 and S.A.P. Paper no. 27, 1912, pp. 28, 30, 55, 56, 58, 81, 82, 83, 97, 104, 105, 119, 138, 139, 186.

Table 4.1 provides data for 1906 on population, pupil numbers and attendance, the number and kinds of teachers and of schools, and the structure of the Education Department administration and its expenditure. It also sketches some of the developments of teacher-training in the period 1906 to 1918.

The continued expansion of agricultural activities into the hinterland during the prosperous period to the outbreak of World War I meant an increase in the number of small Provisional Schools, which became Class IX Public Schools in 1916.¹ It also brought about an increase in the number of untrained and poorly trained teachers, predominantly female. In 1909, despite additional schools, but with nearly 10,000 fewer pupils in schools than in 1901, the number of teachers was lower than in 1908, and 42 per cent of them had no training.² The demand for provisional teachers was so great that the course at the Observation School had to be shortened, and for some, omitted.³ The opening of high schools took the better prepared teachers from the primary schools, but also provided a source of recruits for the teaching service.⁴

The Education Department by additions to its structure endeavoured to assist teachers particularly the isolated and the untrained. The Schools of Instruction, the Winter School, the Nature Study Camp in 1906 were massive inservice conferences helping teachers "... to form a true conception of the real purpose of the school".⁵ At them, up to 300 teachers, "Young and old, probationers and veterans, worked side by side, showing an unaffected earnest desire to make themselves more capable

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1917, p. 2.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1910, p. 8.

3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1912, p. 48.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1910, p. 9. Adelaide High School was created in 1908 by absorbing the Pupil Teachers' School. See B.K. Hyams, op. cit., 1979, p. 59.

5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, p. 12.

TABLE 4.1
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT DATA 1906¹

S.A. POPULATION	376,335
GROSS SCHOOL ATTENDANCE	57,270
IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS	47,598
IN PROVISIONAL SCHOOLS	9,672
PERCENTAGE ATTENDANCE (PRIMARY)	70.7
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	709
ADV. SCHOOL FOR GIRLS	1
PUBLIC (PRIMARY)	277
PROVISIONAL	391
HALF-TIME	40
NUMBER OF TEACHERS	1426
PRIMARY	
HEAD TEACHERS (PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS)	281
ASSISTANTS AND ASST. IN CHARGE	214
PROVISIONAL TEACHERS	414
ACTING PROV. ASSISTANTS	122
PUPIL TEACHERS	115
MONITORS	170
SEWING MISTRESSES (part time)	110
ADMINISTRATION	DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION CHIEF INSPECTOR 6 INSPECTORS SECRETARY ED. DEPT.
BOARDS OF ADVICE	101
EXPENDITURE REVENUE AND LOAN	£169,932
COST PER CHILD INSTRUCTED	£2.12.7
TEACHER TRAINING FACILITY	
At the University Training College an arrangement in 1909 limited the study of University subjects beyond the first year of training to students selected for high school teaching. ² After the University examinations an inspector conducted for the College students practical work for six weeks each year. In 1913 this training institution was renamed Teachers' Training College. ³ The Headmaster of the Currie Street Observation School reported on a six months' course in 1912 for provisional teachers for the multitude of one-teacher schools that were being created. ⁴ Teachers' congresses and schools of instruction for inservice training of teachers flourished early in the period, but became less numerous later.	
SOURCES: 1 Blue Book of South Australia, 1906 in <u>S.A. Parliamentary Papers 1907. Statistical Register of South Australia, 1906 in S.A. Parliamentary Papers 1907. S.A.P. Paper</u> , no. 44, 1907.	
2 B.K. Hyams, <u>op. cit.</u> , 1979, p. 63.	
3 <u>S.A.P. Paper</u> , no. 44, 1914, p. 5.	
4 B.K. Hyams, <u>op. cit.</u> , 1979, p. 71.	

teachers".¹ In 1907 an advisory teacher, Mr. R. Sutton, was appointed.² Later in the period the number of inspectors and assistant inspectors was increased. In 1911, an Assistant Chief Inspector, A.H. Neale, was appointed largely to administer the Provisional Schools, leaving the Chief Inspector, M. Maughan, to supervise the Public Schools. In 1914, despite additions to the inspectorate under Maughan as Director and three assistant inspectors, W. Ham, F.J. Gartrell and E.W. Skitch, (T.S. Nicolle had become Headmaster of the Observation and Practising School) being available, the number of schools that received only one inspectorial visit was greater than ever before.³ By 1917, a Superintendent of Primary Education, C. Charlton, and a Superintendent of Technical Education, C. Fenner, had been appointed and there were nine inspectorial districts.⁴

The inspectors Burgan, Whitham, Smyth, Martin, Whillas and McBride, inherited by Williams had all come under the influence of Hartley's fundamental tenets for the inspection and examination of schools,⁵ either as inspectors or as teachers in the schools.⁶ In fact, with few exceptions, the inspectors still serving at the end of World War I were in the schools during Hartley's reign.⁷ The inspectorate during the 1906-1918 period was not a well-knit group. Some inspectors had experienced being driven by Hartley and frustrated by Stanton, who was still never far away in his secretarial position until 1916. Burgan and Whitham had been demoted when Price, as

1 loc. cit.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1908, p. 15.

3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1915, p. 16.

4 Education Gazette, vol. 33, no. 366, Jan. 1917, pp. 37, 39.

5 See above, p. 90.

6 Blue Book of South Australia, 1905, p. 66 revealed this fact when studied in conjunction with the Register of Classified Officers, Education Department, S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/92.

7 S.A.P. Paper, no. 2, 1919, p. 42. This public service list of officers studied in conjunction with the Register of Classified Officers, Education Department in S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/92 revealed this.

Minister, reorganized the Education Department. They were relatively old men when serving under Williams; so, too, were the new members such as Roach and Darke appointed in the later years of this period. Harry, A.H. Neale, Charlton, Cherry, Fairweather, Cole, Pavia and Warren had been Presidents of the S.A.P.S.T.U. They had all been senior headmasters of primary schools.

The appointment of W.A. West was something of an exception, not in age, but in the fact that he entered the inspectorate after being headmaster of the Pupil Teachers' School. Lydia Longmore was in charge of the Infant Department, Norwood School, before her appointment as inspector in 1917. B.S. Roach had been lecturer in History and Literature at the University Training College and Editor of the Children's Hour before his appointment as an inspector.

Promotion from the inspectorate to Assistant Chief Inspector with A.H. Neale as Chief Inspector did not follow seniority and brought about the resignation of Inspector Smyth. It also brought discredit, in the Parliament, on the Education Department because incorrect information was supplied.¹ The appointment from outside the service of Inspector Jordan, holding M.A. and B.Sc. degrees, his subsequent behaviour, altercations with the administration and members of the inspectorate, and his failure to cooperate with other inspectors caused further friction.² The dismissal of Inspector Cherry for improper conduct was a blow to the reputation of the inspectorate.³ For officers who relied so much on their position for power and prestige, such behaviour could lead to distrust by teachers and damage the proper development of their role.

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 16, 18 Sept. 1913, pp. 368, 393.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1912, pp. 1-30.

3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 3 Dec. 1912, p. 1146.

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

The development of the role of the inspectors under influence from the legislature, the Royal Commission on Education that it set up and the 1915 Education Act that it protractedly passed is examined below. The pressures from the two Directors of Education, Williams and Maughan, are also examined, along with those of the superintendents appointed during World War I.

In 1906, the Governor when opening Parliament announced not only that there would be a surplus of £80,000 of revenue over expenditure due to the abundant harvest and good prices, but also that the Government was sending overseas Williams, who had taken up his duties as Director of Education with great zeal and had stimulated the whole education system.¹ This was an overseas visit with great potential to influence the development of the role of the inspectors. The Parliament accepted this Government action, for there was a notable social sentiment in the Parliament that education was a national investment.² A sentiment which, nevertheless, did not ensure that funds flowed to education in times of prosperity,³ nor prevent the deprivation of education for funds in order to assist the war effort in World War I.⁴ The announcement of Williams's overseas tour indicated how fortunate Williams was in having Price not

1 S.A.P. Debates, Governor's Speech, 5 July 1906, pp. 1,2.

2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 15 Nov. 1905, p. 754. See also A.G. Austin and R.J.W. Selleck, op. cit., pp. 197, 198, 199. This growing nationalism, patriotism and urge to increase the national efficiency was Australia wide at this time. Likewise the endeavour to change teachers' outlook and practices by conferences and exhibitions was attempted by Directors of Education in the centralized systems of the various States.

3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 16 Nov. 1910, p. 792. South Australian society was described as a body of people among the wealthiest in the world, yet not wanting to pay taxes to provide educational opportunities that other progressive nations were providing.

4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 9 Sept. 1915, p. 792; Council, 17 Nov. 1915, p. 2113; and Assembly, 8 Aug. 1918, p. 137.

only as Minister of Education but also as Premier and Commissioner of Public Works. Both men were involved with the same mission to provide a system of education giving an equal opportunity to all children regardless of their social status or place of residence.¹ Consequently Price always acted promptly in judging and approving Williams's recommendations² including Regulations to increase salaries of male assistants to render the service more attractive to young men.³ Likewise Price permitted country inspectors to reside in Adelaide instead of in their districts in order to benefit from monthly conferences with the Director, and to be imbued with enthusiasm for the "new education" and for the extension of secondary and technical education.⁴ This unity of purpose in developing the educational ladder was not surprising, for Williams, the eldest son of a Cornish migrant, lived and taught at Moonta among the closely knit, fervently Methodist community of Cornish miners, from whom came much support for the Labor Party in South Australia.⁵ Price's Government, too, was accused of hob-nobbing with the teachers,⁶ when Williams was President of the S.A.P.S.T.U., and of piling up expenditure on education that taxpayers could not afford.⁷ Price did say, "It is certain that we shall have to spend more money on education. The first want is for first class teachers".⁸

Williams in his first year as Director did nothing, nor did he ask the Minister and Parliament to do anything, to change the Regulations concerning those aspects of the annual examination

1 H. Beare, "The Influence of Alfred Williams, and the Price Ministry, on Public Education in South Australia", unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Melbourne, 1964, pp. 123, 124, gave Price's policy. See also T.H. Smeaton, op. cit., pp. 100, 101. S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, pp. 12, 13, 14 and Education Gazette, vol. 22 no. 234, April 1906, pp. 100, 101, showed Williams's similar sentiments.

2 H. Beare, op. cit., p. 124.

3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, p. 16.

4 ibid., p. 14.

5 H. Beare, op. cit., pp. 33, 36, 44.

6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 23 Nov. 1905, p. 834.

7 loc. cit.

8 T.H. Smeaton, op. cit., pp. 100, 101.

and inspection about which he had been so scathing in his presidential address at the 1905 annual conference of the S.A.P.S.T.U.¹ Instead he took practical steps to initiate the inspectors into two new additional roles, outside their main inspecting and examining role in the classrooms developed so firmly in the previous periods. He used the inspectors as inservice educators² of teachers and public relations officers to tell the public what the schools were doing and why they were doing it. He treated them, along with outstanding teachers, as professional colleagues and members of a team to spread information on the mission of the primary school at teachers' congresses, at winter and summer schools and at public meetings.³ While Williams was overseas in 1907 with Tate of Victoria attending the Imperial Conference on Education sponsored by the League of Empire in London, Chief Inspector Maughan carried on with meetings for teachers and the public. He reported enthusiastically that kindergarten demonstration lessons in northern towns of South Australia were watched intently in almost breathless silence by the crowd of onlookers.⁴ At the evening meetings the people were enlightened by the inspectors on the aims and objects of the education system.⁵

This keenness to meet and discuss spread throughout the whole system and the Chief Inspector told of staff conferences in the schools "... binding the whole staff into a firm partnership with common interests, common aims and common sympathies".⁶ The inspectors, too, were full of praise for the schemes for the improvement of the teaching. Whitham,⁷ still smarting from his demotion, was perhaps less enthusiastic than Inspector Martin who considered that the inservice courses had

1 Education Gazette, vol. 21, no. 226, Aug. 1905, pp. 130, 131.

2 See above, pp. 149-151.

3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, p. 12.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1908, p. 15.

5 loc. cit.

6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, p. 18.

7 ibid., p. 19.

achieved greater success than the most sanguine expected. "Already there are signs of more life and greater activity in the teaching and of more interest and greater effort on the part of the children."¹

Williams was aware of the age-old complaint that inspectors did not get enough time in their inspection visits to advise teachers or to enlighten parents and others in the community. His remedy was to hold congresses, summer and winter schools and schools of instruction for teachers, and to appoint an advisory teacher, not more inspectors. At these conferences inspectors had to lecture, advise and demonstrate; there was no chance nor excuse to resort to checking records, to inspecting books and to routine examining. This was different from Hartley's approach. Hartley joined the inspectors in their examining and inspecting in order to inspect the inspectors and to get greater uniformity; Williams took them to congresses and conferences to imbue them with his ideals for the development of teachers, in keeping with the general sentiments of the time² which were quite different in Hartley's time.

After the first flush, the role of the inspectors as inservice educators and community educators did not develop to the extent that it promised. This was partly because Williams had other ideas and ideals to pursue after his overseas observations; partly because his ill-health retarded him in pursuing his goals; partly because he failed to increase the size of the inspectorate, which he could easily have done with Price's help if he had desired it; and partly because the inspectors, ageing and under-staffed, without Williams's prodding, were content to continue their routine testing and increasingly detailed inspecting.³ Nevertheless the inspectors

1 ibid., p. 24.

2 A.G. Austin and R.J.W. Selleck, op. cit., pp. 197-199.

3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, p. 29. Inspector Charlton's comment was typical. So much routine work had to be done, there was no time to advise and inspire.

had absorbed some of Williams's ideals; there was much greater concern for children's well-being in their reports; they had absorbed the Herbartian principles of interest and process rather than drill and facts; and they were more concerned with quality in education than with quantity.¹

Williams did revise the notes and instructions on annual examinations of schools in 1907 in The Education Gazette.² He still permitted the inspectors to test every child in every class in all subjects or by sampling, though he permitted the teachers to complain to the inspectors if they felt the sampling was unfair. He also removed the secrecy that he had contended was associated with the inspection process under Stanton, by publishing the percentages of marks required to get a school classification from A to F. In addition he added a clause which stated that while the inspectors would be guided largely by the marks obtained they could use their judgment on the educative value of the teachers' work and raise or lower the classification.³ By so doing he gave more power to the inspectors, but greater cause for dissatisfaction among teachers. At the same time, Williams pushed the annual examination forward to begin on April 2,⁴ and thereby brought criticism from the inspectors that they would not have time to carry out the valuable incidental inspection before the annual examination to the detriment of the children's education and their results.⁵ If the inspectors' evidence can be taken at face value, Williams's decision about the date of annual examinations changed the nature of the incidental inspection, making it a rushed, superficial and non-advisory visit. All of these criticisms had been made before,⁶ even by Williams, who

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1909, p. 22 and 1908, p. 24 were examples by different inspectors.

2 Education Gazette, vol. 23, no. 244, Feb. 1907, p. 59.

3 ibid., p. 60.

4 ibid., p. 59.

5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1908, p. 16.

6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 43, 1891, p. 2. See above, p. 85.

had said at the 1905 Union conference that the inspectors were bound hand and foot by the nature of the system and the time at their disposal.¹ On the surface it appeared that as Director of Education he had done little to alleviate this. Certainly the system of inspection and examination was little changed from the 1905 scheme of Stanton, whose inspectors also complained that time did not permit them to carry out their advisory function,² necessitating their meeting groups of teachers on Saturday mornings.

From the beginning of his term of office as Director of Education, Williams made it clear by his activities in some directions and lack of them in others, that, although there would not be a dramatic change in the nature of the inspection process, its procedures and routines by the inspectors, there would be much added emphasis on the development of teachers as the chief agents in the education of children.³ For that was how Williams saw the way of getting value for money spent on children's education. Williams's first sentence in his first annual report as Director of Education was "The value of a school system to any community is determined by the insight and interest of the teachers".⁴ This is in stark contrast to Hartley's first report as Inspector-General which was mainly concerned with the result examination conducted by the inspectors and from which the percentage of passes measured the efficiency of each school and indeed of the whole system.⁵ It was through inservice training of teachers and boosting their morale, not through tighter inspection and more examination, according to Williams, that the State and its children would get a more efficient service. Hartley believed that teaching could

1 Education Gazette, vol. 21, no. 221, Aug. 1905, pp. 130, 131. See above, p. 140.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1904, p. 23; 1905, p. 25; and 1906, p. 22.

3 See above, p. 150-152.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, p. 12.

5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1880, pp. xi - xv.

be improved for the bulk of teachers by means of inspection and examining pupils, though he himself was noted for his demonstration lessons to teachers.

When the inspector ceases talking about teaching, and takes a lesson from beginning to end under timetable conditions (as Hartley did) you may easily conceive what an influence such an example would have on inspectors, teachers, and educational methods.¹

It appeared that Williams had priorities other than relieving the burden of the inspectors and changing the nature of the inspection process. Provisional teachers needed much help; teachers' residences and many schools needed renovation; teacher training needed up-grading; the inservice training of teachers though adding to cost had proved very beneficial. There was the desire to emulate overseas countries, particularly following Williams's overseas visit, to move strongly in secondary and technical education, and medical inspection of school children.² The embarrassing necessity to provide education for the children of settlers in distant parts of the state at five times the cost per pupil in an urban school was an increasing drain on the coffers.³ The Chief Inspector was still able to say at the end of 1907 that the inspectors to be thoroughly effective needed some leisure for reading and more

1 D.A. White, "Primary Education in Australia" in Education Gazette, vol. 13, no. 131, Sept. 1897, p. 124 (my insertion in the bracket).

2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 11 Nov. 1908, p. 760. A Member called for a more vigorous policy in secondary and technical education and called attention to the admirable and valuable report of the Director of Education. Another Member stressed the importance of the school as an agent of social progress under the economic conditions and industrial competition of the time and quoted Williams. S.A.P. Debate, Assembly, 24 Sept. 1913, p. 443.

3 All of these matters were raised in the Director's Annual Reports in S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, pp. 12-16 or S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1908, pp. 12-14 or S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1909, pp. 12-17.

time for teaching the teacher. Nevertheless he could not see the likelihood of increased inspectorial staff despite the need.¹

Everything pointed to the fact that Williams did not consider changes to the routines and procedures of inspecting and examining a high priority. He wanted to change the spirit of the relationship between inspectors and teachers, not the letter of the law. The previous February notice in The Education Gazette on Annual Examination of Schools was replaced by a notice, Course of Instruction and Suggestions to Teachers. This new notice opened with a consideration of the function of the elementary school and the teacher and ended with a small addendum on annual examination of schools.² Williams also withdrew inspectors from their normal inspection work in order to assist him at teachers' congresses and to run schools of instruction of their own for teachers.³ When he did confer with inspectors on methods of inspection and examination it was always to seek the methods that would produce the best teaching.⁴

In Williams's early years as Director, the incidental inspection reports in the inspector's register were much fuller and more helpful than in the past. Inspector McBride inspected Hindmarsh School from 8 to 15 April 1907 and reported in four pages of neatly written comments,⁵ which was a change from Burgan's one page in a flowing indecipherable hand.⁶ McBride's four pages were chockfull of advice, dictatorial and firm - rewrite timetables; show detail; correlate; make more use of; cultivate; get relief models made; I strongly advise; never accept carelessly written work; prescribe three temperance lessons; all teachers must be in the playground at recess time, and he directed that

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1908, p. 15.

2 Education Gazette, vol. 25, no. 268, Feb. 1909, pp. 42-59.

3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, p. 12.

4 ibid., p. 14.

5 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/34/2 vol. 5, 1907, Hindmarsh School.

6 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/67/2 vol. 3, 1904, Norwood School.

... assistants are to leave school not later than three-quarters of an hour after last dismissal - unless their services are particularly desired by the headmaster.

McBride left no doubt that his advice was to be obeyed. Hartley would have been delighted.¹ Nevertheless, McBride was fair; where he was critical he left specimens for guidance. The thoroughness of his inspection was evident in this four page report; on the buildings he noted that eleven panes of glass were damaged, nine window hasps were missing and the dust pits were full. Williams's pressure on the development of the inspectorial role was having some effect.

The main influence of Parliament on the role of the inspectors came from the funds that it provided, or failed to provide, for education and the inspectorate. Nevertheless influence also came from Members' questions, calls for returns, contributions to education debates and introduction of petitions from the electorate. Parliament's allowance of Regulations, setting up the Royal Commission on Education, and, after years of debate, producing the 1915 Education Act all had their influence on the role of the inspectors. The extension of the terms of reference of the Select Committee of the House of Assembly to embrace all education as a Royal Commission was brought about because there were so many Lutheran petitions protesting about the possibility of departmental inspectors, not behaving particularly well at the time, inspecting their schools and about compulsory attendance, matters which, they contended, interfered with their religious freedom.²

In the period 1906 to 1919, many of the criticisms in Parliament were directed at the inspectors themselves whereas previously the criticisms were rather of the system than of the

1 B. Condon (ed.), op. cit. See letter 104 from Hartley to Inspector Whitham, "... what is wanted is a command that must be obeyed".

2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 27 Sept. 1911, p. 577.

inspectors. Their behaviour¹ and misbehaviour,² their ideas,³ their interpretation of Regulations,⁴ as well as their role,⁵ their appointments⁶ and acting appointments,⁷ and where they resided,⁸ all came under parliamentary scrutiny.

The 1913 Regulations⁹ did include substantial changes to the nature of the inspection process. Although they were published just before Williams's death, and it fell to Maughan to implement them, it was likely that the changes in the Regulations were mainly Maughan's work. The introduction of the efficiency mark for teachers, for instance, was not in keeping with Williams's evidence to the Royal Commission, where he declared that he preferred to use inspectors' reports and their personal knowledge of teachers to machine-made promotion of teachers.¹⁰ Several matters raised at the 1912 annual conference of the Union and those recommended in The Third Progress Report of the Commission, not requiring amendments to the Education Act, were incorporated in these Regulations, which the Minister refused the executive of the Union to see before they were tabled.¹¹

According to the Regulations teachers were to make their own pupil promotions based on their own examinations held simultaneously towards the end of the year.¹² This was a process advocated by the S.A.P.S.T.U.,¹³ and, for which the interstate witnesses to the Commission gave unanimous support

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 21 Sept. 1915, p. 974.

2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 3 Dec. 1912, p. 1146.

3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 17 Aug. 1911, p. 395.

4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 16 Sept. 1915, pp. 910, 911.

5 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 9 Sept. 1915, p. 797.

6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 14 Dec. 1906, p. 136.

7 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 4 July 1911, p. 16.

8 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 25 Sept. 1918, p. 656.

9 Education Gazette, vol. 29, no. 315, Jan. 1913, pp. 25-50.

10 S.A.P. Paper, no. 75, 1913, p. viii.

11 Education Gazette, vol. 29, no. 316, Feb. 1913, p. 87.

12 Education Gazette, vol. 29, no. 315, Jan. 1913, p. 41.

13 Education Gazette, vol. 28, no. 310, Aug. 1912, p. 178.

despite opposition by Williams and the local inspectorate.¹ Inspect and examine had been the fundamentals of the inspectors' role under Hartley and were well-known and understood by this group of ageing inspectors. However the new Regulations removed half of that role and should have created time for the advisory role that Williams had emphasized, particularly since Maughan, as Director, had increased the number of inspectors.² However Maughan had also introduced a structured assessment of teachers by the inspectors, who bereft of their examining role to support their assessing, increased the detail of their inspecting and testing, as though reluctant to assume a greater advisory role, yet professing its importance. So the combined pressure from the Commission, the Government and the Parliament, responding to the initial pressure from the Union, brought about a major change in the inspectors' role. Nevertheless it was an incomplete change because of a counter pressure from the inspectorate.

The Department took the opportunity to insert clauses in the Regulations that tightened the central control. For the first time inspectors and others deputed by the Minister to visit and report on schools could legally instruct teachers on all matters calculated to improve their school, and the instructions given had to be carefully followed by the teacher.³ No doubt the inspectors' advice had previously been taken by teachers as instructions, but now it had the force of law. Almost as though underlining the new authority of the

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1912, p. viii for Williams's opposition; p. 99 for inspectors' opposition; p. 139 for Queensland's Senior Inspector's evidence; p. 190 for evidence from Peter Board, Director of Education, N.S.W. S.A.P. Paper, no. 75, 1913, p. 46, Tate said that inspectors had never promoted children in Victoria. Teachers were responsible for the management of their schools subject to the criticisms of the inspector.

2 Education Gazette, vol. 29, no. 325, Oct. 1913, p. 371, and vol. 32, no. 354, Jan. 1916, pp. 29, 52.

3 Education Gazette, vol. 29, no. 315, Jan. 1913, p. 25.

inspectors, the Regulation that Boards of Advice were empowered to make suggestions but not to give orders to teachers was repeated.¹

Schools were no longer classified for efficiency² but the assessment of teachers was put on a firmer base with the introduction of the efficiency mark. Teachers' promotion would be decided on efficiency (75 marks maximum), educational qualifications (10 marks) and length of service (15 marks). The inspector would judge the efficiency of the teachers on their influence on character formation and development of intelligence, on interest and zeal, ability to organize and plan, on the value of methods revealed by the inspector's tests and examinations, on means taken to train children for independent work, and on attention to cleanliness and hygiene.³ The scale of maximum marks for Head Teachers to make up the efficiency mark of 75 were:- Influence 6, Interest 8, Organization 15, Effectiveness in Teaching 30, Discipline 10, Sanitation and Hygiene 6. For teachers in Provisional Schools and small schools, for Chief Assistants, and for Assistants there were scales of marks with different weightings.⁴

With the efficiency mark for each teacher replacing the classification rating of schools for efficiency, the assessing role of the inspectors was pushed to the fore as never before. The compilation of the efficiency mark required much careful observation and judgment on the part of the inspectors, taking into account all the teachers' qualities listed above; nor did the inspectors have annual examination results to support their judgment of the quality of each teacher. Maughan, the new Director of Education, at least allowed the inspectors to spend a whole day on each inspection in small schools instead of the

1 ibid., p. 27.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1914, p. 15.

3 Education Gazette, vol. 29, no. 315, Jan. 1913, p. 29.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1914, p. 24.

half-day under Williams.¹ This was made possible by the increasing use of motor cars for travel by inspectors.² An inspector's full report was entered in each teacher's history, and along with the efficiency mark, academic qualifications, and length of service, determined his or her position on a teachers' promotion list.³ Even the inclusion in the promotion criteria of academic qualifications, which had probably been included in Williams's looser and less public scheme, brought angry comment from the Parliament that it caused discontent among teachers.⁴ The President of the Union also declared at the 1913 annual conference that the inspectors more than ever were the judges of the teachers' professional ability, yet what the teachers had been looking for from the Regulation that gave them the right to examine and promote their pupils was for the inspectors to come mainly in the guise of advisory visitors.⁵

Neither the Government nor the Education Department acted upon the Commission's recommendation that a woman inspector should be appointed to investigate conditions under which female teachers had to live and teach, and to report on the teaching of needlework and allied domestic subjects.⁶ Williams had given evidence opposing this recommendation.⁷ Nevertheless the recommendation conveyed the message of the necessity for pastoral care of teachers to the inspectors, who cited cases of their activities in this field in their annual reports.⁸ The Chairman of the Royal Commission, in debate in Parliament after the Commission had reported, was adamant on the kind of woman inspector he did not want for this pastoral care - "... a sour-faced officer with a great bundle of red-tape".⁹

1 ibid., p. 21.

2 ibid., p. 31.

3 ibid., p. 15.

4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 31 Oct. 1916, p. 1756.

5 Education Gazette, vol. 29, no. 322, July 1913, pp. 310, 311.

6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 75, 1913, p. v.

7 ibid., p. 135.

8 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1913, p. 23; 1914, p. 21 and 1915, pp. 25, 26 are examples.

9 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 21 Sept. 1915, p. 963.

The Commission made no recommendation about where the inspectors should reside, but questioned several witnesses about it. Williams and the S.A.P.S.T.U. were in accord in opposing inspectors with country districts having their headquarters away from Adelaide on the grounds of cultural isolation and the need for inspectors to meet frequently with the Director in Adelaide.¹ Tate was equally as adamant that the inspectors should reside in their districts and be in touch with the real life of their districts,² "... in the sense of a bishop of a See".³ He saw more clearly the district leadership role, which Williams wanted, but who considered it best achieved by the inspectors being members of a central team.

The Commission advocated the promotion of younger and more qualified teachers to the position of inspector. Seniority should not give the strongest claim; efficiency and suitability both physically and educationally should be the first consideration for appointment as inspectors.⁴ Williams's great friend, Tate, in Victoria was specifying that applicants for inspectorship should be between the ages of 25 and 40 and hold honours degrees.⁵ The Commission also recommended that a selection of assistant inspectors should be made from all teachers in receipt of £250 per annum or more, the number of them not to exceed the number of inspectors.⁶ Williams had arranged the appointment, with opposition from the Union, of assistant inspectors who were not permitted to inspect or examine in schools of a class higher than that from which they came; some returned to the teaching service.⁷

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 75, 1913, p. 134 and no. 27, 1911, p. 83.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 75, 1913, p. 43.

3 R.J.W. Selleck, Frank Tate - A Biography, Carlton, Melbourne University Press, 1982, p. 88.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 75, 1913, p. xi.

5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 75, 1913, p. xix.

6 ibid., p. xi.

7 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1912, pp. 96, 97.

After the proclamation of the 1915 Education Act, several recommendations of the Royal Commission awaiting the proclamation were attended to.¹ In accordance with the legislation, Superintendents each responsible for a Branch, would work under the general control of the Director. The Teachers' Classification Board would have but one inspector on it and a teacher representative, whereas in these matters previously the inspectors had remained supreme. The Director would determine the course of instruction for each Branch, but for the Primary Branch there would be an Advisory Curriculum Board to help. It would be chaired by the Superintendent of Primary Education with two inspectors and two teacher members. The inspectors considered that this was merely formalizing what had been the practice of inspectors and teachers getting together annually to determine the following year's program. But, of course, there was a difference; teachers were there by invitation of the inspectors who were in control, whereas under the new arrangement the teachers had a statutory right to be there and the meetings would be under the control of a senior officer, the Superintendent of Primary Education. The new Advisory Council of Education of 20 members would have no inspector on it, but would include the three Superintendents and the Principal Medical Officer as well as academics, employers and Union representatives including one from the S.A.P.S.T.U.

The Boards of Advice were abolished and School Committees for primary schools would replace them. Councils for high schools and technical schools would be established. Attendance was compulsory on every occasion, conditionally, that the school

1 The Parliament first debated an Education Act Amendment and Consolidation Bill, introduced by F.W. Coneybeer, Minister of Education in the Verran Labor Administration on 8 November 1910. It was reintroduced to Parliament in 1911, but the extension of terms of reference of the Royal Commission on Education caused it to be shelved. Finally, under the influence of war-time sentiments and after several gibes at the inspectors, the Bill became the 1915 Act No. 1223 on 23 December, 1915 and was proclaimed on 13 January, 1916.

was open for all children aged 6 to 14 years. Parents had the duty to educate handicapped children from 6 to 16 years of age. A public primary school could be established with an expected average attendance of 6, a higher primary school with an expected average attendance of at least 20 students qualified for admission to a high school, and a high school with 40 qualified pupils. There would be 4 hours of instruction through the medium of the English language in private schools, that would be inspected on request.¹ So at least one new² task for the down-graded inspectors was provided in the Act.

As a consequence of the Education Act, 1915, the Regulations governing inspections and examination of schools were further elaborated and revised.³ The inspectors had their obligations. They had to confer with the head teacher at the end of the inspection; they had to report on each member of staff; and before leaving the school had to, whenever possible, meet the staff to discuss the results of their observations.⁴ This Regulation requiring inspectors to confer with teachers at the end of an inspection savoured of the evidence given by Peter Board, Director of Education, in New South Wales to the Royal Commission. He declared that the advice given at the end of an inspection was one of the most important elements of the inspection system.⁵ It removed some of the tension and secrecy from the relationship between inspector and teacher, and made it a more open one. Not so many exercise books needed to be held for the inspectors' perusal. With the permission of the district inspector copy books could be dispensed with.

1 Education Act, 1915, pp. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20.

2 Wyatt visited, if not inspected, private schools in 1856, but with no authority under the 1851 Education Act. See above, p. 41.

3 Education Gazette, vol. 32, no. 355, Feb. 1916. The Regulations under the Education Act, 1915 were included after p. 158.

4 ibid., p. xx.

5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1912, p. 190.

Efficiency marks for the state of books would be included in marks for discipline.¹

Parliament, through the Education Act, 1915, brought about other changes in the inspectors' role apart from their activities in inspecting schools. It had created the position of Superintendent, which pushed the inspectors down the hierarchical ladder and left them farther away from the influence of the head of the Department. Their opportunities to influence decisions of the Director were likewise decreased. In the classification of teachers for salary and promotion and in curriculum development, where the inspectors had been virtually in command, with the creation of the Teachers' Classification Board and the Advisory Curriculum Board, the inspectors were relegated to being contributors to the decisions along with others. The creation of the Advisory Council of Education without inspectorial representation was another blow to the prestige of the inspectors, and confined their role as advocates to their reports.

In this period, the only Superintendents appointed were C. Charlton for Primary Education and C. Fenner for Technical Education. Charlton, under war-time conditions, was so busy managing his Branch and setting up the associated Teachers' Classification Board and the Advisory Curriculum Board, that he did not visibly concern himself with the inspectorate as he had done as Chief Inspector. Fenner had no inspector under his jurisdiction. He busied himself writing and talking about Technical Education for such audiences as the S.A.P.S.T.U. annual conference.²

Entries in the Inspector's Register at Norwood School just prior to and during World War I reflected the influence of the new Regulations as well as the conditions and happenings of the

1 Education Gazette, vol. 32, no. 354, Jan 1916, p. 31.

2 Education Gazette, vol. 33, no. 372, July 1917, pp. 141, 142.

time - the patriotic zeal of the community; overcrowding in the schools; the use of antiquated desks; concern for hygiene and children's health; experimentation particularly in the infant departments; clashes between inspectors and other advisory staff; replacement of the inspector's annual examination by a detailed inspection; examination and promotion of pupils by teachers instead of by inspectors; no assessment of school efficiency but more emphasis on the assessment of teachers' efficiency as judged by inspectors; a mandatory discussion by the inspector with teachers at the conclusion of an inspection; a more genuine concern for teacher and pupil at inspection, but with some remnants of the inquisition.

The inspection reports indicated, too, how the inspectors followed the Regulations closely and used the more severe option when it suited, and so wasted valuable time. Inspector W.A. West, obeying the new Regulations that required the inspector to make frequent visits besides the detailed inspection, called at Norwood School and satisfied himself that Pavia, the Headmaster, had taken great care with examinations and promotion of pupils after consultation with class teachers.¹ A month later he called again and noted that the headmaster's general supervision and detailed supervision of work was admirable.² Despite these assurances of the soundness of the administration of the school, at his next incidental visit³ Inspector West saw fit to comment in the register that he had been through those pupils not promoted, an option allowed in the Regulations, and had marked in red pencil those that he wanted the headmaster to reconsider - thus negating the headmaster's responsibility. The roll at the detailed inspection⁴ was 1341 with 1124 present, hence it is

1 Inspector's Register, Norwood School, visit, 6 Feb. 1913, held at Norwood School.

2 Inspector's Register, Norwood School, visit, 10, 11 April 1913, held at Norwood School.

3 Inspector's Register, Norwood School, visit, 9, 10 Feb. 1914, held at Norwood School.

4 Inspector's Register, Norwood School, inspection, 27-31 Oct. 1913, held at Norwood School.

likely that a competent headmaster had relieved the inspectors of over a thousand individual examinations in various subjects of the curriculum, only to be treated in this abject fashion.

Such an action by an inspector illustrated the smallness of thinking and the waste of valuable time that can come about in a system of education controlled centrally by Regulations even with a relatively benign central administration. The treatment was to V.J. Pavia, a former President of the S.A.P.S.T.U., who had spoken knowingly on major issues confronting the teaching service in his presidential address.¹ He was a headmaster who dwelt on every word that the inspector wrote or uttered. In the lengthy report following the inspection of 25 to 27 April 1910, by Inspector McBride, Pavia as Headmaster of Norwood School had underlined in red ink every criticism, got his teachers to initial the report, and ordered from the Department documents that McBride had recommended including one on how to treat snake bite.² That his scrutiny of inspectors' reports was both precise and critical was indicated by an initialled correction in red ink by McBride after Pavia had pointed out the incorrect and unfavourable comment.³ The inspector's annual examination followed less than two months after the April inspection of 1910. The results of the examination brought commendation from all quarters. McBride sent Pavia a letter saying, "You and your staff deserve the flattering comments made by the C.I.",⁴ and the acting chairman of the Norwood Board of Advice sent him a congratulatory note on the "excellent" classification.⁵

1 Education Gazette, vol. 28, no. 310, Aug. 1912, pp. 177-179.

2 Inspector's Register, held at Norwood Primary School.

3 Inspector's Register, 15 and 16 March 1911 inspection, held at Norwood School.

4 Letter from W.J. McBride to V.J. Pavia, 10 July 1910 in Inspector's Register held at Norwood School.

5 Letter from Herbert Jones to V.J. Pavia, 7 July 1910 in Inspector's Register held at Norwood School. The different dates show that the Board of Advice received the copy of the report direct from the office; the school received their copy from the inspector who resided at Clarence Park.

Pavia's "Notes to Teachers at Staff Meetings" was left loosely in the Inspector's Register of Norwood School.¹ The staff meetings recorded spread over the period from 1908 to 1913. The notes showed him to be a true "department man", a stickler for Regulations and what the Department wanted, and gave evidence why Chief Inspector Maughan said of his school in 1909, "The school is a fine machine, working with clock-like regularity and as far as mechanical precision is concerned leaves little to be desired".² Pavia was certainly not the kind of headmaster who needed a threefold check on the promotion of his pupils just because the Regulations permitted it, and the inspector had time to spare to do it.

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

The actions of members of the inspectorate from 1906 to 1918 influenced their collective role and the perception of others of their role. Their colleagueship with Williams in administering the inservice programme, their evidence to the Royal Commission, their reaction to the decisions to transfer the examination and promotion of pupils to teachers and to assess teachers by means of an efficiency mark, their own behaviour and misbehaviour of some, and their place of residence, as well as the composition of the inspectorate, all had an impact on their role and their standing in the community and in the eyes of the teachers.

The inspectors initially accepted and praised the role that Williams had given them as members of a team to advise and help teachers and to inform the community on the aims of the

1 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/67/4.

2 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/67/2 vol. 1.

education system.¹ Consequently teachers' expectations were that the inspectors' role would be mainly an advisory one.² However, the elderly, conservative inspectors held firmly to the Hartley traditional role of inspect and examine, a stand more easily taken through lack of guidance from Williams because of his frequent absences on sick leave.

Under Williams, the newly appointed inspectors were also struck with the inadequacy of the time which it was possible to spend in the small schools. They adapted their role in different ways to the limited time. Each wanted to do more; Inspector A.H. Neale to take classes in order to show the teacher how to improve her methods.³ Nevertheless, he used the advisory teacher, Mr. Sutton, for assisting with examinations instead of using him full time in advising teachers.⁴ This use of an adviser for examining duties had occurred in Hartley's time when Burgan, the organizing inspector, was used in this way.⁵ The phenomenon was not peculiar to Australia. L.E.A.s in England in 1876 distinguished between "efficient inspectors" or general inspectors and "organising inspectors" or advisers in special fields, who took on, in the course of time, the more formidable powers of the inspectors.⁶

Inspector Charlton, on the other hand, showed the genuineness of his plea for more time for inspiring teachers, by conducting the examinations, to him the less important aspect of his inspectorial duties, by correspondence for the remote schools at Oodnadatta and Tarcoola. However, he made sure that

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, p. 24. Inspector Martin, 62 years old, one of the older inspectors gave lavish praise to Williams's scheme, but still saw the value to teachers and pupils of a detailed inspection.

2 Education Gazette, vol. 27, no. 298, Aug. 1911, p. 212.

3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1908, p. 26.

4 loc. cit.

5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1877, p. 20. See above, pp. 78, 79.

6 D. Winkley, "LEA Inspectors and Advisers: A developmental analysis", in Oxford Review of Education, vol. 8, no. 2, 1982, p. 123.

Assistant Inspector Ham visited the remote schools for incidental inspection and advisory purposes.¹ He also found it necessary to travel at least 30 miles by trap in order to inspect two outback schools in a day and then to find that he had no time to carry out the important part of his mission - to advise, enhearten, admonish, and inspire the teacher.² Inspector McBride, too, arranged the advisory teacher's work (a new role for the inspector) so that he could spend a whole day in each school.³ Despite the help of the advisory teacher, he still found it necessary to call teachers together on Saturday mornings to advise them on the revised curriculum and the aims of education.⁴ Inspector Martin, an old hand, admitted that he had expressed in the past the same sentiments as Neale and Charlton; he had left teachers groping in the dark through lack of time to advise them, but Williams had rectified this, he thought, by the appointment of an advisory teacher who could step into the breach.⁵

Inspector Smyth gave evidence to the Royal Commission on how the inspectors achieved uniformity. With the individually examined subjects, papers were drawn up and criticized at the Christmas conference and printed. Consequently it did not matter who did the examining. To overcome the idiosyncrasies in the collectively examined subjects, the inspectors went to a school as a body and each examined in a subject while the others stood round and made notes. They returned to the office and further discussed the methods of examining. He felt that this was a better method of getting uniformity than that in the other states of allowing for the "personal equation".⁶

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1908, p. 29.

2 loc. cit.

3 ibid., p. 23.

4 ibid., pp. 23, 24.

5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, p. 24.

6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1912, p. 98.

When teachers took over the examining and promoting of pupils, the inspectors, instead of using the time saved for their advisory function, which teachers expected, inspected in greater detail in order to assess teachers' ability according to a detailed set of prescriptions.¹ Any teacher who expected to escape supervision under the new arrangement was bound to be disappointed.² So minutely did the inspectors inspect and test that their time for advising was diminished, and in fact they failed to make an advisory visit to many schools.³ Attempts by Hartley to put a numerical assessment, in his case a percentage, on the quality of teaching had brought criticism of the inspectors' part in it. It was no different in Maughan's attempt. So began a clash between the advisory role and the assessing role of the inspectors, a clash which on the face of it could have been avoided with a little less zeal on the part of the inspectors for their accountability role. The inspector's own actions distorted their role from being an enhanced advisory one to a detailed 'looking into' role.

The early annual reports in the period indicated that the inspectors still inspected in some detail the school records, but viewed them not for the sake of finding mistakes that they could criticize, but for their contribution to better teaching. For instance the timetable was viewed favourably not because it was complete according to Regulations, but because it had taken into account the ability of the children and their attendance, and grouped them suitably.⁴ Inspector Burgan believed that there should be records in schools related to children's physical development from the physical training programmes and results of proper eye and ear tests.⁵ So there was a new emphasis and a new attitude; the records were for the welfare of children not for the well-being and efficiency of the system.

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1914, p. 15.

2 ibid., p. 25.

3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1915, p. 16.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, p. 22.

5 ibid., p. 20.

Even so some of the older hands had their gibes at admission registers not in compliance with directions; there were erasures in them as well as pet names such as Polly and Sissy. There were rolls in which the absent marks were not in red ink.¹ Despite these latter comments the inspectors through their attitudes to inspections had contributed to the development of their role along the lines that Williams had advocated.

Likewise the Inspector's Registers at Norwood School indicated that the inspectors endeavoured to develop their role in the inspection process largely as Williams wanted it but with some interpretation. It appeared that the tests were on the work shown in the teachers' work programmes, and the aim of the inspections was to discover whether the pupils had been taught on the right lines, whether the teachers were cultivating in their pupils the power of thinking clearly, and of expressing themselves plainly, and a growing interest and desire to do well.² In the inspection reports at Norwood School rarely were the inspectors' criticisms on content, but were usually directed at teachers' methods and their impact on children's thinking and behaviour.³ At the inspection from 10 to 14 July 1916, Inspector McBride did criticize content. He said "I think it unwise to foist this science (botany) on any class in the school". This was probably not a reasoned proposition, but an expression of his chagrin at the audacity of A.G. Edquist, a specialist in nature study, in placing in the Inspector's Register an entry, visit of advice re nature study, in which he recommended, for Grade 7 girls, the study of botany.⁴

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1908, p. 19.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1907, p. 14.

3 Inspector's Register, Norwood School. Inspector West's report on his visit on 11, 12 Nov. 1914, and Inspector McBride's report on his inspection, 9, 10, 29, 30 March 1916, were good examples.

4 Inspector's Register, Norwood School, visit of advice, 22 Feb. 1916, held at Norwood School.

Inspector McBride was noted for his thoroughness at inspection, and his detailed inspection of 6 1/2 days in 1915, assisted by two other inspectors was no exception. His lengthy report was a saga of instructions, advice, criticisms and praise. He noted everything from mundane matters such as rusty pannikins to professional matters such as the absence of "rutly" teaching and numerous instances of original treatment of subjects. He numerated eight matters needing attention. The headmaster in getting teachers to initial the report congratulated them on their excellent work; he analyzed the report and found 332 Excellent, 20 Very Good - Excellent, 47 Very Good, 11 Good, 12 Very Fair, and 1 Fair.¹ The extent to which the scale was so finely graded was surprising when compared with the practice in Scotland where the inspectors were concerning themselves with the scope of the work as a whole.² McBride was not only thorough at inspection, but he also returned in April 1916 to give a three hour address to the staff on points connected with the inspection, in accord with Regulations.

In 1919, McBride was back in the school criticising less, praising more, still addressing staff but not stating for how long, and still listing weak spots (this time a few isolated ones) so that remedial measures might be promptly applied. He could not find language eulogistic enough to express his appreciation of work done for patriotic purposes.³ But he had another language to reward it:

In consequence of the high character of the organization, interest, zeal, teaching and of the discipline I have decided to award to the head teacher and most of the staff efficiency marks higher than those obtained last year.⁴

Herein lay the real power of the inspector.

1 Inspector's Register, Norwood School, inspection, 25 Oct. to 2 Nov. 1915, held at Norwood School.

2 T.R. Bone, op. cit., p. 250.

3 Inspector's Register, Norwood School, incidental inspection, 28, 31 Jan. and 6, 7, 10, 11 March 1919, held at Norwood School.

4 Inspector's Register, Norwood School, detailed inspection, 18-22 Aug., 15-17 Sept. 1919, held at Norwood School.

The careful and detailed observation of methods, organization and discipline and children's reaction to them, evident in inspection reports at Norwood School in this period, were necessary for the allotment of efficiency marks to teachers. These assessments had to be made by the inspectors without the benefit of the inspectors' result examination as the teachers, themselves, did the examining and promoting of pupils. However the inspectors' interpretation of Regulations determined their individual roles. No superior drafting a Regulation requiring the inspectors to meet the teachers would have envisaged a three-hour address.

Even when the inspectors were showing their shortcomings in their reports, they were still concentrating on teachers' methods and their influence on children, and not on factual content. Inspector West, at an inspection visit on 11, 12 November 1914, gave some inconsistent advice in his report. He wrote, "Children are told too much and spoon fed to (sic) much. They should be allowed to rely more upon themselves",¹ and a few lines before he contradicted this with "I would like to see some uniform method of ruling the work books for arithmetic".² Inspectors Harry and Cole carried out the detailed inspection of the infant department, where Lydia Longmore, a disciple of Montessori, was in charge. Their comments that the work was "too simple and easy" and "not to allow too much guessing at measurement when rulers are at hand" tended to indicate their lack of understanding of Montessori methods.

The behaviour of some inspectors did not enhance their standing in the community nor aid the development of their role. The evidence given to the Royal Commission by Inspector Jordan, aired in the press and in Parliament, although rejected substantially by the Commission, did throw a poor light on the

1 Inspector's Register, Norwood School, inspection visit, 11 and 12 Nov. 1914, held at Norwood School.

2 loc. cit.

inspectorate and on Williams's judgment in appointing him. Jordan told the Commission that Adey, the Headmaster, had debarred him, as directed by Williams, from inspecting Adelaide High School.¹ Jordan's article in The Education Gazette was sound and reasonable indicating that he saw the United States of America as the model for South Australian secondary education whereas the established members of the hierarchy were wedded to the European model. His gibe that, in his favoured model, the smart got on unfettered by "promotion by seniority"² or "jealousy of his superior officers"³ was perhaps fair comment, but hardly suitable, particularly the latter comment in an Education Gazette article. A.H. Neale's "He had slapped my face, and I felt that I wanted to punch his eyes",⁴ even though spoken metaphorically did not paint the inspectorate as the harmonious team it had been in the early days of Williams's term nor add to its prestige. Jordan must have been a difficult person, but his rebellion against Williams's dictatorial stance and Neale's rigidity on travel from country inspections on Saturday is understandable. Hartley was dictatorial and rigid with inspectors on similar matters, but such altercations with his inspectors were in the strict privacy of his confidential letters, certainly not in the inspectors' common room.⁵

Such incidents as these, the dismissal of Inspector Cherry⁶ for misconduct, and the pique and resignation of Inspector Smyth when not promoted⁷ were well publicised and permitted Members of Parliament to say some damaging things about the inspectorate: a spirit of autocracy, jealousy and petty-mindedness pervaded

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1912, pp. 1-15.

2 E. Jordan, "Education in California" in The Education Gazette, vol. 26, no. 290, December 1910, p. 252.

3 loc. cit.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1912, p. 22.

5 B. Condon (ed.), op. cit., letters 102 and 138.

6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 3 Dec. 1912, p. 1146.

7 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 16 Sept. 1913, p. 368.

it;¹ save us from the inspectors;² "I am not at all struck with everybody in the education system";³ private schools did not want such inspectors deciding their efficiency;⁴ the inspector came up on one train and back on the next;⁵ rigid conservatism and arrogance surrounds them,⁶ and they were somewhat behind the times in their methods.⁷

The inspectors were lax in inspecting the district high schools. In fact, the Inspector's Registers of Norwood School, only rarely mentioned the high school initially on the same site as the primary school. Inspector McBride's report on the Annual Examination from 13 to 17 June 1910, at Norwood School contained a note saying that he had no time to spend in the high school. This kind of behaviour permitted the Commissioners to report that the minimal supervision of high schools by district inspectors was insufficient and recommended that a thorough system of inspection of high schools should be instituted and carried out initially by the proposed Superintendent of Secondary Education.⁸ Hence an opportunity to extend their role and influence into the high schools was lost by the action or inaction of the inspectors.

On the other hand some inspectors had an exalted opinion of their own role. Inspector Charlton told the Commission that the inspectors were idealists working in advance of the teachers and influenced the teachers' lives, preventing them from stagnating. The inspectors were leaders up the education hill with a wider view of the child's interest than the teacher had. They must be experts in their field, sympathetic and know men

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 21 Sept. 1915, p. 963.

2 ibid., p. 974.

3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 5 Oct. 1915, p. 1136.

4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 2 Dec. 1910, p. 1282.

5 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 16 Oct. 1917, p. 588.

6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 21 Sept. 1915, p. 974.

7 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 17 Aug. 1911, p. 395.

8 S.A.P. Paper, no. 75, 1913, p. xix.

and children - so much depended on their judgment.¹ Another inspector told the Commission that they looked upon themselves as taking the place of the parents to see that every child had a fair chance of promotion.² Thus showing that the lurking distrust of teachers had remained with the inspectors ever since Hartley had taken over from Wyatt.³ He also declared to the Commission that the children were more afraid of the teacher than of the inspector.⁴ Such an inane statement indicated insensitivity on the part of the inspector in relations with teachers.

Despite these perceptions of their role by some members of the inspectorate, a model role was available. By 1917, Lydia Longmore was an inspector and she saw her role as helping teachers to innovate. Her first four entries in the inspector's register at Norwood Infant School were reports of visits to arrange for the "Ellis" experiment in reading and to assist in an experimental class, which was to have a special timetable, exemption from the ordinary examination and was to work under her direct supervision. This lady had revealed in these short entries that she knew what her role should be, namely, a professional colleague of teachers assisting them to innovate.⁵ She was well ahead of her more experienced male counterparts in thinking about the inspector's role. Their entries revealed their undoubted zeal, but also their pompous attitudes, their absolute certainty of the validity of their advice and instructions coming as they did from beings so superior to

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1912, p. 105.

2 ibid., p. 99.

3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 18 July 1877, col. 408, 409.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1912, p. 98. F.H. Spencer, Education for the People, London, George Routledge and Sons Ltd., 1941, p. 48, in comment on the ill effects in England of the new code of 1861 said, "Just as under the system the teacher became the stern enemy of the pupil, so the inspector was, or was regarded as, the enemy of the teacher."

5 Inspector's Register, Norwood School, visits 23 Feb., 6, 12 March, 15-17 May 1917, held at Norwood School.

headmasters and teachers. No one other than such an inspector would have spent three hours, to use McBride's own word, "addressing" teachers. Compare such an attitude with Longmore's approach after one of her experiments had been assessed by another inspector as a great success. She introduced her advice by saying, "I think it wise that the teacher should now teach..." In getting Inspector Roach to assess the reading and spelling of this class undertaking the Ellis reading experiment, in which she had been intimately involved, she showed a keen sense of objectivity in evaluation.¹ She was prepared for her work to be put to the test. The behaviour of this member of the inspectorate did no damage to the role of the inspectors, but enhanced it. Here was a positive contribution to the development of their role by a member of the inspectorate.

The inspectors themselves used their annual reports, and their role as advocates to further the cause of all the matters dear to Williams's heart - improved lighting, ventilation and hygiene of buildings for the sake of children's and teachers' health; the medical inspection of children; the benefits of the better initial training; and the improved and increased activity in the professional development of teachers. They praised The Education Gazette articles giving teachers insight into the work of Pestalozzi, Froebel and Montessori. They told of their more frequent meetings with teachers and of working with them as a team. Just as Williams earlier had the inspectors, his experts and his outstanding teachers working with him as a team, the inspectors themselves were using city teachers to demonstrate to teachers and citizens, enlightening them on the aims and objectives of education.²

However, events were catching up with the inspectors for the new high schools were taking the better trained teachers

1 Inspector's Register, Infant Department, inspection 16-19 Sept. 1918; held at Norwood School.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1908, pp. 23-25. Inspector McBride's report is typical of the annual reports of inspectors from 1906-1910.

from the primary schools, not that they objected, for the high schools were good recruiting and training places for future teachers. Moreover the number of outback schools had been steadily increasing. In addition the good seasons prior to the outbreak of war had meant that well paid jobs were available outside teaching, and recruitment of teachers was difficult, so much so that untrained teachers had to be employed.¹ These matters added to the load of the inspector in advising the untrained teachers, in inspecting the continuation classes and assisting in country high schools; and what advice could they give about decorations and neatness for the tent schools of some new settlements where the school masters were also living in tents?²

Next the war effort restricted the development of their role by the inspectors. The shortage and cost of paper caused reduction in the size of The Education Gazette and only small extracts of the inspectors' annual reports were published. Consequently their role as advocates was restricted. No longer were reports of Teachers' Association meetings, where inspectors did valuable work, published. Shortage of teachers worsened and women teachers were forced to teach very large classes and worked longer hours on reduced pay in the cause of the war effort.³ All of these conditions made greater demands on the inspectors, and at least forced them to develop a role adapted to war-time conditions. However, no inspector nor the Director attended the first meeting of the Children's Patriotic Fund.⁴ Some inspectors were approved to inspect Junior Cadet Corps' training.⁵

1 See above, p. 150, and Table 4.1, p. 151.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1910, pp. 5-41, refers to the matters mentioned here.

3 Education Gazette, vol. 33, no. 372, July 1917, p. 135.

4 Education Gazette, vol. 31, no. 350, Oct. 1915, p. 183.

5 Education Gazette, vol. 32, no. 357, April 1916, p. 173.

Pressures for Development of the Role of the
Inspectors from Teachers

The S.A.P.S.T.U. was used by the teachers to endeavour to bring about changes in the role of the inspectors. The Teachers' Associations by this time were affiliated bodies, and though still used by inspectors to address, advise and demonstrate to teachers out of school hours, they had to share this time with Union officials. The annual conferences were still attended by governors, ministers, federal and state, and other influential citizens. Moreover the Union continued to bring speakers from outside the State as well as delegates from unions in other states, who usually commented on the good relations between the departmental officers and the teachers,¹ as did the President.² Spurred on by its successful advocacy for change in 1905, the S.A.P.S.T.U. continued to press for reform with its immediate past President as Director of Education, and its President of 1897 and 1898 as Chief Inspector.

At the 1906 conference,³ the President, Alexander Clark, gave rather subdued approval of Williams's innovations. He was grateful for the increased allowances to some outback teachers, as liberal as public funds would allow, and the promise of a subsidy only for fly screens, again for financial reasons. He was grateful for the removal of penalties on head teachers for petty errors in returns, and for the steps taken to remedy the glaring omissions in the training of students at the University Training College. He hailed with satisfaction the approaching establishment of school cadet corps, something that the inspectors under Stanton⁴ had been advocating unsuccessfully, was to come to fruition in Williams's first year as Director.

1 Education Gazette, vol. 26, no. 285, July 1910, p. 191.

2 Education Gazette, vol. 25, no. 273, July 1909, p. 167.
"... in no State were the friendly feelings between teachers and inspectors warmer than in South Australia".

3 Education Gazette, vol. 22, no. 237, July 1906, p. 167.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1905, p. 18.

However, it was this former inspector's plea for consideration for the over-worked inspectors that brought cheers from the assembly. He emphasized that to maintain the efficiency of the schools meant constant and unremitting effort, long hours in schools, lengthy and carefully digested reports, the discomforts of travel, and long absences from home. He drew attention to the practice in some states of not holding inspections or examinations on Fridays so that the inspectors could write reports, transact correspondence and prepare plans and examination papers. This was a magnanimous statement from one, who, at the disbandment of the Board of Inspectors, was forced to accept a position as head teacher.

The S.A.P.S.T.U. was still using The Education Gazette as a vehicle to publicize the motions sent to the Department or discussed in deputations to the Minister of Education, as well as to get full publicity for the addresses and ideas floated at the annual conferences. The nature of inspections and the inspectors' role became the prime targets for reform. The Union used a multi-pronged attack on such matters as, teachers, not inspectors, promoting children; less detailed inspections; concern at the appointment of assistant inspectors; and teacher representation on classification and curriculum boards. The executive members wrote to or saw the Minister and then published the results in The Education Gazette. They circulated a questionnaire to members and took the consolidated opinions to the Department. They raised the same issues at the annual conference. They presented the same ideas to the Royal Commission. They expressed loyalty to the Department, yet letters of complaint appeared in the press.¹ In 1915 they published The S.A. Teachers' Journal and used it for professional and industrial purposes. The editor was probably more outspoken in 1919, after the end of the war, on enervating, unhealthy and almost impossible conditions in which teachers had

1 Education Gazette, vol. 27, no. 296, June 1911, p. 157.

to work for the lowest pay and the largest classes in the Commonwealth,¹ than the President in his address to the annual conference.² The S.A.P.S.T.U. with its journal was an educational and political force to be reckoned with.

Williams's frequent illnesses and his consequent lack of contact with the S.A.P.S.T.U. and his loss of continuity in imparting his philosophy to the inspectors, brought criticisms from the Union on the conduct of inspections, while, at the same time its President extolled the fine feeling that existed between departmental officers, the teachers and the Union.³ The Union did not want assistant inspectors appointed, and in any case these people of less experience and lower standing should not be sent to help teachers in the back-blocks.⁴

Motions moved by women teachers at the 1911 Union conference were directed at the activities of the inspectors and the nature of inspections. One claimed that teaching was made subservient to the inspector's annual examination, which controlled the year's work and the method of teaching.

We start the new year with it before our eyes, feeling thankful for any tips gathered from the last. (Laughter.) We have one goal and follow a well-beaten track. Few teachers venture to stray, and if they do they hurry back to the ruts fearing they have lost valuable time. As we approach the end of our journey our anxiety increases. We stop teaching and cram - we miscall it recapitulation. (Hear, hear.)⁵

Abolish the inspector's examination and all these evils would vanish. There must be simultaneous examinations in all schools, not spread over eight months as were the inspectors'

1 S.A.T. Journal, Aug. 1919, p. 22.

2 Education Gazette, vol. 35, no. 396, July 1919, p. 157.

3 Education Gazette, vol. 27, no. 298, Aug. 1911, p. 193.

4 Education Gazette, vol. 26, no. 285, July 1910, p. 189.

5 Education Gazette, vol. 27, no. 298, Aug. 1911, p. 212.

examinations. There must be a fixed promotion time and the teachers must make the promotions of pupils.

Our school classification, and to some extent the status of the teacher, depends upon our chance fortune or misfortune in arithmetic, grammar, and spelling tests, and to some extent on the inspector. (Hear, hear.)

Pavia speaking for the Teachers' Union painted a picture of the busy lives of the inspectors and told the Commission that the most valuable part of the inspectors' work was teaching the teacher, talking over, in the dinner-hour, ways of overcoming difficulties. However, he was critical of the fact that the inspectors were not seeing enough of the Director and consequently they were each interpreting the Regulations and instructions in their own way leading to dissatisfaction in the service. He added that inspections had greatly increased in detail; he had acted as an inspector and never before had he seen the four-page list of questions to which the inspector had to get answers. Further he declared that with some inspectors in a few minutes in the school everything became cold, cheerless and unresponsive; they could demoralize a school, and the results depended on their mood. He wanted uniformity from the inspectors and that was why they should not live in country districts and why the Union wanted a teacher representative to attend the monthly and annual conferences of the inspectors.²

These were some of the matters that the Union was feeding into the Royal Commission on Education.³ The unionists were in effect, if unwittingly, seeking a firmer structure, lock-step instruction of classes instead of individuals, more uniformity

1 loc. cit.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1912, pp. 55-58, 81, 82. Similar evidence was given to the 1881-1883 Inquiry. See, for instance, S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, p. 104.

3 Education Gazette, vol. 28, no. 310, Aug. 1912, pp. 177, 178.

and tighter central control, even if teachers were to help in curriculum construction and make pupil-promotions. They would become locked into the system as their President had said the inspectors were.¹ With inspectors calling for every bit of work done by the pupils, teachers were made to feel that all trust in them was at an end. So the detailed inspection combined with examination introduced by Stanton, and little changed by Williams, had brought about a deterioration of trust between teacher and inspector - the very thing that Williams wanted to avoid. The 1913 Regulations attempted to cover most of these Union criticisms. Teachers were to examine and promote their pupils and the assessment of teachers' efficiency was to be more objective by the use of the efficiency mark. However, at the 1914 annual conference of the S.A.P.S.T.U., the President claimed that the detailed inspection outlined in these Regulations was the old result examination under another name. It was just as rigid an examination as ever obtained in the State.²

As a consequence of the teachers' advocacy through the Union and the subsequent legislation, teachers had legally intruded into areas that had been the province of the inspectors since 1874. If their wish for an appeals board³ had been granted, it would have been an arbiter of inspectors' decisions. It was unlikely that the inspectors would accept these intrusions without some retaliation. It came in the form of added minuteness of inspection⁴ in assessing teachers' competence, a process that inspectors considered could only be done by the inspectors. Nevertheless the teachers still indicated that they wanted the inspectors' visits and, as well

1 ibid., p. 178.

2 Education Gazette, vol. 30, no. 335, July 1914, p. 262.

3 Education Gazette, vol. 28, no. 310, Aug. 1912, p. 179.

4 Education Gazette, vol. 35, no. 396, July 1919, pp. 157, 161.

as safeguarding the interests of the taxpayer, they advocated, at the 1917 annual conference of the Union, a role for them:

... in keeping the teacher in good heart, in being to him a source of courage, hope, and inspiration, a sympathetic counsellor rather than a carping critic.¹

At this same 1917 conference, the S.A.P.S.T.U. had the new woman inspector, Lydia Longmore, address the gathering.² This was a master stroke for the future development of the inspectors' role, for there was a woman, an outstanding practitioner in progressive education, who had been used by other inspectors at schools of instruction, about to make her own mark and create her own role as an inspector. She had already demonstrated in experimental work at Norwood School that her role was that of a professional colleague of teachers in innovation and change,³ and that she fitted the description for the inspectorial role that the Union had advocated at this conference.

Conclusion

The development of the role of the inspectors in the period from the appointment of the first Director of Education to the end of World War I, began promisingly with Williams stressing the membership of the inspectors in an advisory team with the task of lifting the status and professional ability of teachers, the dominant factor in educating children, and of enlightening the community on the aims of education.

Under Williams, the examining and inspecting roles were developed with the aim of helping, encouraging and enlightening teachers rather than repressing them with carping criticism.

1 Education Gazette, vol. 33, no. 372, July 1917, pp. 137, 138.

2 ibid., p. 142.

3 Inspector's Register, Norwood School, visits, 23 Feb. and 12 March 1917. Held at Norwood School.

Williams was less concerned with the assessing role of the inspectors and left it largely as a matter of trust between teachers and inspectors. Chief Inspector Maughan had endorsed these roles and encouraged other roles as advocates and liaison officers. In the early years of this period the S.A.P.S.T.U., representing teachers, was commenting favourably on inspectors' attitudes and their concern for teachers' welfare. All, too, except some religious petitioners to Parliament, accepted without question the need for the inspectors' fundamental role of ensuring value from the schools commensurate with expenditure. An advisory teacher after visiting outback schools confirmed this need by saying that the taxpayers did not realize what harm was being done under the guise of schooling.¹

Things began to change towards the end of Williams's term of office, for, because of his poor health, he was not regularly guiding the inspectors in conference, and he had not given them more time for their tasks by increasing their number, despite the increasing numbers and spread of schools. Maughan as Director attempted to develop the objectivity of the assessing role by introducing the efficiency mark. He also wanted the increased time available to the inspectors, consequent upon teachers taking over the function of promoting and examining pupils, to be used for advising teachers. The relations between teachers and inspectors were damaged, largely because of the inspectors' manner of implementing the more systematic but cumbersome assessing procedure. Thus the two roles, assessing and advising, were in conflict and did not to satisfy teachers' needs.

The cry of the Union and the teachers had been to abolish the inspectors' annual examination. They achieved that, and the teachers took over the inspectors' erstwhile task of examining and promoting pupils. The teachers' hope was that, as the

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1910, p. 35.

inspectors were not examiners anymore, they would come as friendly advisers, and would concentrate on the highest and broadest aspects of the teachers' work, and indulge in only as much detailed inspection as assured the taxpayers of a fair return. However, the inspectors, bereft of their annual examination to help them in assessing teachers' ability, the one role that nobody else could take from them, inspected and examined in greater detail. This took so much time that there was little time left for advising teachers. The inspectors found it easier to carry out routine inspection, even if in greater detail, than to perform the more creative but difficult task of advising teachers with different qualifications, status and ability in various environments including war-time conditions.

Stanton in trying to perfect the inspecting and examining system failed to see that the successful inspector-teacher relationship must be one of mutual trust.¹ Maughan, a decade later, in endeavouring to improve the system of the inspectors' assessment of teacher efficiency, produced a system, described by teachers as susceptible to the idiosyncrasies of individual inspectors and "wicked in its injustice",² which, again, indicated lack of mutual trust between teachers and inspectors. In 1905, the image of the inspection process had been determined by the way in which the inspectors had administered it, and it was generally not a favourable one. The same thing could be said of this period at the end of World War I in 1918. However, there were other contributing factors. Teachers' forbearance of tardy and miserly Governments, forcing many of them to exist on pitiful salaries in times of rapid rise in the cost of living, had worn thin. They were discontented with large classes in over-crowded rooms and passages in the city schools, and of abominable living and teaching conditions in the country, made

1 See above, pp. 117-119.

2 Education Gazette, vol. 35, no. 396, July 1919, p. 162.

bearable only by their own attempts at decoration. They were drained by their magnificent patriotic efforts and sacrifices during the war with meagre material rewards. All, including inspectors, had missed the earlier driving force of Williams's missionary zeal. In addition, much of the blame for the unsatisfactory situation must go to the politicians of 1910 to the outbreak of war. If they had not held up education bills that later became the 1915 Education Act, the relevant education matters could have been implemented in peaceful and prosperous times rather than partly implemented when the nation was at war in a difficult economic climate.

Consideration of the three periods so far discussed point to some inherent weakness in the whole concept of inspection of schools, for, despite development of the inspectors' role over more than 40 years, the same criticisms were levelled, mainly by teachers, particularly at the two inquiries, 1881-1883 and 1910-1913. Teachers' futures depended on the whim of inspectors; demands of inspection and examination led to cram and restricted teachers' opportunities to explore new methods; there was too much secrecy involved; and a reluctance of the inspectors to put their advisory function to the fore. Nevertheless, no one challenged the accountability role of the inspectors, the value for money purpose of inspections.

There is little doubt that the appointment of inspectors from the senior ranks of headmasters tended to conserve rather than change the system laid down by Hartley. Nevertheless inspectors appointed by Hartley were young; those appointed by Williams and Maughan were old, yet criticisms in these periods were much the same. The inspectors stayed too long in the position, became out-of-date and should have returned to the schools. This was a proposition that the Royal Commission considered in a draft report, but then rejected it.¹ There were

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 75, 1913, p. lviii.

pleas to promote the enthusiastic, exotic rebel¹ to the position of headmaster, but never a plea to promote such people to the position of inspector, and the S.A.P.S.T.U. was as much to blame for this as the central administration. The rising cry for freedom for teachers did not extend to inspectors, who, nevertheless, when offered freedom from individual examining and promoting of pupils, bound themselves into detailed inspection to assess teachers rather than advise them, which teachers claimed was their great need. In fact the inspectors made the detailed inspection so minute in detail and exhaustive in scope that some teachers would have preferred to return to the earlier inspector's annual examination.² It was the same in Scotland when the inspector's examination was dispensed with, some teachers preferred their old chains to the new freedom.³ Up-to-date teachers were wanted, and schools of instruction were organized to achieve this. It did not extend to inspectors. Inspectors had been sent interstate for specific purposes, but the Education Department of South Australia had not contemplated training schools for inspectors.⁴ The members of the S.A.P.S.T.U. wanted as inspectors the smartest, the wisest, the experienced and the careful, to inspect with sympathy, tact and wisdom, and to guide and encourage teachers.⁵ However, their solution was not to train such people but to select senior headmasters.

Perhaps the look at the fundamentals of the inspectors' role had been too uncritical by all parties, teachers, the administration, Parliament and the inspectors themselves. Nevertheless, there were promising signs that a more critical appraisal of the inspectors' role was beginning. The 1881-1883 Inquiry endorsed the existing dominant role of the inspectors of

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1898, p. 15.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1915, p. 20.

3 T.R. Bone, op. cit., p. 150.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1912, p. 84. A Commissioner explained that Victoria had special training for young inspectors.

5 Education Gazette, vol. 26, no. 285, July 1910, p. 189.

examining pupils, policing of Regulations, and reporting to the administration. On the other hand, the 1910-1913 Royal Commission recommended definite changes in the inspectors' role. It removed the examining of pupils from the role and it endeavoured to provide time for an enhanced advisory role; even a return to the roles of inservice educator and community educator so fruitful in the early years of this period. It recommended selection of inspectors on the grounds of suitability for the task and not on seniority. The conservative members of the inspectorate kept to their modified examining and inspecting role with the added or amplified role of assessing teachers to an efficiency mark, which was, through their own actions, clashing with the advisory role. However, an innovative woman in the inspectorate, Inspector Lydia Longmore, of her own initiative, developed a role as a professional colleague of teachers and an innovator with them.