INTRODUCTION

The Title

The title of this thesis, "The Development of the Role of Inspectors of Schools in the Education Department of South Australia : 1875 to 1970", needs explanation. It is an historical study and not an academic study of "role" and "administration". Consequently in this study "role" simply means a generalized description of the activities of a group of people, the inspectors of schools, in their official capacities as revealed in the literature on the period and the documents of the period. It is limited to the Education Department of South Australia, not only to contain the size and scope of the study, but also to add a topic, that has previously been neglected, to the growing literature on the history of education in South Australia.

The year 1875 was chosen as the beginning of the study, even though there were inspectors in South Australia before that date, because it was the 1875 Act No. 11 of the South Australian Parliament that created a public system of education managed by a full-time permanent head, rather than the previous state aided private system presided over by a part-time chairman of the Central Board of Education. The year 1970 was chosen to end the study, for in that year A.W. Jones was appointed Director-General of Education, the "Freedom and Authority Memorandum" was issued, and soon after the office, Inspector of Schools, was changed to Senior Education Officer and then to Principal Education Officer, and subsequently to Superintendent of Schools with changed status and duties.

In the title of this study, "development" of the role means those changes over the period in the general activities of the inspectors, including their manners, attitudes, procedures and means used in their interaction with others, mainly teachers, in their official capacity, that can be detected and verified from an analytical study of the source material. In South Australia, "inspector of schools" has been the title reserved for those officers who visited and reported on primary schools, and sometimes infant schools, and their teachers. However in the title of the inspectors' association, the South Australian Institute of Inspectors of Schools, the term embraces all inspectorial positions irrespective of the kind of schools visited, as does the use in The Journal of Inspectors Of Schools of Australia and New Zealand. In the title of this study, "inspector of schools" is used in the generic sense, but in the text the term is used both generically and specifically, which should be clear from the context. The study is concerned essentially, but not exclusively, with the primary school inspectors.

The Reasons for the Study

The reasons for undertaking the study were two-fold, one academic, the other personal. The personal reasons have been explained in the Preface. The academic purpose stems from the fact that none of the literature on the history of education in South Australia dealt directly with the inspectors of schools and their function in the system. Douglas Pike in Paradise of Dissent: South Australia 1829 - 1857 (1957) dealt with political and religious dissent prior to and in the early years of the founding of the Colony. In "A Society Without Grandparents" and "Education in an Agricultural State", both in Melbourne Studies in Education, 1957 - 1958, E.L. French (ed.), 1958, he extended the study to the turn of the century with only passing comment on Inspector Wyatt's "easy yoke" and Hartley's overworked

inspectors. T.H. Smeaton in Education in South Australia from 1836 to 1927 (1927) dealt briefly with approximately the first century of education in South Australia with only occasional mention of inspectors as such.

Education historians associated with the University of Adelaide, the Flinders University of South Australia and the South Australian College of Advanced Education, particularly at the Magill Campus, and others have concentrated on aspects of education in South Australia other than the inspectorate. G.E. Saunders's B.A. Hons. thesis, University of Adelaide, 1958, was entitled, "John Anderson Hartley and education in South Australia". His M.A. thesis, University of Adelaide, 1965, was entitled, "Public education in South Australia in the nineteenth century and some factors affecting it". Hedley Beare's M.Ed. thesis, University of Melbourne, 1964, dealt with the influence of another head of the Education Department of South Australia, Alfred Williams, and the Price Ministry. W.G. Richards's M.Ed. thesis, University of Adelaide, 1973 dealt with yet another Director of Education, W.T. McCoy. R.J. Nicholas's B.Ed. thesis, University of Melbourne, 1949, was entitled, "The Growth and Development of State Secondary Schools in South Australia with special reference to the 20th Century". His M.Ed. thesis, University of Melbourne, 1953, had the title, "Private and Denominational Secondary Schools of South Australia; their Growth and Development". B.K. Hyams's Ph.D. thesis, Flinders University, 1972, was entitled, "State school teachers in South Australia 1847 - 1950: a study of their training, employment and voluntary organization."

P. Cook, M. Vick, I. Davey, D. Grundy, R. Goutmann and K. Wimshurst, more recent education historians, in theses and in journal articles, particularly in ANZHES Journal, renamed History of Education Review, have tended to concentrate on class conflict, social, political and ideological problems in the early history of education in South Australia, with rare comments on the inspectors.

Murray Park Sources in the History of South Australian Education from 1971 onwards, under the general editorship of Brian Condon, provided an indexed collection in accessible form of several sources. Some of these publications were excerpts on education from Catholic, Anglican and Methodist newspapers; press cuttings of the Education Department; microfilms of The S.A. Teachers' Journal and of The Guild Chronicle, and primary school Courses of Instruction. The publication with most information concerning inspectors was The Confidential Letterbook of the South Australian Inspector-General of Schools 1880 - 1914 (1976).

The activities of the South Australian inspectors have been neglected in the studies and source material cited above. This present study, in breaking new ground, views the development of the role of the South Australian inspectorate over a period of nearly a century. The hope is that the study will stimulate others to undertake more detailed studies of South Australian inspectors' activities over shorter periods of time, as well as of problems faced by them at particular times, and also studies of individual inspectors, and the women inspectors appointed since 1896. W.T. Lucas has produced a study of one of the kinds suggested. He chose one particular facet of the South Australian inspectors' role developed during the 21 years of J.A. Hartley's administration of the Education Department. This was the substance of his M.Ed. thesis, "The Role of the Inspectorate as an Agent of Inservice Education 1875-96", Flinders University, 1976. B. Pirkis made a considerable study of Inspector W.L. Neale, who left South Australia to become Director of Education in Tasmania in 1905, in his M. Ed. dissertation, "William Lewis Neale : The South Australian Years", Tasmanian College of Advanced Education, 1981.

Studies of the kind suggested have been made of the inspectorates in other states of Australia. C. Turney in "The Rise and Decline of an Australian Inspectorate" in

Melbourne Studies in Education 1970, R.J.W. Selleck (ed.), studied the development of the New South Wales inspectorate from around 1850 to the turn of the century. D.S. Bowmer chose the same period, as in Turney's paper above, in his M.Ed. thesis, "The Development of the Inspectorial System in the Public Schools of New South Wales 1848-1905", University of Sydney, 1965. R.I. Francis, "Schooling under the Council of Education, 1867-1880: The Inspector's Lot was not a Happy One" in Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society, Vol. 66 Part 1, June 1980, chose part of the same period. An individual Victorian inspector was singled out for study by R.J.W. Selleck in "The Strange Case of Inspector Robertson", in Melbourne Studies in Education 1964, E.L. French (ed.). Indeed Selleck's "Frank Tate: A Victorian Australian" in History of Education, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1976, deals mainly with Tate's inspecting days.

Another Victorian was chosen for study by R.H. Whitely in his M.Ed. thesis, "Donald Clark, the first chief inspector of technical schools", University of Melbourne, 1980. B. Parker in his M.Ed. thesis at Monash University, 1983, studied the life and contribution of Ernest Eltham, who succeeded Donald Clark as Chief Inspector of Technical Schools in Victoria. B.A. Mitchell's, "Pioneer School Inspector, William McIntyre", in Armidale and District Historical Society Journal, No. 17, 1974, was a similar study in New South Wales. C.R. MacPherson in her M.Ed. thesis, "Education in Van Diemen's Land, 1804-56, with special reference to Thomas Arnold the Younger, Inspector of Schools, Van Diemen's Land, 1850-56", Monash University, 1981, studied an individual inspector. L. Fletcher in Pioneers of Education in Western Australia, 1982, has made a study of William Adkinson, a pioneer inspector of schools in that State. G. Partington in the same publication studied "James Pollitt Walton, Chief Inspector of Schools" and M. Lake dealt with "Cyril Jackson: professional administrator". M. de Jabrun studied inspectors' reports from 1875-1890 in North Queensland Schools in order to consider the environmental factor in Queensland education, published in History Teacher, No. 28, Oct. 1981.

Some examples of recent studies in Britain of the kind suggested to be made on the South Australian inspectorate are: D. Winkley, "L.E.A. Inspectors and Advisers: a developmental analysis" in Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1982; J.E. Dunford, "Robert Lowe and Inspectors' Reports", in British Journal of Education Studies, Vol. 25, No. 2, June 1977; P. Brendon, "The changing role of the Inspectorate", in New University, Vol. 4, No. 3, May/July, 1970, and M.J. Illing, "An Early H.M.I., Thomas William Marshall, in the Light of New Evidence" in British Journal of Education Studies, Vol. 20(1), February 1972.

The Structure of the Study

The study has been divided into eight chapters. Chapter 1 deals with the education system and the inspectorate in South Australia prior to 1875 as a background for the study of the development of the role of the inspectors from the assent to the 1875 Education Act onwards to 1970 in Chapters 2 to 7. Chapter 8 contains conclusions drawn from the material in the previous chapters. The Chapters 2 to 7 examine the development of the role of the inspectors in the chronological periods shown below.

Chapter 2: From the 1875 Education Act to the 1881-1883 Inquiry (1875-1883),

Chapter 3: From 1884 to the appointment of the first Labor Minister of Education (1884-1905),

Chapter 4: From the appointment of the first Director of Education to the end of World War I (1906-1918),

Chapter 5: From the end of World War I to the end of World War II (1919-1945),

Chapter 6: From 1946 to the Establishment of the Recruiting and Training Branch of the Education Department of South Australia (1946-1959),

Chapter 7: A period of Transition from Quantitative to Qualitative Problems (1960-1970).

The chief reason for these divisions was for ease of handling data. It must be stressed that they in no sense imply that the development of the role of the inspectors was disjointed with sudden changes of direction at the beginning of each period. There are other sound reasons for the choice of the divisions. Each period had some distinctive features, had a kind of unity, and the beginning and end of each period were major events as indicated below.

Chapter 2 1875-1883

The period from the assent to the 1875 Education Act to the Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Working of the Education Acts, 1881-1883, was the time when J.A. Hartley, President of the Council of Education and then Inspector-General, in striving to build a centrally controlled, uniform and efficient system of elementary education, in a Colony peopled by many non-conformists and voluntaryists, used his inspectors to examine pupils and police Regulations so strictly and severely that the Inquiry resulted.

Chapter 3 1884-1905

The post-inquiry period to the appointment of the first Labor Minister of Education, Thomas Price, included the publication of The Education Gazette, the death of Hartley, the establishment of the South Australian Public School Teachers' Union (S.A.P.S.T.U.), the inept administration of the Board of Inspectors and of L.W. Stanton. It ended with the biggest shake-up of the administration of the Education Department by a ministry in its history, with the S.A.P.S.T.U. playing a significant part. It was generally a time of economic depression, unemployment, restricted government spending on education, and frequent changes of Government. Despite the financial stringency more land was opened to settlers, necessitating more schools in the outback.

Chapter 4 1906-1918

The next period began with the appointment of the first Director of Education, Alfred Williams. He had a mission which he pursued with zeal until ill-health sapped his energy and ultimately brought about his death. Williams's mission was to implement the "new education" of Britain, Europe and the United States of America into schools throughout South Australia and to begin secondary education as in other states and in other parts of the western world. The promising start to this period faded under the weight of Price's death, Williams's ill health and death and a particularly obstreperous Parliament. The 1910-1913 Select Committee and Royal Commission on Education brought about major changes in the role of the inspectors, as did the introduction of the Efficiency Mark in the assessment of teachers. World War I hastened assent to the 1915 Education Act, imposed restrictions on the inspectors, but also provided opportunities for patriotic effort jointly with teachers. The S.A.P.S.T.U. added to its equipment as a force in educational progress by publishing The S.A. Teachers' Journal from 1915.

Chapter 5 1919-1945

The period between the end of World War I and the end of World War II included world-wide social and political upheavals such as the Great Depression, World War II, and a surge for greater individual liberty, exemplified in education by the New Education Fellowship movement. The S.A.P.S.T.U. and the Women Teachers' Guild were active in seeking professional freedom for teachers. The inspectors' role was influenced in distinctly different ways by the three Directors of Education, McCoy, Adey and Fenner, during the period. The First and Second Progress Reports of the Committee of Enquiry into Education in 1931 and the First Report of the Education Inquiry Committee in 1945 were very different documents and had different impacts on the inspectors' role.

Chapter 6 1946-1959

The period from the end of World War II to the establishment of the Recruiting and Training Branch of the Education Department of South Australia was marked by the overwhelming increase in the number of children enrolling in schools. This increase combined with the post-war high expectations from schooling, the shortage of materials and workers of all kinds including teachers, forced the administrators of the Education Department to concentrate attention on solving these problems. The inspectors became educational handymen. The teachers in short supply had improved bargaining power and their organizations sought changes in the inspectors' role. The Final Report of the Education Inquiry Committee in 1949 was supportive of the inspectors, and pointed the way to provide support for them in their inservice education of teachers.

Chapter 7 1960-1970

The establishment of the Recruiting and Training Branch heralded the transition from dealing with quantitative problems to those of quality in education. It relieved the inspectors of administrative tasks in the recruitment of teachers and directed their attention to the important task of improving the quality of teachers and head teachers in a burgeoning inservice training programme of day and residential conferences. The National Seminar for Inspectors of Schools was instituted and led to further inservice education opportunities for inspectors. The relations between inspectors and teachers were good compared with those in other Australian states. Nevertheless, like conditions in this restless and tumultuous period, the inspectors' role, more professional but less powerful, was in a state of flux in 1970, for the Freedom and Authority Memorandum had been issued and the Karmel Committee was about to report.

Within each of the Chapters 2 to 7 sub-headings have been introduced with the ideas of the easier marshalling of data and of the clearer presentation to the reader.

Under the sub-heading, Introduction, is set out the plan of the chapter and its aim. Reference is made to the social, political, economic and educational conditions and events under which the inspectors operated. Modern historiographers such as Brickman[1] and Veysey[2] assert that the history of any aspect of education cannot be viewed in isolation from its social, political and economic conditions in both a world and local setting, if the account is to be a valid one. This principle was kept in mind during the division of the total period into six parts in the Chapters 2 to 7. It has also been observed throughout this study about the institutionalized behaviour over nearly a century of these agents, the inspectors, in the educative process.

Within each of these chapters the sub-headings beginning with, "Pressures for Development of the Role of Inspectors..." have categorized the pressures as from three sources:

(1) from the Legislature and from Superiors,
(2) from the Inspectors Themselves, and
(3) from Teachers.

The word, pressure, is used to cover a positive force or influence for change leading to development and also a negative force or constraining influence on change leading to the status quo.

---

1 W.W. Brickman, "Theoretical and Critical Perspectives on Educational History", in Paedagogica Historica, vol. 18, no. 1, 1978, pp. 44, 56, 71.

2 L.R. Veysey, "Toward a New Direction in Educational History: Prospect and Retrospect". Doing History of Education II, in History of Education Quarterly, Fall 1969, pp. 345, 357.

Pressures from the legislature and the inspectors' superiors came from the Parliament itself, its debates, its motions, bills, Acts, petitions, returns, allowance or disallowance of Regulations, Members' questions and, of course, allotment of finance. In addition the Government including the Minister of Education, part of the legislature, could bring pressure to bear on the activities of the inspectors. Select Committees and Royal Commissions on education set up by the Parliament or the Government, their reports to Parliament and debate on them in Parliament may be considered as a source of pressure from the legislature on the inspectors. On the other hand evidence to such commissions from teachers and inspectors could provide pressures to be considered under the other two categories. Boards of Advice were created by the Parliament, reported to the Minister of Education, and could well be considered as a source of pressure from the legislature on the role of the inspectors. The inspectors' superiors included under this heading were the permanent heads of the Education Department, called over the period President of the Council of Education, Inspector-General, Chairman of the Board of Inspectors, Director of Education and Director-General of Education. Over the years other levels of officers, superior to the inspectors were added such as, Assistant Inspector-General, Superintendents of Branches, who became Directors of Divisions, with Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents under them, Chief Inspector, Assistant Chief Inspector, and Staff Inspector. The Minister of Education, the political head of the Education Department, could be considered as the inspectors' superior or as a member of the legislature.

Throughout the whole period, the inspectors' influence on their own role waxed and waned according to the nature of the composition of the inspectorate and the strength and dominance of the other sources of pressure. For instance, in the period before the 1881-1883 Inquiry, the inspectors' influence on their

role was insignificant compared with the dominating influence of Hartley. Their influence to maintain the status quo, namely the role that Hartley set for them, could be said to be a pressure coming from their dedication to the task, their unwillingness to depart from the "fixed line" and their inability or unwillingness to find time to develop an advisory role. An individual inspector's interpretation of Regulations or instructions could be considered a pressure for the role to change, particularly if it set an example for other inspectors to follow. Inspectors' advocacy for their role to change or not in their annual reports, in articles in The Education Gazette and in The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia and New Zealand, in their evidence to inquiries and in motions emanating from their conferences constituted their own initiated pressures.

The pressures from teachers came mainly from their organizations, the Teachers' Associations, the S.A.P.S.T.U., the Women Teachers' Guild and the South Australian Institute of Teachers as they developed over the years. They used their journals, The S.A. Teachers' Journal, The Guild Chronicle, and S.A.I.T. Newsletter as vehicles for their pressures. In addition they used evidence to commissions and inquiries, correspondence and delegations to the permanent and ministerial heads of the Education Department, their annual conferences and public meetings with powerful interstate speakers, and the motions to the Director of Education from inservice conferences. Occasionally they made direct contact with the Guild of Inspectors of Schools of South Australia.

A study of the literature and documents showed that the sources of pressure, by and large could be placed in the three categories listed above. However it might be contended that these three categories are not sufficiently comprehensive to include all the sources of pressure for change in the inspectors' role. The contention might be that pressures from such sources as the following might not be covered - from parents, students, the press, world education movements,

education legislation, thoughts and practices in other states and countries, teachers' unions outside the State, social upheavals, economic conditions and local geographical conditions. Nevertheless, it is contended here, that these sources of pressure are subsumed under the three main categories. Community, parental, student and media pressures are reflected in those from the legislature, whose members received much of their information and ammunition from these sources. Indeed, the other sources of pressure listed as possibly not covered by the three categories were evident in the well-informed legislature's activities. However, the influence of world education movements, events in other states and overseas and of local physical conditions may be reflected more so in the pressures from superiors, from teachers and from the inspectors themselves.

Sometimes there is doubt under which sub-heading to place a particular pressure for the development of the role of the inspectors. All three categories, legislature and superiors, inspectors themselves, and teachers, can contribute to the pressure from a particular source depending on circumstances. For instance, an inspector first suggested the formation of Teachers' Associations around the Colony, and when performing at them the inspectors developed their advisory role in various ways. Nevertheless it was the teachers who began the Associations and usually invited the inspector to join them normally as President and to address them and advise them. Indeed Hartley published an article on Teachers' Associations in The Education Gazette and hinted at the role that the inspectors should play, and later provided an example. Again, the first organizing inspector was appointed by the Council of Education, but the first appointee and the other inspectors influenced the development of the particular role before it was abolished by the administration, probably through lack of funds. When such ambiguous cases occur the source of the pressure is placed under one or more subheadings considered appropriate with an explanation given.

The other sub-heading within each chapter is "Conclusion". In each case it consists of a general statement of the development of the role of the inspectors in the period as revealed from a study of the literature and documents under the previous headings.

Reference Sources Used in the Study

Source materials on the development of the role of the inspector of schools over nearly a century must be such as to provide a balanced input of data in order to counter bias from any single source. The role of the inspectors is largely constituted from those things that they do when visiting schools. One source, the official Regulations, makes this appear a relatively simple and straight-forward matter. Other sources such as the inspectors' evidence to royal commissions and committees of inquiry, their annual reports, their articles in The Education Gazette and in The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia and New Zealand, and its earlier version of Australia only, show that these visits and the inspectors' part in them are much more complex than the Regulations indicate.

The reports in the Inspector's Register in each school provide a different slant. They show what the inspectors did in the schools, what time they took and their evaluation of the particular school. Teachers revealed their views of the inspectors' role at school visits in evidence to royal commissions and committees of enquiry, in minutes of Teachers' Association meetings, in comments on the reports in the Inspector's Registers, and in publications of the teachers' unions as well as in information supplied for parliamentary debates and in parliamentary questions prompted by School Committees and other groups. Teachers also had published in The Education Gazette and in The S.A. Teachers' Journal articles from contemporary writers and distinguished lecturers giving

their views on what the nature of inspections and the role of the inspectors should be. The administration did the same in The Education Gazette and in The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia and New Zealand. Little wonder that writers of the history of education are urged not to accept the views of officialdom at face value.[1]

Hence the necessity for wide sources of reference that can cover the views of not only ministers, directors, senior bureaucrats and inspectors, but also those of parliamentarians, teachers, community groups and even of children. Evidence must be found to check, put into perspective, or reconcile, for instance, the inspector's statement which said that he was so hard-worked that he had no time for advisory work and the statement of the Member of Parliament, who said that the inspector came up on one train and went back on the next.

It is particularly important to have this breadth of views, as indicated above, when dealing with a complex of interpersonal relationships, communications, personalities and emotions as is the inspectors' role at inspections. At least an inspector, a teacher and children are involved, all with different thoughts, feelings and expectations in an exercise of authority and power in a government school environment with all that that embraces legally and morally. There are others interested in the outcome of the inspection visit. Officers senior to the inspectors want a report, which sometimes reaches the Parliament; children's parents are interested in the outcome, as is the local community. Teachers have prestige, promotion and salary at stake, and sometimes their union or association will display interest.

South Australian Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) were available from 1857, and prior to that the Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Council of South Australia from 1851, the

---

1 L.R. Veysey, op. cit., p. 345.

year in which the first inspector of schools was appointed. Archival material was available on the Executive and Legislative Council established on 23 February 1836, and on the Legislative Council established on 15 June 1843. Not only did these sources provide information on the social, political and economic setting in which the inspectors operated, but they provided a check on any uncritical acceptance at face value of such official documents as annual reports of ministers of education, of directors, and of inspectors. Moreover questions on education asked in Parliament usually originated from the electorate, school committees and parents of school children, as well as from press reports, editorials, leading articles or letters to the editor. Replies came from officials of the Education Department. In debates on motions and bills concerning education, some Members of Parliament showed that they took note of the reports of directors and inspectors and quoted from them frequently. Some, indeed, were knowledgeable about world movements in education; others exhibited only parochial interest usually related to expense.

South Australian Parliamentary Papers were available from 1857. Prior to that, similar substance appeared in Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Council with the Various Documents Connected Therewith, and in The South Australian Government Gazette as far as this study was concerned from 1851. The South Australian Government Gazette was first published in 1839. Before that time, the newspaper, South Australian Gazette and Colonial Register, was used as a gazette for all Government notices and papers. Education Acts appeared in Acts of the Parliament of South Australia, but the Regulations under the Acts were included in the Parliamentary Papers or in The Government Gazette, and from 1885 in The Education Gazette. The Parliamentary Papers included such items as annual reports of the Central Board of Education and of the Council of Education and, after 1878, the Annual Report of the Minister of Education, initially called the Minister Controlling Education. The annual reports of the Inspector-General and

later of the Director of Education were included along with, for many years, the annual reports of the inspectors of schools. Even after the inspectors' annual reports, or excerpts from them, were published from 1885 in The Education Gazette, they were periodically published in Parliamentary Papers. As appendices to the main education annual report, there were published such reports as those of the Headmaster of the Model School, of the Principal of the Training School, of the Superintendent of School Visitors and of Boards of Advice; and later of the Principal of the Teachers' College and of the Principal Medical Officer and the Psychologist. Later still the Minister's Annual Report was expanded to include the activities of the Branches and then the Divisions of the Education Department. Over the years an increasing array of statistics was attached to the Minister's Annual Report.

Also included in Parliamentary Papers were reports of royal commissions and committees of inquiry into education and their minutes of witnesses' evidence, so valuable in getting cross-examined evidence from a cross-section of community representatives as well as from officials of the Education Department. Reports of overseas visits of Directors of Education and of others were included, if they had been tabled in Parliament. Occasionally, a parliamentary paper dealt directly with the inspectorate. For instance, the "Report of the Civil Service Commission on the Status and Salaries of Inspectors" stated that twelve teachers had higher salaries than three of the inspectors. It recommended placing the inspectors in the professional division of the service.[1] In addition, the parliamentary papers included Blue Book of South Australia and Statistical Register of South Australia for the previous year. They were valuable sources of statistical data on education over the period studied.

The Education Gazette was first published in 1885, with J.A. Hartley as editor. It has continued to be published

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 184, 1880.

monthly, and more recently weekly, ever since. Historians may consider it a biassed reference source, providing only departmental points of view, particularly when the editor was the Inspector-General of Schools. No doubt Hartley manipulated the contents in order to communicate to teachers and others his ideas of "standards" in an efficient colonial system of education, but he did publish reports and minutes of meetings of Teachers' Associations. Admittedly, criticisms from country associations were usually mild and apologetic. That could not be said of the scathing criticism of the result examination by the President of the South Australian Teachers' Association, which the editor included in The Education Gazette[1]. There is no doubt that the severe criticism of departmental practices by the President of the S.A.P.S.T.U.[2], fully reported in The Education Gazette of August 1905, was a factor in the removal of Stanton from the office of Inspector- General and the changes in the inspectorate.

The numbers of The Education Gazette over the years have contained not only official instructions, statistics and appointments, but also articles by inspectors, teachers, directors and authors, local, interstate and overseas. The articles have been wide-ranging on topics such as world trends, N.E.F., UNESCO, conflict in Australian education, impressions of American education, to local discussion of teaching methods, curriculum and school libraries. Over the years articles on famous educators, philosophers and psychologists - Montessori, Froebel, Pestalozzi, Herbart, Piaget and others have been included. The open section of early volumes contained queries from teachers, often about inspections and examinations, and replies to them. Until shortage of paper during the First World War caused their omission, reports of Teachers' Association meetings and lengthy reports of annual meetings of the Union

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 5, no. 39, May 1889, p. 41.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 21, no. 26, Aug. 1905, pp. 128-132.

were published. The S.A.P.S.T.U. produced its own journal, The S.A. Teachers' Journal in 1915, and from then on these reports appeared in that publication. When the annual reports of inspectors ceased appearing as appendices to the ministers' annual reports, they were published firstly in full and then excerpts in The Education Gazette. For many years specialist advisers or inspectors of elementary agriculture, nature study and drawing filled its pages with information related to these courses. For practically the whole of the period under consideration, The Education Gazette, used throughout South Australia as a vehicle of communication to teachers, School Committees, Members of Parliament and others, was nevertheless a pot-pourri of information on contemporary education and a useful source for this study.

The Inspector's Registers of Norwood School have been a special reference source for this study. Most of the registers were held at Norwood School, some at the South Australian Archives in G.R.G. 18/67/1 Vol. 2, 18/67/2 Vol. 1, 2 and 3, 18/67/3 and 18/67/4. The Inspector's Registers from 1878 to 1886 are missing, and to fill the gap the Register of Inspectors' Examination, Hindmarsh School, has been used.[1] Both schools had similar histories and by and large the same inspectors. The writer chose Norwood School, despite Hindmarsh's more complete records, largely on the grounds of easier access. Norwood's past records are held mainly at the school, whereas Hindmarsh's are held mainly at the South Australian Archives where hours of access are restricted. Perhaps another advantage of using Norwood School was that it reflected the stages of development of primary, secondary and infant education in South Australia more comprehensively than

---

1 Norwood and Hindmarsh were suburbs of Adelaide, established early in the Colony's history, equidistant from the city, Hindmarsh to the west and Norwood to the east. They developed as working class areas with similar rises and falls in population at about the same time. Hindmarsh was closer to the port of Adelaide and consequently was industrialized sooner than Norwood.

Hindmarsh did. Other bonuses in favour of Norwood were that one of its headmasters, Alfred Williams, left it to become in 1906 the first Director of Education, and it was the alma mater of the present writer. Methodologically it might be argued that Norwood School was atypical. However, from a comparison of inspection reports, the chief concern for this study, of the two schools, Norwood and Hindmarsh, there was no distinguishable difference in kind or quality. Many of the reports were written by the same inspectors. Both schools, of course, were staffed, suburban schools very different from the one-teacher country school.

The inspection reports on Hindmarsh School from 1879 to 1886, used in place of the missing Norwood reports, were held at the S.A. Archives in G.R.G. 18/34/2 Vol. 1, 2. Between them, the Inspector's Register of Norwood School and the Register of Inspectors' Examination of Hindmarsh School contained the signed reports of visits, inspections and annual examinations by a variety of inspectors for practically the whole of the period.

From the inspectors' expressed views, comments, advice and recommendations at Norwood School, something has been added to, taken from, or confirmation given to, the development of the role of the inspectors gleaned from other sources. The study of these Inspector's Registers provided continuity to the story of the inspectorate, for the inspectors visiting Norwood School overlapped the six periods into which the total period has been divided. The aim has been to thread the knowledge gained from the Norwood Inspector's Registers through the whole study. The inspectors' activities took place at Norwood School when it was a primary school; when it increased in size and divided into boys', girls' and infant departments; when it added opportunity classes for the backward; when it became a Central School to pioneer alternative secondary schooling; when it became a practising school and then a demonstration school, with a separate infant practising school. Norwood was a school rich in changes that were the history of schooling in South Australia.

Several of its headmasters became inspectors, Alfred Williams went direct from being its Headmaster to Director of Education, and Lydia Longmore, the first infant inspector, served in it. The reports of the inspectors revealed how they coped with changes in Regulations governing inspections and examinations, with changes in curriculum content and method, and with different personnel visiting the school, and the changing quality of staff over the years. In essence the reports provide a longitudinal view of the changing role of the inspectors, in visiting one particular school - how in fact they interpreted their officially prescribed duties.

The Norwood School inspection reports highlighted the different names given to the inspection visits, firm at first but unsure and variable later.

In this thesis, the term "inspection" has been used to describe generally the sum total of all that inspectors did, or should have done, when they visited schools in their official capacity. The term "inspection" has also been used for that part of an inspector's visit devoted to "looking into", prying, and policing Regulations related to school records, attendance, accounts, timetables, lesson notes and programmes of instruction; it sometimes included critical observation of teaching methods and the advice given to teachers. This particularized use of the term "inspection", as used in early times at Norwood, described the main purpose of what has been called at different times in the period or even by different inspectors at the same time, the preliminary inspection or the incidental inspection. It specifically excluded examination of the pupils by the inspectors and the recording of results. Nevertheless, the inspectors may have done some questioning and examining to probe some aspect of instruction.

The visit at which the examination of the pupils by the inspector was a prominent feature, but not always the only feature, was called at Norwood the annual examination. However,

in other documents it was given various names, such as, annual inspection, general inspection, ordinary inspection, detailed inspection, inspector's examination and sometimes inspection for results or examination by "standard".

Towards the end of the period, official memoranda[1] avoided the word, inspection, (except that Form PS41 of 1968 still included it) and named inspectors' visits as Special Visits, Advisory Visits and Biennial Visits, of which only the biennial visits were recorded in the Inspector's Register at Norwood Demonstration School. The biennial visit was used for both advisory and assessment purposes.

The S.A. Teachers' Journal[2]: The Official Organ of the S.A. Public School Teachers' Union (S.A.P.S.T.U.), first published in 1915, has been a useful reference source for this study, particularly for tracing the development of the teacher-inspector relationship and of teachers' perceptions of the role of the inspectors. For the period, 1885 to 1914, the open section of The Education Gazette was the reference source for this type of material. Evidence in the 1881-1883 Inquiry and in the 1910-1913 Royal Commission has provided similar information.

S.A.I.T. Newsletter of the S.A. Institute of Teachers was another publication of the Union after it had changed its name. It began in 1963 and was last published in 1968. Its issue of 23 August 1965, contained the report of the S.A.I.T. Committee on Inspections which was not published elsewhere. The report indicated strong feelings on the way that teachers felt the role of the inspectors should develop.

---

1 Memorandum to Heads from the Superintendent of Primary Schools and the Superintendent of Rural Schools, 30 May 1967.

2 Different titles for this journal have been used haphazardly by its publishers. This study uses The S.A. Teachers' Journal in the text.

The Guild Chronicle: Official Organ of the S.A. Women Teachers' Guild first appeared in 1938 as the publication of the break-away women members of the Union and ceased publication in 1951. In its 13 years' existence there was a detectable shift of emphasis from the main concern of the The S.A. Teachers' Journal and of the S.A.P.S.T.U. with problems in primary education to infant, secondary and technical education. The Guild Chronicle showed a generous attitude to the inspectors and proffered ideas to help develop their role as leaders. The attitude of the Guild was in contrast to the fault-finding attitude of the Union. The press-cuttings of the Women Teachers' Guild, held in the South Australian Collection of the State Library, revealed their interest in progressive education, national and international affairs in education, the outcome of the Education Inquiry Committee and in women's affairs, but not obsessively.

If there was no uniform concern among teachers about the development of the role of the inspector, the same could be said of inspectors' views of their own function expressed in their national journal, The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia. It was published with this title from 1937 to 1949. From 1950 it became The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia and New Zealand. It was last published in 1956. Many of its articles came from the biennial Australasian conferences of the Institutes of Inspectors of Schools.

A search for the minutes of meetings of the Guild of Inspectors of Schools of South Australia failed to find any except of recent meetings of the South Australian Institute of Inspectors of Schools. The search included S.A. Archives, Australian National University, S.A. Institute of Teachers, as the Guild was an affiliated association of S.A.P.S.T.U. for many years, and the staff library of the Education Department of South Australia. Some reference to the Guild's evidence to committees of inquiry was discovered. Unfortunately and

surprisingly the Guild's submission and answer to the questionnaire circulated by A.C.E.R. in its survey of inspection of primary schools about 1959 was destroyed by A.C.E.R. in the 1970s.

Theses consulted in the study are listed in the Bibliography and referred to in footnotes where appropriate, as are the Journals.

Supplementary and comparative data was available in series such as Melbourne Studies in Education; Pioneers of Australian Education; Australian Dictionary of Biography; and Murray Park Sources in the History of South Australian Education.

General literature, newspapers and other works used in the study appear in footnotes and are listed in the Bibliography. Manuscript material consulted is also listed in the Bibliography.

CHAPTER 1

THE EDUCATION SYSTEM AND THE INSPECTORATE IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA PRIOR TO 1875

The purpose of this chapter is to sketch the development of education and of the role of the inspectors of schools before 1875 in the Colony of South Australia. It provides the background and setting for the main study, the development of the role of the inspectors of schools in the period from 1875 to 1970, dealt with in Chapters 2 to 7. The chapter deals briefly with the origins of education in the Colony to the 1847 Education Act, the Board of Education and the appointment of the first inspector of schools in 1851. It then deals with education and the small inspectorate under the 1851 (or 1852) Education Act and the Central Board of Education to 1875.

The founders of the Colony aimed to make South Australia autonomous and free from Colonial Office interference, and to follow Edward Gibbon Wakefield's principles in colonization of freedom - free settlers, free enterprize capitalism and freedom of faith.[1] The voluntaryist, George Fife Angas, a dissenter like Wakefield, founded the South Australian School Society, whose plans for education in the Colony fitted in with the principles of the founders.[2] Education, like the colonizing,

---

1 D. Pike, "Founding a Utopia", in E.L. French (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1957-1958, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1958, p. 51.

2 ibid., p. 54.

was to be left to private enterprize.[1] There was to be elementary education for emigrants, and a proprietary school for the education of children of the better classes of colonists. The rising generation would receive a sound moral and religious education to fit them to play a part in "... that great English empire, the foundations of which are about to be laid".[2] Education had to be supported by voluntary effort and patterned on that given in the English public schools for children of the rich.[3]

However, the planners of this education had not allowed for conditions in the Colony with which voluntaryism could not cope. The South Australian School Society went bankrupt during the depression of the early 1840s, and its school closed.[4] The newly appointed Governor Robe provided help through his Ordinances No. 13 and 14 of 1846 by providing state aid to schools and the churches.[5] Far from helping, the gesture split the Colony denominationally, and on issues of state aid to religion and self-help in education. Robe was forced to have issued Ordinance No. 10 of 1847, whereby churches were granted aid in proportion to the voluntary contributions they received, and Ordinance No. 11 of 1847, which separated aid to education from aid to religion by creating a Board of Education to supervise the subsidy of the salaries of teachers.[6]

---

1 ibid., p. 51.
2 G.E. Saunders, "The State and Education in South Australia, 1836-1875", in E.L. French (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1966, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1967, p. 206. The quote is from the South Australian Gazette and Colonial Register, 18 June 1836.
3 ibid., p. 207.
4 loc. cit.
5 D. Pike, "A Society Without Grandparents", in E.L. French (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1957-1958, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1958, p. 57.
6 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1967, pp. 210, 211.

The Ordinance No. 11 of 1847 "For the Encouragement of Public Education" (the 1847 Education Act) had given the Governor of South Australia, with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council, the power to create a Board of Education with authority to subsidize the salaries of teachers and to provide for visits to schools and their inspection by the Governor, justices of the peace and inspectors.[1] This was the first mention in legislation of inspectors in connection with schools in the Colony. Supervision of schools, however, under the Board of Education was meagre, and visiting to check attendance and to certify returns appeared to be done by justices of the peace.[2] However, teachers were required to advertise a date on which they would conduct an oral examination of pupils in public each year.[3]

This Ordinance or 1847 Education Act, by its very title, was the first step towards setting up a public system of education in South Australia. It was an attempt to overcome the economic and sectarian ills that had beset education in the infant Colony in its first ten years since its beginning in 1836.[4] In effect the 1847 Education Act merely provided financial assistance under difficult economic conditions to an ailing group of private schools in this free-enterprize colony, peopled mainly by non-conformists, dissenters and voluntaryists, who resented government interference in religion and education. Some schools, including some German schools linked with the

---

1 T.H. Smeaton, Education in South Australia from 1836 to 1927, Adelaide, Rigby Ltd. 1927, pp. 46-50. Smeaton called this Ordinance the Education Act of 1847 (page 44), and the Royal Commissioners' report in 1883 gave this legislation as the first Education Act (S.A.P. Paper, no. 27A, 1883, p. iv.). However, later writers considered Act No. 20 of 1851 assented to on 2 Jan. 1852 as the first Education Act, probably because elected members were added to the Legislative Council for the first time. See D. Pike, A Society Without Grandparents, op. cit., pp. 58, 59.

2 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1967, p. 211.

3 T.H. Smeaton, op. cit., p. 59.

4 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1967, pp. 208, 209.

Lutheran churches, did not accept the subsidy.[1] The 1847 Education Act did not specifically prohibit denominational teaching, but the Board of Education rather than the churches distributed the subsidies to schools.

Governor Robe's grants to schools appeared to be successful in reinforcing the fundamental assumption of the founders, that no sectional interest, Anglican, Catholic, non-conformist, dissenter or voluntaryist, had challenged, namely that education in itself was good and necessary.[2] Thirty-three schools had accepted the grant in 1849 and by March 1851 the number of aided schools had increased to 115 with over 3,000 children attending.[3] However, because of severe public criticism of standards, of the quality of teachers and of the considerable number of children not attending any school, the Legislative Council appointed a select committee to make inquiries.[4] The members of the select committee in their brief report, read to the Legislative Council,[5] declared that the grants were "an aid to incompetence",[6] and recommended the appointment of an inspector of schools.[7]

Dr. William Wyatt,[8] M.R.C.S., Secretary of the Medical Board of the Adelaide Hospital, City Coroner and Protector of Aborigines was appointed Inspector of Schools on 6 March 1851[9] at the age of forty-six. Wyatt, an Anglican, had not been a teacher but as an educated and interested Adelaide resident from

---

1 ibid., p. 210.
2 ibid., p. 207.
3 ibid., p. 212.
4 S.A.G. Gazette, 3 June 1850, p. 366. The committee of four was "... to enquire generally into the subject of education, and into the working of Ordinance No. 11 of 1847".
5 S.A.G. Gazette, 9 Jan. 1851, p. 9.
6 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1967, p. 212.
7 loc. cit.
8 P. Serle, Dictionary of Australian Biography, vol. 2, Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1949, pp. 513, 514 was the source of Wyatt's biographical details.
9 S.A.G. Gazette, 6 March 1851, p. 149.

February 1837 was a committee member of the South Australian School Society. Several qualified non-conformists were passed over for the inspectorship when the Governor, an Anglican, appointed him in this generally non-conformist paradise of dissent.[1] Wyatt, apparently well-to-do, bought town lots at the first land sale in May 1837 and amassed a considerable fortune. He was known for acts of philanthropy, and for humanitarian qualities in his other activities, and at least his medical experience qualified him to detect conditions in schools deleterious to health.

Wyatt's not very closely defined role as inspector of schools is epitomized in his letter of appointment of 4 March 1851 from the Colonial Secretary.

> I have the honour to notify you that the Lieutenant-Governor has been pleased to appoint you as Inspector of Schools in South Australia.
>
> His Excellency desires me to say that he does not consider it necessary to give any detailed instructions as to your duties, since the office being a new one His Excellency, placing every confidence in your zeal and abilities, thinks it better to leave you to the exercise of your own judgment upon them.
>
> I am, however, to observe that, as your appointment has for its object to promote the education of the people, it will be necessary that you should avoid as much as possible any interference with the religious feelings or prejudice of the parents of the children in the different schools you superintend.[2]

Dr. William Wyatt, Inspector of Schools, reported for the quarter ending 30 June 1851, not to the Board of Education, the body that recommended subsidies for teachers to the Government,

---

1 D. Pike, A Society Without Grandparents, op. cit., p. 58.
2 T.H. Smeaton, op. cit., pp. 60, 61.

but to the Colonial Secretary, Charles Sturt. In the report, he not only presented a stinging indictment of school accommodation and of the quality of some teachers who regarded tuition as "a profitable speculation",[1] but also made some suggestions.[2] He queried the continuation of the subsidy. He suggested building a normal college for training purposes. He suggested the provision of school houses for half-time teachers to compensate for poor attendance in country districts. He advised that there should be no advanced schooling. He considered that teachers should receive a fixed stipend not depending on attendance. He suggested a government depot for distribution of books and equipment to teachers. He also advocated local committees with powers of "limited surveillance",[3] and, of course, he considered the reading of the bible was a sine qua non,[4] but not as a book from which to learn to read.

Despite Wyatt's short-comings, which some historians seem to have stressed[5], at the outset of his career as an inspector he indicated that he could be an advocate for better education, even if a not very strong or persistent one. Nevertheless Wyatt's report may have influenced the new Legislative Council of 16 elected members and 8 non-elective members nominated by the Governor.[6] On 8 October 1851, the Legislative Council set up another select committee to consider the propriety of bringing in a general education measure. The Committee, to which Wyatt gave evidence similar to his first quarterly report,

---

1 S.A.G. Gazette, 7 Aug. 1851, p. 556.
2 ibid., p. 557.
3 loc. cit.
4 loc. cit.
5 D. Pike, "Education in an Agricultural State" in E.L. French (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1957-1958, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1958, p. 72. Pike said that, "Wyatt had steadfastly pursued a do-nothing policy for 24 years".
6 S.A.G. Gazette, 19 Aug. 1851, p. 587.

presented its report to the Legislative Council on 9 December 1851.[1] Shortly afterwards the Legislative Council passed Act No. 20 of 1851 which received assent on 2 January 1852.[2] Some of Wyatt's suggestions were embodied in the new Education Act.

Within this Act the hand of the voluntaryists could also be detected. The Act provided for aid to be given only to those schools that gave "... a good secular instruction based on the Christian Religion ..."[3] but keeping all controversial issues out of the schools. The Act established a Central Board of Education of seven members, nominated without respect to party or religion, with powers different from those of the previous Board of Education. An inspector was to visit, inspect and report to the Central Board of Education on all schools established under it. District Councils, or where they did not exist, two Justices of the Peace, could similarly visit, inspect and report. The Central Board of Education had the power to license teachers, withdraw licences and adjust teachers' stipends within the minimum of £40 and the maximum of £100; to subsidize school building on a pound for pound basis to a maximum of £200 but to be conducted and maintained on a self-supporting principle; to determine the kind, quality and extent of instruction imparted, and to establish a book depot to supply schools at cost. The state would meet the fees of destitute children, but the expenditure of the Central Board had to be approved annually by the legislature.

The Act, though restricting the Central Board of Education financially, did not fetter it with detailed instructions, so that it had some flexibility in providing for a population thinly scattered in rural districts, yet with a concentration in

---

1 Report of Select Committee of the Legislative Council, appointed 8 Oct. 1851, together with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix, Legislative Council Paper, no. 14, 1851.

2 Victoriae 15, Act No. 20 of 1851.

3 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1967, p. 214. The quotation is from the Act.

and around Adelaide.[1] In line, too, with evidence to the Select Committee that prepared for it, the Act did not contain a compulsory attendance clause, as child labour was so valuable in an agricultural community.[2]

At this time, New South Wales had two systems of schools - the national schools and the denominational schools. The Board of National Education was responsible for the national schools and a separate Board for the denominational schools. Both sets of schools received financial assistance from colonial funds, as did similar sets of schools in the other Australian colonies with the exception of South Australia. This left South Australia as the only Australian colony not supporting denominational schools from colonial revenue.[3]

South Australia had followed England, Scotland, Ireland and other British colonies in that the government appointed inspectors of schools when the state began funding schools for the purpose of providing public education. England began state grants to schools in 1833 and inspectors were appointed there and in Scotland in 1839 and 1840.[4] In Ireland, government grants had been given to schools to support non-denominational teaching since 1815, and by 1837 the government employed twenty-five inspectors to visit schools without warning to see that the

---

1 Legislative Council Paper, no. 14, 1851, p. iv.
2 ibid., p. 10.
3 A.G. Austin, Australian Education 1788-1900: Church, State and Public Education in Colonial Australia, Melbourne, Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1961, pp. 47, 83, 93, 102.
4 T.R. Bone, School Inspection in Scotland 1840-1966. Publications of the Scottish Council for Research in Education 57, London, University of London Press Ltd., 1968, pp. 15, 19. Both England and Scotland had inspection of a kind by the Church dating back to 1696 in Scotland (T.R. Bone, op. cit., p. 11), and in England apart from clergymen visitor-inspectors in the 16th Century, from 1701, when an inspector of London's charity schools was appointed. (E.L. Edmonds, The School Inspector, International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962, pp. 5, 6.)

grants were used for that purpose.[1] The situation was not clear cut in New South Wales, but certainly the first permanent appointment of an inspector, William Wilkins, was made in 1854, (three years after Wyatt's appointment in South Australia) after the Board of National Education was established in 1848 to organize and disburse funds to national schools.[2] Prior to that inspectors had been appointed "... to watch over the financial, and not the educational business of the schools".[3]

The reason for Wyatt's appointment as an inspector in South Australia was plain. He was to check on the value that the Colony was getting for the money it was spending, about which the community and the Legislative Council had grave doubts.[4] How this non-teacher was to do this and what his duties were was not set down as clearly as were the duties of Her Majesty's Inspectors (H.M.I.s) by Dr. Kay (later Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth) in England.[5] Indeed, Wyatt's duties were not laid down as precisely as the duties of inspectors were set down in New South Wales a few years later, where Wilkins had followed Kay-Shuttleworth's thinking.[6] The 1852 Regulations of the Central Board of Education in South Australia were directed at licensed teachers, not at inspectors. However, some of the inspector's duties could be deduced. The teachers were told that their licences could be withdrawn by the inspector, and

---

1 ibid., p. 15.
2 C. Turney, "The Rise and Decline of an Australian Inspectorate" in R.J.W. Selleck (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1970, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1970, p. 162.
3 D.S. Bowmer, "The Development of the Inspectorial System in the Public Schools of New South Wales 1848-1905", unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Sydney, 1965, pp. 9, 10. See also C. Turney, op. cit., p. 160. See also D.C. Griffiths, Documents on the Establishment of Education in New South Wales 1789-1880, Melbourne, A.C.E.R., 1957, p. 72.
4 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1967, p. 212.
5 P. Brendon, "The Changing Role of the Inspectorate" in New University, vol. 4, no. 3, May/July 1970, p. 21.
6 C. Turney, op. cit., 1970, pp. 176-179.

that he would call for the attendance book.[1] In carrying out his ill-defined duties, Wyatt had used "a process of persuasion and suggestion"[2] rather than acting from a position of authority, for the Government had instructed him on appointment to observe and advise rather than dictate.[3]

There were good reasons, in the political and religious setting, for this laissez faire, timid or restrained approach by the Central Board of Education. It relied for funds on a cheese-paring legislature,[4] that "cribbed, cabined and confined"[5] them, and did not want to antagonize its influential voluntaryists and other members. They were operating in a community with a general dislike of government intervention in any matter.[6] For instance, the Lutherans had a "strong-prejudice against placing their schools under government control and the provision of the Education Act",[7] and for a long time they maintained their own schools.[8] By 1867, the Catholics had set up their own system of education with a Director-General, Fr. J.E. Tenison Woods, a Central Council and Local Boards supervising 30 schools with an attendance of about 1800.[9] The Central Board and Wyatt were aware, too, of the tangled political and sectarian issues still being debated over

---

1 S.A.G. Gazette, 19 Aug. 1852, p. 509.
2 P. Brendon, op. cit., p. 21. This was a piece of advice that Kay-Shuttleworth had given his inspectors.
3 M.J. Vick, "The Central Board of Education South Australia, 1852-1875", unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Adelaide, 1981, p. 184. Also see above, p. 29, for Wyatt's letter of appointment from the Colonial Secretary.
4 D. Pike, Education in an Agricultural State, op. cit., p. 72.
5 T.H. Smeaton, op. cit., p. 108.
6 ibid., p. 75.
7 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1860, p. 5. This was the Chief Inspector's Report for 1859 written by Wyatt.
8 D. Morris, "Father J.E. Tenison Woods and Catholic Education in South Australia", in C. Turney (ed.), Pioneers of Australian Education Vol. 2, Sydney, Sydney University Press, 1972, p. 15.
9 ibid., pp. 24, 31.

state aid to schools with Congregationalists, Catholics, Lutherans, Methodists and Presbyterians as well as the Anglicans vacillating and changing stances in varying degrees.[1]

Hyams considered that Wyatt's and the Central Board's restrained supervision was explained by the still residual voluntaryist opposition to intervention of the state; the apathetic attitude of the parents, who sent their children to school when not required for work in this mainly impoverished agricultural community, and their parsimony in paying fees; the generally poor calibre of teachers; and the bewildering array of standards of tuition.[2] He compared the reaction of Wyatt, the former surgeon, in South Australia with that of Inspector Wilkins, the former teacher, in New South Wales to these kinds of conditions. Wilkins's reaction was to standardize procedures and to use firmer central control. Wyatt's reaction was to assess the worthiness of schools only in general terms in order to establish that the teachers were not collecting government money fraudulently. He judged inefficiency by a fall in attendance rather than by inspectorial observation. The assessment of "value for money" was left to the vigilance of parents rather than to the perspicacity of the inspector.[3]

If the reminiscences in 1915 of a teacher, who contended that his recollection of school life went back to 1862, were valid, then Hyams's description of Wyatt as "easy-going"[4] was vindicated. G.R. Kanem described an inspection visit by Wyatt:

---

1 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1967, pp. 221-223.
2 B. Hyams, "The Teachers' Independence and Its Erosion: a South Australian Example, 1847-1875" in Paedagogica Historica, vol. 12, 1972, pp. 475, 477.
3 ibid., pp. 477, 478.
4 B. Hyams, "The teacher in South Australia in the second half of the nineteenth century" in Australian Journal of Education, vol. 15, no. 3, Oct. 1971, p. 284.

> About 11.15 on Wednesday the Doctor came along. He looked at the roll-book, had a little chat with the teacher, heard the upper class read, asked a few questions, told us we were good boys, and gave us a half-holiday. By 12.15 we were all out at play. The system was beautiful in its simplicity. It followed the line of least resistance. It created no friction. It economized time.[1]

Progress in education under the Central Board of Education and Inspector Wyatt was rapid in quantity, particularly in country areas, but poor in quality. The Board did ask the Government to supply them with reports on education in Britain and elsewhere in order to keep in touch with educational developments.[2] What the Central Board was not able to do was to convince the legislature to provide funds for a continually improved supply of books, for buildings, for a training facility, and even funds adequate for the forage of the inspectors' horses.[3] They did get funds for a second inspector, with duties no better defined than Wyatt's. He reported to Chief Inspector Wyatt who reported on his behalf to the Central Board.[4] However there were insufficient funds for the inspectors to visit the schools most remote from Adelaide, which magistrates, justices of the peace, ministers of religion, district councillors and others inspected and reported on.[5] This was perhaps an admission that inspections were for governmental rather than educational purposes. In 1855 there were insufficient funds for the inspector to recommend increased stipends for efficient teachers.[6] Efficiency was based on

---

1 G.R. Kanem, "Reminiscences" in S.A.T. Journal, Sept. 1915, p. 14.
2 M.J. Vick, op. cit., p. 184.
3 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1967, p. 215.
4 S.A.G. Gazette, 23 Aug. 1855, p. 644.
5 S.A.G. Gazette, 12 Feb. 1857, p. 150.
6 S.A.G. Gazette, 21 Feb. 1856, p. 123.

attendance, "a tolerably fair criterion of the capabilities of the teacher".[1] Funds were provided for destitute children's schooling, and for the necessary expansion of the system to country districts, as the population of Adelaide changed from about one-third of the colony's total population in 1844 to about one-seventh in 1861.[2] In 1856, two-fifths of the children under instruction were attending schools not licensed by the Central Board of Education.[3]

Funding of schools was no better after the first completely elected Parliament met under a new constitution in 1857.[4] In consequence of the reduced vote by the Parliament, in 1861 teachers had to begin work with reduced stipends.[5] Funds were made available in 1859 for a site in Grote Street for the long projected model school, initially to be a normal school.[6] Wyatt, despairing of ever getting a normal school for training teachers but showing some educational leadership, suggested the appointment of "organizing persons" and sub-inspectors.[7] If they could supply practical information at a school over a period of a week or more then a normal school would not be required.[8] However Wyatt's plea in 1854 for an organizing person was not answered until 1876, after his resignation when

---

1 S.A.G. Gazette, 28 Feb. 1853, p. 496.
2 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1967, p. 215.
3 S.A.G. Gazette, 12 Feb. 1857, p. 145.
4 T.H. Smeaton, op. cit., p. 78.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 18, 1861, p. 3.
6 S.A.P. Paper, 26 April 1860, p. 362.
7 Soon after Wyatt's appointment as Inspector of Schools in 1851, Mr. H. Nootnagel was licensed on the nomination of Wyatt as Sub-Inspector of German Schools (S.A.G. Gazette, 29 May 1851, p. 370). He gave evidence to the Select Committee on education in 1851 (Legislative Council Paper, no. 14, 1851, pp. 13, 14). He does not feature in any of the documents examined concerning the schools under the Central Board of Education. He probably inspected those German Schools not receiving government funds through choice or because they were providing a denominational education. (See above, pp. 27, 28, 31, 34, 37).
8 S.A.G. Gazette, 2 March 1854, p. 176.

Thomas Burgan was appointed to do this kind of work.[1] This was further evidence that Wyatt did not pursue his sound educational suggestions with the vigour necessary to get them implemented. The most notable example was his early recommendation for a training facility which was not fully achieved during his term of office.

The Regulations of the Central Board of Education for the observance of licensed teachers were attuned to the politics of the time,[2] but were suggestive rather than dictatorial and administered flexibly by the inspectors.[3] Preparation of a "day and hour table"[4] was recommended, not demanded. Teachers fixed their own hours within a required total of five hours a day. Elementary instruction in reading, writing, arithmetic, and the rudiments of grammar, geography and history were expected, but no syllabuses or standards were rigidly set. The nearest that the Regulations got to being commands was that for German Schools the teaching of English was indispensable, and that a chapter in the Old Testament and one in the New should be read daily.[5]

The Regulation that a teacher should not associate the school with a particular denomination, party or section of the inhabitants seemed reasonable in view of the political and religious climate of the time.[6] However the Regulation that no female teacher in a school, nearer than a mile from a male teacher, was allowed to retain a boy over the age of seven, except with the sanction of the inspector,[7] seemed to be over protective of female teachers or show over concern with possible

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1877, p. 12.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 30, 1862, p. 16.
3 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1967, p. 225.
4 S.A.G. Gazette, 19 Aug. 1852, p. 509.
5 loc. cit.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 30, 1862, p. 17.
7 loc. cit.

breaches of morality. It was probably Wyatt's association with such a Regulation that moved Pike to condemn his irritating paternalism and his obsession with sin.[1]

Wyatt resuscitated the Preceptors' Association to bring together "into harmonious cooperation"[2] teachers previously unknown to each other. He even suggested a little help from the public purse.[3] The Preceptors' Association had developed from the School Teachers' Association which was established in 1851. Although it had educational objectives, its influence had been almost negligible.[4]

Wyatt saw in the Association means "... to increase the general efficiency and to introduce, as far as conflicting circumstances will permit, a greater degree of uniformity and system".[5] Through their Association teachers arranged to visit each others' schools, to help one another in their public examination of pupils, to exchange useful hints, and to divest themselves of "any inordinate self-complacency"[6] by comparing their methods of teaching among themselves. Wyatt was alive to the value of teachers conferring, and the Association members became aware of some of the shortcomings of the school system. They wanted some training classes for licensed teachers, in order to develop efficient methods of instructing their irregularly attending pupils.[7] With the matter of irregular attendance the Central Board seemed powerless to cope,[8] and

---

1 D. Pike, Education in an Agricultural State, op. cit., p. 72.
2 S.A.G. Gazette, 4 March 1858, p. 179.
3 loc. cit.
4 B.K. Hyams, "State school teachers in South Australia 1847-1950: a study of their training, employment and voluntary organization", unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Flinders University of South Australia, 1972, pp. 130-133.
5 S.A.G. Gazette, 26 April 1860, p. 363.
6 ibid.
7 B.K. Hyams, op. cit., 1971, p. 283.
8 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1860, p. 2.

Wyatt saw the remedy as nothing short of a compulsory measure[1] which he knew was not politically acceptable. The Association members also wanted a uniform time-table for licensed teachers throughout the Colony. They complained of inadequate inspections, and wanted a system of public competitive examinations for pupils.[2] So there were pressures to change the role of the two inspectors coming from teachers in a situation that the Chief Inspector had sponsored himself. The teachers wanted standardization, uniformity and prescription, things that the press[3] had been calling for and which the Central Board ironically had been reluctant to impose on teachers in a community generally opposed to Government direction.[4]

The major role of the inspectors was to visit and report on schools. In the early years Wyatt was able to make as many as six visits to some schools in a year. On these visits he confirmed or cancelled probationary licences, laxly granted by the Board at the request of a District Council or a group of citizens prepared to say that the applicant was of good moral character.[5] In addition he recommended some teachers for increased stipends. The efficiency of these teachers was judged largely on the attendance of children at the school. Some advising may have been done, as Wyatt reported that teachers acted on his suggestions and he had to reply to frequent applications for advice.[6] The inspectors did no formal examining of pupils at inspection visits, although there was evidence of some incidental testing in spelling and dictation.[7] The inspectors were convinced of the value of their visits to

---

1 S.A.G. Gazette, 4 March 1858, p. 180.
2 B.K. Hyams, op. cit., 1971, p. 283.
3 loc. cit.
4 D. Pike, Education in an Agriculture State, op. cit., p. 75.
5 S.A.G. Gazette, 19 Aug. 1852, p. 507.
6 S.A.G. Gazette, 10 Feb. 1853, p. 100.
7 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1860, p. 4.

schools, and it appeared that teachers liked their visits.[1] Inspector E. Dewhirst, appointed on 14 August 1860 to replace the deceased Second Inspector Smith, expressed his regrets that, because of the increased number of schools in country places and his greater duties, some of his inspections were hurried and superficial, and consequently were not as beneficial to the schools as a more thorough inspection would have been.[2]

Wyatt had adminstrative duties in addition to the inspection visits in the city, suburbs, towns and country in which, in 1853 he travelled 1,000 miles in making 294 visits to 110 schools, making six visits to six schools, but only one visit to 45 schools.[3] His administrative work comprised dealing with correspondence, interviews, attendance at meetings of the Central Board of Education, and visits to unlicensed schools "... of the lowest description, such as now abound under the charge of persons whom poverty, misfortune, or extravagance has forced into the ranks of teachers",[4] ostensibly in order to judge suitability of teachers applying for licences and to see if the conditions for aid from colonial funds were met.

Wyatt also wrote annual reports to the Central Board for himself and the second inspector. They were general in character. The recurring comments were on the adverse effects of poor attendance; the effect of the incompetence of untrained teachers, who, nevertheless, sought advice; the community's "torpid indifference"[5] to education; the necessity of a training institution; the inferior school-houses particularly in the city of Adelaide; teachers' introduction of new subjects and use of teaching methods, such as the monitorial plan; the need for more inspectors and higher stipends for teachers.

---

1 W.C. Grasby, Our Public Schools - an Educational Policy for Australia, Adelaide, Hussey and Gillingham, 1891, pp. 6, 7.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 18, 1870, p. 9.
3 S.A.G. Gazette, 2 March 1854, p. 176.
4 S.A.G. Gazette, 21 Feb. 1856, p. 124.
5 S.A.G. Gazette, 19 Feb. 1853, pp. 99, 100.

Wyatt in his early reports to the Central Board did comment on the instruction in the schools. He found that apart from reading, writing and arithmetic, the subjects were of "most limited description".[1] In grammar and geography even "the technology"[2] had not been acquired. In history the information acquired in a few lessons had been committed to memory; singing and drawing, where introduced, with few exceptions, had been of "the rudest character".[3] These criticisms by Wyatt of instruction seemed severe, but they were put in clearer perspective when, in the same report, he said that there were "trifling discrepancies"[4] between attendance at inspection and in monthly returns. It was not until Wyatt reported for himself and the second inspector that a separate paragraph was included on the state of the teaching and content of each of the subjects, and this despite Wyatt, Second Inspector Smith and his replacement never having been teachers.[5]

In 1861 another task was given to the inspectors. Although they did not examine pupils systematically, they were now required to examine new applicants for teachers' licences for their educational attainments in subjects taught in schools,[6] test the practical effect of their teaching in the schools and then award them a second or third class certificate.[7] The system was similar to the three grade system of classification of teachers introduced by Wilkins in New South Wales from 1855, which in turn followed the English system of classification.[8] However it was still necessary for District Councils to appoint teachers, with the approval of the inspector and the sanction of the Central Board of Education, qualified by education only,

---

1 S.A.G. Gazette, 11 Nov. 1852, p. 683.
2 loc. cit.
3 loc. cit.
4 ibid., p. 684.
5 B. Hyams, op. cit., 1971, p. 282.
6 ibid., p. 17.
7 S.A.P. Paper, no. 35, 1863, p. 4.
8 D.S. Bowmer, op. cit., p. 64, and C. Turney, op. cit., 1970, p. 172.

without teaching qualifications or experience. Hence the necessity, the inspectors contended, for a model school, which would help get a more uniform educational plan than had existed.[1] Wyatt used the Pulteney Street Schools as a makeshift venue for this training to get uniformity, but was criticised by the non-conformists for tainting teachers with denominationalism because of the schools' Anglican origin.[2] Of the 308 licensed teachers in 1873, 149 held Board or other certificates and 159 were on probation or were uncertificated.[3]

From the time that the two inspectors were formally given the task of examining teachers and checking their practical teaching for licences and certificates, the Central Board of Education moved, if tentatively and slowly, to a more definitive system of education and an expanded role for the inspectors.

The examining of teachers was an assessing role in the making. In addition, from the Board's depot the books and materials of the Irish National School Society and the British Foreign School Society, prepared by experienced teachers and strictly non-denominational, not only brought a uniformity of instruction to the children of the shifting population of the Colony, but also their use greatly helped the inspectors in forming an estimate of the comparative value of the schools, and of the teachers.[4]

The Board's teachers were anxious to improve themselves as instanced by the large sale of such books as Stowe's Training Scheme and Morrison's School Management from the Board's school book depot.[5] This pointed to the need for an advisory role for the inspectors.

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 15, 1865, p. 4.
2 D. Pike, A Society without Grandparents, op. cit. p. 62.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 24, 1874, p. 4.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 41, 1866, pp. 5, 6.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 18, 1870, p. 3.

Members of the Central Board of Education were looking with some envy at Victoria, where 1 in 5.58 of the population were in attendance at school, with a regularity not equalled in England or the United States of America, compared with 1 in 6.3 in South Australia.[1] They attributed Victoria's success to a government much more liberal with funds for education, the use of "payment by results" borrowed from the 1862 Revised Code in England, and regular local supervision and management of schools.[2] There was the hint of adding the examining of pupils to the role of the inspectors.

The members of the Central Board of Education pondered on payment by results for two years. They were already paying an increased stipend to teachers, whose pupils showed progress, judged by the inspectors, from one inspection to the next. Nevertheless they believed that payment by results would no doubt improve the quality of instruction, give confidence to the parents and advance the interests of teachers. They acknowledged that it would certainly need more inspectors, but more complete inspection would lead to greater efficiency at small extra cost compared to the advantages.[3] So in 1871 they reported:

> Without any desire for the adoption of a complicated or elaborate system of payment by results, we think it would be a great advantage if we were able to employ such a staff of inspectors as would justify us in requiring from them a half-yearly report on each school of the number of children that passed, or failed to pass, a defined series of standards in reading, writing and arithmetic, similar to those of the revised code, for which graduated school books have been published, and are already in use in our schools.[4]

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 19, 1869, p. 4.
2 loc. cit.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 18, 1870, p. 6
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 22, 1871, p. 7.

The Central Board of Education wanted more inspectors and a change in their role. However change depended on finance, and the 1870 vote from Parliament was lower than each of the three preceding years. As a consequence the Central Board of Education had been forced to close fifty schools, aiming at larger schools which could be better staffed.[1] The circumstances had changed greatly since the passing of the 1851 Education Act and changes were needed. Provision for maintenance and supervision of schools was needed; payment of assistant teachers and pupil teachers,[2] which was the responsibility of the head teacher, needed attention; a supply of trained teachers should be assured; more regular attendance of children was essential; and increased provision for teaching children of the poor was required.[3] The Central Board of Education noted that Queensland had abolished all fees in 1870 and paid the salaries of all teachers, but considered that South Australia might try reduction of fees to improve attendance.[4] Likewise, it noted that compulsion was a fact in England, Upper Canada and Victoria, but in South Australia, disliking bureaucratic control, it had to be a last resort - reduced fees and better teaching were more attractive propositions.[5]

Wyatt had his own, not so different, remedies for South Australia's deficiencies in education. A model school was the first requirement whereby teachers could be taught systematic

---

1 ibid., pp. 1, 2.
2 S.A.G. Gazette, 16 Nov. 1854, p. 818. Pupil teachers had been introduced into two schools in 1854, but they were the responsibility of the principal teachers and not of the Central Board of Education. Wyatt also reported the use of monitors in 1852, but considered that children left school too soon to be well qualified monitors. S.A.G. Gazette, 10 Feb. 1853, p. 99.
3 ibid., p. 2.
4 ibid., p. 6.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 73, 1872, p. 8.

management. An education rate should be struck.[1] Teachers' salaries should be paid conjointly by the state and local authorities to obviate over-charging and non-payment of fees. A measure of compulsion was necessary. Uniform and complete inspection coupled with local supervision were desirable.[2]

Despite the acknowledged deficiencies and needs, the Central Board of Education had not been idle in moving to a more uniform and definite course of instruction, taught more widely. This was evident in the description of subjects taken by pupils. For example, not just reading as before, but reading letters and monosyllables, reading easy narratives and reading fluently; not just writing, but writing on slates and writing in copy books.[3] Moreover by 1868 there were five infant schools for children between the ages of 4 and 6 years, where young minds were drawn out effectively and pleasantly by collective teaching using objects, pictures, singing and amusing stories.[4]

Such was the state of affairs and the stirrings afoot in South Australian education with its small inspectorate of two men with no teaching experience, when John Anderson Hartley, B.A., B.Sc., Headmaster, Prince Alfred College, joined the Central Board of Education at the age of 26 years in 1871.[5] The son of a Wesleyan minister, he was brought up in England in the strict Wesleyan code with its inculcation of "... uprightness, honesty, reverence and a sense of duty high-lighting integrity

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 56, 1868, pp. iv, v. makes it clear that this would be a local rate.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 18, 1870, p. 9.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 19, 1869, p. 5.
4 ibid., p. 2.
5 Biographical details of Hartley have been extracted from G.E. Saunders, "J.A. Hartley and the foundation of the public school system in South Australia", in C. Turney (ed.), Pioneers of Australian Education, Volume 2, Sydney, Sydney University Press, 1972, pp. 149, 151, 153, and from an extract from the Australian Schoolmaster published in The Education Gazette, vol. 13, no. 124, Feb. 1897, pp. 39, 40.

and dedication".[1] He had taught in England and so became the only person administering public education in South Australia with teaching experience.

Immediately, initiatives, attributed by The Register to Hartley,[2] appeared in the annual report of the Board, even though the annual vote of funds from Parliament was not increased and stipends had to be reduced and licences revoked and refused.[3] The establishment of "provisional schools" for sparsely populated places was suggested for the first time, but not until the minimum stipend (£40) had been reduced.[4] The 1851 Education Act with its provision for aiding schools already established, but not for initiating or repairing schools, was shown to be suited to the country rather than to the towns. It had not served well the children of the poorer classes in the city and suburbs. The power to build new schools and replace old ones was needed, as was tighter central control over organization and fees.[5]

Requests for an increased number of inspectors were not new, but the telling arguments for an increase to permit a new role for the inspectors in a "... searching examination of the scholars, and a corresponding complete and detailed report of the condition of each school",[6] were. Victoria had 10 inspectors for 908 schools; New South Wales had 10 for 846 schools; South Australia had 2 for over 300 schools. There was little time for conference with teachers to point out defects in method and to offer suggestions. Every class should be examined and reports should show the character of each school in method, organization, discipline and attendance. With special visits

---

1 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1972, p. 149.
2 ibid., p. 153.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 73, 1872, p. 1.
4 ibid., p. 2.
5 ibid., p. 3.
6 loc. cit.

and reports needed, this work could not be done by two inspectors.[1] Moreover, an appendix showing South Australia as the colony with by far the lowest cost per pupil, and Queensland with the highest, appeared in the Central Board's annual report for the first time.[2] Apparently the Board's hope was that it might shame politicians or spark intercolonial rivalry in them. Despite these strong arguments, Parliament refused the money for the third inspector on the grounds that a new Education Act was in the offing.[3] Members of Parliament in effect told the Central Board that they were well aware of the deficiencies in the working of the 1851 Education Act, but the Board would have to await their deliberations.

Hartley became, in February 1874, Chairman of the Central Board of Education, with almost completely new membership following the "Hosking affair",[4] in which the Government had appointed as Third Inspector, James Hosking, a professional teacher and an advocate of firm central control. However the Government had notified the press but not the Central Board. The Board members, including Hartley, resigned. Hartley was reappointed and subsequently elected as Chairman. Hartley was the only member who had been a teacher,[5] and he had the backing of the Government as head of the so-called education department.[6] As Chairman, he acted very much as the autocratic head of a system of education which he was developing.

Hartley looked at the system and saw that the relative independence of the inspectors without a precisely defined role was militating against the Board's decision-making.[7] Desiring the inspectors to report to the Board, not to Chief Inspector

---

1 loc. cit.
2 ibid., p. 15.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 36, 1873, p. 2.
4 M.J. Vick, op. cit., pp. 276-278. See also G.E. Saunders, op. cit. 1972, p. 154.
5 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1972, p. 154.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 5 May 1874, col. 17.
7 M.J. Vick, op. cit., p. 190.

Wyatt, who then reported to the Board, he created three inspectorial districts, central, northern and southern.[1] As a consequence Wyatt resigned and the position of chief inspector was abolished.[2] He wanted the inspectors' opinions on the efficiency of the schools, as shown by the more searching method of inspection that the Central Board of Education, or he as chairman, had prescribed.[3]

These instructions prepared for the guidance of the inspectors[4] were indeed prescriptive of the role of the inspectors and restrictive of any initiative that they might use. Inspectors had to carry out the instructions of the Board; they had to inspect every school at least twice in each year (except those in very remote places), one with, and one without notice, and no school was to be omitted because of hearsay that it was closed. They were instructed how to inspect two schools in close proximity. Travel time between schools was to be the least possible. Times of arrival and departure at a school had to be recorded. On arrival at a school, they were to check immediately if the lesson corresponded with the time table, examine the records and then conduct examinations in all subjects with special attention to the 3 Rs. They were to point out privately faults and deficiencies and note them in the observation book for future reference; there was no mention of commendation or encouragement. The report on each school had to include its organization, methods of teaching, instruction and progress, the attendance and the notes made in the observation book.

Inspectors had to adhere to a three months' list of inspections unless altered by the Board. They had to provide weekly diaries, and attend Board meetings when possible to give

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 26, 1875, p. 4.
2 M.J. Vick, op. cit., pp. 282, 284. See also G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1972, p. 154.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 26, 1875, p. 4.
4 S.A.G. Gazette, 19 March 1874, pp. 443, 444.

information. Once a year they had to confer with officers of the Board with the object of improving methods of performing their inspectorial duties. They had to provide an annual report. In addition to these duties they had to arrange to examine teachers and pupil teachers[1] in Adelaide in June and December each year.

Never before had South Australia's inspectors been given such precise and detailed instructions. It was the first time, too, that they had been given a precisely defined examining role. The inspectors' examination replaced the annual public examination by the teacher, which Hartley had successfully recommended be deleted from the Regulations.[2]

For the four years before Hartley's appointment to the Central Board of Education the vote for education from Parliament had been stationary and even reduced, yet in Hartley's first year as chairman he was able to get a special vote to employ 69 assistant teachers and pupil teachers in accordance with a formula depending on attendance.[3] Previously the responsibility for payment of assistants and pupil teachers had been the responsibility of the head teacher.[4] Nevertheless, Hartley and the Central Board still sought the things that Wyatt had asked for nearly a quarter of a century before - better school buildings, a supply of trained teachers with improved salaries, a training institution and later a measure of compulsory attendance by children.[5] Both men agreed that, "The one vital condition of a good school is a good teacher".[6] Where they differed was that Wyatt tended to defer other developments until he had the supply of trained teachers; Hartley did not procrastinate. He moved to get more efficient teachers from

---

1 See above, footnote 2, p. 45.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 26, 1875, p. 4.
3 ibid., p. 2.
4 S.A.G. Gazette, 26 April, 1860, p. 361.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 26, 1875, p. 5.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 36, 1873, p. 5.

those he had by means of strict supervision and examination of pupils, and so indirectly of the teachers, by the inspectors.

There is no doubt that Hartley, the former teacher, as Chairman of the Central Board of Education served the cause of education with energy and competence but also "... with the arrogance of one sure of his own motives and abilities".[1] However the benign, Dr. Wyatt, through an inert Board, admittedly energized by Hartley in Wyatt's last three years, had some achievements to show from his 24 years of service. Under the Central Board of Education, during Wyatt's term the role of the two inspectors had developed from Wyatt's initial role as general factotum and visitor to schools, largely to check on attendance and to license teachers, to a role falling short of that of examiner of pupils. The inspectors' general assessments of conditions, efficiency of instruction and achievements of pupils were valued by the Central Board and did affect the stipend of teachers. They were not teachers, but their general advice seemed to be sought and appreciated by teachers. There were good reasons for the restrained inspections in this voluntaryist and dissenting society, where education was subsidiary to political issues.[2]

The Central Board's annual report for 1873, signed by Hartley in 1874 said that the successful work of the schools depended largely on effective inspection. The effectiveness of the inspection was important not only for the character and completeness of the inspector's report to the Central Board but also for the advice that it allowed the inspector to give to the teacher.[3] The statement heralded a more exacting role of examining and detailed inspecting for the inspectors, some of whom would be former teachers. Although Wyatt and his colleague were relatively free agents under the Central Board, they were

---

1 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1972, p. 151.
2 See above, pp. 34, 35.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 24, 1874, p. 3.

overworked, partly because they were denied assistance by a niggardly legislature and partly because they travelled too far and too much without much system. Nevertheless they had an image of being respected, well-meaning and generally helpful.

In the first year of Hartley's chairmanship of the Central Board of Education the role of the inspectors changed dramatically. Their chief function was to be examiners of each child in the schools of their districts, on set subjects to prescribed standards. The inspectors were given districts, but they had no chief inspector to report to. They reported to the Central Board, which meant to the energetic and powerful Chairman, Hartley. Their program of inspections and procedures had been laid down in precise detail as never before. They knew what they would examine and inspect, and so did the teachers know. They had lost their independence and freedom of action, and their role was precisely defined by a different personality being at the helm.

CHAPTER 2

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROLE OF THE INSPECTORS FROM THE 1875 EDUCATION ACT TO THE 1881 - 1883 INQUIRY

Introduction

This chapter traces the development of the role of the inspectors of schools in the Education Department of South Australia under various influences in the context of the social, political, economic and educational conditions of the period, 1875 to 1883.

From the time that assent was given, on 12 October 1875, to the Education Act of 1875,[1] South Australia's inspectors of schools were in the public eye. This Act set up a public system of education, which was "...free to all who could not pay, unsectarian and compulsory",[2] and gave a charter to the inspectors to determine the standard of compulsory education.

> "Compulsory standard" shall mean competency in reading, writing and arithmetic to the satisfaction of an Inspector of Schools or other person authorised by the Council.[3]

It also gave extensive powers[4] to the Council of Education which replaced the Central Board of Education. The Council of

---

1 Act no. 11 of 1875, an Act to amend the Law relating to Public Education, assented to 12 Oct. 1875.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 13 July 1875, col. 383.
3 Acts of the Parliament of South Australia, 1875. Education Act, 1875, no. 11, clause 2, p. 38.
4 ibid., clause 6, p. 39.

Education was to have a full-time, salaried President. The membership of the Council of Education was gazetted in December 1875 with J.A. Hartley as President.[1] Hartley had been Chairman of the previous Board.

This Act, providing for centralized control of education, was produced at a time of economic prosperity in the Colony.[2] The economy was better in 1875 than for some years before and after it when the depressed state of the economy[3] was monotonously referred to in the Governor's speech at the opening of the bicameral Parliament elected under limited franchise. The Education Bill had previously been rejected by the Parliament which included in both Houses many non-conformists imbued with English middle class traditions of self-help,[4] while its upper House, the Legislative Council, was dominated by conservative land-holders unwilling to spend public money on education[5] other than an elementary education for the working class.[6] It has been contended that the economic situation was a factor in the passing of the 1875 Education Act to centralize the control of education, in that the prosperity of the time meant no increase in direct taxation and consequently support for the Bill in the Legislative Council.[7] Likewise it has been

---

1 G.E. Saunders, op. cit., 1972, p. 155.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Governor's Speech, 6 May 1875, col. 2.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Governor's Speech, 27 May 1870, col. 2 and Administrator's Speech, 31 May 1878, col. 2, 3, are examples on either side of 1875.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 13 July 1875, col. 384, and 27 July 1875, col. 515, provide examples of this voluntaryism in the debate on the education bill. The Minister introducing the Bill declared that free education was absolutely unsuited to the requirements of the country.
5 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 9 July 1890, p. 434 shows that a Bill for free education was carried in the House of Assembly in 1873 but was rejected in the Legislative Council. Seventeen years later it was again rejected by the Legislative Council. See S.A.P. Debates, Council, 27 November 1890, col. 2179.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Council, 3 June 1879, col. 18.
7 H. Bannister, "The Centralisation Problematic" in the Australian Journal of Education, vol. 24, no. 3, October 1980, pp. 255, 256.

contended that, because of the bumper harvest and buoyant finances, the colonists, who usually disliked government intervention, accepted in this Bill greater centralized control over education as the political corollary of central funding.[1]

The 1875 Education Act of the South Australian Parliament indicated the influence from neighbouring colonies,[2] for it contained some of the features of the New South Wales Public Schools Act No. 22 of 1866 and others of the Victorian Education Act No. 447 of 1872.[3] All three Acts abolished boards of education, South Australia and New South Wales setting up councils of education, of which the minister of education was not a member, to administer the public system of schools, whereas the Victorian Act provided for a minister of public instruction and an inspector-general of schools. Victorian education was free for a basic schedule of subjects; South Australia and New South Wales charged fees for all who could afford to pay. The compulsory attendance clause in South Australia was more demanding, 70 days in each half year, than Victoria's 60 days, but whereas in South Australia compulsory attendance was for ages between 7 and 13 years, Victoria's was between 6 and 15 years. South Australia was to establish public schools with a likely attendance of at least 20 whereas New South Wales required 25. South Australia assisted financially non-denominational private schools of fewer than 20 enrolments, the so called "provisional schools". New South Wales certified denominational schools. South Australia had 4 1/2 hours of secular instruction per day and provision for reading holy

---

1 M.J. Vick, "The Central Board of Education South Australia, 1852 - 1875" unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Adelaide, 1981, p. 342.

2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 18 July 1877, col. 405. A member informed the House of Assembly that the 1875 Education Act was based on the 1872 Victorian Act and the 1866 N.S.W. Act.

3 The features of these Acts are taken from Acts of the Parliament of South Australia, 1875, pp. 37-41; Acts of Parliament of Victoria, 35 and 36 Victoriae, 1872, pp. 204-207; The Public General Statutes of New South Wales from 26 Victoriae to 38 Victoriae, 1862-1874, pp. 3805-3808.

scripture at least a quarter of an hour before school, whereas New South Wales allowed an hour a day of school time for religious instruction by clergy of one persuasion. South Australia had boards of advice with nominated members; Victoria had boards of advice elected by the rate-payers; New South Wales had individual school boards which would regularly visit,inspect and report on the school placed under their supervision. South Australia and Victoria defined their compulsory standards of education to mean and include competency in reading, writing and arithmetic to the satisfaction of an inspector of schools.

Similar developments towards public and universal elementary education were evident in other countries in the latter half of the nineteenth century.[1] In the debate on the Education Bill in the South Australian Parliament in 1875, references were made to education and legislation in England, Canada West, New Zealand and the United States of America, as well as in Victoria and New South Wales.[2] Reference might well have been made to the 1872 Education (Scotland) Act that had been proclaimed creating for Scotland a system of public schools administered by a coordinating central body,[3] with enlarged influence by Her Majesty's Inspectors.[4]

Teachers, parents, parliamentarians, the Council of Education and its President, J.A. Hartley, were all concerned with the activities of the inspectors given their ostensibly powerful evaluatory and determining role in connection with the compulsory standard. Consequently pressures for inspectors to act in certain ways but not in others came from various sources,

---

1 W. Boyd and E.J. King, The History of Western Education, London, Adam and Charles Black, 1972, pp. 379-382.

2 S.A.P. Debates, Council, 14 September 1875, col. 1011; Assembly, 13 July 1875, col. 396; and Assembly, 15 July 1875, col. 429, 430, provide examples.

3 I. Cumming and A. Cumming, History of State Education in New Zealand 1840-1975, Wellington, Pitman Publishing N.Z. Ltd., 1978, pp. 45, 62.

4 T.R. Bone, op. cit., p. 75.

such as the Parliament, the Council of Education and its President, Boards of Advice and the Public Teachers Association.[1] It was the clash of the expectations of these different groups of the role of the inspectors that largely brought about the 1881-1883 Inquiry into the Working of the Education Acts.[2] Not only did it give teachers, members of the Teachers' Association, members of Boards of Advice and others the opportunity to air their views on the inspection process and the changes that they wanted, but it also allowed Hartley and the inspectors to put their own views and answer the criticisms under cross-examination by the Commissioners. Teachers and officers of the Department[3] giving evidence were beyond the restraints of Regulations, and indeed, were granted immunity from any punitive action.[4] Their evidence would not necessarily be free of prejudice, but their answers to questions were put to other witnesses for testing and checking.

The publication of the Final Report, the Commissioners' recommendations and the evidence of witnesses provided further opportunity for parliamentary debate and critical public comment

---

1 C. Thiele, Grains of Mustard Seed, Education Department, South Australia, 1975, p. 30. This Association was formed in 1875 about the same time as the Education Act was passed.

2 The Inquiry into the Working of the Education Acts began as a Parliamentary Select Committee on 10 Aug. 1881, became a Royal Commission on 21 Nov. 1881, and ceased taking evidence on 17 Oct., 1882 (S.A.P. Paper, no. 27A, 1883, pp. iii, 100). The Governor announced to Parliament on 31 May 1883, that its work was completed (S.A.P. Debates, Governor's Speech, 31 May 1883, col. 2).

3 Under the Central Board of Education the officers employed had been considered to constitute the Education Department even though it was not recognized in the 1851 Education Act. See S.A.P. Debate, Assembly, 5 May 1874, col. 17, and 12 May 1874, col. 110. By the time of the 1881-1883 Inquiry, the Education Department was a Government department under the Minister Controlling Education governed by Act no. 122 of 1878 to amend the Education Act 1875, assented to 30 Nov. 1878.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27A, 1883, p. xi.

on the role of the inspectors. Teachers supported by a member of a Board of Advice also gave evidence that there had been changed attitudes[1] at inspections by Inspector-General Hartley and Inspector Stanton particularly, since the inquiry had been in progress.

Table 2.1 provides some basic data on population, pupil numbers, attendance, the number and kinds of schools, the number and kinds of teachers, the structure of the Education Department and educational expenditure at the beginning of the period, 1876 to 1883. It also shows the structure of the administration in 1876 and the teacher-training facility available in the period.

The structure of the administration developed during the period. In 1878, the Council of Education was abolished, Hartley became Inspector-General of Schools, the permanent head of the Education Department of South Australia, under a Minister Controlling Education.[2] The numerical strength of the inspectorate remained the same except that an assistant inspector was appointed in 1880. He was used to assist the other inspectors and to inspect alone some of the remote provisional schools. Initially the five inspectors were deployed as four district inspectors and one organizing inspector. The organizing inspector had the duty[3] of organizing new schools, assisting those teachers who were not trained and visiting and helping, in all inspectorial districts, those teachers who had been found deficient at the previous inspection. In 1879, the number of inspectorial districts was increased from four to five and the organizing inspector became a district inspector. The office administration was carried out by the Secretary with a small clerical staff.

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no.122, 1881, q. 3078, p. 150 and S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, q. 3635, p. 11.
2 See above, footnote 3, p. 57.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1877, p. 5.

TABLE 2.1

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT DATA[1] 1876

S.A. POPULATION		225,677
GROSS SCHOOL ATTENDANCE		28,765
IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS		27,661
IN PROVISIONAL SCHOOLS		1,104
PERCENTAGE ATTENDANCE		52.7
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS		304
PUBLIC		264
PROVISIONAL		40
NUMBER OF TEACHERS		550
HEAD TEACHERS		252 (99 uncertificated)[2]
ASSISTANTS		23
PUPIL TEACHERS		102
SEWING MISTRESSES (part time)		124
PROVISIONAL TEACHERS		49
ADMINISTRATION	PRESIDENT COUNCIL OF EDUCATION (6 LAY MEMBERS) 5 INSPECTORS SECRETARY	
BOARDS OF ADVICE		2
EXPENDITURE REVENUE AND LOAN		£86,698
COST PER CHILD INSTRUCTED		£2.9.9
TEACHER TRAINING FACILITY	Formal apprenticeship of pupil teachers was not used until 1874. Grote Street Training School opened in 1876 with a one-year course often abbreviated.[3] It was known as the Training College from 1879. It had an associated City Model School and Practising School.[4] Study of kindergarten teaching methods on Froebelian lines was introduced in 1879 for women students.[5]	

SOURCES: 1 Blue Book of South Australia - 1876 in S.A. Parliamentary Papers, 1877. Statistical Register of South Australia, 1876 in S.A. Parliamentary Papers, 1877. S.A. Parliamentary Paper no. 34, 1877.

2 The uncertificated number is from S.A.P. Paper, no. 161, 1876, p. 2. Strictly it is true just prior to the handover from the Central Board to the Council. See above, p. 42 for the certification scheme.

3 B.K. Hyams, Teacher Preparation in Australia: a History of its Development from 1850 to 1950, ACER Research Series, no. 104, Hawthorn, 1979, pp. 23, 28.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 40, 1878, pp. 33, 35.

5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1880, p. 23.

Two members of the inspectorate, whose activities Hartley so closely guided and monitored, had been appointed under the Central Board of Education. They were Edward Dewhirst and James Hosking. Edward Dewhirst, who, at the age of 44 years,[1] had been appointed second inspector to Dr. Wyatt in 1860, had not been a teacher. However, according to one who had been a pupil and a teacher during his more than thirty years as an inspector, he was by no means the least effective inspector and was easily the best loved.[2] The other inspector inherited by Hartley was James Hosking, whose appointment on 1 January, 1874 by the Government, without informing the Central Board of Education, caused the resignation of Board members including Hartley.[3] He had been the teacher in charge of Gilbert Street School in Adelaide, where Dr. Wyatt had reported that this highly qualified teacher had raised it to a state of efficiency despite ill-disciplined pupils whose attendance was irregular.[4]

The other three members, Hartley had arranged to be appointed immediately after he became President of the Council of Education, thus indicating the importance that he attached to their role.[5] Of these three appointments made in 1876 by the Council of Education, Burgan was described as an indefatigable teacher when he had been in charge of Gilles Street School in 1861;[6] Stanton had begun teaching at Clare School in 1872;[7] and Whitham, though not a teacher, had been active in the Birmingham Education League in England in connection with Forster's Education Act.[8] All three were young men on appointment as

---

1 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/92, Register of Classified Officers - Education Department, p. 2 has details of Dewhirst's official career.
2 G.R. Kanem, op cit., p. 14.
3 See above, p. 48.
4 S.A.G. Gazette, 26 April 1860, p. 367.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1877, p. 5.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 30, 1862, pp. 6, 7.
7 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/92, Register of Classified Officers - Education Department, p. 5.
8 G. Saunders, op. cit., 1972, p. 164.

inspectors. Burgan was 39, Stanton 33 and Whitham 31 years of age at appointment.[1]

These were the men who in 1876 inspected teachers and examined pupils for Hartley in classes from Junior to Four in public and provisional schools throughout the Colony.[2] The average of passes in the inspectors' examination in the three inspectorial districts was, in 1875, 57.22 per cent,[3] and in the four inspectorial districts in 1876 was 61.11.[4] These same inspectors, with the addition of Assistant Inspector Curtis in 1880, were available to Hartley in 1884, when they inspected more teachers and examined more pupils in classes from Junior to Five in fewer public schools but many more provisional schools.[5] The average percentage on the result examination in 1883 was 78.5 for public schools and 65.9 for provisional schools,[6] which indicated considerable improvement on the 1875 results.

The quality of teachers available was a problem throughout the whole period despite the existence of the Training School or Training College. In 1876, of the 426 teachers, omitting the sewing mistresses, at least 280 were provisional teachers, uncertificated teachers or pupil teachers, comprising two-thirds of the service.[7] By 1884 the situation was possibly worse than in 1876 with nearly double the number of pupil teachers and nearly five times the number of provisional teachers.[8]

The Principal of the Training College, in his report for 1884, complained that he was forced to select trainees from provisional school teachers and from pupil teachers who had

---

1 S.A. Archives, G.R.G., 18/92, op. cit., pp. 4, 5, 6.
2 See Table 2.1, p. 59.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 161, 1876, p. 3.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1877, p. 5.
5 See Table 3.1, p. 95.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1884, p. viii.
7 See Table 2.1, p. 59.
8 See Table 3.1, p. 96.

failed the examination at the end of their four-year apprenticeship in schools.[1] Despite the admission of some students not up to the standard required to undertake the University subjects, the exit students performed creditably, but there were too few of them. Of the 35 students who left Training College in December 1884, 5 had passed the examination for II class certificates, 28 the III class certificates and 2 failed.[2] Of the pupil teachers about to be appointed as teachers or to proceed to the Training College, 13 had passed and 8 had failed their final examination.[3]

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

The legislature and the inspectors' superiors had several means to bring pressure to bear on the development of the inspectors' role. Under the new 1875 Education Act, Regulations were prepared and continually revised by Hartley as President of the Council of Education and then as Inspector-General under a Minister Controlling Education. The Regulations were developed from the detailed guidelines for the inspectors issued by the Central Board of Education in 1874 when Hartley was Chairman.[4] The Members of Parliament also influenced the inspectors' role with their speeches, motions, questions and actions in Parliament. The Select Committee and subsequent Royal Commission, which Parliament created in 1881, contained the Minister of Education as Chairman and six other Members of Parliament. It had a definite impact on the role of the inspectors. The commissioners' questioning of witnesses, their Report and subsequent debate in Parliament all had their impact. In addition the Inspector-General as a witness to the

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1885, p. 26.
2 ibid, p. vi.
3 loc. cit.
4 See above, pp. 49, 50.

Inquiry was able to explain and defend the role that he set the inspectors and continually modified.

The pressure to develop the role of the inspectors came from the new Council of Education in the form of the 1876 Regulations,[1] under the 1875 Education Act, prepared by Hartley as President. Under the heading, Inspectors, Regulation II, 10 stated unequivocally that, "Inspectors will conform to the following instructions ..."[2] This was followed by nine firm statements to which the activities of the inspectors had to conform. They were not quite as dictatorial as the 1874 Instructions for Guidance of Inspectors. For instance in the 1876 Regulations there was no clause stating that the inspectors immediately on entering a school had to check that the work going on corresponded with that specified on the time-table, or that they must examine the school records. Also the 1874 instructions on how to inspect neighbouring schools and to keep travel time to a minimum, so that maximum time was available for inspection, were omitted in 1876. Nevertheless, the 1876 Regulations were still prescriptive and restrictive on inspectors in that, for instance, Regulations II, 10(2), (3) stated:

> They will make one thorough inspection in the year of each school in their respective districts. Notice of the date of this inspection is to be posted, so that in due course of post it will arrive forty-eight hours before the time at which the examination is to commence.
>
> They will visit the schools as often as possible without notice.[3]

The word, thorough, in the minds of the inspectors[4] meant that they did those things in the 1874 rules mentioned above as omitted from the 1876 Regulations. Likewise instructions and

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 21, 1876, Education Regulations, gazetted 13 March 1876, pp. 1-11.
2 ibid., p. 1.
3 loc. cit.
4 See below, pp. 79, 80.

advice to teachers had to be put in writing, when the inspectors might have preferred to leave them to the privacy of an oral discussion.

In addition some expansion of the role was indicated. The notion of help to teachers and demonstration of methods was added. A more human and less official touch concerning relations of inspectors and teachers emerged. Regulations II, 10(5), (6) stated:

> Inspectors, in their intercourse with teachers, will be guided by a feeling of respect for their office and of sympathy with their labors. They are to point out any errors as kindly as possible, and give the teachers all the help they can towards making themselves more efficient. Any unfavorable comments that may be necessary must not be made in the presence of pupils.
>
> While present in a school, Inspectors are as a rule, to leave the general management in the hands of the principal teacher; but they are empowered, should they find it necessary, to take the teaching of a class, or of the whole school, into their hands for a time, to show the teacher how defective methods may be improved.[1]

Teachers were to show inspectors courtesy and the respect due to their position. The procedure for teachers aggrieved at an inspector's report was official, short and to the point - complain to the Council within seven days - but at least it existed.[2] There was a hint at inspectors' district leadership role, in as much as Regulation II, 10(1), stated that "Inspectors when so required by the Council, will reside in their own districts".[3] On the other hand that Regulation may merely have been for economy sake in visiting schools in the districts as often as possible, and thereby increasing the inspectors' influence.

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 21, 1876, p. 1.
2 ibid., p. 2.
3 ibid., p.1.

Under Regulation VI, 66, 67 - Course of Instruction - the following was stated:

> The ordinary instruction in Public Schools will be regulated by the annexed programme, which will form the standard for the Inspector's Examination; but teachers will be always at liberty to carry their pupils further than is shown; and in considering claims for promotion, account will be taken of the proficiency of the scholars.
>
> Scholars are to be classified according to their attainments : the programme specifies the minimum that may be fairly asked of children at the ages indicated.[1]

The annexed programme, called in Regulation VI, 71, Programme of Inspector's Examination, gave a one-line description of the content of each subject that would be examined by the inspectors for pupils in classes from Junior Division (infant) to Class 4 (compulsory standard). The expected average age for each class was shown - a ploy to counter teachers putting over-age pupils in a class to raise "percentages".[2]

Moreover a detailed marking scheme was shown, including marks for attendance of pupils at the examination, for general good order and proficiency in drill, deductions if poetry and object lessons were not properly taught, and deductions for over-age classes. From the percentage of passes, the additional payment for successful teaching was calculated and added to the fixed salary of the principal and assistant teachers. This was the Council's "payment by results" which was not to exceed two-thirds of the fixed salary[3]. The percentage of marks gained

---

1 ibid., p. 5.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1877, p. 16. Inspector Stanton found 80 per cent over-age in Junior Division and 38 per cent in Fourth Class.

3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 21, 1876, p. 7, showed "two-thirds" in Regulation VII, 79 gazetted on 13 March, 1876, whereas S.A.G. Gazette, 7 Jan. 1876, p. 41, gave "fifty per cent" in the same Regulation. This change was one of the adjustments made by the Council.

at a school was the "result". One hundred per cent of marks earned the maximum allowance, with a proportionate rate for lower percentages.[1]

The Council of Education soon made adjustments to the scheme[2] so that the annual report for 1876 declared that the adjusted scheme had been beneficial to the schools and approved by the teachers. Nevertheless, in the 1877 annual report, the Council found it necessary to defend this "debatable question",[3] so open to criticism. The criticisms mentioned in the Council's annual report concerned the proportion of salary determined by the results and the lack of reward for teachers who taught extra subjects and beyond the standard.[4] However, the Council defended the result examination by declaring that the difference in teachers' income for different results was small; there was no penalty for pupils' non-attendance nor for pupils' ages; and schools opened for less than nine months were not examined by the inspectors for results. Moreover, when a school appeared not up to standard at the general inspection or at the inspection for the result examination, the organizing inspector was sent to help with discipline and method.[5] Thus the Council considered that it did develop the inspector's advisory role by means of the organizing inspector.

The 1878 Education Amendment Act placed the Education Department under a Minister Controlling Education, and Hartley became Inspector-General. Hartley reported[6] that, as the administration gained from experience in administering the result examination and the inspectors considered complaints and

---

1 loc. cit.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1877, p. 3.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 40, 1878, p. 6.
4 ibid., pp. 6, 7.
5 ibid., p. 6.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1880, p. xii.

suggestions from teachers,[1] minor alterations to Regulations were made year by year in order to do justice to teachers and pupils. Regulations governing payment by results and the inspectors' examination for 1879 were changed by increasing the fixed salaries of teachers, decreasing the proportion of payment by results to a maximum of one-fourth of the fixed salary, and eliminating the result payment where the results on the inspectors' examinations were less than 60 per cent.[2] This precise cut-off percentage put great pressure on the inspectors, particularly in the assessments of order and drill that depended on their personal judgment. It made more necessary the uniformity in examination content and procedures, so sought after by Hartley, for this Colony with so many ill-prepared teachers.[3]

The Inspector-General spent the bulk of his annual report on a defence of the inspectors' result examination.[4] He related it to the charter given to inspectors in the 1875 Education Act to see that a satisfactory "compulsory standard" was available to all of the children of the Colony. He defended it against "cram" which he defined as forcing knowledge into the mind without caring whether it be retained. Cram came from faulty teaching methods, while the inspectors' examination aimed at testing comprehension. He defended it against narrowing the curriculum and restricting able teachers, pointing out that many teachers who achieved good results gave lessons on subjects beyond the examination probe. He used the opportunity to state his great faith in a carefully and uniformly administered

---

1 S.A.P Paper, no. 35, 1879, p. 34. Inspector Burgan reported that country teachers wanted a percentage added to results to compensate for poor attendance.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1880, p. iii. See also no. 37, 1879, Education Regulations, 1879, pp. 2, 3.

3 ibid., p. 18, and S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1881, p. 15. Inspector Whitham reported that some teachers were "lamentable failures" at teaching three or four classes at the same time. See also Table 2.1, p. 59, and pp. 61, 62.

4 ibid., pp. xi, xii.

inspectors' examination of each child, each year, in each subject as the means to raise the standard of instruction in the public schools of the Colony.[1] Thus he put great pressure on the inspectors to develop their role accordingly.

The Education Regulations, 1879 added to the role of the inspectors when they made provision for the inspectors to name those children who must be promoted and presented for examination in a higher class at the next annual examination.[2] This Regulation was a blow to the authority and independence of teachers, and the South Australian Public Teachers' Association aired its criticism of it in the report of its annual meeting in The South Australian Register.[3] The main complaint was that teachers knew the capabilities of their own scholars, whereas the inspectors knew little about them. Moreover, although the nominal age difference between successive classes was 18 months, according to the average age suggested for each class from Junior to Class 4, the inspectors' examination was held every 12 months, causing hardship to teachers and pupils. The Association recommended to the Department that pupils be promoted by inspectors only with the concurrence of their teachers. The Parliament by allowing these Regulations, and the Minister and Hartley by framing them, added a further note of distrust to the relations between the teachers and inspectors, particularly so as the promotion of pupils was the prerogative of head teachers in other Australian colonies.[4]

As a consequence of the holding of the 1881-1883 Inquiry and the lapse of the Bill to give effect to its recommendations, there was a period of five years from 1879 without new or

---

1 ibid., p. xii.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 37, 1879, Education Regulations, 1879, p. 3.
3 The South Australian Register, 22 December 1879, p. 6.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 75, 1913, q. 7081, p. 46; no. 27, 1912, q. 5380, p. 139; q. 6077, p. 190, showed the policy in Victoria, Queensland and New South Wales.

revised Regulations including those dealing with the role of the inspectors.[1]

All Regulations governing the activities of the inspectors were officially the policy of the Council of Education and then of the Minister Controlling Education and hence of the Government. However, they had been increasingly seen in the Parliament and in the community as the policy of one man, J.A. Hartley. For instance, as Basedow, Member for Barossa, told the House of Assembly in 1877, that when there was a change of Government and a new Minister of Education, it really did not matter as the whole of the management of the Education Department was in the hands of one man, namely Hartley.[2] Another Member said that the Minister was just a "conduit pipe"[3] to Parliament, and yet another described Hartley as "imperium in imperio"[4] and "...as jealous of his petty power as if he were the autocrat of all the Russias".[5] He was also accused of usurping the power of the Council of Education and of the Minister of Education.[6]

Basedow had moved that the education laws in force were unsatisfactory and should be changed.[7] He got support from other Members.[8] It was said that the inspectors had their firm instructions from Hartley.[9] Also there was not the kindness and assistance of the former Chief Inspector, Dr. Wyatt, and there was a tone in the Regulations of distrust of teachers.[10] Likewise the inspectors should step in, like the German and

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1884, pp. x, xvii, and 1885, pp. x, xvi.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 18 July 1877, col. 413.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 27 June 1878, col. 237.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 29 August 1877, col. 812.
5 loc. cit.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 10 October 1877, col. 1226.
7 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 18 July 1877, col. 405.
8 ibid., col. 407; 29 Aug. 1877, col. 806-810; 10 Oct. 1877, col. 1226, 1237.
9 ibid., Assembly, 18 July 1877, col. 409.
10 loc. cit.

American inspectors, and give model lessons.[1] Further, it was suggested that they should do more than examine pupils; they were urged to do something towards improving the skills of teachers by holding conferences.[2] The Regulations had not been changed in order to amplify the advisory role of the inspectors and the nature of the incidental inspection, but had concentrated on the annual inspection and examination and related matters as the major concerns of the inspectors. Indeed, this emphasis was practically admitted by Hartley in his Annual Report for 1879.[3]

Members of Parliament also commented on how Hartley shifted the inspectors in and out of their districts to suit his own ends, thus militating against the inspectors becoming leaders in their districts.[4] They claimed that there should be more sympathy between inspectors and teachers,[5] and were always ready to quote the inspectors if ever they hinted that the Colony was not getting value for the money expended on education.[6]

Hartley defended his inspectors and himself against the criticisms by declaring to the 1881-1883 Inquiry that the inspectors' actions were not designed to gratify their particular idiosyncrasies but to measure uniformly the work done in the different schools.[7] Likewise he claimed that inspectors acted so that teaching was carried out in a thorough and efficient manner, while doing full and complete justice to those who served the Department.[8]

---

1 ibid., col. 413.
2 ibid., Assembly, 25 June 1878, col. 183.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1880, p. xii.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 4 July 1878, col. 302. One Member complained that Hartley kept inspectors hanging about the office instead of being in their districts.
5 ibid., Assembly, 28 June 1883, col. 311.
6 ibid., Assembly, 27 June 1878, col. 245.
7 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, q. 6824, p. 216.
8 ibid., q. 6834, p. 218.

Hartley, as the inspectors' immediate superior, had his own means of shaping the role of the inspectors. He joined them at inspections, and checked on them by visiting schools after their inspections;[1] he instituted the inspectors' conference; he used his Circulars to Inspectors, Confidential Memoranda and confidential letters. These circulars, confidential memoranda and letters were largely related to the inspectors' annual examinations and the quest for uniformity.[2] Tables of comparative percentages awarded by inspectors were sent; copies of inspectors' arithmetic examinations were requested; instructions were given for promoting pupils, polite but firm rebukes on standards of difficulty were given; information on Government school buildings was requested at the time of the preliminary inspection; opinions on Regulations were requested; how to conduct the result examination was shown; ministerial instructions to see at preliminary inspections that transferred pupils were placed in the correct class were sent; a complete Programme of the Inspector's Examination, 1882 was sent; and instructions that repairs and renovations required were not to be included in the report of the Annual Examination were sent. At this stage, the main tenor of Hartley's pressure on the role of the inspectors was to make them uniform and strict examiners of pupils.

The preliminary visit[3] to the schools by these inspectors initially was meant to be helpful to teachers who would have benefited from the inspectors' observation of conditions at the

---

1 B. Condon (ed.), The Confidential Letterbook of the South Australian Inspector-General of Schools 1880-1914, Murray Park Sources in the History of South Australian Education no. 8, Adelaide, 1976, Letter 17 to Inspector Dewhirst, 14 July 1880. "Such a serious discrepancy appears to indicate a difference between your mode of examination and mine."

2 B. Condon (ed.), op. cit., letters from 20 May 1880, to 23 Feb. 1883, in order, refer to the matters listed.

3 See above, p. 21. This visit, not for examining pupils, has been called the preliminary inspection or the incidental inspection.

school, the programme, the timetable, methods of teaching and discipline.[1] However, the Council, in addition to the incidental inspection report, asked for full information on:

> school buildings, furniture, drill ground, school material, organization, discipline and method, the personal influence of the teacher and tone of the school, the qualifications of the teacher, his capacity for improvement, the approximate number of children in the neighbourhood, and difficulties as to compulsory education.[2]

Most of the matters on which information was requested were incorporated into the preliminary inspections, and to satisfy the administration, the inspectors made these visits without notice fault-finding events. The time available for advising teachers was also reduced.

Hartley introduced the inspectors' conference[3] for the purpose of improving inspectors' methods of performing their duties,[4] which soon meant achieving greater uniformity in the result examination and the setting of "standards".[5] Hartley, however, so dominated it and retained the right of veto,[6] that at least one inspector felt powerless. Inspector Dewhirst had experienced the earlier freer control under the Central Board of Education, the tighter control of the Council of Education under the 1875 Education Act, and the rigid centralized control of a

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 161, 1876, p. 3.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1877, p.9.
3 C. Turney, "The Rise and Decline of an Australian Inspectorate", in R.J.W. Selleck (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education 1970, Carlton, Melbourne University Press, 1970, pp. 191, 192. William Wilkins had introduced the inspectors' conference in New South Wales in 1860 because Kay Shuttleworth had found it so useful in England in developing a uniformity of outlook in the inspectorate. However, in New South Wales it developed into something like an inspectors' association - something that could not have occurred in South Australia with Hartley's firm control and use of the veto.
4 S.A.G. Gazette, 19 March 1874, pp. 443, 444.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1880, p. xii.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, q. 6285, p. 156.

Minister and an Inspector-General under the 1878 Education Amendment Act no. 122. When asked by a Commissioner at the 1881-1883 Inquiry whether he had the same power as an inspector in England, he replied, "I do not know that I have any power. My business here is to inspect schools".[1] Nevertheless the inspectors' conference introduced by Hartley did add to the role and authority of the inspectors. Its findings were circulated as though they were the inspectors' decisions, and teachers sought the inspectors to elaborate at association meetings. So important to the teachers were the changes made in standards at the inspectors' conference, that they sought to have twelve months' notice of changes.[2]

Basedow, a former teacher in Germany, in a debate in the Parliament disagreed with the notion that the very keystone to the education system was inspection. To him the most important factor was the quality of the teachers, and he claimed that Hartley agreed with him.[3] Basedow had been Minister of Education for a short time in 1881,[4] and such confidences could have been shared between them. It was all a matter of money and until Parliament voted enough money for the proper training of teachers and their employment, Hartley had to retain the pupil teacher system, payment by results, and the inspectors' result examination.[5] If Basedow's claim was true it gives another facet of Hartley's character. This instigator and defender of the South Australian inspectors' chief instrument in their work, the result examination, considered that it was an expedient to be used while the teaching service was inadequately trained, and not the cornerstone of their role.

---

1 ibid., q. 4807, p. 86.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, q. 1998, p. 88.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 10 July 1883, col. 430.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Council, 28 June 1881, col. 135. A change of government saw J.L. Parsons replace F. Basedow as Minister of Education.
5 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 10 July 1883, col. 430. See also Table 2.1, p. 59.

This revelation by Basedow also indicated how the role of the inspector at any particular period was very considerably determined by the economic and social conditions of the time. The politicians of the day repeatedly gave lip-service[1] to the importance of education to this Colony of fluctuating economic conditions, long distances and sparse population with much developmental work needed in water conservation, transport facilities and services, but continually voted too few funds to finance education.[2] This in turn meant employment of inadequately trained teachers, pupil-teachers and monitors who needed much more than casual advisory assistance.[3] Again lack of funds meant the employment of too few inspectors to have time for advice, direct help and demonstration to teachers. In other words, lack of finance precluded the full development of an advisory role for the inspectors, and constituted a negative pressure or constraint by the legislature on the development of the role of the inspectors. Hartley, too, was forced to the position that the best way to get the best from his teachers, of meagre educational background and relatively unknown application, was the strict and relentless use of the examining role of his few inspectors, admittedly something he appeared to do with great relish. He ensured that it was applied just as strictly according to Regulations to the humblest pupil teacher as to the graduate headmaster,[4] with, as the 1881-83 Inquiry evidence showed, considerable criticism from the latter and aspersions cast on the role of the inspectors.

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 25 June 1878, col. 199 and 20 July 1881, col. 334, provide examples.

2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 26 October 1880, col. 1638 and 20 July 1881, col. 330, provide examples of opposition to funding.

3 See above, Table 2.1, p. 59 and pp. 61, 62.

4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 15 Nov. 1893, col. 2806. Hartley was quoted as saying that he had to legislate for the average teacher. S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, q. 6711, p. 203. Hartley said that rules to check work must apply to all teachers. S.A.P. Paper, no. 27A, 1883, q. 6907, p. 5. Hartley wished for increased knowledge and culture among the teachers.

The formal recommendations on inspections of the 1881-1883 Inquiry merely reinforced the role for the inspectors that Hartley had prescribed. The Commissioners attached great importance to effective inspection, the backbone of the system,[1] to secure full advantages for children and the faithful discharge of duties by teachers - the value for money purpose. To give teachers confidence that an equal test was applied it was essential that inspectors got uniformity in their examinations. Results in the inspectors' examination should not be ends in themselves, for the aim was good teaching and example, but the Commissioners could not suggest a better means to test the attainments of children, the character of the teachers' work and their fitness for promotion. It was up to the inspectors to set examinations which rendered cram worthless.[2] The Report was silent on payment by results, but recommended fixed salaries for teachers plus a bonus depending on the merit rating of their school.[3] This bonus for merit was obviously meant to replace payment by result or percentage. The inspectors' task should be to determine a merit rating instead of a percentage result, and, of course, it would be done by means of inspection and examination. This scheme of the Commissioners was the basis of the 1885 major revision of the Regulations concerning the inspectors' examination.[4]

On complaints about the Inspector-General's manner and his administration, matters that had moulded the inspectors' role in the past more so than any other single influence,[5] the Report was non-committal, he was neither guilty nor innocent,[6] even though it was these widespread complaints that caused the

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 3 July 1883, col. 347.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27A, 1883, p. ix.
3 loc. cit.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1885, pp. 1-12.
5 B. Condon (ed.), op. cit., 1976. See letters 1 to 5, 20 May 1880; letter 6, 29 May 1880; letters 9 to 13, 2 July 1880; letter 14, 12 July 1880; letter 17, 14 July 1880; letters 22 to 25, 12 Jan. 1881; letters 31, 33 to 35, 9 May 1881.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 28 June 1883, col. 308.

inquiry to be set up.[1] These criticisms had increased in 1881,[2] and perhaps the Commissioners attributed the complaints to the troublesome times of the colonists who had experienced a long drought and a temporary depression.[3] The Commissioners rejected[4] the rumour and the claim in Griffiths's evidence as President of the South Australian Public Teachers' Association that the Inspector-General and the inspectors[5] were set on removing all of the old teachers. The Commissioners would have been aware of similar claims made in the Parliament in 1879, when a Member declared, in their defence, that the inspectors were gentlemen who did not go out of their way to do injury to teachers.[6]

The Commissioners gave no hint of their assessment of the inspectors' evidence that pointed to an "exceedingly happy family"[7] in the Education Department, which was managed efficiently without friction, though their evidence was ridiculed in the House of Assembly after the publication of the Report.[8] The Commissioners were content to confirm what everyone knew about Hartley - his indefatigable industry, his administrative power and his enthusiasm for promoting the education of the children of the people - and to give the qualities that the head of a large department should have, namely, courtesy and kindliness to staff, who should not mistake activity and energy for want of consideration. They did, however, recommend that the Inspector-General should not examine schools,[9] which recommendation he ignored in 1883, the year of

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27A, 1883, p. xi.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 3 July 1883, col. 345.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Governor's Speech, 2 June 1881, col. 4.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27A, 1883, p. xi.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, qq. 3097, 3102, p. 151.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 9 July 1879, col. 362, 364.
7 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 3 July 1883, col. 345.
8 loc. cit., Dixson, a member of the Commission, in his satirical reference in the House of Assembly to the "happy family" avoided reference to Inspector Dewhirst's reluctant evidence (S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, qq. 4751-4763, pp. 83, 84) and his letter (S.A.P. Paper no. 27, 1882, pp. 230, 231) relating to friction between Hartley and himself.
9 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27A, 1883, p. ix.

publication of the Report.[1] He assisted the inspectors in turn, used the experience to compare their inspection methods, and decided on repeating this procedure in order to develop uniformity in examination.[2] So Hartley was freed by the official Report, to continue to exert his influence on the future role of the inspectors in much the same way as he had done in the past.[3]

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

The dominant force in the development of the role of the inspectors in this period came from Hartley. However, the inspectors themselves did contribute to its development as discussed below.

Burgan became, in 1876, the first organizing inspector,[4] similar to the kind of appointment that Wyatt had advocated in 1854.[5] Although the Council created this position in 1876 and Hartley cancelled it in 1879, Burgan developed the role,[6] and other inspectors brought pressure on him to use his role in their districts. Hence pressure for the development of this advisory role can be said to come from pressures from the inspectors themselves. Burgan visited, in all of the inspectors' districts, schools that had been found deficient in some way at the previous inspection or annual examination. The deficiencies could be in some or all of buildings and teaching apparatus, organization, methods of instruction, discipline and order, and examination results. He remained in each school

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1884, p. xi.
2 loc. cit.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1884, p. xvii. Hartley expressed great regret over the delay in the recommendations becoming law, with the consequence of no revision of Regulations for a total of five years.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1877, p. 5.
5 See above, pp. 37, 38.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1877, pp. 20-23.

(sixty in 1876) for periods ranging from one day to a week. In schools where instruction, discipline and results were unsatisfactory, he found that unsuitable buildings, poor furniture and lack of teaching apparatus contributed to the instructional and disciplinary defects, as did unsuitable positioning and grouping of the children, unsuitable time-tables and lack of programmes of instruction.

In his advice on methods of instruction, he concentrated on simple principles such as, teachers reading interesting material to and with children; meticulous correction of writing; and the use of the blackboard and "mental" in teaching arithmetic. He advocated physical drill as an aid to discipline and good order. This use of Burgan's teaching ability delighted Inspector Dewhirst, who had not been a teacher, for he could use him to advise teachers on methods of teaching.[1] This advisory aspect of the role of inspectors, Burgan certainly developed, after the Council's initiation, beyond the examining and the detecting of faults of the other inspectors. However, by 1879, the position of organizing inspector had disappeared, presumably through lack of funds - a blow to those who advocated a strong advisory role for the inspectors.

In his three years as an organizing inspector before becoming a district inspector, Burgan did contribute to the development of an advisory role for the inspectors, who, of course, had access to his annual reports which described his advisory work in the schools. Burgan modestly attributed much of the improvement in teaching to the influence of the City Model School,[2] to which teachers could be sent for observation. It was Burgan, too, who suggested the establishment of Teachers' Associations so that country teachers could benefit from meeting to discuss educational matters.[3]

---

1 ibid., p. 12.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 40, 1878, p. 32. See also Table 2.1, p. 59.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1880, p. 22.

However, the fact that Burgan in his first year as organizing inspector had to conduct annual examinations in 20 schools,[1] other than the 60 unsatisfactory schools to which he gave advisory service, pointed to Hartley attaching less importance to the advisory role than to the examining role which in his opinion provided great stimulus to teachers. Likewise, in his final year as organizing inspector, not only did Burgan conduct annual examinations of pupils, but also examination of teachers and pupil teachers, examination of pupil teachers in practical teaching, tested applicants for teaching positions, and conducted an inquiry into the cause of diminishing attendance in schools.[2] All of these matters were important to the administration but further reduced Burgan's time as an adviser of teachers.

The improved results[3] on the inspectors' examination, was evidence to Hartley that the inspectors' role of examining pupils, policing Regulations and reporting to him was justified and was correct. The hard-working inspectors by their dedicated application to this role also provided a pressure for it to continue in all its severity in the way in which Hartley had directed it. In fact, in this period, such was the over-powering pressure of Hartley on the development of the inspectors' role, that a case could be made that the only pressure by the inspectors themselves was to maintain the role that Hartley had given them. The reasons for the inspectors recording in writing trivial breaches of Regulations and instructions on procedures and the keeping of records by teachers and pupil-teachers were not difficult to find. First, they saw that Hartley himself did it in the Inspector's Registers.[4] Second, they knew from his annual reports that he

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 34, 1877, p. 20.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 35, 1879, pp. 32, 33.
3 See above, p. 61.
4 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/34/2, vol.1, Register of Inspectors' Examination, Hindmarsh School. Inspector Dewhirst noted in the Inspector's Register at Hindmarsh School at the Incidental Inspection 23-28 Sept. 1880, that the Roll Book was marked according to instructions following criticism by Hartley at an Incidental Visit on 26 Sept. 1879.

believed that strict obedience to Regulations (by inspectors as well as teachers) led to uniformity throughout the system, efficiency in the schools, and justice to teachers.[1] Third, they knew that Hartley would examine and analyze their reports. Indeed he would visit a school to check on an inspector's report and criticize the inspector for defects that he found not being reported.[2] All copies of inspection reports returned from head office to Hindmarsh School were invariably signed by Hartley.[3] These written reports by inspectors on trivial breaches of Regulations or instructions were probably included to satisfy Hartley that they were obeying the Regulations and were doing their job. If the sole desire had been to correct the fault and assist the teachers, these matters could have been discussed in person with teachers, and corrected on the spot, rather than entered in the Register. By writing such reports the inspectors contributed to a role of detecting faults and breaches of Regulations.

The inspectors by their actions at inspections, by their obedience to Regulations and Hartley's demands, by their advocacy in their annual reports, by the example that they set in application to duty and by the conditions that they endured, did contribute to the development of their role and the view of their role held by the community, the teachers and the pupils. The conditions that they endured in carrying out their duties were illustrated in Inspector Whitham's annual report for 1877 in which he reported travelling 3,778 miles, chiefly by horse, in 604 hours in order to make school inspection visits of 4 3/4 hours duration on average.[4] Their devotion to the examining task was illustrated by the personal sacrifices of the much criticized Inspector Stanton. In 1881, he surrendered every

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1881, p. xvii.
2 B. Condon (ed.), op. cit., letter 104, 25 Feb. 1884, to Inspector Whitham.
3 S.A. Archives, G.R.G., 18/34/2. vol. 1, Register of Inspectors' Examination holds these signed reports.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 40, 1878, p. 22.

public holiday and the usual Michaelmas vacation, examined pupils on Saturdays and travelled on Sundays in order to complete his annual examination of pupils.[1]

From their wearisome and stressful travel and concentration on routine, the inspectors contributed in a negative way to their role. They became liverish, unpleasant, nit-picking and even spiteful.[2] They took the routine track of examining and inspecting rather than the creative path of advising teachers. Some of their activities in one direction, their lack of activity in others and their interpretation of their role brought criticism,[3] and sometimes praise,[4] from teachers and parents and were aired in Parliament, and consequently the inspectors had an indirect but definite influence on their own role, albeit largely determined by Hartley.

The inspectors in their evidence to the 1881-1883 Inquiry for the most part justified their actions by referring to the great improvement in the system of education since the introduction by Hartley of the thorough inspection and examination procedures.[5] Nevertheless, Inspector Hosking admitted under questioning that the system of inspection and examination was unfair to the true educator who taught children how to learn, and favoured the crammer.[6] Inspector Stanton, to

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1882, p. 6.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, q. 2042, p. 90; q. 1983, p. 87; q. 2035, p. 90 and no. 27, 1882, q. 4363, p. 67 provide examples.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 3 Oct. 1876, col. 1376 and 11 Oct. 1876, col. 1502. Inspectors Dewhirst and Stanton missed an inspection and a school site selection in the South-East and parents complained to the Minister. Assembly, 18 July 1877, col. 413, failure to give model lessons was reported.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 25 June 1878, col. 189. The annual reports of inspectors were praised for bristling with suggestions for carrying out the compulsory clause of the Education Act, 1875.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, q. 637, p. 31 and q. 1136, 1137, p. 53.
6 ibid., q. 1359, p. 62.

whom was directed most of the criticism of harshness of manner, severity of examining and rigid adherence to rules and Regulations,[1] showed himself to be completely in tune with the Hartley fundamentals of obedience to Regulations and thoroughness of examination to achieve justice and to raise standards. He told the Commissioners that inefficiency had remained undiscovered for years before the present rigid system of inspection was adopted.[2] When a Commissioner suggested that the result system forced the inspector "to mark out particular grooves", Stanton firmly answered, "No; rather to set out particular standards".[3] He, too, told the Inquiry that fixed salaries for teachers with payment by results added was "... one of the most efficient factors in our system".[4] He did not believe in allowing children to express their individuality, rather he believed that there should be a certain amount of suppression and repression as well as encouragement.[5] Nor did he believe in individual progression as teachers would require manifold classification of pupils which would be expensive.[6]

Inspector Dewhirst, to whom compliments were paid for his ability to get the best from children, yet using questions no less difficult than the other inspectors used,[7] reluctantly gave evidence not in keeping with that of his colleagues. He contended that the programme of instruction was too extensive and the standard too high, producing strain in children and criticism throughout the Colony.[8] He suggested adding a sixth class without increasing the content of the course of

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27A, 1883, pp. 109, 110 contained a letter of 4 July 1882, that Inspector Burgan felt obliged to write to the Commissioners because of the numerous adverse comments from teachers about Stanton.
2 ibid., q. 7324, p. 30.
3 ibid., q. 7377, p. 32.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, q. 528, p. 27.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27A, 1883, q. 7367, p. 31.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, q. 520, p. 26.
7 ibid., q. 2363, p. 109.
8 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, q. 4705, p. 81.

instruction.[1] He also intimated that the Inspector-General's opinion prevailed at the inspectors' conference,[2] and that he was not prepared to depart from Hartley's "fixed line".[3] When Hartley determined the original standards for classes, he, as an inspector, was not consulted but he thought that Judge Boucaut and the Chief Justice were.[4]

Inspector Dewhirst's other criticisms were that the result examination led not only to cramming but to "cramping"[5] of the good schools reducing them to a uniform level of mediocrity, even if it did stimulate the inferior schools. Inspector Stanton considered that the only reasonable objection by head teachers against payment by results was that they had to bring their schools up to a certain standard with the aid of assistant teachers in whose selection they had no voice.[6] This was an argument against central control of staffing. Stanton immediately gave a counter argument that no commanding officer selected his own subordinates, and, in any case, head teachers did select their pupil teachers, sewing mistresses and monitors.[7] By and large, the inspectors were satisfied with the role given to them, and Dewhirst, though dissatisfied, was not prepared to change it.

Pressures for Development of the Role of Inspectors from Teachers

The teachers wanted something better from the inspection process than they were getting. Their pressures for development of the inspectors' role are discussed below.

---

1 ibid., q. 4710, p. 81.
2 ibid., q. 4751, p. 83.
3 ibid., q. 4741, p. 83.
4 ibid., q. 4747, p. 83.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 40, 1878, p.13.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1881, p. 14.
7 loc. cit.

The criticisms from the South Australian Public School Teachers' Association, launched by the older teachers of the Colony who felt threatened by the new regime, were that the payment by results scheme demanded a higher standard than in the other colonies and that it led to cramming.[1]

W.J. Young, Headmaster of Hindmarsh School, thought that the inspectors should be educationists, and take a generous view of education, and not be like enemies or opponents to the teacher or the children, but rather friendly and considerate.[2] He, whose school was getting high percentages in the result examination,[3] also held a firm view of the inspectors' visits.

> What the inspectors do is of the barest and most negative character. If they find anything wrong they show it up, but they show nothing at all as to the general character of the school.[4]

Young was supported on the paucity of the preliminary inspection report which varied from a line or two to a page according to another head teacher.[5] He wanted a form with headings for the inspector to report under. Indeed Hartley and the inspectors obliged, not for the Incidental Inspection but for the Annual Examination. Soon after this evidence was given to the 1881-1883 Inquiry, a specimen pass sheet was issued with instructions to paste it on the inside cover of the Inspector's Register. The date on it was 20 June 1882. Prior to this evidence the Annual Examination form showed only the head teacher's name, the percentage obtained and the signature of the

---

1 B.K. Hyams, op. cit., 1972, pp. 312, 313, 314.
2 S.A.P.Paper, no. 122, 1881, q. 2319, p. 105.
3 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/34/2, vol. 1. Register of Inspectors' Examination Hindmarsh School. Result Examination, June 1880, a percentage of 88.11 was achieved under Inspector Dewhirst.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, q. 2571, p. 124.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, q. 4267, p. 49.

Inspector-General. Immediately after this evidence, the expanded printed summary form for the Annual Examination showed passes attainable and passes gained in each subject and a qualitative one word comment on each. The inspectors also made lengthier general comments on the Annual Examination and fuller Incidental Inspection reports at Hindmarsh School.[1]

J.T. Smyth, Headmaster of Norwood School, held firm views about the inspectors' role.

> I think the inspectors do not take sufficient time for examinations, but hurry them through. In a comprehensive system of education like ours more time should be given to the examination, and in making their half-yearly inspections, six months before the annual examinations the inspector should really make visits of inspection and more than a mere observation of the school as they do. The inspector comes in and observes what is going on like a visitor, and that is nearly all he does. He should take a class and show the teacher how to adopt his methods, and the teacher, by that means, would have a better idea of what he required, and the result examination would be very much easier on account of the suggestions which he would have made.[2]

Alexander Clark, Headmaster of the Grote Street Model Schools and formerly a headmaster in Sydney, gave evidence to the 1881-1883 Inquiry not only in his own right but as convener of the Conference of Headmasters of Model Schools set up for the purpose of preparing evidence to present to the Inquiry.[3] It was this Conference that passed a resolution of confidence in the Inspector-General.[4] Clark was generally well disposed

---

1 S.A. Archives, G.R.G. 18/34/2, vol. 1, Register of Inspectors' Examination, showed this contrast in reports on Annual Examinations at Hindmarsh School on 14-16 June 1881, and on 26 June - 6 July 1882.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, q. 4072, p. 35.

3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, qq. 2233-2243, p. 99.

4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, q. 5142, p. 99.

towards the South Australian education system compared with that in New South Wales,[1] and had no personal complaints against the Department as had some other witnesses from the teaching service.[2] Hence, his views including those of the Conference of Headmasters of Model Schools on the inspection process as expressed to the Inquiry are worthy of careful consideration. He considered that the hard and fast pre-determined test of the South Australian inspectors, to which every child was subjected, did not compare favourably for assessing children's knowledge and teachers' instruction with the New South Wales inspectors' examination based on the teachers' register of lessons taught.[3] The South Australian tests in reading were so straightforward that they did not induce teachers to devote time to teaching the subject, and the inspector had to examine so many children in short time that comprehension was not tested.[4] Arithmetic questions should have been more straightforward.[5] The examination in geography and history in Fourth Class upwards should have been written not oral, otherwise a large class was questioned on minute detail, and a small class only on important facts.[6] He gave instances of inspectors' churlishness and irritability upsetting children and influencing results.[7] He considered that uniformity, the great aim of Hartley and the inspectors, gave undue advantage to teachers who crammed and worked in a groove rather than to those who taught well and soundly.[8]

Hartley proudly and vehemently countered Clark's testimony by quoting from a copy of The Times recently brought back from England by Inspector Dewhirst. Mr. Mundella, the Education

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, qq. 1843, 1844, p. 82.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, q. 4176, p. 41, Noye's evidence, and q. 5856, p. 134, Niehuus' evidence, provide examples.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, q. 1983, p. 87.
4 ibid., q. 1883, p. 83.
5 ibid., q. 2024, p. 89.
6 ibid., q. 2075, p. 92.
7 ibid., q. 1983, p. 87, q. 2035, p. 90, and q. 2042, pp. 90, 91.
8 ibid., q. 1988, p. 88.

Minister in England, was about to call the chief inspectors together to arrange to meet once a year in order to agree upon a system of examination and then enforce the uniformity on their inspectors. This was something that South Australia had been doing since 1874. He pointed out that South Australia examined to find if children were thoroughly and intelligently taught as did Victoria, though a larger proportion of a teacher's income depended on it there, whereas England examined to find if children had attained the minimum to receive the grant.[1]

Clark's evidence before the Inquiry showed that he also considered that standards should have been easier in order to prevent the evils of mechanical teaching, namely, children industriously crammed, sickness amongst pupil-teachers and children, and the hampering of teachers, who, in any case placed too much importance on the result examination.[2] Moreover, he argued that teachers should have been given twelve months' notice of changes made in the standard at the January Inspectors' Conference,[3] and head teachers should have made their own promotion of pupils, and not the inspectors using the result examination.[4] Clark believed, too, that it was not the inspectorial test alone that kept teachers up to the mark, but the incentive of their improving children's lot and pleasing the parents.[5]

Mr. J. Griffith, Head Teacher of the Franklin Street School, was also the President of the South Australian Teachers' Association, whose complaints aired in the press and the Parliament contributed to the establishment of the 1881-1883 Inquiry.[6] However, he did confirm, what others had reported, that inspectors had adopted a kindlier attitude at inspection

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, q. 6296, p. 158.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, and qq. 1975, 1978, 1982, p. 87.
3 ibid., q. 1998, p. 88.
4 ibid., q. 2083, p. 93.
5 ibid., q. 1994, p. 88.
6 B.K. Hyams, op. cit., 1972, p. 313.

since the Inquiry had been in progress.[1] But he also informed the Commissioners of the opinions expressed by teachers, who were members of the South Australian Teachers' Association, in response to a circular sent by him.[2] The members contended that they could get their pupils to the standards set for the classes, given more time. However, because the time between the inspectors' annual examinations was too short they condemned them on the grounds of lack of justice to teachers and pupils, and that they led to cram.[3] Other changes that the teachers wanted included:[4] twelve months' notice of change in standards; the compulsory standard lowered; the 60 per cent minimum for results payment abolished; pupils examined by the inspector as they were taught, in a class, and not individually; compulsory attendance increased to 45 days a quarter; teachers to have a voice on pupils' promotion; pupils not examined unless they had attended at least 100 days prior to the examination; education to the compulsory standard to be free; removal of the second marking of the attendance roll as it was a sign of distrust of teachers, reduced teachers' salaries and the staffing of the school.

A comparison of the changes as they affected the role of the inspectors suggested by Clark representing the headmasters of model schools and those suggested by Griffiths representing the older, less qualified and less successful teachers[5] reveals much common ground. Neither suggested abolition of the inspectors' examination, but only its modification, changes in the manner of administering it by the inspectors and in the use of the results by the administration. Both wanted the examination based on what the teacher's programme revealed had been taught. Both wanted reduced standards (or more time to reach the existing standards) in order to decrease the incentive

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, q. 3078, p. 150.
2 ibid., q. 3107, p. 152.
3 ibid., q. 3108, p. 152.
4 ibid., q. 3109, p. 152.
5 B.K. Hyams, op. cit., 1972, p. 312.

for teachers to cram. Both wanted a year's notice of changed standards. Both wanted teachers to promote pupils or at least to join the inspectors in the process. Both wanted less rigidity and greater consideration for special circumstances at inspection and examination rather than uniformity. There were differences. Griffiths's group wanted more class and less individual examination by the inspectors; Griffith's suggestions for change were directed more to teachers' welfare, promotion and salary; whereas Clark's suggestions had a ring of concern for pupils about them.

Other specific criticisms of the inspectors' role in teachers' evidence to the Commission[1] were that: different inspectors gave different results; teachers were insulted and degraded before children by some inspectors; they caused teachers to have results on the brain in school, on the street, at home, in bed and even in the house of God;[2] inspectors were rude in their treatment of teachers; the standard was altered without notice; teachers in schools with limited appliances were judged on the same standard as teachers in the model schools; the inspectors did not give model lessons, one of the duties of inspectors in nearly every country in the world; and the inspectors took the children's examination scripts away, giving teachers no opportunity to see where they were astray. These were some of the complaints in evidence which were repeated in the Parliament, and could certainly sway Members to agree with a complainant that there was a feeling that the inspectors were not first class, and that their behaviour needed changing.[3]

Conclusion

The period from the assent to the 1875 Education Act, that gave the inspectors a charter to be key links between the

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881; no. 27, 1882; no. 27A, 1883.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 3 July 1883, col. 344.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, q. 2481, p. 118.

schools and the administration, to the 1881-1883 Inquiry, which inquired into the working of the Acts under J.A. Hartley and the inspectors, was the time when a centrally controlled system of public education was in the process of being set up in South Australia following a long period of little control or direction from the Central Board of Education. It was also a time in this essentially rural economy when the Parliament, the guardian of the public purse, had pressures on it for the development of railways, roads, harbours, reservoirs and better communications, as well as for the development of the schools and their administration.

Hartley was given the task of developing an efficient system of elementary education available to all the children of the Colony. With great energy and close attention to detail, he set about building up a uniform system of education as efficient as the inspectors, the teachers, resources and funds available to him would permit. He saw the inspectors as his chief agents in carrying out the task and getting the uniformity and efficiency that he desired. Accordingly, he developed a role for them in visiting schools, based on two fundamental tenets. The incidental visit or preliminary inspection without notice was largely based on the first principle: that strict obedience to the Regulations of the Education Acts led to uniformity throughout the system, efficiency in the schools and justice to teachers and children.[1] The annual examination for results was based on the second principle: that the careful examination by the inspectors of each child each year in each subject was essential to raise the standard of instruction in the public schools.[2]

As the inspectors were practically Hartley's only agents in the field, he kept adding to their duties in addition to the major ones of inspecting schools and examining pupils and

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1881, p. xvii.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1880, p. xii.

reporting on them.[1] In addition, teachers' examinations for certificates had to be set and administered, as well as those for pupil teachers. Moreover, the inspectors had to meet at least annually in conference with Hartley to review standards, and their own role, chiefly as examiners of pupils. They had to provide an annual report in which the inspectors tended to advocate changes which Hartley either criticized or implemented without recognizing the source. The inspectors quickly became over-worked.[2] There was no increase in their numbers, except that an assistant inspector was appointed in 1880, and the useful position of organizing inspector lapsed, presumably through lack of finance. Consequently, something had to yield or be neglected in the role of the inspectors.

The Parliament through passing the 1875 Education Act gave the inspectors an important role. Through its inadequate funding it hindered the development of their advisory role. Through its creation of the 1881-1883 Inquiry it gave teachers and others the opportunity to influence their role, as they did. Through its Members' comments and criticisms it provided further stimulus for change. Despite these parliamentary induced pressures, Hartley's influence seemed always to be present. He did assist in drafting the 1875 Education Act. The Regulations, including those governing the duties of inspectors, inspection of schools and the annual examination, were largely the work of Hartley. In fact, the Minister of Education explained to the House of Assembly that the preparation of the 1879 Regulations was delayed because of the illness of the Inspector-General's wife.[3]

---

1 See above, pp. 65-68.

2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 27 August 1879, col. 776, 777. The Minister of Education valued the inspection scheme and the result examination, but conceded that a drawback was the heavy load of work for the inspectors. S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1880, p. 11. Inspector Stanton commenting on the result system said, "The amount of work entailed upon the Inspectors is certainly heavy..."

3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 18 June 1879, col. 188.

Apart from the initial burst of appointing three new inspectors, in a period of rare prosperity, Hartley did not add greatly to the strength of the inspectorate despite expansion in the schools. Perhaps his contemporary, Grasby, was right when he said that Hartley had a mania for economy, and always asked of any move in education, What will it cost?[1] In the Inquiry, Hartley did inform the Commissioners that he was not in favour of an advanced school for boys at state expense.[2] He also told them that he did not like to recommend heavier expenditure on public education than he was obliged to.[3] Early in his term as head of the Department, when his standing was so high, Hartley could have assisted the inspectors by providing better teachers in the schools for them to influence. If he had deplored the use of pupil teachers, as some parliamentarians did, instead of using them as a cheap way to staff schools, he had a chance of getting funds from Parliament to employ experienced teachers. He did in fact get some outstanding teachers from the other Australian colonies. Even the creation of the Inquiry was urged by Hartley, "... to dissipate the mists of prejudice which envelope our work".[4] Finally, the recommendations of the Commission endorsed completely the role of the inspectors of thorough inspection and uniform examining set for them by Hartley.

In this initial period of development of a public system of education in South Australia, although the inspectors performed other functions, the dominant aspect of their role was the examination of pupils, the policing of Regulations in the schools and reporting fully to the administration. The inflexible manner in which they did this came from Hartley's pressure, Government parsimony and their own weariness from

---

1 W.C. Grasby, Our Public Schools: An Educational Policy for Australia, Adelaide, Hussey and Gillingham, 1891, p. 43.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 122, 1881, q. 306, p. 18.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1882, q. 6581, p. 193.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1881, pp. xvi, xvii.

constant routine examining and wearisome travel. Nevertheless, the education system benefited, for, as Inspector Stanton reported, the rigid nature of the inspections and examinations was a wholesome terror for dilatory individuals,[1] and the inspectors had made it not possible for drunkards to continue as teachers, nor persons who had failed at everything else to turn to school-keeping.[2]

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1880, p. 11.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1883, p. 10.