CHAPTER 6

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROLE OF THE INSPECTORS FROM 1946 TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE RECRUITING AND TRAINING BRANCH, 1959

Introduction

This chapter examines the pressures from various sources, including the three reports of the Education Inquiry Committee, for the positive development and the restraints in change of the role of the inspectors in the period immediately following World War II to the establishment of the Recruiting and Training Branch of the Education Department in late 1959.

In the years immediately following the end of World War II, lack of finance was not the constraining influence on developments in education. In fact the South Australian inspectors at a conference in Sydney had been able to tell their colleagues from other states that the immense importance of the schools had never before been so clearly recognized nor had money ever been so freely granted for educational purposes.[1] However, in common with the rest of the world, there were other constraints on developments in education by way of shortages of materials,[2] manpower and teachers.[3] When the magnitude of the

---

1 Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia, vol. 12, no. 2, Dec. 1948, p. 23.
2 S.A.T. Journal, Nov. 1946, p. 17.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 23 July 1946, p. 624.

re-building task following the neglect during the war was realized and the expectation of the people was so high, the Minister of Education, Baden Pattinson, was forced to admit that it was impossible to meet the demands without Commonwealth funds. The other state ministers of education agreed with him at a meeting of the Australian Education Council, but none of them wanted Commonwealth control of education.[1]

The greatest pressure of all on the Education Department was to cope with the rapid and unprecedented[2] increase in number of children in the schools. Tricks of demography were played on the schools.[3] In the period, 1945 to 1960, the enrolments in South Australian primary schools increased by 226 per cent from 58,732 to 132,859[4] which was considerably higher than in other Australian States.[5] The period was marked by this great expansion of the number of pupils in the schools and by the measures of expediency taken to cope with the situation.

Table 6.1 provides some data on population, pupils, teachers, schools and Education Department structure and expenditure at the beginning of the period 1946 to 1959. It also provides a brief sketch of the teacher training facility available in the period.

The inspectorate had lost some of its talented and academically well qualified members through promotion during

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, May 1958, p. 7.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1951, p. 3. The increase, 5,745, in enrolment in 1950 was not quite unprecedented as the increase in 1892 was higher when fees for children under 13 years of age were abolished.
3 In South Australia in 1935 during the Great Depression there had been 8,270 births which was the base of the recruiting pool for employment in teaching, the professions and general labour for the 1950s; whereas the births in 1950 numbered 17,306, which was the base for school enrolments from 1955 onwards.
4 Information Handbook, 1976, Education Department, S.A., p. 48.
5 Information Handbook, 1974, Education Department, S.A., p. 30.

TABLE 6.1

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT DATA 1946[1]

S.A. POPULATION	640,552
GROSS SCHOOL ATTENDANCE	70,843
PRIMARY (INCL. OPPORTUNITY)	59,861
HIGH SCHOOLS (INCL. CORRESPONDENCE)	6,930
BOYS AND GIRLS TECHNICAL SCHOOLS	3,183
AREA SCHOOLS	608
HIGHER PRIMARY	261
PERCENTAGE ATTENDANCE (PRIMARY)	84.3
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	785
HIGH	34
TECHNICAL HIGH	1
TECHNICAL (BOYS AND GIRLS)	12
AREA	11
HIGHER PRIMARY	13
CORRESPONDENCE	1
PRIMARY	495
RURAL (CLASS VII)	218
NUMBER OF TEACHERS	2935
HIGH SCHOOL	389
TECHNICAL (BOYS AND GIRLS)	196
CORRESPONDENCE	40
PRIMARY	1945
RURAL (INCL. AREA)	365

ADMINISTRATION

DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION	1 INSPECTORS OF HIGH SCHOOLS
SUPT. PRIMARY SCHOOLS	2 INSPECTORS OF TECHNICAL SCHOOLS
SUPT. HIGH SCHOOLS	1 INSPECTOR, GIRLS SCHOOLS AND CLASSES
SUPT. TECHNICAL SCHOOLS	
SUPT. RURAL SCHOOLS AND C. I.	1 INSPECTOR, INFANTS DEPARTMENTS
ASSISTANT SUPT. PRIMARY SCHOOLS	1 INSPECTOR, DOMESTIC ARTS
STAFF INSPECTOR	1 INSPECTOR, MANUAL TRAINING
PRINCIPAL MEDICAL OFFICER	12 INSPECTORS OF SCHOOLS
PSYCHOLOGIST	3 ADVISORY TEACHERS
RESEARCH OFFICER	
SECRETARY	

EXPENDITURE REVENUE AND LOAN	£ 1,162,611
COST PER CHILD INSTRUCTED (EXCLUDING BOYS AND GIRLS TECHNICAL)	£ 14. 7.2 (PRIMARY) £ 32.14.2 (SECONDARY)

SOURCES: 1 Statistical Register of South Australia, 1946-47 in S.A. Parliamentary Papers, no. 3, 1947.
S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1947.

TABLE 6.1 (CONTINUED)

TEACHER TRAINING FACILITY	This period has been called "the years of quiescence"[1] in teacher-training. Entry to the sole Teachers College was restricted during the Great Depression and was only 176 in 1946, a fact related to the low birthrate during the depression.[2] Courses were much the same as those revitalized by McCoy in 1921.[3] Free places in the Physical Education Diploma course at the University of Adelaide were offered to teachers with three years' teaching experience.[4] In 1946, Probationary Studentships bonding students in the fifth year of secondary schooling to enter Teachers College were re-introduced in an endeavour to boost the numbers and quality of the intake.[5] In 1956 South Australia's second teachers college, Wattle Park Teachers College, opened.[6] In 1947 the University introduced the Associateship of the University of Adelaide (A.U.A.) as the award for a three years' course at the University and Teachers College.[7] The first Professor of Education of the University of Adelaide was appointed at the end of 1959.[8] This was the period of emergency teacher training schemes for adults.[9] Inservice Training for teachers occurred and developed but was not an outstanding feature in this period.[10]

SOURCES:
1 B.K. Hyams, op. cit., 1979, p. 133.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1951, p. 3.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 62, no. 724, Nov. 1946, p. 197.
4 Education Gazette, vol. 64, no. 748, Nov. 1948, p. 199.
5 Education Gazette, vol. 62, no. 715, Feb. 1946, p. 60.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1957, p. 5.
7 B.K. Hyams, op. cit., 1979, p. 133.
8 S.A.T. Journal, Feb. 1960, pp. 3, 4.
9 Education Gazette, vol. 63, no. 734, Sept. 1947, p. 150.
10 See below, pp. 267, 268.

World War II under Fenner's directorship. W.V. Leach had been appointed Assistant Superintendent of Primary Schools, A.W. Pitt became Staff Inspector and C.M. Griggs took the position of Inspector of High Schools from E. Allen who had combined that position with a superintendency. Nevertheless, by the time of Fenner's enforced retirement, the inspectorate consisted of academically well qualified members, such as Paull, Shaw, Fitzgerald, J.H. McDonald, Whitburn and Polkinghorne as well as Ruth Gibson and Florence Blake. They had come from high, junior technical, higher primary, area, primary and infant schools as well as from assistant inspectorship and advisory teacherships.[1] Mander-Jones began with an inspectorate of 19 members including an inspector of high schools, 2 inspectors of technical schools and one each of girls' schools and classes, infant departments, domestic arts and manual training. Moreover 4 of these inspectors had been appointed under McCoy, 5 under Adey and the remainder under Fenner.[2] In addition there were 4 advisory teachers who carried out some inspectorial duties.

By 1956 the administration had been increased by the addition of a Deputy Director of Education, E. Allen, the abolition of the position of Superintendent of Rural Schools, but the addition of two Assistant Superintendents of Primary Schools, B.T. Fitzgerald and J. Whitburn. There were also 3 additional district inspectors, D.C. Smith, A.E. Butcher and A.J. Whitelaw. The number of inspectors of infant departments had been increased to 3, specialist inspectors to 5 and inspectors of secondary schools to four. In addition there were spuervisors of music, physical education and visual aids, an organizer of school libraries and an expanded Psychology Branch.

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 60, no. 699, Oct. 1944, p. 205. Acting appointments of J.H. McDonald, J. Whitburn, B. Fitzgerald and K. Polkinghorne from various sources were listed.

2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 2, 1944, p. 47, and Education Gazette, vol. 62, no. 720, July 1946, p. 139.

The quality of the teaching service had improved in both training and qualifications, so that in 1946, 1153 primary teachers held Certificates from IA to IIIB and 82 held university degrees.[1] In Rural Schools (Class VII and Area Schools), 155 held Certificates.[2] However the intake to the teachers colleges in this period was small as was the outflow of certificated teachers from them.[3] In addition the number of untrained and emergency trained teachers employed increased and the overall quality of the service did not improve. In 1957 48 per cent of all teachers in primary schools were temporary staff, of whom 52 per cent were unclassified.[4] Also 172 temporary teachers, including about 87 unclassified, in the primary service resigned, not all, of course, because of unsatisfactory performances.[5] Likewise, 68 teachers, including 17 men, resigned from the permanent staff in primary, area and higher primary schools.[6] However, there were signs of improvements to come. In 1957, the A Course in Teachers' College, the one-year course that had provided teachers for the one-teacher, Class VI schools,[7] was abolished so that all courses were a minimum of two years.[8]

The increase in school population and the shortages of teachers and accommodation that dominated the educational scene in this period and the measures adopted to meet them produced changes in the role of the inspectors of a kind not known before. Most inspectors were engaged to some degree in the recruitment of teachers; all became educational handymen, and

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1947, pp. 19, 21.
2 ibid., p. 19.
3 ibid., p. 20.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1958, p. 40.
5 ibid., p. 36.
6 loc. cit.
7 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1951, p. 4. Class VII schools became Class VI.
8 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1958, p. 6.

one had to manage a building division within the Education Department.[1]

Teachers in short supply were in a strong bargaining position to bring pressure to bear for changes in salary, conditions of employment and inspection and assessment procedures. The S.A.P.S.T.U. and the Women Teachers' Guild did this effectively using deputations to the Minister and the Director, their conferences as well as their respective journals, The S.A.Teachers' Journal and The Guild Chronicle. They achieved long service leave in the Education Act Amendment Act No. 31, 1949. They were just as effective when the Union and Guild settled their differences and became the S.A. Institute of Teachers in 1951.

The Teachers Salaries Board which under the Education Amendment Act of 1945[2] replaced the Arbitration Court in determining the salaries of teachers, but not of inspectors, awarded generous salary increases to teachers "...in keeping with the state of national inebriation of the times".[3] Consequently the inspectors' salaries were sometimes less than those of whom they were inspecting thus lessening the senior colleague aspect of the inspectors' role.[4] The Public Service Commissioner, who recommended appointment, salary and conditions of employment of inspectors, as public servants, was now seen to be a major barrier to development of the inspectorate.[5] The teacher-inspector relationship was further weakened by the Guild of Inspectors ending its affiliation with the Union, though individual inspectors remained members or associate members

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1951, p. 3. The Building Division was established in 1949 under Inspector J.S. Walker.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1946, p. 2. This Act also established the Education Policy Board in place of the Advisory Council of Education. It had no impact on the role of the inspectors.
3 S.A.T. Journal, Feb. 1948, p. 9.
4 S.A.T. Journal, Feb. 1949, p. 8.
5 loc. cit.

of the Union.[1] The Teachers Salaries Board also sat as an Appeals Board to hear teachers' appeals against recommendations for special positions. Consequently added importance was placed on the inspectors' assessing role. The introduction of the Teachers Certificate brought about minor changes in the assessing role of the inspectors.[2]

The appointment in 1946 of the new Director of Education, Col. E. Mander-Jones, an exceedingly courteous[3] and decorated ex-serviceman from New South Wales, did bring pressure to bear on the development of the inspectors' role. Whether through his innate cautiousness or because of his difficulty in getting propositions accepted by his Minister or the all-powerful Premier Playford, he consulted widely, including the inspectorate, before making a decision. This occurred despite his own admission that an emergency existed.[4] As each problem arose he seemed to add to the administrative tasks of the inspectors. Mander-Jones was a scholar and much preferred analyses and discussions on matters of long term import to the hard-nosed decision-making on matters of immediate moment. He relished the release by the Government of the Final Report of the Education Inquiry Committee in 1949, concerning which the Minister told the Legislative Council that it was not a report on which speedy conclusions could be reached.[5] Mander-Jones had the inspectors discussing the Report in conference, thus deferring action. However, he did implement some of its recommendations on the inspection process, but failed until 1959 to get a Recruiting and Training Branch established, the equivalent of which was hinted at in the First Report.[6]

Another appointment that influenced the role of the inspectors was that of Baden Pattinson as Minister of Education

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, March, 1949, p. 2; Oct. 1950, p. 23.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 64, no. 745, Aug. 1948, p. 146.
3 Guild Chronicle, vol. 8, no. 16, June 1947, p. 4.
4 ibid., pp. 7, 13.
5 S.A.P. Debates, Council, 6 Sept. 1949, p. 523.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 15, 1945, p. 9.

in late 1953. Unlike his predecessor, R.J. Rudall, he was not prepared to go along with the Director's cautious pace. He taught departmental officers, including inspectors, the value of good public relations including prompt replies to questions and complaints. He got Parliament on side through his own good public relations in this regard.[1] He even got permission for Parliament to go into recess so that Members could participate in Education Week.[2] Indeed the Minister entered the managerial side of education in that he was Chairman of the Education Week Executive Committee in the metropolitan area, whereas district inspectors were committee conveners[3] in the country.

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

The Parliament, the Government and the administration of the Education Department had to introduce measures to cope with the greatly increased influx of children into the schools throughout this period. This section examines the changes in the inspectors' role brought about by these groups in coping with the situation. It also considers the three Reports of the Education Inquiry Committee and their impact on the role of the inspectors.

The Education Inquiry Committee, set up by the Government by direction from Parliament, in its First Report provided some ideas for the development of the inspectors' role. It recommended extension and development of inservice education of teachers through workshop conferences, not always conducted by inspectors, but involving teachers from the different groups of schools in not only country districts, but also metropolitan

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 23 Aug. 1956, p. 375.
2 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 11 Oct. 1960, p. 1272.
3 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1958, pp. 17, 18.

districts.[1] The Committee also recommended that not only teachers' education should be extended inservice by travel, observation and exchange, but also that of inspectors and principal administrative officers should be extended likewise.[2]

The Committee advocated tidying up the chaotic state of classification and certification of teachers, while retaining the skill mark scheme of assessment of teachers by inspectors.[3] The assessment was to be mainly for promotion purposes, as salary increments were to be automatic except when inspectors assessed teachers as unsatisfactory.[4]

The Committee attempted to remove some of the pastoral care of teachers from the inspectors' role by the recommended appointment of a female welfare officer to whom the female teachers would unburden their domestic difficulties more so than to a male inspector.[5] A similar proposition was put by the Royal Commission on Education in 1912 and rejected.[6] It was no more successful on this occasion.

The legislature and the administration of the Education Department reacted to these recommendations. Regulations were gazetted in 1947 for the provision of a Teachers Certificate,[7] and E.D. Circular, no. 21, Promotion Marks and Skill Marks, was published.[8] The Teachers Certificate gave a tertiary qualification base for Certificated Teachers. From 1948 it was to be awarded to teachers who had completed satisfactorily a three-year course at Teachers College, held the Associateship in Arts and Education of the University of Adelaide,[9] and had

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 15, 1945, p. 18.
2 ibid., p. 19.
3 ibid., pp. 20, 23.
4 ibid., p. 22.
5 ibid., p. 28.
6 S.A.P. Paper, no. 27, 1912, pp. v, viii, ix.
7 Education Gazette, vol. 63, no. 735, Oct. 1947, p. 162.
8 Education Gazette, vol. 64, no. 745, Aug. 1948, p. 196.
9 See above Table 6.1, p. 260.

satisfied the Public School Teachers Classification Board that they had the teaching ability required by the Director. For teachers already in the service there were alternative ways of gaining the Teachers Certificate. Teachers, not holding the qualifications for a Teachers Certificate, but holding the long-established IIIB or IIIA Primary Certificate were called Classified Teachers. Others not holding these certificates were called Unclassified Teachers.

E.D. Circular, no. 21 showed that for primary teachers, Classified and Unclassified Teachers were awarded Skill Marks on a scale of 10 to 45. Ranges of marks were shown in each category for assessment as unsatisfactory, efficient, very efficient and exceptional. Certificated Teachers were awarded Promotion Marks. The range of marks depended upon which promotion list the teachers were competing. For example, teachers competing for Headmasterships Class I, had to have a minimum promotion mark of 200 to be on the list, 210 to be qualified for promotion, and could go to a maximum of 220. The Superintendent awarded the Skill or Promotion Mark after consideration of the inspector's report and other evidence of the teacher's work recorded in the Office of the Education Department.

The response to the Committee's recommendation to extend and improve inservice conferences was satisfactory. This work by inspectors had waxed and waned since the days of Williams's Teachers' Congresses in 1906. Schools of Instruction and Schools of Method of the kind envisaged by the Committee had been held during the War, and E.D. Circular 9 governing their conduct had been revised, but in 1947 still restricted attendance to country teachers once a year.[1] Under certain conditions the Director awarded a mark for promotion purposes to a teacher satisfactorily completing a course at a School of

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 63, no. 728, March 1947, p. 72.

Instruction, for example in Physical Education.[1] In February 1947, 15 Schools of Instruction and Schools of Method ranging in length from 4 days to 3 weeks were advertised, 6 being under the control of inspectors of schools, and included metropolitan districts.[2]

The Committee's desire to have teachers and inspectors observe and experience other systems overseas and interstate was fulfilled to some extent, despite the Minister having to restrict leave for overseas travel because of staff shortages.[3] A new extension of overseas visits, beyond the traditional exchange with England, resulted from the funds made available from the lend-lease arrangements during the War through the United States Education Foundation in Australia.[4] The first South Australian exchange teacher reported to South Australians that the Director of Studies at his American School was a kind of local inspector able to help and guide teachers over a wide field, yet many teachers resented his intrusion in the classroom.[5] The inspectors who went interstate or overseas were able to share their benefits from the visits with other inspectors at the September and January Staff Conferences held in this period.[6] Some of the matters reported on were a UNESCO Seminar held in Melbourne, a Conference of Inspectors of Schools in New Zealand, English schools, Tasmanian education, and aspects of American education by the first South Australian inspector to receive a Smith-Mundt grant to study educational administration and supervision in the United States of America.

The Special Report on Secondary Schools for Country Children with Special Reference to Area Schools of the Education

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 59, no. 687, Oct. 1943, p. 184.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 63, no. 728, March 1947, p. 72.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 66, no. 764, March 1950, p. 90.
4 Education Gazette, vol. 68, no. 793, Aug. 1952, p. 172.
5 H.M. Searle, "American Schools and Education" in the Education Gazette, vol. 71, no. 829, Aug. 1955, p. 224.
6 Staff conference agenda papers and minutes from 1949 to 1958 are held by A.W. Jones.

Inquiry Committee was published in 1946, soon after Mander-Jones took up his appointment as Director of Education. As it was Government policy to make rural secondary schools comprehensive, the Committee considered that it was necessary to unify the administration of secondary education which was spread between the four superintendents. As a first step the Committee recommended that the inspectors who dealt solely or chiefly with secondary work should form one secondary school inspectorate, of which the services of each member would be available wherever the need existed, whether in high, higher primary, technical or area school. This was a sound suggestion and individual inspectors made themselves available for all of these schools. However, the separateness of the branches brought about by Fenner and enshrined in the Education Act Amendment Act of 1941 coupled with Fenner's known favouritism towards the Technical Branch had left deep divisions that could not be removed quickly.

In its Final Report, the Education Inquiry Committee rejected criticisms of the purpose and methods of inspection, but considered that the inspectors' assessing role, which materially determined teachers' opportunities for advancement, caused teachers to see inspectors as formidable persons and not sufficiently discerning. The Committee members found them, capable, hard-working and fair-minded in an arduous task that was growing more diverse, responsible and creative in nature, and far broader and richer than the old role of examining, assessing, looking into, and of marking every child's work.[1] Neither teachers nor community realized sufficiently the creative work that inspectors did, for instance, in establishing an area school, nor did they realize how much was required of inspectors in guiding the young teacher with the freer, more flexible curriculum that obtained, and with internal testing and examining that replaced the external and uniform Qualifying Certificate Examination. The rapid developments in educational thought and practice meant that inspectors had to inform and to

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 15, 1949, p. 39.

inspire teachers, and even to refashion their craftsmanship to meet the broader purposes of instruction. Inspectors had to inform their district communities, through Education Weeks and public meetings associated with Schools of Method, of trends in education and what schools were trying to do with parent and community support.[1] The Committee recommended more advisory visits, smaller districts, more inspectors, time to read and to reflect, and clerical help, not to relieve the inspectors of their multifarious tasks, but so that they could play their part in maintaining efficiency and, more vitally, in extending and enriching the educative process. It also recommended a change in name which was not accepted.[2]

However, like the First Report, the Final Report was produced too late and at the wrong time for maximum impact. A Bill for long service leave for teachers was about to go before Parliament and the Union's own report on recruitment of teachers was nearly ready for public release.[3] The value of the 1949 N.E.F. International Conference on "Education for Democratic Living" was being questioned in Parliament. A Member protested on behalf of the Public Schools Committees Association at the closing of schools to attend it following numerous complaints from parents[4] - a far cry from 1937. Increased salaries and a reclassification of primary schools[5]; shortages of accommodation and teachers' residences[6]; claims of subversive teaching in schools[7]; a Government continually under fire because of the huge increase in the cost of education;[8] and a call for greater effort in recruiting teachers[9] were not the conditions for the acceptance of an idealistic report.

---

1 ibid., pp. 39, 40.
2 ibid., p. 40.
3 S.A.T. Journal, Oct. 1949, pp. 3, 9.
4 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 10 Aug. 1949, p. 244, and Council, 9 Aug. 1949, p. 186.
5 S.A.P. Debates, Governor's Speech, 23 June 1948, p. 4.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Council, 29 June 1948, p. 60.
7 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 24 June 1948, p. 33.
8 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 17 Oct. 1950, pp. 1054.
9 S.A.P. Debates, Council, 26 July 1950, p. 71.

Nevertheless the Director of Education did get the inspectors to discuss and debate the Final Report. On 2 September 1949, he had his Superintendent of Primary Schools, W.V. Leach, send a memorandum to all inspectors that he wished to devote the bulk of the staff conference, 7-9 September 1949, to a discussion of "Classroom Methods and Individual Progression"[1] as a follow-up to the N.E.F. conference and the release of the Final Report of the Education Inquiry Committee, a copy of which had been supplied to all inspectors. Mander-Jones did follow some of the lines of the Final Report on the inspectors' role in that he treated inspectors as district leaders and encouraged them to undertake creative research. One such exercise was research into the possibility of regional teachers colleges in some country centres in South Australia.[2] Another was for inspectors to make submissions to the chairmen of various departmental committees.[3]

The Director and the Superintendents encouraged the inspectors to tell their colleagues at staff conferences of experiments and developments in their districts in the hope that this innovative role would spread. Some of these experiments discussed were - the planning of social studies; experiments with A and B streams at Whyalla; School of the Air in the Northern Territory; a news-sheet in an inspector's district; new techniques in assessment of subjects; and experiments in inservice training. A new style of School of Instruction was also described and evaluated. It was for 110 commercial teachers from all kinds of secondary schools, state and private, and for 20 students in the commercial E course at Adelaide Teachers College. The scale of the School was reminiscent of Williams's Teachers' Congresses, but the modern version had

---

1 Copy of the memorandum held by A.W. Jones.
2 Letter from the Director of Education, 9 July 1954, to Inspector A.W. Jones in the River District, and the results of the research, held by A.W. Jones.
3 A.W. Jones holds a copy of his letter of 26 May 1953 to the chairman of the Spelling Committee.

differences. A professor from Adelaide University was used to open it; examiners of the Public Examinations Board were there to discuss problems with teachers; commercial firms provided exhibitions of books and equipment; visits were made to commercial firms and government departments, and above all teachers were able to move motions and forward them to the Director of Education, through the inspector in charge of the School of Instruction.

In this period, 1946-1959, the Director of Education, Mander-Jones, the Superintendents, and even the Ministers of Education, Rudall and Pattinson, used the staff conferences to develop the role of the inspectors.[1] The whole thrust of these conferences centred on the inspectors, for many of whom these occasions were the only visits to head office.

The Director, Deputy Director and Superintendents travelled abroad and interstate to conferences and they used the staff conferences to inform the inspectors of their observations; at the February 1953 conference even to forecast that, in England, television would challenge radio broadcasts to schools. They also briefed inspectors on matters of moment at the time, and increasingly involved the inspectors administratively in matters not usually associated with inspectors' duties. Matters discussed over the years were - skill and promotion marks (1949); individual progression (1949); the Progress Certificate (1950); recruitment of teachers (1953 and 1954); the Royal Visit (1953); furniture and expansion in 1953 when inspectors were invited to submit ideas for new designs in school buildings; standards in primary schools (1953); inservice training of teachers (1954); accommodation in schools (1955); planning of inspectors' work (1955); and the work of inspecting schools (1958).

---

1 All matters discussed here are contained in Agenda papers and minutes of Staff Conferences, held by A.W. Jones.

Rudall as Minister used the staff conference to stress the importance of the inspectors' role as a link between the teachers in the schools and the administrators in head office. He declared that a clear interpretation of departmental policy, discussed at staff conference, to teachers by the inspectors was a great morale builder. Pattinson, who succeeded Rudall, stressed the pace and propriety of communication between inspectors and head office and with the public. Delays and misinformation on policy matters did not produce good relations between the Department and the public. He wanted inspectors involved publicly in their districts, but using great care to avoid statements that might reflect on departmental policy.

The Director and Superintendents gave good use of the staff conferences to the specialists in physical education, visual aids, school libraries, manual crafts, art, vocational guidance, psychological services, testing and pupil record cards, and in schools' broadcasts to display their particular services to the inspectors. The specialists hoped to make the inspectors ambassadors in the schools for their particular services. The Principal of the Teachers College arranged for part of the conference discussion to be held at the Teachers College in order to enhance the cooperation between inspectors, the inservice educators, and the Teachers College lecturers, the pre-service educators.

The staff conference as conceived by Mander-Jones was a pot-pourri of inservice education aimed at influencing the inspectors' role. Mander-Jones could be stubborn and slow to make decisions, but he could never be accused of vindictiveness, as Fenner before him had been accused. He was inherently fair, in fact, too fair. What other explanation could there be for a Director to tell his Superintendents, plagued by shortage of teachers, and inspectors, strenuously conducting teacher recruiting campaigns with meagre success, that if they had a greater proportion of teachers there would, proportionally, be fewer people for other occupations; choice of occupation must be

left to individual decision?[1] At the same conference he urged the inspectors to look after the material welfare of teachers and to be guide, philosopher and friend to the teachers, who, he assured them, looked forward to the inspectors' visits. Nevertheless, two years later, he gave a cold, calculated, mathematical analysis of the inspectors' work which treated them as automatons without a hint of their pastoral or inspirational roles.[2] The only explanation for such a change in emphasis could be that the Public Service Commissioner or the Minister of Education had complained at the expense of inspections or the possible expense of inspectors' expectations of their role.

The continuing concern in education of the Parliament, the Government and the administration of the Education Department from the time of Mander-Jones's appointment to the 1960s was the shortage of teachers. It was inevitable that the role of such important and mobile people in education as the inspectors would not remain unchanged. The Government announced in 1947 that it would endeavour to get 200 women teachers from the United Kingdom.[3] It was not very successful. It also announced that it would ask Parliament to allow employment of women teachers to the age of 65 years.[4] The legislature did approve of the re-employment of retired teacher-superannuants as temporary assistants, and the length of bonded service was reduced to three years.[5]

The Government also declared that it would endeavour to double the numbers in Teachers College.[6] An immediate clash between the Director's ideals and the practical necessity of the situation became apparent. He set ideals of matriculation for

---

1 Minutes of Staff Conference, 3-6 Feb. 1953, p. 3. Held by A.W. Jones.
2 Minutes of Staff Conference, 25-28 Jan. 1955, p. 6. Held by A.W. Jones.
3 S.A.P. Debates, Governor's Speech, 26 June 1947, p. 4.
4 loc. cit.
5 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1948, p. 3.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Governor's Speech, 26 June 1947, p. 4.

all entrants to Teachers College, a three-year course for all, and the gaining of an Associateship in Arts and Education of the University of Adelaide before employment. The members of the Women Teachers Guild to whom he made these suggestions knew that they could not be achieved in a system that had been chronically short of teachers even with the humblest of entrance requirements of the past.[1] Soon after these brave words the inspectors were asked to give publicity to special adult schemes of teacher-training and to advise applicants on them. In country districts they were to conduct special short term school-based training schemes.[2]

In the third term 1949, the Minister of Education, R. Rudall, urged by members of the Women Teachers Guild,[3] arranged for two inspectors, G.R. Gibson and A.W. Jones, to conduct a state-wide recruiting campaign for entrants to Teachers College, for Probationary Students to study Leaving Honours in a high school and for Junior Teachers.[4] On the recommendation of the inspectors, Preliminary Probationary Studentships[5] were made available for study in Leaving Courses in secondary schools and advertised in the campaign of visits to schools and public meetings in 1950. When Pattinson was Minister, he extended the campaigns by having up to three inspectors, including K.E. Barter and A.H. McLay, as leaders of teams of teachers and Teachers College students. This was a new and public role for the inspectors, that was seen by teachers, parents and parliamentarians as providing valuable contributions to the cause of education.[6] The demands for a full-time recruiting officer became less vehement, but were met when Inspector A.W. Jones was appointed Superintendent of Recruiting and Training in late 1959. At that time the standing of inspectors was high.

---

1 Guild Chronicle, vol. 8, no. 16, June 1947, p. 13.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 63, no. 734, Sept. 1947, p. 150.
3 Guild Chronicle, vol. 15, no. 3, Dec. 1949, p. 6.
4 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1950, p. 2.
5 loc. cit.
6 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 2 Dec. 1954, p. 1680.

One Member of Parliament, a former teacher, told the House that inspectors were no longer ogres. Since distinguished people had been appointed, they were greeted with pleasure in the schools.[1] Perhaps Pattinson's plea to the inspectors for better public relations had been heeded.

There were other changes in the nature of the inspectors' tasks brought about by the legislature, the Government and the Education Department administration. The percentage of visits to small one-teacher schools, where the inspectors' visits had been so necessary, but so demanding in time, travel, expense and energy, had changed. For instance, in 1938 there had been 533 Class VII schools, 53 per cent of all primary schools, whereas at the end of 1949, after which primary schools were reclassified, there were only 129 Class VII schools, 19 per cent of all primary schools.[2]

R.J. Heffron, Minister of Education in New South Wales, in 1948, told the Australasian Conference of Inspectors of Schools that his inspectors were ambassadors to the schools from head office, and that the Department used them to get information of every kind.[3] Col. Mander-Jones used his inspectors in similar fashion, though handymen, or even sergeants, might have been a more appropriate term than ambassadors, for the inspectors collected duties as each minor crisis occurred. For instance in 1949, inspectors were authorized to approve expenditure up to £10 on repairs to schools and residences when the Department was swamped with such requests.[4] They also had to report on general living conditions of teachers, for which task the South Australian Institute of Teachers wanted a Welfare Officer.[5] All requests for buildings and furniture from School Committees and

---

1 S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 1 Nov. 1960, p. 1612.
2 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1939, p. 50 and 1951, p. 9.
3 Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia, vol. 12, no. 2, Dec. 1948, p. 5.
4 Education Gazette, vol. 65, no. 751, Feb. 1949, p. 62.
5 S.A.T. Journal, March 1949, pp. 9, 11 and Dec. 1953, p. 33.

Heads of schools had to go to the district inspector for recommendation.[1] The inspector had to inform Heads of schools to purchase Boomerang Books from the Education Department, not from the booksellers.[2] The district inspector had to visit schools seeking not to admit five year-olds because of accommodation problems, and endeavour to find an alternative.[3] Education excursions, popular under the new curriculum, of longer duration than half a day, had to have the district inspector's approval.[4] The list went on - reports on bus routes and acquisition of land for school sites. Some of the administrative tasks for the inspectors were definitely professional. One inspector chaired a committee to write an arithmetic handbook for teachers, but even so also had to supervise the physical production of the book.[5] The inspectors certainly did more than examine, inspect and assess under Mander-Jones.

Unesco found in the early part of this period in the Australian states that these many administrative tasks heaped on the inspectors could interfere with their main task of supervising their schools and helping their teachers.[6] This was the fear that some South Australian teachers had about their inspectors, loaded with administrative activities by their political head, the Minister of Education, and their educational leader, the Director of Education, under the unprecedented growth conditions of the time.

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 72, no. 843, Oct. 1956, p. 273.
2 S.A.T. Journal, Aug. 1955, p. 22.
3 Education Gazette, vol. 66, no. 707, pp. 125, 126.
4 Education Gazette, vol. 63, no. 734, Sept. 1947, p. 156.
5 A.W. Jones(ch.), Arithmetic Handbook for Teachers in Primary Schools, Education Department of South Australia, 1958, p. 5.
6 UNESCO, Compulsory Education in Australia, A Study by the Australian National Co-operating Body for Education, Paris, UNESCO, 1951, p. 79.

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

In this period the inspectors gave considerable attention to analyzing their role and its value to the education system and, indeed, acted on their findings. This activity was further expanded by the participation of the Guild of Inspectors of Schools of South Australia in the A.C.E.R. survey of the inspection of primary schools. These matters under the conditions of the period are examined below.

The inspectors' annual reports indicated that the inspectors thought deeply about their role. Like the teachers who had adapted well to the new curriculum, they saw that their responsibilities were much broader than examination results. They saw the curriculum bestowing freedom to teachers in curriculum-building, planning and selection of methods of instruction, and likewise bestowing more freedom to the inspector to assist and assess.[1] Nevertheless they saw themselves as guardians of standards.

> Loosening the bonds of the old rigid system has without doubt resulted in some relaxation of standards, and the inspector has a very real responsibility in the matter of recognizing and notifying this weakness.[2]

They saw a major difficulty in their role, that of keeping a good watch over standards and at the same time trying to develop an experimental and progressive approach in teachers.[3] The falling off in standards of arithmetic caused the older teachers and the older inspectors considerable apprehension about the scholastic future of bright pupils.[4] The newer inspectors suggested that restricting the choice of curriculum would be in the best interests of children who changed schools during the

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 62, no. 719, June 1946, pp. 127, 128.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 63, no. 732, July 1947, p. 122.
3 loc. cit.
4 ibid., p. 124.

year.[1] Another of the newer inspectors advocated standardization of arithmetic methods in the primary schools.[2] He followed it up by chairing a committee which prepared and published Arithmetic Handbook for Teachers in Primary Schools. In so doing he added to the role of the inspector elements of advocate for policy change and curriculum builder.

This advocacy by inspectors for change in departmental policy showed the freedom that inspectors were given at this time to develop their own role. An article by an inspector in The Education Gazette challenging departmental policy on transfer from primary to secondary schools was sanctioned by the Director and Deputy Director of Education and even encouraged.[3] This article and the policy were debated in The S.A. Teachers' Journal throughout 1951.[4]

South Australia's inspectors were also using their national journal to publish articles, including some papers from their national conferences, that put pressure on themselves and their colleagues not only to change aspects of their role but also to remind them of their fundamental role that must not be changed or removed.[5] This contributor took it for granted that the fundamental purpose of inspections since South Australia had appointed inspectors, that of safe-guarding public expenditure and the general well-being of school children, remained unchanged.[6] This safe-guarding of standards, currently of both

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 64, no. 744, July 1948, p. 132.
2 A.W. Jones, "Standardization of Arithmetic Methods in the Primary School" in The Education Gazette, vol. 70, no. 812, March 1954, pp. 87-91.
3 A.W. Jones, "Transfer from Primary to Secondary School", in The Education Gazette, vol. 67, no. 775, Feb. 1951, pp. 65-67.
4 S.A.T. Journal, April 1951, pp. 10, 11; May 1951 pp. 6-8; Oct. 1951, p. 5.
5 See for example, M.J. Gerlach, "The Inspector's Responsibilities" in The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia, vol. 10, no. 2, Dec. 1946, pp. 69-77. This article was presented on behalf of the South Australian inspectorate.
6 ibid., p. 71.

attitudes and attainments, he considered still to be the inspectors' most serious responsibility, which had increased with the departure from rigidity and uniformity. Inspectors had to assess on a much broader base than previously, when inspectors assessed with amazing confidence that poetry was worth 3.1 out of 5 and discipline 8.2 out of 11.[1] Nevertheless inspectors' school reports and reports on teachers had to be sound in judgment not only because of their effect on individuals' promotion but also because of their importance to the development of the system by having the right person in the right position.

Without a prescriptive course of instruction, and with teachers given freedom of choice, the inspectors had to advise teachers with rare judgment if they were to retain "...the maximum of efficiency, consistent with maximum progressiveness and initiatives",[2] yet at the same time not impose their own fads, interpretations and value systems on teachers.[3] Gerlach's solution to this problem was for the inspectors' to provide opportunities for informal discussions so that inspectors and teachers could know each other better as persons.[4] Gerlach saw the appropriate style of the inspectors' leadership to be that of the human relations school of educational administration, whereas, in question time after his address, a Victorian colleague saw danger in departing from the Weberian principle of impersonal relationships.[5]

The inspectors, too, showed that they were developing their roles as district leaders, inservice educators and communicators of policy to the public by the kind of inservice conferences that they were organizing. For instance, a Combined School of Method and Regional Conference, held at Wudinna in May 1950 for

---

1 ibid., p. 72.
2 ibid., p. 76.
3 ibid., p. 73.
4 ibid., p. 71.
5 ibid., p. 76.

all teachers in the Far West inspectorial district, was residential. This involved the local community in providing board for the week, which meant much parent-teacher interaction. The School of Method provided demonstrations and practical work for the teachers in handicrafts as well as displays of items. In addition to the inspector of manual training such bodies as the Country Women's Association and Junior Red Cross were used, along with the Organizer of School Libraries, the Country Lending Service of the State Library and booksellers. A public meeting was chaired by the local Member of Parliament. The platform was shared by the district inspector, who spoke on "Teaching as a Career", with the president of the men's branch and the president of the women's branch of the S.A.P.S.T.U., who showed and evaluated the film, "Australia at School", and spoke on "Women in Education" respectively.[1] Similar conferences were held in 1951, the jubilee of federation.[2]

It was in this period that the Australian Council for Educational Research began its study of the work of inspectors of schools in Australia.[3] The Guild of Inspectors of Schools of South Australia was invited to answer a questionnaire dealing with the activities of the inspectors.[4] At about the same time one of the Guild's members had returned from the United States of America where he had observed and studied supervision of schools.[5] The inspectors used these two events to take a serious look at their role. From the latter event the Guild members learnt that the American educational supervisors were

---

1 Education Gazette, vol. 66, no. 768, July 1950, p. 148.
2 Education Gazette, vol. 67, no. 781, Aug. 1951, p. 173.
3 D.G. Ball, K.S. Cunningham and W.C. Radford, Supervision and Inspection of Primary Schools, A.C.E.R. Research Series no. 73, Melbourne, A.C.E.R., 1961, p. v.
4 W.C. Radford, A study of Inspection in Australian State Primary Schools, a statement distributed at the Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Association of Institutes of Inspectors of Schools, A.C.E.R., 1956, pp. 2, 3.
5 Education Gazette, vol. 73, no. 852, July 1957, p. 223.

the nearest equivalent to Australian inspectors. The supervisors' status was lower than that of principals and their function was mainly advisory. Although principals had the main role in assessing teachers, some supervisors did assess teachers, not for promotion purposes, but for the teachers' self-improvement, for determining tenure or for retaining employment.[1] The Guild also favoured the appointment of cadet or intern inspectors similar to the appointment of cadet supervisors used for training supervisors in United States of America.[2]

From their efforts towards making a submission to the A.C.E.R. the members of the Guild learnt much about their role and saw ways of making it more effective through training and provision of facilities.[3] They discovered that their role was indeed a multi-faceted one. Although there were common elements in the role of country inspectors of schools, metropolitan inspectors of schools and inspectors of secondary schools, there were also differences. Because the High Schools Branch lacked assistant superintendents, which the Primary Branch had, inspectors of secondary schools had more office administrative duties than other inspectors.

The inspectors in country districts were the focal point for advice to the public and to teachers on all things educational. Consequently they had to develop their role not only as generalists but also as something of specialists in areas such as visual aids, guidance, recruitment of teachers,

---

1 Outline of an address to the Guild of Inspectors of South Australia held by A.W. Jones.

2 A draft letter to the Minister of Education from the Hon. Secretary of the Guild of Inspectors of Schools of South Australia on the training of inspectors included this idea, March 1958.

3 Submissions accepted by the Committee of the Guild of Inspectors from A.W. Jones on Duties of an Inspector of Schools in a Country District, Secondary Inspections and Training of Inspectors contained information on these matters. Held by A.W. Jones.

and the human problems of teachers in relation to such things as board and coping with the parochialism of small communities. Moreover, probably no superior departmental officer had an overall realization of the multifarious work done by the district inspector. Any of the Director, or the Minister through him, the Superintendents, two Assistant Superintendents, the Secretary, the Property Officer, the Transport Officer, the Accountant, the Psychologist and the Vocational Guidance Officer sent requests for reports direct to the district inspector concerning any kind of school in the district. More democratic and participatory control of schools meant meeting more school committees and deputations and holding public meetings on such matters as consolidation of schools, changed bus routes, and plans and sites for new schools. Preparation, both professional and organizational, for Schools of Method and Regional Conferences were very demanding of the inspectors' time.

According to members of the Guild of Inspectors, the inspectors' part in all these activities would have been more effective if clerical help had been available; if a professional course in administration and supervision had been available to the inspectors; if a management course to improve efficiency in routine procedures had been available; and if inspectors had been provided with time for reading and researching.

Although the Education Department of South Australia and the Inspectors' Guild did not respond as elaborately to the requests from the A.C.E.R. as did their counterparts in Western Australia,[1] the inspectors' investigation into their role did help to bring about discussions of it not only by themselves but also by the administration and by teachers.[2]

---

1 D.G. Ball et al., op. cit., pp. v, vi and Appendix I.

2 S.A.T. Journal, April 1959, p. 14 indicated that the S.A. Institute of Teachers had set up a Committee on Inspection. The Director of Education made Inspection of Schools a special item at the Staff Conferences of September 1957 and February 1958.

Pressures for Development of the Role of the Inspectors from Teachers

Teachers, in short supply throughout the whole of the post-war period to 1959, were in a strong position to bring pressure to bear to change their conditions of employment. They had achieved a Teachers Salaries Board on which the S.A.P.S.T.U. and the S.A. Women Teachers' Guild had strong representatives. The Board was also a Teachers' Appeals Board to which a teacher could appeal against recommendations to special positions. This meant virtually that the teachers could appeal against inspectors' assessments. The Education Inquiry Committee had also recommended that skill marks or the inspectors' assessments should not influence annual salary increments, except in the case of unsatisfactory teachers.[1] Thus teachers had considerable freedom from the inspectors' influence and could speak up on the inspectors' role without fear of reprisals. This section of the study examines mainly the pressures from teachers through the S.A.P.S.T.U. and the Women Teachers' Guild and when these bodies combined as the South Australian Institute of Teachers in 1951.

The S.A.P.S.T.U., dominated by male primary teachers eager for promotion to the limited number of promotion positions, kept pressure on the inspectors to change their role. Members of the Women Teachers' Guild, with greater technical, secondary and infant orientation, were restrained in their criticism of the inspectorate. Nevertheless it was the Women Teachers' Guild that pushed the inspectors into a role of recruiting teachers,[2] whereas the Union had been negotiating for a full-time recruiting officer.[3]

The general tenor of reference to the inspectors' role was that teachers wanted visits from inspectors but in an advisory

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 15, 1945, p. 22.
2 Guild Chronicle, vol. 15, no. 3, Dec. 1949, p. 6.
3 S.A.T. Journal, Nov. 1949, p. 5.

capacity. "It is their assessing and their inspecting functions which do so much to nullify their advisory friendliness."[1] This was the message on the inspectors' role whether from the President of the Union, the editor of The S.A. Teachers' Journal, the columnists such as The Diarist, "Bill" and Sagittaria, associations or correspondents. With the advent of a suggestive rather than a prescriptive course of instruction, teachers wanted this advice to be in the form of guidance, suggestion and assistance in developing new ideas, and not the forcing on them of the inspectors' own ideas or fads, which they had the right to challenge in any case.[2] All of the pressures from teachers through The S.A. Teachers' Journal for changes in the inspectors' role were to one end, namely to provide more time in the inspectors' school visits for face to face advisory work. Strangely there was little pressure for greater use of the inspectors' advisory role by means of inservice conferences.[3]

There were protests at the multiplicity of jobs given to the inspectors.[4] Some, but not all, of these tasks were associated with the personal and educational welfare of teachers, and in any case they took time away from their advisory work with teachers. Inspectors' abilities as educators were swamped by the load of administrative duties.[5] Inspectors had become the handymen of the Department investigating complaints as they occurred. No doubt they did this work well, but it took time away from their advisory role.[6] If this administrative role was considered important, the teachers had two solutions: appoint more inspectors[7] or appoint district superintendents to shoulder the administrative load.[8] Then the

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, Aug. 1950, p. 14.
2 S.A.T. Journal, July 1946, p. 17.
3 S.A.T. Journal, Dec. 1960, p. 32.
4 S.A.T. Journal, March 1949, p. 9 and Dec. 1960, p. 13.
5 S.A.T. Journal, Nov. 1955, p. 20.
6 S.A.T. Journal, Feb. 1959, pp. 8, 9.
7 S.A.T. Journal, Aug. 1950, p. 14.
8 S.A.T. Journal, Oct. 1956, p. 3.

inspectors could fulfil their advisory role, develop experimental and remedial work in the schools, direct the work of specialist advisers, mould public opinion in the districts, and advise the Director on district needs and trends, and have time for professional reading.[1]

On inspectors' reports, teachers were somewhat ambivalent. The inspectors, always conscious of the need to report, contributed to the rush at inspections and reduced the time available for advising.[2] Nevertheless, the inspectors' reporting role provided a vital link between teachers and school and head office.[3] A satirical article questioning the value of publishing excerpts from inspectors' annual reports in The Education Gazette went unchallenged.[4] However, when these "...interesting, illuminating and sometimes provocative"[5] reports ceased to be published there were complaints, for it was good for teachers to read of other inspectors' thoughts as well as those of their own inspector.[6]

So the real objections to the handyman role and the reporting role of the inspectors were that they contributed to the hurried nature of inspections and reduced the time available for the valued advisory role. The mere reporting of results in arithmetic and spelling could mean that inspectors neglected the important advisory work of discussing methods and processes used in the tests.[7] The handyman role so overloaded the inspectors that they had no time to compliment teachers and pupils on bookwork and the teachers on well-planned programmes, or to hear the poetry that the children wanted to recite, despite the fact that assessment of the particular teachers was not greatly

---

1 loc. cit.
2 S.A.T. Journal, March 1948, p. 21.
3 loc. cit.
4 S.A.T. Journal, Oct. 1949, p. 10.
5 S.A.T. Journal, Nov. 1960, p. 14.
6 loc. cit.
7 S.A.T. Journal, Feb. 1959, pp. 8, 9.

significant.[1] All wanted the inspector to do less routine work but more advisory work as a fellow worker with the teachers in the schools, making the incidental inspection a planning session.[2] A majority of head teachers of "hub schools", with the responsibility of advising teachers in nearby small schools, in answering a questionnaire considered that inspectors should do this advisory work.[3]

The reports in the Inspector's Register at Norwood School during the period 1946 to 1959 did bear out the teachers' criticisms of the inspection process and to some extent the changes in the inspectors' role that the teachers desired.[4] To keep the reports in perspective it must be kept in mind that Norwood Primary School became a Practising School in 1947 and a Demonstration School in 1960, and Norwood Infant School became a Practising School in 1954. Consequently part of their staffs were specially chosen Demonstration Assistants and the Heads were also special appointments as Master of Method and Mistress of Infant Method.

There was evidence that routine checking of records was carried out and the accounts of the School, the School Committee and the Parents and Friends Association were checked. There was also evidence that the inspections were rushed and even omitted. At the primary school there were no incidental inspections in 1948[5] and 1949 and in 1957 no incidental or ordinary inspection. Lack of time forced the inspectors to miss seeing in 1948 and 1950 the physical education, which had been reduced in 1949 because of a polio epidemic. In 1952 the

---

1 S.A.T. Journal, Aug. 1957, p. 18.
2 S.A.T. Journal, Sept. 1959, p. 8 and Oct. 1956, p. 3.
3 S.A.T. Journal, Nov. 1958, pp. 22, 23.
4 The evidence that follows is taken from the inspection reports between 1946 and 1960 on Norwood Primary, Practising or Demonstration School and on Norwood Infant or Infant Practising School. The Inspector's Registers are held at Norwood School.
5 S.A.T. Journal, Nov. 1948, p. 7. Only 60 per cent of schools had incidental inspections in 1948.

inspector admitted that in the limited time he had available he did not see all classes. Infant and primary inspection reports tended to be short, which would have pleased teachers if the time had been given to help and advice. Ordinary inspection reports were generally long, but helpful. In the case of the primary school they were often typed away from the school.

The reports also indicated a shift from detailed inspection for assessment purposes to a more helpful purpose. Inspiration and encouragement were evident in the warm praise given for anything innovative or novel - pupil lecturettes, a broadcast by the girls' choir, use of models in geography, the use of radio and cinema, individual progression, the use of the splendid library out of school hours, and rules to ensure maximum freedom for all. Arithmetic and spelling tests were still given by the inspectors. Sometimes numerical results were given in the reports, but rarely any comments of an advisory nature. When inspectors did give advice, it was usually given in the form that teachers desired, namely, as a matter for discussion; for example, the matter of a firm base of history and geography for social studies courses. There was little evidence of the old authoritarian style. Nevertheless the advice was still valued. One Master of Method had enclosed in red square brackets all pieces of advice given in the report of the Ordinary Inspection of November 1947.

Conclusion

For the whole of the period, 1946 to 1959, the Education Department of South Australia, like other education departments in Australia and education authorities around the world, was forced to give attention to the business side of the educational enterprize. For staff, accommodation and equipment, the Department had to compete with other businesses, both government and private, from limited supplies. As never before it had to

conduct advertising campaigns for staff and even build its own schools. South Australia's low birth rate in the Great Depression and high birth rate after World War II meant a small pool for recruiting teachers at the time of a large influx of children to the schools. Consequently the inspectors, important and mobile officers of the Department, were drawn into the business side of the operations as administrative handymen and recruiting officers, while retaining in various degrees their roles as examiners, assessors, inspectors and advisers.

The increase in enrolments brought about a new and public role for the inspectors, that of recruiting teachers. The inspectors' main task had been the improvement of teachers after they had been appointed to the classroom. However, in this period, they also had the task of finding the teachers so that they could be trained and appointed. Several inspectors were directly involved as leaders of recruiting teams visiting schools throughout the State seeking young people to enter the teaching service. District inspectors were involved in public meetings when the recruiting teams visited schools in their district and in follow-up work. District inspectors were heavily involved in advertising, interviewing and selecting applicants, for adult short courses of training in Adelaide, and in supervising short courses of training in the schools of their districts. This recruiting work also developed the inspectors' role in other ways. It meant greater contact with the public, closer liaison with Teachers College staff, and involvement in various inservice courses. Moreover, the success of the recruiting campaigns meant more students in Teachers College for whom more practising schools were required. Consequently inspectors had to be on the look-out for suitable applicants for positions as demonstration assistants.

The increase in the number of teachers, though not matching the increase in enrolments, brought retired teachers and women who had resigned to marry back into the schools. They needed

little help from the inspectors except in refresher courses. However, the increased number of poorly qualified, untrained or emergency trained, and unclassified teachers did add tc the inspectors' advisory, assessing, and even penal role as some of these temporary unclassified assistants had to be dismissed or encouraged to resign.[1] On the other hand, the limited supply of teachers demanded that good teachers in the service be kept satisfied and so discouraged from resigning to take up positions in South Australia's increasingly industrialized economy.[2] Hence there was pressure on the inspectors' pastoral care for teachers, their human relations and their advisory role.

The increase in enrolment necessitated the building of more schools and additions to existing schools. On the business side this meant adding to the administrative role of the inspectors in checking the need for the accommodation, in selecting and checking sites, and in displaying plans to school committees for approval or amendments. More schools led to reclassification of primary schools which in turn meant more promotions, more appeals and pressure on the inspectors for careful and accurate assessments and personal reports on teachers.

Consolidation of schools, partly because of the shortage of teachers, meant fewer one-teacher schools, and to that extent less time spent by the inspectors in travel. However, it also meant more area schools, and the inspector involved in a multiplicity of associated problems such as transport, housing, curriculum, organization and staffing.

Increased enrolments, too, had brought increase in the number of head office staff and in the number of advisory teachers and supervisory staff in music, physical education, school libraries, opportunity classes, hard-of-hearing and

---

1 See above, p. 262.
2 loc. cit.

guidance. All of these people needed information, advice and guidance from the district inspectors, the leaders in their districts.

There is no doubt that the inspectors did well the administrative tasks heaped on them in this time of rapid expansion.[1] Most of these administrative tasks did have the potential to help teachers in the long term, for instance, by inspectors recruiting more teachers smaller classes could follow, and by inspecting residences for purchase improved living conditions for teachers could follow. However, time taken by the inspector for these tasks did contribute to the hurried nature of inspections and reduced the time available for advising teachers.

Unesco found that rigid methods of classification and promotion of teachers forced inspectors to devote a disproportionate amount of time and thought to assessing and appraising teachers.[2] Despite this finding, in South Australia, the Education Inquiry Committee, the Government, the Union and the inspectors all saw the promotion scheme as necessary. Regulations to improve it, but not to make it less rigid, by introducing the Teachers Certificate and promotion marks were accepted by all parties. The Parliament had already provided a Teachers Appeals Board in the interests of justice to teachers, which had the effect of putting more pressure on the inspectors to assess more carefully and to report more accurately, as their assessments and reports would be used as evidence at appeals. Thus time was taken away from the inspectors' advisory role which the teachers apparently valued so much.

The inspectors' role in this most unusual period, 1946 to 1959, had certainly moved from Hartley's examine, look-into and

---

1 S.A.P. Paper, no. 44, 1957, p. 11; S.A.P. Debates, Assembly, 2 Dec. 1954, p. 1680; S.A.T. Journal, Oct. 1957, p. 4, provide examples of praise for their efforts.

2 UNESCO, op. cit., pp. 58, 59.

report. The inspectors still did these things, but with less fanaticism in a climate of freedom that would not tolerate the former severity. They still assessed teachers in much the same way as McCoy had introduced, but with a Teachers' Appeals Board to confirm their assessments or to provoke them to great exactitude in assessments and in personal reports. Inspectors were still vital links between the schools and the Department, and a stronger link with the public was forged under ministerial pressure. In this period of great expansion when nothing could stand still, the inspectors were drawn into a multi-faceted administrative role. They were more ubiquitous, more public, seen as leaders and communicators helping the cause of education, and not as forces for preserving the status quo. The bug-bear of insufficient time for advisory work was still present, despite vastly changed conditions. The assessing role and the advisory role still sat uneasily together, but as Unesco discovered, it was "... by no means impossible to be a just assessor and a trusted professional leader",[1] particularly if the inspectorial visit was colleague calling on colleague for the solution of mutual problems.[2] The spirit in which inspectors approached their whole task and the spirit in which teachers received them were the keys to the development of the inspectors' role.[3] In South Australia spirits were high.

---

1 UNESCO, op. cit., p. 81.
2 loc. cit.
3 W.D. Neal, "Educational Supervision" in The Journal of Inspectors of Schools of Australia and New Zealand, vol. 17, no. 1, Dec. 1953, p. 13.