CHAPTER 5

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROLE OF THE INSPECTORS FROM THE END OF WORLD WAR I TO THE END OF WORLD WAR II

Introduction

In this period from the end of World War I to the end of World War II pressures to change the role of the inspectors came from the Parliament, Governments, and Ministers of Education as well as from the three Directors of Education, the Superintendents and other senior officers active during the period. The impact of the 1937 New Education Fellowship Conference on the role of the inspectors was considerable. In South Australia, the Conference had the backing of the Government[1] and of the Minister of Education who granted leave with pay for all teachers who joined the Conference. Without this leave the impact of the N.E.F. Conference would have been far less. W.J. Adey, the Director of Education, had attended the Seventh Annual Conference of N.E.F. at Cheltenham, England, when on an overseas study tour of Europe and North America in 1936.[2] The N.E.F. activities impressed him and he strongly supported the holding of a Regional Conference of N.E.F. in Australia and New Zealand in 1937. He became the first President of the South Australian Section of N.E.F.[3] Adey's

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 54, no. 618, Jan. 1938, p. 59.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 52, no. 597, April 1936, p. 125.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 54, no. 626, Sept. 1938, p. 232.

attitude was different from that of his predecessor, W.T. McCoy, who reneged on attendance at the Locarno Conference of N.E.F. on "The True Meaning of Freedom in Education" when overseas. He could have heard such speakers as Pierre Bovet and Carlton Washburne,[1] but decided to restrict himself to the more practical and less theoretical Imperial Conference on Education.[2]

The Inspectors themselves, a progressively younger, more academically qualified and more progressive group of inspectors than in the period ending with World War I, were willing to look critically at their own role and to change it.

Pressures for development of the role of inspectors from teachers, came from the S.A.P.S.T.U. mainly through its journal The S.A. Teachers' Journal. Also in the later part of the period some powerful women teachers influenced the role. First their influence came from the Women Teachers' Progressive League, a powerful association of the S.A.P.S.T.U., and later from the break-away Women Teachers' Guild, using its journal, The Guild Chronicle.

There were two distinctly different inquiries into education set up by the Parliament and the Government, during this period. The Committee of Enquiry into Education[3] produced First and Second Progress Reports on 1 April and 19 June 1931 as S.A. Parliamentary Paper no. 69, 1931. The Education Inquiry

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 43, no. 492, July 1927, p. 208.
2 W.G. Richards, "W.T. McCoy and his Directorship of Education in South Australia 1919-1929." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Adelaide, 1973, p. 88.
3 The Committee of Enquiry into Educaton was unlike previous committees of inquiry which were committees of parliamentarians, whereas the members of this one were the Director of Education, W.J. Adey, Professor J. McKellar Stewart of the University of Adelaide, and a business man, J.W. Sandford, elected as Chairman. This Committee did not call for evidence or submissions.

Committee was appointed by the Government in late 1942.[1] The impact of these two inquiries on the role of the inspectors as creations of the legislature has been examined along with other pressures from the legislature and as required elsewhere in the chapter. The Education Inquiry Committee, though set up during the period did not produce its Final Report until more than three years after the end of World War II.

The period was a time of world social upheavals. The immediate post-war economic depression and the Great Depression were accompanied by the rise of different political ideologies, Marxism, Nazism and Fascism in Europe, along with a surge for greater individual liberty in the industrial democracies, particularly Britain and the United States of America. The spread of these movements was assisted by improved means of mass communication including radio and the developing means of entertainment through the cinema and talkies. The clash of these ideological movements contributed to the outbreak of World War II.

These social and political movements were accompanied by world movements in education. The New Education Fellowship was gaining in strength and spreading its influence by means of international and regional conferences. The philosophies of Rousseau, Pestalozzi and Comenius, and the psychological aspects

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Council, 14 Oct. 1942, pp. 857-864. Hon. E. Anthoney moved for a committee to inquire into primary and high school standards, more adequate provision for adult education and the kinds of education related to post-war reconstruction. S.A.P.S.T.U. on 21 Nov. 1942, also requested appointment of the committee. The Education Inquiry Committee Chairman was E.L. Bean, Parliamentary Draftsman, but the message and philosophy of the First Report, S.A. Parliamentary Paper, no. 15, 1945, were from Dr. H.H. Penny, Senior Lecturer, Adelaide Teachers College. J.F. Ward, Headmaster, Prince Alfred College, was the third member, and, because of the outcry at no woman being on the Committee, Mrs. H.W. Hooper was added.

of child development advanced by Binet, Bovet and Piaget were urged to be heeded in the classroom.[1] The psychological movement in education was gaining momentum, as was the use of intelligence tests and objective scholastic tests. There was also the move against existing examinations, their reliability and validity as well as their anti-educational effect.[2] The Qualifying Certificate Examination held at the end of primary schooling for determining entry to secondary school, systematized and publicized by McCoy, did not escape this attention.

These world movements influenced Australian education through better means of communication; through the increased flow of educational publications; through the attendance of Directors of Education and Superintendents at overseas conferences and reporting to Governments; through the visits of educators of world repute such as Professor John Adams; and through the holding of N.E.F. regional conferences in Australia and New Zealand. Some of these conferences and travel were made possible through the generosity of American Education Trusts, such as the Carnegie Foundation, that were prominent in this period.[3]

There were implications for the role of the South Australian inspectors from these broad movements. The

---

1 I. Cumming and A. Cumming, op. cit., pp. 217, 218.

2 S.A.T. Journal, July 1929, pp. 141, 142 contained, "Examinations Good and Bad" by P.B. Ballard reprinted from The Times, 25 May 1929; May 1929, p. 81 advertised C.R. McCrae, Psychology and Education, Melbourne, Whitcombe and Tombs, 1929. Education Gazette, vol. 40, no. 457, Aug. 1924, p. 201 showed a lecture, "The New Examiner" by P.B. Ballard; vol. 52, no. 596, March 1936, p. 104 contained a review of P. Hartog and E. Rhodes, An Examination of Examinations, International Institute Examinations Inquiry, London, 1935.

3 Education Gazette, vol. 56, no. 652, Nov. 1940, p. 229. C. Fenner acknowledged that his overseas observations as Superintendent of Technical Education were made possible by grants from funds such as those of Carnegie and Rockefeller.

Parliament, the Government, the administrators of the Education Department, and, indeed, many teachers saw the inspectors as the chief agents in bringing about changes in methods of teaching and in outlook and attitudes of teachers. Hence the necessity for inspectors to be abreast of these developments around the world. Teachers, through their Union, also saw the inspectors as barriers to their professional freedom. It had taken teachers some forty years to wrest from the inspectors the right to promote pupils from class to class. Inspectors, too, were still examiners, whose tests were under scrutiny for accuracy, reliability, validity, and whether they were necessary. Likewise they were assessors who attempted to put a numerical value on a teacher's competence. Again this was a process that was caught up in the maelstrom of educational debate of the period.

Table 5.1 contains data on population, pupils, teachers, schools, and the structure and expenditure of the Education Department for the year 1919. It also provides the highlights in the development of teacher preparation in the period 1919 to 1945.

M.M. Maughan resigned as Director of Education on the grounds of ill-health in 1919 and was replaced by W.T. McCoy, who had been Director of Education in Tasmania. The administrative staff expanded slowly during the period 1919 to 1945, with set-backs during the Great Depression. Under the directorship of W.T. McCoy, a Superintendent of Secondary Education, W.J. Adey, was appointed in accord with the 1915 Education Act in 1920. He had to combine the position with that of Inspector of High Schools. In 1945 under Dr C.E. Fenner as Director there were four superintendents namely H.C. Hosking, Superintendent of Rural Schools and Chief Inspector; W.T. Martin, Superintendent of Primary Schools; E. Allen, Superintendent of High Schools; and G.S. McDonald, Superintendent of Technical Schools. At this time the Primary

TABLE 5.1

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT DATA 1919[1]

S.A. POPULATION		470,780
GROSS SCHOOL ATTENDANCE		85,784
IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS		70,851
IN PROVISIONAL SCHOOLS		11,762
IN HIGH SCHOOLS		3,171
PERCENTAGE ATTENDANCE (PRIMARY)		78.8
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS		954
HIGH		21
TECHNICAL		9
DOM. ARTS. WOODWORK CENTRES		17
COMMERCIAL		4
PUBLIC (PRIMARY)		357
CLASS IX		535
HALF-TIME		11
NUMBER OF TEACHERS		2323
HIGH SCHOOL		163
(INCL. D.A.,W.W. CENTRES)		
PRIMARY		
H.T. (PUBLIC SCHOOLS & DEPTS)		379
ASSISTANTS &ASST. IN CHARGE		709
TEACHERS IN CLASS IX SCHOOLS		541
PUPIL TEACHERS		168
MONITORS		254
SEWING MISTRESSES (part time)		109
ADMINISTRATION	DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION SUPT. PRIMARY EDUCATION SUPT. TECH. EDUCATION CHIEF INSP. & REGISTRAR A.C.E. MEDICAL INSP. OF SCHOOLS 11 INSPECTORS 3 ASST. INSPECTORS SECRETARY TO M.E. CHIEF CLERK	
EXPENDITURE REVENUE AND LOAN		£ 408,319 (1918/1919)
COST PER CHILD INSTRUCTED		£ 4.4.2 (PRIMARY) £ 12.1.0 (SECONDARY)

SOURCES: 1 Public Service List, 30 June, 1919, in S.A. Parliamentary Papers, 1919.
Statistical Register of South Australia, 1919 in S.A. Parliamentary Papers, 1920.
S.A. Parliamentary Paper, no. 44, 1920.

TABLE 5.1 (CONT.)

TEACHER TRAINING FACILITY	The number of students at the Training College doubled in one year to 325 after the short course of training from the Observation School was incorporated in the College in 1919.[1] Returned soldiers from World War I entered the College and some resumed their broken courses. From 1921, the distinct courses in Teachers' College for one-teacher schools, primary, infant, secondary, commercial and arts and crafts were named by the letters of the alphabet from A to H. The short course was extended from six months to a year and the primary course to two years.[2] All matriculated students at Teachers College studied some arts or science subjects at the University, undertook professional studies at the College, and did their practice-teaching in six practising schools - two infant, three primary and one model country school - staffed with masters or mistresses of method, chief demonstration teachers and assistant demonstration teachers. In 1927, the College shifted into new premises and became known as Adelaide Teachers' College.[3] During the Great Depression intake of students was severely reduced and as a consequence the number of junior teachers appointed to schools increased.[4] In 1939, the University of Adelaide devised three sets of diplomas of pre-primary, primary and secondary education,[5] but still had no chair of education by the end of this period. Inservice education of teachers was not a particularly notable feature of this period, but Education Weeks were exceptionally good.

SOURCES: 1 B.K. Hyams, op. cit., 1979, p. 75.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1921, Report of the Director of Education, pp. 21, 22; and S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1922, Report of the Director of Education, p. 25, and Report of the Principal of the Teachers' College, p. 38.
3 B.K. Hyams, op. cit., 1979, p. 75.
4 ibid., p. 108.
5 ibid., p. 128.

Branch had a Staff Inspector, A.W. Pitt, and was soon to get an Assistant Superintendent of Primary Schools, W.V. Leach.

The 1919 inspectorate of 11 inspectors and 3 assistant inspectors had increased to 12 district inspectors and 3 advisory teachers by 1945. In addition there were an inspector of infant departments, an inspector of girls schools and classes, an inspector of high schools, an inspector of manual training, and 2 inspectors of technical schools.

The inspectors, with the exception of Lydia Longmore, whom McCoy as Director took over from Maughan were the elderly former senior headmasters of primary schools, who had taught under Hartley and experienced his rigid inspection and examination procedures. They had been in their positions as inspectors up to 14 years prior to 1919. They were practically all non-graduates.[1] McCoy, Adey and Fenner proceeded to have graduates, not always senior headmasters, appointed. They appointed such men as L. Jefferies, W.T. Martin, J.H. Williams, A.W. Pitt, E. Allen, W.V. Leach and M. Gerlach and women such as Adelaide Miethke, Ruth Gibson and Florence Blake. As a consequence by 1945 all inspectors and advisory teachers, except for a few specialists, were graduates, and the majority held the post-graduate Diploma in Education,[2] the only education qualification available to them at the University of Adelaide. The majority of the new inspectors, much to the suppressed chagrin of the S.A.P.S.T.U., had come from secondary teaching.[3] Some successful appointments came from the Teachers College[4] and

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 2, 1920. List of officers on the Permanent Staff at 30 June 1920, Education Department, pp. 41, 42.

2 Education Gazette, vol. 61, no. 702, Jan. 1945, p. 1.

3 S.A.T. Journal, July 1932, p. 13. The Association that expressed this annoyance mainly on the grounds that it restricted promotion opportunities for primary school men, did not mention that primary school women were not eligible for promotion as head teachers beyond a Class VI school, despite, according to the minutes, a woman being present at the meeting.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1924, p. 24.

the Practising Schools from where some advisory teachers were appointed and later promoted inspector, necessarily as acting appointments during World War II.[1]

With the exception of Lydia Longmore and J.C. Noack, all of the inspectors inherited by McCoy had been over 50 years of age at appointment. In contrast the inspectors appointed under McCoy and Adey, and still in service at 30 June 1939, were all under 50 years of age at appointment, with a range from 31 to 46 years of age.[2] Seniority and lengthy experience in primary schools ceased to be the basis of selection for inspectorship; suitability for the task was the criterion. An advertisement for the position of inspector of schools invited applicants to state what high school subjects they could examine up to Leaving standard, and what qualifications they had to examine special work in Central Schools.[3] By the end of World War II, the inspectorate of 1919 had been transformed from a loyal, hard-working group of ex-senior headmasters set on maintaining standards to a lively well-qualified group looking critically at their own part in educating children.

Decisions made in the early part of this period set a pattern to improve the quality of the teaching service. The new scale of salaries linked to academic qualifications and skill in teaching provided incentive for teachers to undertake further study.[4] A policy of training before teaching[5] meant that the main source of supply to the lengthened Teachers' College courses was from Probationary Students, rather than from junior (pupil) teachers. The Probationary Students, under bond, had financial support from the Education Department in their final two years of secondary education. Hence by 1927 there were 422 students in the Teachers' College from a relatively select

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 60, no. 699, Oct. 1944, p. 205.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 2, 1920, p. 41, and 1939, p. 40.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 44, no. 498, Jan. 1928, p. 1.
4 Education Regulations, 1920, Supplement to The Education Gazette, Dec. 1920, p. 22.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1922, p. 38.

intake.[1] In addition the Department was able to cease employing temporary and supplementary teachers.[2] Certificated teachers were appointed to Class VII Schools, the former Provisional or Class IX Schools, for the first time in 1927 when there were still 499 of these schools.[3] In 1939, the Chief Inspector was able to say that the majority of teachers in these schools were certificated.[4]

However the Great Depression brought changes. No Probationary Students were appointed and there was no intake to Teachers' College in 1932, resulting in an enrolment of only 139 students.[5] At the end of the period the Advisory Council of Education sent a report to the Minister of Education showing concern at the decline in the number and quality of recruits beginning before World War II and accentuated by it.[6]

Inservice training was limited in extent under McCoy. For instance, the Schools of Method conducted by the inspectors in 1921 were not allowed to be attended by teachers who had been to one in 1920, nor by teachers fresh from Teachers' College.[7] Splendid Education Weeks were held in 1929 and 1936, the centenary of the State, and had a great "tonic effect".[8]

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

This section examines the developoment of the role of the inspectors under pressures from the legislature from the period after World War I, through the Great Depression and World

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1928, pp. 9, 17.
2 ibid., p. 9.
3 ibid., p. 3.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1940, p. 33.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1933, p. 11.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1945, pp. 23, 24.
7 Education Gazette, vol. 37, no. 418, May 1921, p. 112.
8 Education Gazette, vol. 46, no. 526, May 1930, p. 169.

War II. It also examines the influence of the three Directors of Education and their senior officers on the role during the period. The influence of the New Education Fellowship conference of 1937 is also examined.

The message from the Parliament to the inspectors in 1919 was that the appointment as Director of Education of W.T. McCoy, formerly Director of Education in Tasmania and a teacher and inspector in New South Wales, was no reflection on them.[1] Nevertheless they might as a result get out of the groove into which they had possibly got.[2] They were reminded that South Australia was a State of great extent and distance and consequently the cost of administration was high, and, though the shadow of the war had passed, money had to be found before it could be used to tackle the complexities of the peace.[3] England and Scotland had learnt the same lesson; in their Education Acts of 1918 there were liberal and far-sighted measures for better education to repair the damages of war, but without finance they were powerless to implement them. Scotland was to have had compulsory full-time schooling to fifteen and compulsory part-time to eighteen. Secondary education was to be free[4] - something that South Australia had provided since 1908. Financial restraints on the development of the system generally and so on the inspectors' role were predicted.

In 1929, Parliament was recalled early to grapple with the effect of the world-wide industrial depression on the people of South Australia. It was a time when the Royal Commission on Disabilities in Australia had granted South Australia £500,000 per annum for two years because of its industrial and rural

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 7 Aug. 1919, p. 328.
2 loc. cit. The same kind of statement was made when Stanton was replaced 14 years earlier. See S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 15 Nov. 1905, p. 756.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 9 Oct. 1919, p. 1140.
4 I. Cumming and A. Cumming, op. cit., p. 219.

economic problems.[1] It was a time, too, when Members of Parliament were questioning every expense in education.[2] This was also the year that W.J. Adey was appointed Director of Education. He was not a graduate and not the senior Superintendent, but he had been through the whole gamut of positions in the Education Department from monitor to the combined, expense-saving positions of Principal, Adelaide High School, and Inspector of High Schools and later Superintendent of Secondary Education and Inspector of High Schools. A little over a year after his appointment as Director, he was made a member of the Committee of Enquiry into Education set up by Parliament to find ways of saving expenditure on education. Within a month of his appointment as Director by a Liberal Government, Adey was addressing a large gathering of teachers, inspectors and others. He made a policy statement that, owing to financial stringency, it was not the time to launch into new schemes, but to consolidate and develop what was already initiated.[3] It set the pattern of the introductory remarks of the Ministers of Education, whether Labor or Liberal, in their annual reports of the next several years.[4] It also indicated that there would be financial constraints on the activities of the inspectors. Such constraints sometimes produced pressures for improvisation and brought about changes in the inspectors' role.[5]

In 1939, when Germany attacked Poland and Britain and France declared war on Germany, a circular was sent to South Australian teachers and inspectors informing them of the need

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Governor's Speech, 2 May 1929, pp. 1, 2.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 12 June 1929, p. 321; 8 Aug., p. 652; 5 Nov., p. 1773 provide some examples.
3 S.A.T. Journal, Oct 1929, p. 209.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1930, p. 3 and 1936, p. 3, used almost the same wording as Adey in his address.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1932, p. 19. For instance, District Inspector Allen in charge of the South District was forced by shortage of funds to assume the role of Superintendent of Secondary Education and Inspector of High Schools.

for economy in expenditure because of the need for funds by the Commonwealth for defence.[1] The circular was signed by the new Director of Education, Dr. C.E. Fenner. Fenner was full of ideas for developments in education, particularly technical education. He also had ideas about how the inspectors' role should develop, but was faced with shortage of funds.

In the first decade of the period, 1919-1945, apart from Parliament's and several different Governments' limitations on funds, only occasionally was a matter raised in Parliament that had a direct bearing on the role of the inspectors. The value of Education Week in the River Murray District, the brain-child of Inspector Leach, was questioned.[2] It had been a fine example of inservice education of teachers and an outstanding exercise in public relations. Inspectors were also urged, in their capacity as assessors of teachers' efficiency, to make allowance for the disabilities under which teachers worked in over-crowded and under-staffed schools which caused strain and discontent from one end of the Department to the other.[3]

In the decade before World War II that embraced the Great Depression, the drive by Parliament and by Governments to save public expenditure affected the inspectors' role in various ways. Reduced employment opportunities meant that any new teachers to be inspected were of good quality, and few resignations meant that inspectors were well acquainted with their teachers. Reduction of teachers' salaries, discontinuance of bonuses for teaching domestic arts, woodwork and agriculture, and suspension of school building activities did not assist teacher-inspector relations. Disruption of inspections occurred through delay in filling vacant inspectors' positions, through reduction in the age of retirement for men to 65 years and for

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 55, no. 638, Sept. 1939, p. 226.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 8 Aug. 1929, p. 652.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 14 Aug. 1923, p. 217.

women to 60 years, and through inspectors being called to head office for administrative duties.[1]

Some of the recommendations[2] of the Committee of Enquiry into Education, which had been set up by Parliament, struck at the features of education in South Australia that had been progressively developed since Hartley's time and had been the wills of the various Parliaments since that time. These cherished features and ideals, most of which impinged on the role of the inspectors, challenged on the grounds of economy were:- educational opportunities for remote outback children, improved training for teachers, smaller classes, widespread provision of secondary education, the value to the State of technical education, the positions of headmistresses and infant mistresses, free secondary education, incentives for country teachers, an adequate inspectorial staff to assist teachers, medical and dental services to school children, and woodwork and domestic arts in the primary school curriculum. Adey, in his minority report, disagreed with the suggested reduction of the already undermanned inspectorate, as the closure of small schools spread over ten inspectorial districts would not significantly reduce the burden of the inspectorate.[3] However, he failed to mention the significant part that the inspectors had played over the years in raising the standard of teaching, which also had not been mentioned in the major report.

For the whole of World War II there had been a Liberal Country League Government in South Australia with Thomas Playford as Premier. The state Parliament was busy with legislation affecting the conduct of the war, with post-war reconstruction, with industrialization of the State, with Leigh Creek coal, with nationalization of the Adelaide Electric Supply

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1931, pp. 3, 4, 5, refers to matters mentioned in the paragraph.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 69, 1931, pp. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15.
3 ibid., p. 18.

Company, with the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, with housing and with relations with the Commonwealth Government. Nevertheless, it was not too busy to pass legislation for religious instruction in schools, for area schools and for consolidation of schools by transporting children, for licensing of private technical schools, for abolition of the Qualifying Certificate Examination and for the setting up of an Education Inquiry Committee.[1] Most of this education legislation had some indirect impact on the role of the inspectors. For instance the abolition of the Qualifying Certificate Examination from 1944 meant that inspectors were relieved of setting papers, organizing the conduct of the examination at centres and supervising the marking of papers, but they were given added responsibility in connection with the school-conducted Progress Certificate examination and certification including inspection in private schools. The establishment of area schools and subsequent arrangements for bus routes and disputes concerning them created tiresome problems for district inspectors. As one Member of Parliament insisted, that if inspectors reported, as they claimed, on all aspects of school life, they should report on children on school buses.[2]

Only occasionally were there direct references to the inspectors in the Parliament during World War II. One Member, who considered that the introduction of the Qualifying Certificate was the greatest disservice ever known to education in South Australia, which was never at a lower ebb, declared that the inspectors who set the papers were an outside body who did not know the children and their work.[3] This was an obvious parochial and unwarranted charge. An oblique reference to the inspectors was made by an opposition Member in order to stress the economies that governments had always forced on the

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 26 Sept. 1945, p. 305. All of this education legislation was listed here as achievements of the Playford Government.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 16 Nov. 1943, p. 613.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Council, 30 Sept. 1942, p. 664.

Education Department. He said that the Director of Education led an army that marked time, and that directors of education never embarked on programmes of inspired preaching.[1] Both of these statements were patently false concerning Fenner and his inspectors irrespective of other things that might be levelled at the Director. By innuendo, a Member of the Legislative Council used a quote from Prof. Browne's address at an Adelaide public meeting to attack inspectors. Browne had said that Australian systems of educational administration were highly centralized, rigid and in some ways fascist in character, with teachers supervised in every move by inspectors. The Member went on to say that Tasmania now called its inspectors, education officers, and their function had been changed mainly to organizing educational policies for their districts, helping teachers in progressive moves and bringing about a heightened professional spirit and increased interest and efficiency.[2] While parliamentarians wanted inspectors to be true educational leaders, they also wanted them to be engulfed with day to day problems in the schools, and to investigate such matters as alleged communists in schools[3] and the punishment of a child by standing with head and shoulders in a chimney.[4]

Directors, Superintendents and other senior officers did influence the role of the inspectors to different degrees and in different ways in the period, 1919 to 1945.

McCoy was provided by Parliament with £130,000 increase in his first budget which he spent on teachers' salaries which he knew would benefit morale most.[5] The assessment of a teacher's efficiency by an inspector became an important factor in getting an annual incremental increase in salary.[6] McCoy set in train

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Council, 5 Nov. 1941, p. 1292.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Council, 14 Oct. 1942, p. 861.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 21 Aug. 1940, p. 311.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 24 Aug. 1939, p. 679.
5 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 21 Oct. 1920, p. 1216.
6 loc. cit.

other changes that affected the role of the inspectors. He advertised for an inspector of schools, who need not have been in charge of a large school, but who would be required to reside at Pt. Lincoln.[1] He had reversed Williams's policy on inspectors' place of residence and added a dimension of district leadership to the role of the inspectors in line with the eastern states. He added to the tasks and increased the importance of the inspectors by declaring that all correspondence, with specified exceptions, had to be forwarded through the district inspector[2] to the Director of Education. He was forced to cancel this order.[3]

The revised Regulations of 20 November, 1919[4] dealing with classification of teachers and with skill marks, and the Regulations of 18 November, 1920[5] dealing with duties of inspectors and general rules of inspection, provided the official view of the nature of the inspection process and of the role of the inspectors. Except for minor variations they remained essentially unchanged throughout this period to the end of World War II. The major changes in these Regulations were in the classification of teachers based on academic qualifications gained by examination and on skill, and in the assessment of practical skill in the form of a "skill mark" replacing the former "efficiency mark". The skill mark was awarded by a Superintendent after consideration of the inspector's report. Essentially the skill mark scheme was a scale of marks, 1 to 80, with a minimum and a maximum for various categories of teachers. The category was determined by the teacher's academic and professional qualifications or certificate held. Increments of marks were added or deducted annually as a result of the

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 35, no. 400, Nov. 1919, p. 217.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 36, no. 402, Jan. 1920, p. 1.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 36, no. 405, April 1920, p. 91. This cancellation in three months of an instruction that resulted in delays in correspondence illustrates McCoy's pragmatic approach to administration.
4 Education Gazette, vol. 35, no. 401, Dec. 1919, pp. 225-229.
5 Education Gazette, vol. 36, no. 413, Dec. 1920, Supplement, pp. 1-40.

inspector's assessment. An increase of two marks above the minimum for the position held practically assured the teacher of an increment in salary.[1] The real problem for the under-qualified teachers was that, in order to get to a higher category, position and salary, they had to have the appropriate certificate determined by academic and professional qualifications, as well as the appropriate skill mark. Gaining the qualifications depended on the teachers' own efforts; the skill mark was determined by the inspector. Hence the teachers heaped the blame for lack of promotion on the skill mark and the inspector, not on themselves.

The intimate way in which employment, position, salary, promotion, qualifications, skill mark, gender of the teachers, and ministerial decree were related is shown in Regulation XXXIII of 1919, part of which is shown in Table 5.2.

These Regulations on salary were revised again and gazetted on 18 November, 1920.[2] The number of classes of schools was reduced to seven,[3] Class VII being the one-teacher schools, usually with uncertificated teachers in charge for whom the salary scale for men was £160-180 and for women £120-130.[4] The positions of Master of Method and Mistress of Infant Method were made "special", and Practising Schools removed from the classification.[5]

The salary of certificated teachers was made up of two components -

(a) the position quota, and

(b) the qualification quota, determined by the certificate held and the skill mark.

Table 5.3 shows these quotas for head teachers.

---

1 See Table 5.2, p. 214.
2 Education Regulations, 1920, Supplement to The Education Gazette, Dec. 1920.
3 ibid., p. 21.
4 ibid., p. 22.
5 ibid., p. 23.

TABLE 5.2

SALARIES OF HEAD TEACHERS

The following shall be the qualifications and salaries of head teachers in charge of schools: Provided that no teacher shall have any claim to a given salary by virtue of his certificate alone, and provided further that a teacher first classified before the 1st January, 1902, shall be eligible for promotion by virtue of his marks for practical skill and service without regard to the prescribed certificate.

Class of School	Minimum Annual Average Attendance	Certificate of Head Teacher	Minimum Skill Mark	Salaries	
				Men	Women
				£	£
I.a	800	I.A	75	475	-
I.	600	I.A	71	410-450	-
II.	475	I.B	61	380-410	-
III.	375	II.A	51	350-380	-
IV.	275	II.B	45	320-350	-
V.	175	II.B	41	290-320	-
VI.	65	III.A	35	240-290	-
VII.	40	III.A	31	200-240	160-180
VIII.	20	III.B	21	160-200	130-150
IX.a	15	Nil	11	160	100-110
IX.b	6	Nil	-	150	100-110

Increments of £10 per annum will be paid to head teachers who are not at the maximum salary[1] of their class, subject to the provisions of Regulation XIII., 8.[1] (See below.)

8. Annual increments of salary, as prescribed by the regulations, will be paid to all teachers who are not at the maximum salary, and who are awarded two marks above the minimum prescribed for their present position (vide Regulation XXXIII.), provided that in any year the Minister may direct that no increments, or a proportion only of such increments, shall be allowed.[2]

3. The appointments of uncertificated teachers who are admitted to the service subsequent to the year 1920 may be cancelled by the Minister if they fail to qualify for a certificate within three years of the completion of their training.[3]

SOURCES: 1 Education Gazette, vol. 35, no. 401, Dec. 1919, p. 228. The bracket is my insert.
2 ibid., p. 226.
3 ibid., p. 228.

Table 5.2 has been compiled from Regulation XXXIII, 2, 3 and Regulation XIII, 8, in Education Regulations, 1919.

TABLE 5.3

SALARY QUOTAS FOR HEAD TEACHERS

Primary Schools Position Quota (£s)

Class of School	VI	V	IV	III	II	I
H.T. (Men)	170-260	260-320	310-360	360-390	380-410	410-440
(Women)	130-180	-	-	-	-	-

Qualification Quota (£s)

Certificate	IIIB	IIIA	IIB	IIA	IB	IA
Minimum Skill Mark	21	31	41	51	61	71
Men and Women	40	50	70	80	100	110

SOURCE: Education Regulations, 1920, Supplement to The Education Gazette, Dec. 1920, p. 22.

There was little that was new in these Regulations that governed the activities of the inspectors, except the skill mark that McCoy had brought from New South Wales via Tasmania.[1] The strength of the Regulations and the Circulars to Teachers from McCoy was in their clarity, precision and definiteness with rarely anything left to chance, and with all parties knowing the duties of each other through the wide publicity given to them.

Further standardization was revealed to all in The Education Gazette, where copies of inspection reports by named inspectors on un-named schools were shown on a standard form with detailed headings.[2] The standard form left little room for

1 W.G. Richards, op. cit., p. 177.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 36, no. 407, June 1920, pp. 129, 130.

the individuality of the inspector to show through, nor for being expansive on some strengths or weaknesses in the school, or glossing over others that did not call for comment either favourable or unfavourable. The standard format led to reports lacking the warmth or the venom and the character of some of the earlier reports on Norwood School or Hindmarsh School.

With such pressure to conform, only the outstanding inspector could rise above this standard of reporting. For instance, Inspector Cole's report on the Ordinary Inspection, 8-15 July 1921, at Norwood School certainly conformed to the standard format, but it was an insipid affair with few general remarks and no evidence of a meeting with teachers. On the other hand Inspector Longmore was inspecting and reporting at Norwood Infant School according to the McCoy formula, but also did and reported other things. She got the medical inspector to test a backward child for mental age and arranged for further tests. She included general remarks on the leadership, comradeship and progressive methods of the staff, and complimented them on the teaching aids that they had prepared.[1]

There were losses in the formalizing and legalizing of everything that the inspector did. The former happy, informal and rather ad hoc meetings of teachers with inspectors were not compulsory -

> As far as practicable, the Inspector shall meet the teachers of his district at various convenient centres during the year, for the purpose of lectures, papers, and discussions on educational topics. A short report of each meeting shall be furnished by the Inspector to the Superintendent.[2]

---

1 Inspector's Register, Norwood Infant School, Ordinary Inspection 21-24 Sept. 1920, held at Norwood School.

2 Suplement to the Education Gazette, vol. 36, no. 413, Dec. 1920, Regulations under the Education Acts 1915-1919, p. 3.

Previously, teachers who had attended supplied a brief summary to The Education Gazette, thus giving the event wide publicity and usually praising the inspector and the local community where it was held. Under the new rules, these meetings were held,[1] but not with the same gusto as in earlier times,[2] when the inspectors held these meetings because they wanted to and not because they were compelled to. Previously, such meetings initiated by the inspectors were their voluntary contribution to assist and enlighten their teachers; in 1920 it was laid down as one of their formal duties. No longer could an inspector say, "My business...is to inspect schools".[3] The Regulations gave him or her official duties outside the classroom.

It was McCoy's tidying up of teacher-training that, of all his systematizing, was to have the greatest long term effects on the system and indeed on the inspectors' role. For henceforth the system would have better prepared teachers and the inspectors better raw material to work on. Extensions of courses in Teachers' College caused an hiatus of supply of teachers to the schools for a few years, but McCoy had alleviated that by selecting 66 young teachers fresh from teacher-training institutions in England and sent them to South Australia in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government's

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 36, no. 404, March 1920, p. 74. Addresses to teachers by inspectors were advertised but no reports appeared in subsequent Gazettes. In S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1921, p. 29, the Superintendent of Primary Education said that inspectors held special meetings in the evenings or on Saturday mornings, but on p. 51, Inspector Warren reported that teachers' meetings were not as frequent as some years ago.

2 Education Gazette, vol. 16, no. 163, May 1900, p. 78. Teachers reported a splendid address by Assistant Inspector Gold who gave many valuable hints on a variety of subjects at Port Lincoln. S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1904, Inspector Martin's Report, p. 23. As he was unable to discuss educational matters during early inspections, he met teachers on Saturday mornings in several centres.

3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, q. 4807, p. 86.

immigration programme, while he was in the United Kingdom attending the 1923 Imperial Education Conference.[1]

McCoy continued on his tidying up program. He produced a new Course of Instruction with the help of the Superintendent of Primary Education, 'The Inspector' (apparently meaning, the inspectorate) and twenty teachers.[2] This new course, covering seven primary grades instead of eight as before, was not to be altered for five years, so here again was something clear, distinct and definite on which teachers and inspectors could rest content and secure.[3] The new course, according to the Director did not neglect the 3 Rs nor English, but it aimed at generating, in children, right habits in thought, speech and conduct, a spirit of inquiry and an interest in nature and surroundings. In conjunction with other measures such as the new Regulations on policy in training, examination and classification of teachers and the new scheme of inspection, it would give the teacher more scope and freedom, fresh life and interest, and remove the deadening effect of teaching for results.[4] The same thing had been said by Stanton when he made changes in 1905.[5] However, Stanton's teachers, through their union were less optimistic about the results of the changes and indeed were very critical of the changes.[6] Stanton had accepted cuts in teachers' salaries, whereas McCoy on appointment had them increased.

The Superintendents, under McCoy, did not make a great impact on the role of the inspectors, and the Chief Inspector and Staff Inspector when appointed made even less.

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1924, Report of the Minister of Education, p. 10.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1921, p. 21.
3 ibid., pp. 51.
4 ibid., pp. 21, 22.
5 Education Gazette, vol. 21, no. 226, Aug. 1905, pp. 117, 118.
6 ibid., pp. 130, 131.

The Superintendent of Primary Education, C. Charlton, held the dual position of Deputy Director of Education, and he was also the esteemed executive officer of the Public School Teachers' Superannuation Fund.[1] Although his annual reports were summaries of the inspectors' annual reports and supportive of inspectors,[2] he rarely visited the schools[3] to get a feeling for the way in which the inspectors were performing. He acknowledged that because of McCoy's "compact instructions",[4] "we all know exactly where we are",[5] thus opting out of influencing the inspectors' role. The other contact point for the inspectors, the Chief Inspector, W.A. West, who became Registrar of the Advisory Council of Education,[6] did not visit schools at all to keep in touch with the inspectors on the job.[7] The role of the Chief Inspector had changed. Under earlier regimes, besides his head office duties, he had always inspected a group of city schools or assisted other inspectors in inspecting schools. Under McCoy, he was an administrator purely and simply.

The Superintendent of Secondary Education, W.J. Adey, appointed under McCoy, was also Inspector of High Schools, and had no other inspector immediately under his control, but he did increasingly use the services of the inspectors of schools, particularly those with university degrees. The inspections followed the lines of those in primary schools in reporting, meeting staff, addressing meetings of parents and friends and holding teachers' conferences in conjunction with them.[8] These inspectors observed sporting activities, prefect schemes, house systems and club activities in the high schools and carried the message to primary schools, where McCoy considered such

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, Feb. 1928, p. 13.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1921, p. 28.
3 S.A.T. Journal, March 1920, p. 125.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1922, p. 28.
5 loc. cit.
6 Education Gazette, vol. 39, no. 441, April 1923, p. 105.
7 S.A.T. Journal, March 1920, p. 125.
8 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1928, p. 17.

activities were desirable.[1] The inspectors were acting as cross-pollinators between the two sets of schools. The story always got back to McCoy, although some teachers were questioning whether competitive sport in primary schools was receiving too much emphasis and taking too much time in the curriculum.[2] In developing secondary curriculum Adey did not use inspectors, but used committees of teachers.[3]

The Superintendent of Technical Education, Fenner, had an assistant inspector, G.S. McDonald, from 1926 under his control,[4] and other officers supervising crafts in not only technical schools but in central, high and primary schools, loosely attached to him in spirit if not officially. The Schools of Art under his direction ran special classes for teachers and teachers' college students.[5] Just as many of the Schools of Instruction were listed in The Education Gazette as under his jurisdiction, with these specialists performing, as were listed as conducted by the inspectors. Thebarton Technical High School was under the control of the Superintendent of Technical Education and it became a show place for its use of the Dalton plan. Fenner and the headmaster prepared a paper on it for the Australian Association for the Advancement of Science in Hobart in 1927.[6] Inspectors apparently were not involved.

Adey's relationship as Director with and use of inspectors was different from McCoy's and did more for the inspectors' development. To McCoy the inspectors were essentially field officers with fixed and definite duties not including a share of administration or policy-making.[7] McCoy also observed the strictly hierarchical line of communication. He consulted his

---

1 W.G. Richards, op. cit., p. 22.
2 S.A.T. Journal, March 1926, p. 84.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1922, p. 32.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1927, p. 12.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1923, p. 34.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1928, p. 21.
7 W.G. Richards, op. cit., p. 159.

Superintendents on policy matters, not the inspectors.[1] McCoy was also prone to get his advice from outside the Department, typically sending telegrams to his fellow directors of education in other states on matters needing new decisions in South Australia.[2] Adey on the other hand treated his inspectors as fellow administrators. Often his official replies to the S.A.P.S.T.U. on matters raised were that he had referred the matter to the inspectors' conference, and gave the inspectors' decision, sometimes mentioning that he concurred, sometimes not.[3] The inspectors appeared to relish this opportunity to participate in policy-making and it added purpose and direction to their conferences. It was good training for higher duties. Adey had added a new dimension to the role of the inspectors; they were given a visible part in the decision-making process in formulating policy.

Whereas McCoy declared that the assessing function of inspectors to maintain standards was foremost in the inspectors' duties,[4] Adey was quite clear both at the beginning and end of his directorship that the visit of inspectors was mainly for helping and inspiring teachers and pupils rather than for the purpose of assessing the success of the tuition given.[5] Indeed, in mid-term of office, in telling teachers of his desire to advance the spirit of freedom in the schools beyond the thirty-three Freedom Schools[6] that he had established, Adey declared:

---

1 ibid., p. 160.
2 ibid., p. 166.
3 S.A.T. Journal, April 1931, p. 3; Aug. 1932, p. 7; Aug. 1935, p. 20; Dec. 1937, p. 8 provide examples of this practice.
4 W.G. Richards, op. cit., p. 153.
5 S.A.T. Journal, Sept. 1932, p. 14 and S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1938, p. 7.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1934, p. 16. Freedom Schools were schools chosen by district inspectors to be given freedom in details of curriculum, in organization and teaching methods. They were permitted to undertake research projects of their own choosing.

> I have tried to convince the district inspectors that they are not inspectors in the sense of police investigators. Their job is to advise and guide schools, leaving an atmosphere which will encourage teachers and children to give of their best, and not to find out what the children do not know.[1]

Although Adey advocated altered priorities in the duties of inspectors he did not change the Regulations governing inspections and duties of inspectors. He did not publish samples of named inspectors' reports on unnamed schools as McCoy had done, but gave even more prominence to their annual reports throughout the year in The Education Gazette. Adey trusted his inspectors and gave them freedom of action within the financial restraints of the times.

In the period embracing the difficult economic conditions of the Great Depression, there was a generally cooperative effort by the Superintendents in their use and development of the inspectors and in moving education forward. Whatever the causes, a caring, cooperative effort pervaded the whole system.[2] Contributory causes may have been Adey's trustful leadership; the unifying effect of staff conferences three times a year for inspectors, superintendents, the director and others; the influence of world movements; and the sheer necessity to cooperate for the system to survive under the debilitating conditions.

A committee of teachers and inspectors chaired by the Superintendent of Technical Education produced geography books and maps for use in primary schools.[3] W.T. Martin was appointed

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, Sept. 1935, p. 7.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1930, pp. 4-12 and 1931, pp. 3, 4 indicate a wide range of beneficial developments such as vocational guidance; appointment of a teacher at the Children's Hospital; domestic arts provided in welfare institutions for retarded girls; unemployed girls helped with cookery and needlework; and swimming instruction by teachers without additional allowances.

3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1931, p. 3.

Superintendent of Primary Education along with H.C. Hosking as Chief Inspector in 1930.[1] Martin set about involving inspectors and selected teachers in a revision of the Course of Instruction.[2] Staff Inspector Fairweather, the Inspector of Girls' Schools (A. Miethke), the Assistant Inspector of Technical Schools who became Inspector of Technical Schools (G.S. McDonald) and an Inspector of Schools (E. Allen) combined to supervise, for the Superintendent of Technical Education, the Central Schools, set up to provide an alternative to a high school education for early school leavers.[3] Thus it can be seen that this cooperation existed between Branches and between superintendents, inspectors and teachers. The Superintendent of Technical Education was making his section of the Department a service branch to the whole Department. He was supervising manual training in all schools, his officers were prominent in schools of instruction for teachers, in vocational guidance and in committee work on cinema and radio in schools.

The joint position of Superintendent of Secondary Education and Inspector of High Schools vacated by Adey in 1929 was not filled until 1935.[4] For six years the duties were performed by Inspector Allen with help from other inspectors of schools. In 1932, he had been appointed Inspector of Secondary Schools, but still remained District Inspector for the South District.[5] The Superintendent of Secondary Education selected the entrants to the Teachers College for all courses.[6]

The Superintendent of Primary Education, W.T. Martin, genuinely saw the inspectorate as a vital link between the administration and the teaching service.[7] So essential to

---

1 ibid., p. 15.
2 ibid., p. 16.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1930, p. 6.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1936, p. 15.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1933, p. 14.
6 ibid., p. 18.
7 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1932, p. 17.

efficiency did he see the inspectors' visits that he got the Chief Inspector, H.C. Hosking, to organize inspections, in these difficult times, so that all 1,030 primary schools received at least one visit.[1] The inspectors, according to the Superintendent of Primary Education, were the means by which progressive education policy was made operative and the schools kept abreast of developments.[2] It was the district inspectors who chose the Freedom Schools which were given freedom to vary methods, curriculum and timetable and to experiment with approved projects including village surveys based on the Oxfordshire experiment.[3] The Superintendents arranged for the inspectors' conference to consider the recommendations of the Committee set up to consider the use of radio and cinema in schools. The inspectors were given credit for sponsoring and encouraging the use of these aids in schools.[4] Some inspectors also helped in the lectures given to adults in the Folk High School at Murray Bridge[5] with their Superintendent's blessing.

The inspectors were getting, in a cooperative atmosphere, a varied experience in administration, in committees and in responsible decision-making outside their usual inspecting role. They also benefited from contact with Superintendents with wider purviews, and others with different backgrounds. The inspectors' role was certainly not confined to examining and inspecting.

It was in this cooperative climate that the 1937 N.E.F. Conference had its influence on the role of the inspectors. It had the typical N.E.F. impact - a change of heart on the part of teachers, inspectors and education authorities.[6] Many of South

---

1 loc. cit.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1933, p. 15.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1934, pp. 3, 4.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1933, pp. 3, 4.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1934, p. 18.
6 B. Ensor, "Pupil Activity in Modern Education" in K.S. Cunningham and W.C. Radford (eds.), Education for Complete Living, Melbourne, A.C.E.R., 1938, p. 332.

Australia's teachers, its superintendents and inspectors dwelt among great minds for a week during the lecture tour and then reinforced the experience by reading Education for Complete Living, the A.C.E.R. publication on the proceedings of the conference, and possibly Types of Administration, I.L. Kandel's book, written as a result of his experiences in Australia and New Zealand and financed by the Carnegie Corporation.

The reaction of the inspectors was predictable when they read or heard Prof. F.W. Hart of the University of California comment that inspection of teachers and teaching should be abolished and be replaced by an organized programme of helping teachers to teach, for he saw inspections as the great menace to successful teaching.[2] Nevertheless South Australian inspectors could point to freedom schools, a folk school, village surveys,[3] and advances in the use of radio and of films in the schools, according to A.C.E.R. the best in Australia,[4] all achieved under their guidance and participation. Likewise the massive participation of schools in community activities such as the State's centenary celebrations, visits of royalty, pageants, education weeks, and exhibitions, were all facilitated by the organizing abilities and encouragement of inspectors.[5]

Inspectors, of course, had been criticized many times before. Parliament had criticized (and praised) them, but Members of Parliament were lay-men not aware of the intricacies of the inspectors' task; teachers had criticized their methods and their instruments of assessment, but they were not disinterested parties. Moreover these criticisms from

---

2 F.W. Hart, "The Inspection of Schools" in K.S. Cunningham and W.C. Radford, op. cit., pp. 296, 297.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1934, pp. 3, 4, 16.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1937, pp. 5, 19 and S.A.T. Journal, Feb. 1936, p. 18.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1937, p. 5 and, 1935, pp. 3, 17, provide examples.

Parliament and teachers had been singularly few during the time of Adey's directorship. Here was at least one educator of world renown, not a layman or a teacher with an axe to grind, through this conference questioning their very existence, something that their most vehement critics before had not seriously considered. Even the article, "Do We Need Inspectors?", in The S.A. Teachers' Journal, admitted that the time had not yet arrived in England when the Board of Education could depend on "getting its money's worth" through the headmasters.[1] This was an admission that only inspectors could assume this fundamental role under existing circumstances. Moreover Hart had urged the inspectors' demise because they were obstacles to better teaching, which their Director had told them on several occasions was their main task. The criticism by Hart was a productive pressure, for in subsequent papers and discussions inspectors were led to question the value and objectives of their work.[2]

Prof. I.L. Kandel, both in his lectures and in his subsequent book, Types of Administration, gave the inspectors an enormous boost in confidence and faith in the importance, at least, of some of their work. Kandel saw the inspectors as the answer to decentralization in Australian education. They should exercise a double role, as the local representatives of the Education Department in their districts with more authority to exercise initiative and with relief from routine and clerical work.[3] Kandel also said:

> And yet no position in the educational services of New Zealand and Australia is professionally more important and crucial than that of inspectors; for upon their judgment the welfare of the educational systems should in large part depend.[4]

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, May 1934, pp. 15, 16.
2 L.H. Jefferies, "The Inspector's Objective", in The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia, vol. 2, no. 1, 1938, pp. 19-21, is an example.
3 I.L. Kandel, "Impressions of Australian Education", in K.S. Cunningham and W.C. Radford, op. cit., pp. 657, 658.
4 I.L. Kandel, Types of Administration, Melbourne, A.C.E.R., 1938, p. 61.

What is more, many of South Australia's teachers heard these statements in lectures or read of them in subsequent publications. So did Members of Parliament, members of school committees and parents' associations, such was the publicity given to the N.E.F. conference in the press, in The Education Gazette and in The S.A. Teachers' Journal. Perhaps more importantly still the Director and the Superintendents were made aware of suggestions for reform in the inspectorate. The conference had set the climate for further expansion, development and importance of the role of the inspector.

Fenner's influence as Director of Education on the role of the inspectors was undoubted, just as surely as it was not always beneficial. His ready knowledge of educational developments around the world and his generally progressive ideas, through his fluent and sometimes biting pen, influenced not only inspectors but Members of Parliament, teachers and the citizenry. He was quoted widely and South Australian inspectors published his changes for their role in the Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia.[1] The variations of Regulations in 1942 concerning the duties of the inspectors were the first since 1920. Inspectors were required to give encouragement and inspiration to both teachers and children, but their duties were made more exacting by requiring them officially to examine the accounts of Councils, Committees and other bodies associated with the schools.[2] Fenner also added to the standing of inspectors by including two of them on each of the four newly created curriculum boards.[3] He published in The Education Gazette extracts of their annual reports throughout World War II. By his own example and by using the three inspectors' conferences each year, he led the inspectors to wider and deeper professional reading. He supported their interstate conferences which were held despite the War, and the

---

1 The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia, vol. 6, no. 2, Nov. 1942, p. 27.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 58, no. 667, Dec. 1942, p. 226.
3 loc. cit.

Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia was at its best with many South Australian contributions when Fenner, a contributor, was Director. He urged them to inspire not inspect; he urged shorter inspection reports,[1] but required reports on many district matters without providing the clerical facilities to treat them promptly, nor did he delegate authority to give the inspectors the power to show true district leadership. Nevertheless, he maintained a full complement of inspectors despite falling enrolments and limited funding for education.

In his correspondence with the S.A.P.S.T.U. the Director had stressed that the inspectors were the welfare officers for the teachers.[2] Consequently, the Union encouraged teachers to enlist the help of the inspectors in having blinds, fly-screens and all manner of amenities supplied to schools and dwellings, adding not to be afraid that your complaints will be reflected in your skill mark - a snide comment indicative of the victimization syndrome abroad among the teaching service at the time.[3] The inspectors wanted to be helpful, but these tasks added routine work to the inspectors' load and detracted from time for professional help that only they could give. In the welfare officer role, district inspectors were also made chairmen of management committees of women teachers' hostels,[4] where they were established in or near the place of the inspector's headquarters. This task added to the burden of the inspectors even if enhancing their position in other ways.

Despite Fenner's genuine efforts to lift the sights of the inspectors, which he did, and to develop their roles as inspirers, professional advisers and welfare helpers of

---

1 C. Fenner, "Education in South Australia - Present Tendencies and Post-War Possibilities" in The Education Gazette, vol. 58, no. 675, Oct. 1942, p. 186.
2 S.A.T. Journal, June 1942, p. 11.
3 loc. cit.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1943, p. 4.

teachers, the inspectors' work in these capacities was too little recognized.[1] Likewise the First Report of the Education Inquiry Committee acknowledged that Fenner had increased the number and variety of refresher courses for teachers during the War, yet teachers appeared to attend less willingly than in the past.[2] Moreover the Committee recommended that such conferences should be cooperative affairs used to dispel the separateness of teachers in the different groups of schools that Fenner had developed under Superintendents of Primary Schools, High Schools, Technical Schools and Rural Schools.[3] In addition, evidence to the Committee, not only from teachers but from inspectors and superintendents showed that despite Fenner's efforts, and even because of them, inspectors were still looked upon as inquisitors and examiners, and inspections were harrowing experiences. The skill mark system, essentially the same as McCoy introduced in 1920 though adjusted in the cause of justice, took its share of the blame.[4]

Much of the dissatisfaction with Fenner and with the inspectors' role came from an accumulation of circumstances exacerbated by war-time restrictions. Salaries were pegged during the War, and promotion for the bulk of primary teachers was practically non-existent, particularly for those ill-trained and unqualified, who had been recruited in times of teacher shortages as far back as World War I. These problems were magnified, in the eyes of teachers, by Fenner's disregard of promotion lists when he made appointments that he considered were in the best interests of children. Teachers did not trust the Director.[5] This distrust tainted the inspectors, and

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, June 1944, p. 16. N.E.F. evidence to the Education Inquiry Committee made this point.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 15, 1945, pp. 18, 19.
3 ibid., p. 18.
4 S.A.T. Journal, May 1943, p. 19; Sept. 1943, p. 14; and June 1944, p. 15 provide examples of this kind of evidence from different sources.
5 Guild Chronicle, vol. 6, no. 2, April 1943, p. 9.

teachers feared reprisals in skill mark allotment.[1]

The inspection reports at Norwood School from 1940 to 1946 reflected faithfully the changes in the inspectors' tasks at inspections made during Fenner's directorship. In accordance with Fenner's instructions, the incidental inspection reports became shorter. At the most critical stage of the War no reports of incidental inspections were entered in the Register. The inspectors endeavoured in performing their duties to encourage and inspire by addressing the staff on such matters as class clubs and circles and communal spirit. They also endeavoured to inspire through praise of the staff's corporate spirit and unity when the school reverted from a central to a primary school with the boys' and girls' departments functioning under one headmaster. The staff and students were complimented and encouraged to pursue their tasks with loyalty, courage and resolution despite the harassing news and anxieties of the War. Their efforts for the Schools Patriotic Fund were praised despite S.A.P.S.T.U. objections to S.P.F. efforts being mentioned in inspectors' reports. In the reports of ordinary inspections the arithmetic and spelling results moved from the numerical assessments, insisted on by McCoy and not changed by Adey, to qualitative verbal assessments agreed to by Fenner. Apparently Staff Inspector Pitt did not discuss the ordinary inspection reports with the staff, for appended to each report was the note, "To be read individually or in staff conference at the discretion of the H.M.".

The Superintendents did not influence the role of the inspectors by their writings during war-time restrictions on the use of paper to the degree that Fenner did, who took every opportunity in The Education Gazette, The S.A. Teachers Journal, even The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia,[2] and in

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 23 March 1943, p. 1860.
2 C.E. Fenner, "Australia Calls" in Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia, vol. 16, no. 1, June 1942, pp. 20-22.

books and pamphlets to spread his beliefs in education and his role for the inspector. But they were able to influence the inspectors at the three staff conferences annually, which were considered inspirational in character with outspoken addresses by officers and inspectors.[1] The annual reports of the Superintendents, which during most of the War were restricted to type-written form, reinforced the Director's decree that the chief purpose of inspectors' visits was not examination, but inspiration and help.[2] The Primary Branch used the inspectors, cooperating with teachers, to revise the primary Course of Instruction. The Chief Inspector reported that so highly did the general public value the work of the inspectors that 27 private schools had voluntarily sought regular inspections,[3] which became mandatory for Grade 7 when the Progress Certificate and Allowances were established.[4]

It was a tribute to the power of the Superintendents and their faith in the inspectorate that, in a time of shortage of teachers, of deployment of funds towards the war effort (although the state did have a surplus of £850,000 largely due to revenue from railways transporting troops and war supplies),[5] of declining enrolments and of fewer schools, they were able to keep the inspectorate at full strength - a rare occurrence. So much so that the Superintendents were able to tell the S.A.P.S.T.U. that as the inspectors were more and more adopting the role of advisory teachers rather than that of assessing officers, it was not intended to appoint more advisory teachers.[6] Evidence of the Superintendents to the Education Inquiry Committee indicated the sort of impact that they had on the inspectors' role. The Superintendent of Primary Schools said that in the distant past the inspector would go straight to

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1940, p. 7.
2 ibid., p. 20.
3 ibid., p. 33.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1945, p. 3.
5 S.A.P. Debates, Governor's Speech, 22 July 1943, p. 3.
6 S.A.T. Journal, June 1942, p. 10.

the timetable to see whether the teacher was giving the right lesson. If an inspector did that in 1943, he would be reprimanded, not the teacher.[1] The Superintendent of Rural Schools stated that head teachers of area schools were free to vary curricula, but he controlled it through frequent observation by the inspector.[2] The Superintendents, too, had misgivings about the present system of inspection. They saw a clash of the assessing and advisory roles, the effect on the inspectors of travel and toil, and the unsatisfactory practice of window-dressing by teachers.[3] Inspectors' reports on teachers were just too glowing; faults had to be found to prevent the clogging of the promotion list for the few promotions available.[4]

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

The inspectorate progressed from a group of elderly ex-headmasters relying on experience and direction from superiors to a lively, well qualified group, whose members gave thought to the part that they played in the education of children. This section examines their influence on their own role.

Under McCoy's directorship, the inspectors themselves, with the exception of Lydia Longmore and the younger inspectors whom McCoy had had appointed, did little to influence their own role. They appeared to be quite happy with the firm and definite role that McCoy had fixed for them.[5] Prior to McCoy's appointment, the inspectors had formed an Inspectors' Guild ostensibly to defend the inspectors against uninformed public criticism of their role, to which, they, as departmental

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, May 1943, p. 18.
2 S.A.T. Journal, July 1943, pp. 17, 18.
3 ibid., p. 18.
4 S.A.T. Journal, June 1944, p. 15.
5 See above, pp. 215, 216.

officers, could not reply.[1] The Inspectors' Guild in 1919 had a deputation to the Minister of Education to put the case for the appointment of C. Charlton as Director of Education.[2] However, the Government proceeded immediately to the appointment of McCoy, who dominated the development of the inspectors' role for the next decade. It is possible that the Inspectors' Guild, through its unwelcome intervention with the Government, may have unwittingly determined the development of the inspectors' role for a decade.

It is more certain that the affiliation in 1925 of the Guild of Inspectors of Schools of South Australia with the S.A.P.S.T.U. provided the link between the inspectors and the teachers' representatives that allowed the inspectors to develop their role as senior colleagues of teachers, notably under Adey's sympathetic control. The President of the S.A.P.S.T.U. argued before the Industrial Arbitration Court for a greater margin in salary for inspectors above the salary of headmasters, because of their greater store of educational and psychological knowledge that was used to help their less experienced subordinates in organization, instruction, staff control and class control.[3] After the inspectors' salaries had been increased, the Union spokesman on salaries declared that the increase added dignity to the teaching profession, thus indicating that inspectors were considered by the Union as senior colleagues of teachers and not aligned with the administration.[4] Another affiliated Teachers' Association after a discussion of inspectors' tests and standards resolved not to write to the Union, but to invite the district inspector to enlighten them on the matters at the next meeting.[5] Again, when the Union found that inspectors were transgressing Union policy

---

1 W.G. Richards, op. cit., pp. 36, 37, 38.
2 ibid., pp. 35-38.
3 S.A.T. Journal, July 1925, pp. 1108, 1110.
4 S.A.T. Journal, Nov. 1925, p 21.
5 S.A.T. Journal, July 1933, p 9.

by advocating in their reports participation in competitive exhibitions and displays, it sent a letter to the Inspectors' Guild informing the members that union policy was to discourage competition in such exhibitions and that the Director agreed with them.[1] In so doing, the Union treated the Inspectors' Guild as it would any other affiliated Teachers' Association and did not, in this instance, treat the inspectors as members of the administration and complain to the Minister of Education or Director of Education.

In the decade of conformity to the pattern of the inspectorial role that McCoy had laid down, some of the inspectors, particularly those with a specialist element in their activities, did develop the inspectorial role according to their own specifications. Inspector Lydia Longmore became Inspector of Infant Schools in 1920 when McCoy had made the former Infant Departments of large primary schools separate Infant Schools, and placed them under Infant Mistresses. According to the Inspector's Register of Norwood Infant School,[2] she had continued her role as professional colleague with teachers encouraging them to innovate.[3]

Lydia Longmore had virtually made herself jointly superintendent and inspector of infant schools, the kind of joint appointment that Adey previously had officially in the secondary field. She had made her role something like that of

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, Sept. 1935, p. 3.

2 Inspector's Register, Norwood Infant School, held at Norwood School, contains inspection reports from 29 Jan. 1920 to 17, 18 April 1934 which refer to such matters as:- extension of Montessori classes; testing for mental ages with the Medical Inspector; "A Thought for the Teachers"; encouragement of child studies; involvement of Mothers' Club in classroom activities; experiments with script print; allowances made for poor results, e.g., "measles epidemic" written alongside poor spelling results; discussion of current educational literature; and encouragement of special care during the Great Depression.

3 See above, p. 182.

an itinerant infant mistress or, as Inspector W.L. Neale had said of Australian inspectors a quarter of a century before, she was a "managing teacher" and her role was a mixture of that of an H.M.I., an English headmaster and an American superintendent.[1]

One of her splendid innovations that benefited primary schools was the placing of exit students from Teachers' College in infant schools under infant mistresses for two years and then shifting them to teach in infant grades where there were no separate infant schools.[2] As an inspector, Longmore said that she had endeavoured to put the Montessori attitude of observation and the spirit of freedom into her own method of inspection, and by so doing could see more clearly what the teacher was doing.[3]

Longmore had made her "district", the State's Infant Schools and their appendages, where she assumed the role of district leader. Inspector Adelaide Miethke did the same for Girls' Central Schools and any pageantry, demonstration, display or the Schools Patriotic Fund that needed her organizing ability.[4] Inspector A.G. Edquist made his "district" for leadership the whole of the State's agricultural education.[5] Inspector J.H. Williams was a district inspector who developed a leadership role in his Far North District. He developed the Great Northern Athletics and Schools' Exhibition. His special interest as a Teachers College lecturer had been the teaching of

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1901, p. 20.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 41, no. 468, July 1925, p. 191.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 44, no. 499, Feb. 1928, p. 83.
4 Education Gazette, vol. 44, no. 499, Feb. 1928, pp. 79,80 shows her leadership in Girls' Central Schools; vol. 52, no. 589, June 1936, p. 163 shows her as organizer of pageantry for visiting Royalty; vol. 56, no. 651, Oct. 1940, p. 205 refers to her appointment as Organizer of the Schools' Patriotic Fund.
5 Education Gazette, vol. 44, no. 507, Oct. 1928, p. 273. Edquist was promoted to the position of Inspector of Elementary Agriculture after about 20 years as an adviser in nature study and agriculture.

English Literature and it came to the fore in his district.[1] Children's stories and poems from this exhibition were acclaimed by the S.A.P.S.T.U. and published in The S.A. Teachers' Journal.[2]

In the more relaxed atmosphere under Adey, inspectors assumed and used their greater freedom. That impeccably loyal stalwart, Inspector Gartrell, when McCoy disappeared from the scene, crossed out the elaborate set of printed sub-headings in the Inspector's Register at Norwood School and wrote his report in his own way unfettered by the proforma.[3] Inspector Sutton did the same.[4] It appeared that, in such things under McCoy, they were prepared to conform to meet his wishes, even though they did not like it.

Australia's inspectors of schools, in the quest of the times for freedom of action and expression, and urged on by contacts made at interstate conferences,[5] launched their own journal, The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia, in 1937. South Australian inspectors were contributors of articles, not only advocating developments in education, but also making suggestions about their own role from differently perceived values in education - from freedom rather than from conformity, from development rather than from standards, and from ideals rather than from experience.

Inspector Jefferies by looking at the history of inspections in South Australia,[6] showed the way in which the

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1924, p. 24.
2 S.A.T. Journal, June 1926, p. 145.
3 Inspector's Register, Ordinary Inspection, Norwood Boys' Department, 14-21 July 1931. Held at Norwood School.
4 op. cit., 4-7 Aug. 1930.
5 S.A.T. Journal, Oct. 1934, p. 3 reported a Melbourne meeting of the Association of Australasian Inspectors at which topics such as "The Conflicts between New Ideals and Old", "Unemployed Youth" and "Economic and Cultural Values in Secondary Education" were discussed.
6 L.H. Jefferies, "The Inspector's Objective", in The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia, vol. 2, no. 1, 1938, pp. 19-21.

inspector's fundamental task of seeing that a good return was gained from the State's expenditure on education had been achieved under different conditions and with changing values held in the community. The inspectors under Hartley, with a motley group of teachers, who found conformity to the requirements and discipline of a government school difficult to take, felt their most important task was to keep teachers up to the mark and in so doing attached tremendous importance to minor details far out of proportion to their deserts, and little notice was taken of the teachers' attitude, their methods of attack or their personal influence. The inspectors' tests led to a percentage assessment of pupils and not of the quality of their development as young people. Jefferies went on to question whether he and his colleagues played a part in achieving the aim set for a more child-centred approach to education, namely, to help children to acquire the art of complete living. Did they still in their reports allow minor defects to loom too large in comparison with commendable features? As inspectors they were called upon to be arch-educators and must always have in mind what educational value can be extracted from this and that subject; values that earlier inspectors did not have to consider - development of powers of observation, reasoning, resourcefulness, self-help and self-control, and appreciation of beauty in thought, speech, form and colour. These were the matters that inspectors must give more and more attention to in moulding their own roles.

Inspector Leach got his insights into the inspectors' role, not from history but from young and old teachers' opinions, genuinely expressed, at the conferences held when schools were closed because of the polio-myelitis epidemic.[1] These opinions on inspections varied widely, from enjoyment because of encouragement to experiment and to use initiative and being an

---

1 W.V. Leach, "Inspection - The Teacher's Viewpoint", in The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia, vol. 2, no. 1, June 1938, pp. 34-38.

"infinitely poorer" teacher without them, to detestation; from renewed zest from advisory visits because of being starved of discussion on school problems, to a gruelling experience resulting in tears. From these opinions and discussion of them, Leach proceeded to give his own requisites for inspectors to meet "the almost impossible task of assessing to a skill mark the teachers' ability and at the same time helping and inspiring".[1] The inspectors had dreamed of being artists but found themselves so often as mechanics and superior clerks. The inspectors must remain students, have a love of children and a sense of proportion. They must be research workers and frontier thinkers, and have a philosophy from which they choose the values they serve; otherwise they become set and obstructionist, unwilling to concede to young people the greater liberty that the times demanded or to help them become dynamic in outlook. If inspectors became conformists instead of pathfinders they were as useless, as one elderly teacher described inspectors of the past, as dodderers whose only qualification was seniority. Leach agreed that assessment of teachers was necessary and inspectors were best fitted to do it. Nevertheless more of the responsibility for assessing a staff's ability could be delegated to headmasters. The inspectors, too, could do more to further the cause of creative education and of child-centred schools by more and better schools of method, area conferences, exchange of work, meetings with school committees and parents, coordination with Teachers College and more discussion and publication through the Inspectors' Guild.[2]

South Australia's inspectors were openly discussing their role with teachers. Inspector Gerlach at a Teachers' Association meeting admitted that he had to perform a certain amount of "police work". He had to assess and compare the effectiveness and values of teachers, but most important of all

---

1 ibid., p. 34.
2 ibid., p. 38.

he had to provide inspiration.[1] Inspector Shaw at an association meeting invited teachers to suggest what system of inspection they would like,[2] and at another meeting conducted a lively and frank discussion on the weaknesses of the inspectorial system and its possible improvement.[3]

The evidence of the Inspectors' Guild to the Education Inquiry Committee,[4] besides some political advocacy, did refer to the role of the inspectors. The inspectors expanded, improved and stimulated the craftsmanship of the teachers so that the children received an effective preparation for life. Hence the great need for them to establish frequent contact with the schools, with parents and with the educational influences in their districts, and therefore the need of time for developing such intercourse in which smaller districts would help. This role justified the requests for opportunity to travel interstate and overseas to observe the latest educational practices and to absorb the latest ideas. The evidence on inspections was largely what Fenner, the Director, had already told the inspectors - they should be more frequent and mainly advisory.

Pressures for Development of the Role of the Inspectors from Teachers

The pressures from teachers on the development of the role of the inspectors in this period came mainly through their organizations, the S.A.P.S.T.U. and the Women Teachers' Guild, by means of their publications The S.A. Teachers' Journal and The Guild Chronicle. These pressures are examined below.

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, April 1940, p. 19.
2 S.A.T. Journal, July 1940, p. 13.
3 S.A.T. Journal, June 1940, p. 13.
4 S.A.T. Journal, Sept. 1943, pp. 28, 29.

Members of the S.A.P.S.T.U. through their mouth-piece, The S.A. Teachers' Journal, showed that they were not quite so enamoured as the teachers at Norwood School[1] appeared to have been with the changes, including the role of the inspectors, established in the Regulations of November 1919 and 1920, under McCoy's direction.[2] Initially the Union had said, concerning McCoy's scheme of salaries with efficiency conditions determined by the inspectors attached to them, and skill marks, that he was not experimenting with new ideas on teachers as they had been tried and justified in New South Wales and Tasmania.[3] However, within a few months of the publication of the new Regulations, the Male Assistants' Association criticised them as inhumane requiring teachers to do four nights a week in further study and a woodwork course, for which they paid fees, on Saturday mornings.[4] The S.A.P.S.T.U. also publicised the fact that, in Tasmania from where McCoy had come, the Teachers' Union had before it a motion, "That the system of assessing a teacher's professional ability by awarding skill marks be abolished".[5] Indeed the S.A.P.S.T.U. executive moved that some change in the method of allotting skill marks was desirable.[6] "Cynic", a columnist in The S.A. Teachers' Journal, said that no one in South Australia loved the skill mark, and Tasmanians hated it and called it the "mystery mark".[7] Next the Editor queried whether the skill mark of a Grade 7 teacher was affected by the passes that he had secured in the reformed Qualifying Certificate Examination, about which the inspector invariably

---

1 Inspector's Register, Norwood School, Incidental Inspection, 25-28 February 1921, held at Norwood School. The inspectors reported that they found a diverse, busy enterprize with teachers and the headmaster cooperating to develop in children the very things that the Director had asked the inspectors to advise upon and to encourage - development of character, ability to use knowledge, and citizenship.

2 See above, pp. 212-216.

3 S.A.T. Journal, Nov. 1919, p. 75.

4 S.A.T. Journal, March 1920, p. 125.

5 S.A.T. Journal, June 1920, p. 140.

6 S.A.T. Journal, March 1921, p. 131.

7 S.A.T. Journal, April 1921, p. 154.

enquired.[1] The Women Teachers' Progressive League, a powerful association of the Union, was less critical of the various reforms but acknowledged that there was some dissatisfaction with the allotment of skill marks and desired the abolition of the scheme.[2]

In 1938, the members of the S.A. Women Teachers' Guild declared in their new journal, The Guild Chronicle, that they were all prepared to accept the verdict of the inspectors with respect to skill mark as a fair estimate of their value to the Department.[3] What they objected to was the "adjusted" skill mark prepared by unknown officers.[4] In 1944, the representative of the Women Teachers' Guild gave evidence to the Education Inquiry Committee that the inspection and skill mark scheme was bad because inspectors tried to assess skill which was intangible.[5] It was also unjust, because it was a matter of whether teachers' personality and methods took the fancy of the inspectors.[6] The teachers work was judged by "... a vague, prejudiced, illogical and unsuccessful criterion."[7] Strangely the remedy suggested by the Women Teachers' Guild involved allotment of skill marks. Its suggestion was that two skill marks should be allotted to each teacher, except where two head teachers and two inspectors had reported in one year unfavourably on a teacher. There were to be no inspectors' or head teachers' reports on teachers except on the unsatisfactory ones.[8]

Despite this evidence of teachers' dissatisfaction with the inspectors' assessing role in terms of skill marks recurring at intervals over a quarter of a century, the members of the

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, Jan. 1922, p. 107.
2 S.A.T. Journal, March-April 1923, p. 467.
3 Guild Chronicle, vol. 1, no. 2, Aug. 1938, p. 8.
4 loc.cit.
5 S.A.T. Journal, June 1944, p. 15.
6 loc. cit.
7 loc.cit.
8 loc.cit.

Education Inquiry Committee did not recommend the abandonment of the skill mark system.[1] They knew that England had long ago abandoned numerical methods of assessing the efficiency of her teachers. They knew, too, that as far back as the time of McCoy's appointment as South Australia's Director of Education, the Board of Education in England, on the advice of the Burnham Committee, had adopted the principle of incremental salary increases for assistant teachers based on years of service, and they did recommend for South Australian teachers that positional increments of salary be divorced from skill marks.[2] Their reason for the retention of the skill mark system, though to be changed in its application, for assessing skill and for promotion purposes was that the numerical scheme of assessment was preferred by a substantial majority of teachers.[3] The inspectors were urged to see that the skill mark definitely indicated the quality of the teacher and was not just a reward for satisfactory service which was to be rewarded by the automatic salary increment.[4]

Besides the criticisms by teachers of the assessment system soon after World War I, there were other criticisms of inspectors' procedures. There was a rather juvenile criticism of inspectors' methods of giving dictation,[5] but a more serious one of inspectors' "unnatural hurry"[6] during inspections with bad consequences for pupils and teachers. This complaint about hurried inspections was not new.[7] It appeared again during World War II.

> The incidental is a rush, a look over organization, a mere day or so; records have to be seen, accounts checked, and report written. In between, the hard-working inspector does what he can to see each class

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 15, 1945, p. 23.
2 ibid., p. 41. See also Table 5.3, p. 215.
3 ibid., p. 23.
4 ibid., p. 24.
5 S.A.T. Journal, June 1920, p. 141.
6 S.A.T. Journal, Aug. 1920, p. 32.
7 See above, p. 85.

> and to impart some ideas. When the detailed comes, the time spent is longer, but so are the notes, reports, and records which have to be made. Each class is examined in arithmetic and spelling and the numerical results noted and tabulated. Other subjects must be heard. Notes on each teacher are made, so that a report may be written. A long report on the school is made. During this time the inspector has not a minute to spare.[1]

The teacher who wrote this had a remedy.

> Let us have more inspectors - though I don't like the name - so that they come to our schools more often. When they come let them be able to spend more time on helping demonstrating, advising and inspiring, and less on reporting and checking accounts, etc. Let us make more use of these men, let us not wear them out only half doing the work they want to do.[2]

Six months after this teacher's complaint appeared in print, Fenner, as Director of Education, issued instructions to remove this frantic hurry from inspections,[3] almost certainly in response to the complaint. This was not only a local problem, for about this time a Committee set up to review education in Scotland expressed similar sentiments.

> We confess that the hurried, routine inspection of a succession of classes followed by stereotyped report seems to us a time-wasting practice yielding profit to no one and calculated to bring the whole business of inspection into disrepute. We recommend, therefore, that it be discontinued, and that H.M. Inspectors be left complete discretion to examine with thoroughness and report with candour where circumstances require it, and for the rest, to devote their time to more constructive functions.[4]

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, April 1942, p. 16.
2 loc. cit.
3 See above, p. 228.
4 T.R. Bone, op. cit., p. 215.

Teachers in both McCoy's and Adey's term of office were increasingly aware of the thrust overseas for freedom from the tyranny of imperfect examinations, and succeeded in getting the Qualifying Certificate Examination abolished in Fenner's time as Director. It was held for the last time in 1943.[1] Maughan had released them from the detailed examination of the inspectors, McCoy had demanded numerical results in arithmetic and spelling in the inspection reports and still had the Qualifying Certificate Examination. In this examination he used the inspectors in setting, marking and organizing it, had the results entered in inspection reports, gave wide publicity to it and made it important in the eyes of the community. Hence teachers' pressures to change the Qualifying Certificate Examination were pressures to change the role of the inspectors. The teachers had read, been lectured on or acquainted with the contents of such books as Spearman's The Nature of Intelligence and Abilities of Man, and Ballard's The New Examiner and in Adey's time Examination of Examinations and criticisms by such notables as Hartog, Thomson and Hamley emanating from N.E.F. world conferences, and even A.C.E.R. publications on the poor prognostic value of examinations.[2] One secondary assistant, with approval from Adey, was even testing the efficacy of the Qualifying Certificate Examination.[3]

Teachers read in The S.A. Teachers' Journal that the Canadian Teachers Federation at its ninth annual meeting in Winnipeg debated special reports on examinations.[4] It would be stretching probability too far to suggest that the editor placed this Canadian report in the same issue as McCoy's letter to the

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 59, no. 686, Sept. 1943, p. 172. The decision was announced by the Premier.

2 R.D. Collmann and C. Jorgensen, The Prediction of Scholastic Success, A.C.E.R., Educational Research Series, no. 35, M.U.P. 1935.

3 A.W. Jones, "Some Considerations of the Adequacy of Educational Measurement", unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Adelaide, 1943. See Part I, pp. 1-105.

4 S.A.T. Journal, Dec 1928, p. 276.

President of the Union asking him to reprimand an Association of the Union for its public "strong criticism" in the press of the Qualifying Certificate Examination.[1] The questions in the papers were set by inspectors and carefully edited by the Director, himself. McCoy had never taken kindly to criticisms of his actions, and he was opposed to political activity by teachers concerning education. It was probably this political activity that annoyed him more so than the criticism of the examination, for McCoy, when overseas, revealed in a letter to his Deputy, Charlton, his private qualms about "these terrible examinations"[2] for which he saw no practical substitute. In this quest by some teachers to rid themselves of the Qualifying Certificate Examination, they had the support of some parliamentarians, ostensibly because it was not accomplishing any useful purpose, but mainly because its abolition would save £9,000.[3]

The regular, if, moderate, attack by pockets of South Australian teachers on the Qualifying Certificate was highlighted when a Teachers' Association on conservative Eyre Peninsula rescinded a motion to award a medal to the student in the district getting the highest mark in the Qualifying Certificate Examination.[4] At the same time the more progressive, if not militant, city-based Male Assistants' Association recommended that the Qualifying Certificate Examination not be held in 1938, the year of the polio-myelitis epidemic.[5] The members had been stirred on by an exchange teacher telling them that the abolition of the equivalent examination in New Zealand in 1937 was the greatest progress made in fifty years in that country.[5] They had already been informed in Notes from the A.C.E.R. that Victoria had abolished

---

1 ibid., p. 271.
2 W.G. Richards, op. cit., p. 221.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 7 Oct. 1930, p. 1264.
4 S.A.T. Journal, April 1938, p. 13.
5 loc. cit.

the external qualifying examination for entry to secondary school.[1]

The pressures from teachers for abolition of the Qualifying Certificate Examination succeeded in removing the externally controlled examination and replacing it with the school-controlled Progress Certificate examination. At the same time the pressure from teachers forced a change of the inspectors' role in respect to the new examination, and combined with political funding activity gave the inspectors the added duty of inspecting Grade 7 in private schools to ascertain their worthiness to receive Progress Allowances.[2]

The attacks on examinations and the righteous preoccupation of the teachers and their Union with wage justice and illegal reductions[3] in their salaries, heaped upon their acceptance of a voluntary reduction because of the financial position of the Government, staved off any substantial criticisms of inspectors by teachers in Adey's term of office. What criticisms there were of the inspectors' actions were very mild and often associations' motions were modified by the Council of the Union before they were communicated to the Director of Education. One association wanted discontinued the inspectors' practice of giving detailed results of arithmetic and spelling in their report (as required by McCoy), as it was detrimental to other equally important subjects.[4] After the Union referred it to the Director, who in turn referred it to the inspectorate, a belated reply said that whenever inspectors considered that the numerical estimate was not fair, they added a verbal comment.[5] Fenner later caused the numerical assessments of arithmetic and spelling results to be omitted in inspectors' reports. For

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, July 1933, p. 10.
2 See above, p. 210.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 8 Sept. 1933, p. 1077.
4 S.A.T. Journal, June 1931, pp. 6, 7.
5 S.A.T. Journal, Aug. 1935, p. 20.

instance, in the 1944 ordinary inspection report on Norwood School, Inspector Pitt gave the overall result in arithmetic as 78 per cent, and in spelling as 1.3 errors. No results for separate grades were given. In 1945, Inspector Gerlach gave no numerical results, but assessed arithmetic and spelling as excellent.

With the advent of Fenner, teachers' problems with the inspectorial system and pressures for change, which had been so few under Adey, began to surface in The S.A. Teachers' Journal. The Male Assistants' Association read "The Inspector comes to Ironbank" from the Queensland Teachers' Journal, and commented that South Australia and Queensland had common inspectorial problems.[1] The Headmasters' Association moved a courteous motion that inspectors be requested to adhere to the course of instruction in the examination of all subjects, but the Council of the Union changed "requested" to "required".[2] The S.A.P.S.T.U. organized a convention at Barmera[3] which no inspectors attended. A recommendation from it was that teachers in small schools would welcome visits and advice from headmasters and other head teachers, as teachers could not be expected to unbend to district inspectors, who were there to assess their skill.[4]

Teachers, too, were individually and collectively thinking about the new psychology, the new philosophy, the "new education" and the new methods, weighing up the pros and cons, and not just taking the word of inspectors which had been the ritual of the past.[5] This put pressure on the inspectors to keep abreast of the times, which, according to one

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, Aug. 1939, p. 11.
2 ibid., p. 5.
3 S.A.T. Journal, Sept. 1939, p. 5.
4 S.A.T. Journal, Oct. 1939, p. 10.
5 R.B. Pocock, "The New Education", in S.A. Teachers' Journal, July 1939, pp. 14-18.

Superintendent, as a lively body of educationists (there were nine M.A.s among them) reading judiciously they spared no pains to do.[1]

Indeed, the newer breed of teachers must have had a subtle effect on the role of the inspectors. Some of them had entered Teachers College during the Great Depression, when they had been older than the usual student, and had held previous jobs as labourers, shop assistants, clerks, dairymen and radio salesmen.[2] With such maturity and broader background they were not only splendid material for the inspectors to work upon, but also could show more independence when assessing inspectors' advice.

Not all comment in The S.A. Teachers' Journal was derogatory of inspectors, indeed there was recognition of their power and influence, though the pressures for change were always present. At a country Teachers' Association meeting the mover of a motion to change the name 'inspector' to 'adviser' contended that 'inspector' savoured too much of the inquisition and of fault-finding.

> Inspectors were not enemies but friends. Such men of wide vision, who can lead, inspire, suggest, appraise the zeal, industry, and ideas of a teacher, are deserving of the name "educational adviser".[3]

The suggested change was finally referred to the Inspectors' Guild for consideration. A delegate at a Union Council meeting asked what the Union had done about removing the objectionable competitive element that had been introduced into the Schools Patriotic Fund operations. The reply was, "The inspectors and departmental officials were so loud in their praise of it that nothing could be done".[4]

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1941, p. 14.
2 S.A.T. Journal, May 1940, p. 17.
3 S.A.T. Journal, July 1940, p. 12.
4 S.A.T. Journal, Oct. 1940, p. 8.

The S.A. Teachers' Journal also quoted from New Zealand's National Education, that school inspectors by able and courteous performance of their duties had converted themselves from "wasps to pollinating bees".[1] It also reported a motion of the New South Wales Teachers' Federation, "That for the duration of the war inspection be abolished and inspectors be absorbed into the teaching staff".[2] On the same page Professor Eric Ashby was quoted, "Inspect the schools by all means, inspect the curriculum and the pupils. But not the teachers."[3] The pressures from teachers for change in the inspectors' role were evident in the extracts.

The Women Teachers' Guild in The Guild Chronicle defended the receptive attitude of inspectors to innovative ideas. Concerning the transition of children from infant to Grade 3, it contended that the head of the primary school was not bound hand and foot by the Course of Instruction. If the head put a plan to the district inspector, as a man of ripe experience, he would welcome initiative and an unusual handling of the problem.[4] This generous attitude to the inspector was typical of the Guild and in contrast to the nit-picking attitude of the Union. Women Teachers' Guild members were advocates of "The Common Cause" and its ideals for post-war reconstruction, and were making lists of such ideals for educational reconstruction. One ideal was that the district inspectors would be the leaders of teams of specialist advisers based at their headquarters. These specialists would make horizontal connections with high schools, area schools, infant and opportunity classes.[5] They doubted that funds would be available after the war to put their ideals into practice.[6]

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, Feb. 1942, p. 10.
2 S.A.T. Journal, March 1942, p. 10.
3 loc. cit.
4 Guild Chronicle, vol. 5, no. 3, June 1942, p. 9.
5 Guild Chronicle, vol. 6, no. 3, June 1943, p. 12.
6 Guild Chronicle, vol. 6, no. 4, Aug. 1943, p. 3.

The Union's submission to the Education Inquiry Committee advocated for the inspectors less routine but more authority. Union members wanted more professional help, not time wasted on routine work of examining and signing records.[1] The Union representatives put forward a masterly case to bring about the desired reform to meet teachers' needs. They cited the duties of inspectors in the 1939 Regulations, and the additions in 1942 seeking to encourage and inspire teachers yet adding routine checking of accounts. Inspections were burdensome for teachers and caused strain largely because of the rigid examining of every child in arithmetic and spelling, forcing teachers to concentrate excessively on these subjects. They quoted the Director on easing up in examinations, inspections and reporting and providing more time for discussing, teaching, directing, inspiring and stimulating. They quoted Inspector Leach's address urging less rigidity in the inspection process, more time for inspectors' preparation, and time to extend their work from the classroom to the community. They quoted from G.S. Browne's book, The Case for Curriculum Revision, which stressed a freer hand for the inspectors to experiment and help teachers. However, they favoured retention of the skill mark system as promotion by personal choice had led to injustice, favouritism and dissatisfaction.[2]

Conclusion

One common element throughout the period 1919 to 1945 was the difficult financial climate for education in South Australia and the consequential restraints by Parliaments and Governments on the development of the education system including the role of the inspectors. Another common element was the surge of interest in education as a result of world movements in education related to democratic ideals of greater freedom in

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, Sept. 1943, pp. 15, 23.
2 ibid., pp. 14, 15, 23, refer to all matters in this paragraph.

education aimed at getting all the children of the people to live more completely.

The three directors of education, each contributed to the development of the role of the inspectors of schools in a different way.

McCoy was a systematizer. The duties of inspectors and the skill mark scheme, that they used to determine teachers' salary and promotion, were openly displayed in Regulations and Circulars, clear, precise and definite. Everybody knew that the inspectors had an inspecting role, a limited but definite examining role, an advisory role, an assessing role, and a leadership role. Moreover the reasons for these roles were widely known. The inspectors had to look into things with the object of helping the cause of education, and they had to report defects and deficiencies that they found to a Superintendent so that he could take administrative action to institute remedies. They had to test the basic skills in which results were not the be all and end all of instruction, but standards still had to be maintained. They had to observe and assess teachers in order to determine a skill mark so that the teachers in turn could get promotion and increased pay. They had to advise teachers on better organization, government and method of instruction through a detailed inspection report, made public by samples being printed in The Education Gazette. They also had to advise and help teachers at conferences and meetings, not only at inspection times but also at other prescribed times, planned and advertised. They had a leadership role to inspire their teachers to undertake further study to improve their professional capacity and enhance their attitude to their task of educating children. Moreover the inspectors had to convince the people of their districts of the value of education.

McCoy made other contributions to the development of the role of the inspectors. He improved the academic quality of the

intake of students to Teachers' College by making probationary students in the high schools instead of junior teachers the main source of supply. He increased the lengths of courses and the quality of practice teaching, thus providing the inspectors with better teachers to advise and develop. His other great contribution to the development of the role of the inspectors was in the calibre of the people whom he recommended to the Public Service Commissioner for appointment as inspectors. He broke from the tradition of selecting senior primary school headmasters to selecting those considered most suitable for the position, usually graduates and often from the secondary education field. Men like W.T. Martin, A.W. Pitt, E. Allen, H.C. Hosking and W.V. Leach, who performed well under McCoy, blossomed under Adey and filled higher positions of responsibility under Fenner. Adelaide Miethke, who worked under three Directors, who all used her great organizing ability, and three Superintendents, contended that she always went her own way.[1] These inspectors along with Lydia Longmore moulded their own roles to some degree and influenced those of other inspectors.

These men and women showed by their actions, reports and writings, at various times in their careers how they influenced the inspectorial role. None of the earlier inspectors, who relied so much on their official position for authority rather than on their earned authority, would have sought criticism of their role from teachers as Leach did during the 1938 polio-myelitis epidemic; nor did the inspectors of earlier periods see the incidental inspection as valuable for the "shaping of ideals",[2] as Allen did. Hosking, too, when Chief Inspector under Fenner, concluded that the inspectors of that period showed by their sympathy, by their constructive criticism

---

1 Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia, vol. 5, no. 2, Nov. 1941, p. 12.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1941, p. 16.

and by their inspiration that they held a conception of their role of much wider responsibility than assessing the worth of teachers.[1] Leach also wanted to share the inspectors' role of assessing teachers' competence with head teachers,[2] yet inspectors of the past had resisted giving teachers the right to promote their own pupils from class to class.[3] Nowhere in the Inspector's Register at Norwood School before 1940 is there such a rousing call to action as that of Inspector Pitt's,

> Strike a new note in the work of each grade - a new departure - an expansion in expression - a cultivation of colour and aesthetic appreciation - a reproduction of something inherent in the teacher's own personality so that he can give it sincerity.[4]

Pitt had certainly grappled with the "hard discipline"[5] of writing reports as a part of his inspectorial role.

Adey, in his decade embracing the Great Depression, did not amend the Regulations governing the inspectors' duties, yet his trust in inspectors, his granting freedom of action to them and to teachers selected by them, his amicable but firm relations with the S.A.P.S.T.U. and the Women Teachers' Guild, allowed the role of the inspectors to develop as partners with him and the Superintendents in administration and also as senior colleagues of the teachers in the schools. Adey made it clear that he wanted inspectors to be advisers and helpers of teachers and not searchers for defects. Thus inspectors broadened their outlook and widened the span of their role. On the other hand at that time, Queensland's inspectors were being labelled, in the

---

1 ibid., p. 25.
2 See above, p. 238.
3 See above, p. 163, 164.
4 Inspector's Register, Norwood Primary School, Incidental Inspection, 22, 23 May 1940. Held at Norwood School.
5 O.R. Jones, "The Inspectorate in New South Wales", in The Journal of Educational Administration, vol. 1, no. 2, Oct. 1963, p. 68. The quote is from P. Wilson, "Outlook and Qualities of the Inspector", an address given when in Australia for the Seminar on Supervision, Melbourne, Jan. 1963.

Queensland Teachers' Journal, as departmental detectives rarely giving advice or demonstrations in the art of running a school. They were petty autocrats, fault-finders rather than seekers of excellence. Their influence forced teachers to adhere rigidly to departmental rules, regulations and syllabuses and reduced experimentation and initiative.[1] This was surely a tribute to Adey's policy for the inspectors' role and for the quality of the inspectors' role in South Australia. No such criticism appeared in The S.A. Teachers' Journal at that time.

The inspectors benefited from Adey's encouragement of their attendance at interstate conferences, and from the uplift given by the 1937 N.E.F. Conference. These benefits were revealed in articles that they wrote for The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia, that they had helped to establish. The articles revealed that they were thinking deeply about their role and were making suggestions for its development. They were aware of the pitfalls that could hinder its development; they were aware of the clash between the assessing role and the advisory role, but also conscious of the opportunity available to them to expand their role. In South Australia, they had developed cooperatively a common philosophy, a unity of purpose and thought and a policy that would not, through rigidity and set practices, stifle enterprize and individuality.[2]

Under Fenner, fear of victimization existed among teachers competing for the few promotion positions available, and the distrust of the Director was transmitted to the inspectors, who were the agents who made the first recommendation for skill marks, promotion and salary increments. Moreover the unity of the Department had been harmed when Fenner arranged for each of the four Superintendents to look after a group of schools. Admittedly the Superintendents were not supposed to work in

---

1 G.C. England, "Impact of the Inspectorial System: A Profession Demeaned?", in The Journal of Educational Administration, vol. 11, no. 1, May 1973, pp. 48-50.
2 W.V. Leach, op. cit., p. 37.

water-tight compartments, but inspectors tended to cluster around a particular Superintendent. Consequently the positive developments of the role of the inspectors brought about by Fenner tended to be ignored and defects magnified, particularly by the S.A.P.S.T.U., whose offers of cooperation Fenner had not accepted.[1] By his own writings and use of staff conferences, Fenner encouraged the inspectors to write on the values that they placed on education and on their own role, which they did in The Education Gazette and The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia. He amended Regulations to add inspiration and encouragement of teachers to the inspectors' task, but also added the checking of accounts associated with the schools. He encouraged inservice training and pastoral care by the inspectors as well as shorter reports but more discussion, demonstration and stimulation for teachers and children by them. He also used the talents of the inspectors on curriculum boards, in establishing Area Schools, in the Junior Technical Schools, in certification in connection with the new Progress Certificate examination, in organizing the Schools Patriotic Fund and exhibitions, and in leadership within their districts without supplying the necessary clerical help, time and facilities, though keeping the inspectorate at its normal strength.

In this quarter of a century, 1919 to 1945, economically not conducive to development in education, but with a ground-swell of desire for individual freedom, creativity and child-centred education, as well as the high expectations from education after the calamities of war and depression, the role of the inspectors developed. It was developed in the first decade by precise, practical and open direction and departmental regulation to inspect, test, assess, advise, talk and report. In the second decade, through idealistic sentiment and trust, inspectors were granted considerable freedom to mould their own roles within the limits of finance available and the essential

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, March 1943, p. 15 and April 1943, p. 10.

requirements of the system. During World War II, through intellectual stimulation the inspectors analyzed their role and developed it to benefit teachers, who, because of their distrust of the operation of the promotion system, did not appreciate fully the efforts of the inspectors on their behalf. The clash of the advisory role and the assessing role came to the fore.

The Education Inquiry Committee in its First Report in 1945 set a framework for the future development of the role of the inspector. Importantly, it recommended that the training and education of inspectors be extended inservice by travel, observation of other systems, and exchange.[1] The great pity of this idealistic Report was that its suggestions for coping in the schools with the birth-rate that had been rising since 1939, were published too late and at the wrong time, when the Government was preoccupied with defeating Japan, settlement of returned soldiers, shortages of all kinds and the after-math of a disastrous drought.[2] Chapter 2 of the First Report dealing with the recruitment of teachers should have been published in the first year of operation of the Committee or when the McNair Report was published in England in 1944. At those times the venturesome Fenner was active as Director, and on the Committee's own admission, "On every hand there were evidences of public interest and indeed anxiety, for change and extensions in education".[3] Moreover the Government had shown its willingness to implement change. For instance, the abolition of the Qualifying Certificate Examination was announced in 1943, before the Committee had reported on it. If the Committee had reported earlier on the supply of teachers, the problems that were to plague the administration and the inspectors for more than a decade after World War II may have been avoided or at least ameliorated.

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 15, 1945, p. 19.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Governor's Speech, 19 July 1945, p. 1.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 15, 1945, p. 3.