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Abstract

An Oral History of District Inspectors of Primary Schools in Victoria


The aim of this study was to develop an understanding of the roles of, and contributions made by, District Inspectors of Primary Schools in the State of Victoria, Australia. The functions, responsibilities and strategies of the inspectorial system in the State of Victoria were introduced during the Colonial era and from its inception the system remained largely unchanged until 1983 when the office of the Inspector was abolished.

The multiple, conflicting and confused roles of the inspectorial system developed over the century of its existence and the organizational cultures of regions now responsible for the inspectorial system complicated the work of the Inspectors. Thus the question of how effectively the inspectorial system worked and how it served its functions needs to be addressed, particularly how it enhanced the educational standards and teaching profession.

The study sought to develop an oral history of the District Inspectorate of Primary Schools in Victoria in its last quarter-century, by gaining information from as many of the role-holders that were still alive. The research follows the oral history conventions proposed by Leavy (2011) and explores the experiences, beliefs and perceptions of Inspectors about the system, their values, culture and in-service education and their relationships. It does so by answering the main question: What were the recollections and perceptions held by the Inspectors relating to the Primary Schools’ Inspectorial system in Victoria from 1960-1983? To answer this main question more effectively, three research guiding questions were drawn up. These were:

- What functions were carried out by the Inspectors, and how did the Inspectors carry out their officially assigned and self-allocated functions?
- What were their recollections and perceptions around (i) their assessment of the teaching staff academically and (ii) their other duties associated with their roles?
- What were the personal qualities possessed by these Inspectors that created and developed the unique cultures and values within their specific district?
From the collection of data through in-depth, semi structured interviews, and their analysis, the Inspectors’ perceptions and attitudes were detailed through the findings. The findings have been organised around three major themes

1. Inspectorate values
2. Inspectorate culture
3. Inspectorate in-service education

Although the inspectorial system was introduced as a means to oversee the quality of education, facilities and teaching standards, the research in this study reveals that from 1960 to 1983 the Inspectors were responsible for creating the values, culture and in-service education throughout their Districts to pursue improved standards and quality education. These interacting strategies, guided by individual personalities, experience, qualifications and dedication of each District Inspector ensured, sustained and improved the quality of education provided by the schools. However the lack of a clear understanding of the extended roles that the Inspectors had embarked upon contributed to the demise of the inspectorial system.

Furthermore, to explain how Inspector’s diverse backgrounds, qualifications and career challenges contributed to their individual and idiosyncratic performances, three lifetime stories have been documented illustrating the impact that individuals brought to their roles.

The information included and documented in the findings of this research evaluates important knowledge that educationalists could incorporate into future planning. The need for a clear demarcation of their career performances, their responsibilities, functions and strategies is teased out in this study to create an oral history of the perceptions held by these Inspectors so that these ideas will not be lost to future educational theorists when planning for future tangible educational outcomes.
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Chapter 1: Introducing the study

School Inspectors were an integral part of the educational landscape in Australian colonial and state schools from the end of the 19th century to the decade of the 1980s. In the Australian state of Victoria, Inspectors represented the central Department of Education to primary and secondary schools throughout the state, in metropolitan schools and in rural and remote schools from 1851 to 1983. The school Inspector was considered by many in and around schools to be an archetypal figure: nearly always a male; a figure of intellectual and educational authority; as Oliver Goldsmith might have said:

    a man severe he was, and stern to view…
    Yet he was kind, or if severe in aught,
    the love he bore to learning was in fault…(Goldsmith, 1770, in Wilkinson & Wilkinson, 1935, p.220)

On the other hand, to many teachers, Inspectors may have been authoritarian symbols of centralized powers that were there to enforce dictated policy. In 1983 the Inspectorate in Victoria was summarily dismantled, much to the surprise, even shock, of the incumbents, and the institution has never been restored, despite similar institutions still existing in other countries.

In the 1990s, as authors recognized that the original ‘diggers’ of World War I were dying out and that their memories, once lost, would be gone for ever, a plethora of books, oral histories, documentaries and movies appeared. In the same, but much smaller way, the genesis of this study occurred with the realization that the holders of the office of Inspector in the state of Victoria were slowly dying out and that unless the memories of these significant educationalists were recorded, their valuable stories would be lost forever. The idea of recording their stories in the form of oral history, and then interpreting those stories into a meaningful understanding of what the Inspectorate meant, from the perspectives of those who actually held the position, became the aim of this study. One small book (Holloway, 1990) has been written about the Inspectors of Victoria by a former Inspector, but the genre was more of an official institutional history. The purpose here is to develop a history based on the
memories and perspectives of the office holders themselves and to seek to develop a history of the last two decades of the Inspectorate that covers the years from the time that the earliest of the surviving Inspectors first took office in the 60s to the end of the institution in 1983.

Accordingly this thesis has investigated and reported on the recorded memories of a research cohort, members of which were Inspectors of Primary Schools in Victoria, 1960 - 1983. The initial aim was to cover the history of Inspectors of both Primary and Post-primary schools, but it was soon recognized that this was too ambitious and serving a doubtful purpose. Therefore the study focused on the surviving members of the primary schools’ inspectorate, and sought to access the retrospective thoughts of a representative cross-section of Inspectors from among those still alive at the time the project began.

The years 1960 to 1983 were witness to incremental but enormous changes in the role, duties and offices of the District Inspector (DI): the gradual appointment of more youthful Inspectors; the shattering of the teacher-inspired, stereotypic Inspector image; and the final demise of the Inspectorate with the rise of a regional form of administration. In particular the investigation sought to identify how their leadership, knowledge, organizational skills and expertise functioned, and how their interactive strategies influenced those who operated within the system. It culminated with a synthesis of the findings from the empirical research data from the primary source, the research cohort, and the literature which may be considered as a secondary source for the study. The central chapters of the thesis, Chapters 4, 5 and 6, deliver the findings that emerged from the semi-structured interviews forming the principal source of primary data collected in this study.

The Inspectors operated under the directive of a set of guidelines defined by Regulation III, which were augmented from time to time by directives from the Education Department; however the Inspectors functioned as individuals in their own districts, interpreting their duties as unique operators while seeking to achieve common goals. As the study progressed this became one of the common, defining features in the findings and this dualism of conformity and individualism was a theme that became a hall-mark of the inspectorate. The history of the Inspectors parallels the history of schools in Victoria and indeed Australia but the focus remains on the history of the Inspectorate during its final two decades.

The methodology of oral history was selected for the purpose of this study as it sought to record and analyse the retrospective perceived beliefs, attitudes, feelings and
behaviours of Inspectors about the functions and interactive strategies of the inspectorial system and the teaching profession. The dissertation that has resulted from the research reveals the significant underpinning concepts for the experiences, beliefs and perceptions of the Inspectors concerning the inspectorial system. These views have never been officially documented either before or after the system was abolished in April 1983; the experienced voices of the Inspectors were not considered relevant to the process of change.

**Origins of the study**

Leahy (2011) argues that the position of the researcher needs explicating at the beginning of an oral history research study. This position, stated in what Leahy calls the context of discovery, demands a personal approach and to do this appropriately, the use of first person is occasionally appropriate. I was a member of the Victorian Education Department from 1953 to 1998, retiring after a successful career as a teacher, principal and District Liaison Principal. During my forty-five years in the service, the rights of women, the influence of the Teacher Unions and role of politics changed, but the inspectorial system remained relatively unchanged. Inspectors had the power to influence both one’s personal and professional life. My teaching career depended on successive Inspectors’ judgements of my teaching performance and the rules of the bureaucracy. After retirement I worked in the university sector educating trainee teachers, and in schools, training teachers in new curriculum initiatives. Both sets of opportunities led to ongoing reflection on my career posing major questions. The inspectorial system had been ended; educational standards were now constantly being questioned by employers, educators and the community. Had Inspectors, individually or as a system developed me as a teacher? To what extent had a teacher who had experienced the influence of Inspectors, developed their own career through their own professional studies? To what extent had Inspectors contributed to the professional development of teachers, including myself? For over a decade, these thoughts continued to concern me and raised the further question of whether the inspectorial system, now terminated, had positively influenced the Victorian Education Department’s teaching profession. I also became aware that the operation of the inspectorial system had never been explored thoroughly for the opinions of the Inspectors who operated in the system. I concluded that in order to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Inspectors’ impact on the teaching profession, the perceptions of those who worked in the system for the two decades before it was abolished in 1983 should be discovered and recorded. I needed to
uncover and conceptualize the major elements characterizing their role which might be of
relevance in some form in the future; this led me to pursue this study.

**The Research Questions**

The reflections and pondering described above raised the question as to whether the Primary Schools Inspectoral Service (PSIS) operated effectively to enhance the standards of education in Victoria from 1960 to 1983. The inspectorates formed the framework for this complex operation where DIs, although controlled by Regulation III (3), developed their own individual style and techniques to enhance the quality of education throughout the state. As the PSIS was abolished without consultation, I discovered these Inspectors believed their work and contributions to education had been unsung and lost forever. Therefore the principal research question pursued through the empirical phase of this study was:

What were the recollections and perceptions held by the Inspectors relating to the Primary Schools’ Inspectoral system in Victoria from 1960-1983?

O’Donoghue (2007) advocates the use of research guiding questions to enhance the empirical research and to sharpen the data collection and analysis. Thus three research guiding questions were formulated to direct the study towards its aim. These questions were:

What functions were carried out by the Inspectors, and how did the Inspectors carry out their officially assigned and self-allocated functions?

What were their recollections and perceptions around (i) their assessment of the teaching staff academically and (ii) their other duties associated with their roles?

What were the personal qualities possessed by these Inspectors that created and developed the unique cultures and values within their specific district?

The first research guiding question aimed at developing an understanding of the function carried out by the Inspectors; it will include some comparative information of other inspectorial systems. The term ‘functions’ in this context, was simply intended to mean the day-to-day professional activities of the Inspectors. Accordingly, it incorporates not only those activities which are officially assigned to them, but actions they allocate to themselves as they interpret and implement the role. Thus it was important to review also the capacities of the inspectorate to carry out both the official and self-allocated functions.
The second research guiding question was aimed at understanding the perceptions of the Inspectors had about their responsibilities relating to: (a) the assessment of teachers for individual academic standards, the status of their teaching performance, the effectiveness of their pedagogy and the graded assessments of their progress towards taking career opportunities; and (b) other duties – school and its organization, curriculum implementation and development, grounds and buildings maintenance, and accommodation adequacy - were assigned to their role as DI. In this context ‘perceptions’ are taken to be matters that affect or touch someone; they are subjects that occupy a person’s interest, attention or care.

The third research guiding question was aimed at developing an understanding of the personal qualities possessed by the Inspectors who created and developed the unique cultures and values within their specific district.

Following the analysis of the data and the recording of the findings, the matter of further interrogation and discussion of the findings gave rise to an additional three ancillary questions. Answering these formed the basis of the Discussion chapter, Chapter 7. The questions were:

- What did these Inspectors contribute to the good of primary education in Victoria in the two decades that were studied?
- How and why did the system end?
- What was lost in the ending of the Inspectorate?

**Reasons for the study**

This research discovered and developed an understanding of the PSIS in the State of Victoria, and its impact on primary schooling in the state, through recording and interpreting the memories and perceptions of the Inspectors who operated the PSIS in the last decades of its existence. The aim from the outset has been to record the memories of the Inspectors and then to analyse those recordings to produce a faithful oral history of the last two decades of the Inspectorate and to isolate the fundamental concepts on which their inspectorate duties rest. This primary aim has been enhanced by being granted access to further primary sources, such as Inspectors’ personal documents, diaries and reports, and my life-time’s set of teaching assessments granted by Inspectors. These items embellished the retrospective memories of
the research cohort of Inspectors, and ensured the outcomes of this study were generated by people who personally witnessed or participated in the historical events throughout the particular years of interest.

Primary sources provided the ultimate basis for the information included in historical reports reviewed, and in conjunction with other preliminary and secondary sources, allowed the researcher to validate the information by triangulation. Most historical research is documented, initially from the primary sources examined thoroughly through an interpretive framework, and further developed as the historical sources reveal other pertinent evidence. A lucid articulation of the functions of the inspection system during its final era has been developed; it pertains to Victoria from 1960-1983, the years of monumental inspectorial change that presaged the system’s demise. Intuition has it that the results could be equally relevant to the Inspectors’ role in the much earlier past, or to an underpinning of current or future educational administrator’s role no matter what the level. However, this research should illuminate key successes, concerns and issues, and the underpinning Inspector-administrative concepts of those who participated in the inspection system at the various educational levels: the individual Inspectors and the teachers who worked within the perimeters governed by inspectorial boundaries.

Historical research conducted in the chosen way of analysing oral data, stimulated by an interview protocol, from a research cohort of personnel who have witnessed the accelerated developments and changes of the system individually, did provide the researcher with information that cannot be documented from any other source. A study such as this needed to be completed while ageing individuals involved in the process were capable of informing the researcher of specific role accomplishments, concerns and issues which affected all employees of the Education Department, but especially DIs. Findings from the data analysis led to answering the various levels of research questions which underpinned the past administrative role of the Inspector of Schools, and offer guidance to future educational leaders developing programs of support for school leaders and teachers.

**The purpose of the research**

The purpose of this research was to develop an oral history based on the memories and perceptions of District Inspectors (DIs). The intention was to collect primary data from participants who had been DIs and then to develop deeper understandings of their role and the
part they played in the development of primary schooling in the State of Victoria. Together
with personal artefacts and Education Department documents, the memories of these people
would contribute to developing historical knowledge around the period of the inspectorate
before its demise as an institution. This study sought to discover and document, through the
perceptions of the participants, an understanding of the practices of the DIs with a range of
backgrounds, educational experiences and qualifications.

**The significance of the study**

This study has been a personal learning experience, contributing importantly to my
professional development and growth. It assisted me to pursue my interests and give me the
opportunity to learn more about myself, particularly as a researcher (Glesne, 1999). The
experience, respect and professional relationships I gained should allow me to understand
people, organizations and institutions more clearly. Basic to the personal significance of the
study has been the pursuit of answers to the principal research question posed, the three
research guiding questions and the three ancillary questions emerging through analysis of the
oral histories given by a research cohort of Inspectors of this study’s era. This investigation
has isolated the essential building blocks supporting both official and personal influences
Inspectors had on education in the schools, particularly during the second half of the
twentieth century. The stories were from Inspectors who personally witnessed or participated
in the cavalcade of historical events. Furthermore the opportunities for recording such an oral
history were dwindling as these members are ageing and their stories would soon be lost
forever.

As the researcher, I identified twelve diverse primary source Inspectors still living
who agreed to form the research cohort for my research program. I interviewed these
Inspectors who actually administered the roles delegated to them while performing
inspections of schools and staff employed in schools. Evidence was documented from the
Inspectors’ interviews, reports and other documentary evidence they had collected to verify
the issues and concerns encountered by them while undertaking their roles as Inspector. This
evidence supported or questioned any previous documentation by identifying, evaluating, and
synthesizing historical data that would help educators understand the conditions of
assessment in Victorian schools during the period researched through analysis of the past. It
will also help to imagine and judge the likelihood of alternative future scenarios in education.
The significance and innovation of my research on the PSIS in the Victorian Education Department from 1960-1983 was that a primary source can be significant in defining and clarifying historical facts and events that are mostly identified by historians through interpretation of other primary and secondary sources. My findings were a validated, biographical account of the inspection system in Victoria from 1960 – 1983; it provided a sound scaffold for future planning and developing of assessment policies.

The methodologies and methods used in this research

The methodological approach to this study was based on Leavy (2011), an oral historian working within a social science framework. Leavy proposed a model for research design and methodological framing in oral history which was adopted for the purposes of this study. For the researcher, methodology encompasses a holistic or integrated approach to oral history that involves the elaboration of two contexts; these are the context of discovery and the context of justification.

The context of discovery involved questions such as: how did you come to your topic; what made you interested in it; from what standpoint did you approach your topic; what was the nature of your relationship with the participants throughout the process; and how much personal information did you disclose to your participants?

The researcher had been involved in the Victorian Education Department for forty-five years, and after retirement continued to be involved with the training of teachers. Inquiring into their initial training and the in-service education programs being conducted in schools; she believed that areas of the defunct inspectorial system could be profitably investigated. She had known many Inspectors professionally during her career and realized their memories and perceptions were never recorded when the system was abolished; so she wondered if an injustice had been done. Twenty seven years after an event is a long time and the primary source of retired Inspectors was diminishing. The urgency to record this information led to the topic, ‘An Oral History of Inspectors of Primary Schools in Victoria 1960-1983’.

Prior to contacting the research cohort of retired Inspectors who were willing to participate, the approval for this research was given by the Ethics Committee (Appendix 1). Each cohort member was enthused and relieved that their contribution to education would be honoured. Interviews were conducted early and the researcher travelled to facilitate suitable venues for these elderly participants. The principal research question and three research guiding questions (Appendix 7) were established and sent to the research cohort prior to the
interview thereby enabling them to reflect and collect any relevant data that could be analysed. Interviews were recorded, transcripts were typed and used to code and record the findings (Appendix 8).

The second context of justification advocated by Leavy (2011) involved the research purpose, questions, the procedures and discussions, the manner of data collection, analysis and interpretation. The recorded findings were then analysed to establish any emerging themes which could support individual concepts (Appendix 9, 10, 11): three concepts were identified and formed the basis of the structure of the findings. These important underpinning concepts were classified as inspectorate values, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education. These themes and concepts were discussed, explained and identified (see chapters 4 and 5).

The outcomes expected from the research

The PSIS was accepted unquestioningly for many decades. Cultural and political climates changed but the system remained the same until 1983 when all Inspector positions, including that of District Inspectors and their inspectorates, were abolished. The ancillary questions essentially framed the researcher’s evaluation of the data collected and analysed to establish whether the former method of supervision had credible, performance-enhancing characteristics for individuals’ in question, and whether some elements of the system could be worthy of re-introduction into the Victorian and other education systems.

The knowledge gained from this research involving the theory and practice of state primary Inspectors came from detailed accounts of the mandated roles performed and interpreted by the individuals concerned and how the education district structures, established for evaluation and assessment procedures, were modified over time to provide a fair and equitable form of all round, official school supervision. The evidence provided may allow other nascent educational systems to evaluate the credibility of the Victorian process, enabling their leaders to establish from the data available what could be culled to be workable supervisory procedures and what could be modified or remain discarded. In any system there needs to be an evaluation process in place which allows people to be rewarded for their efforts and the educational communities assured that the value of education in their schools is maintained and continually improved.
This study established criteria from interviews and analysis of documents that would eliminate any weaknesses evident in the system and provide the critical evidence needed to develop a sustainable evaluation system that would be fair and equitable to all parties involved. Historical evidence researched for this project shows that political and cultural changes do affect the thinking behind any decision making; and the critical evidence derived from the data collected may establish research-based, flexible criteria for the future development of any assessment program to be employed in any school system.

The researcher’s personal and document-supported findings also provide valuable data for future teacher assessment innovations. Additionally, this could be the last opportunity to gain a real in-depth understanding of what these Inspectors believed to be their role with its various individual interpretations. Such evidence is important because: (a) inspections have been underplayed historically; (b) Inspectors during the period of more intense change 1960-1983, believed their positive affects in the educational firmament were unsung and (c) there may be a possibility of the return of some form of performance-supervision of schools and teachers.

Inspectors had been functioning in the Education Department system for over a century before the political decision in Victoria in 1983 to abolish the role without consultation with operational personnel. Almost three decades later questions are still being asked about the effectiveness of the present, seemingly laissez-faire system; several sources have flagged a return to a variant of the inspectorate system with the former role of Inspectors being a model for quality control and accountability. Such a model could be a future alternative to ‘league tables’ and quantitative measures of school performance through the standardized tests which typify the present, thereby contributing to future thinking.

This study identified how these past Inspectors’ strategies enhanced children’s education, and principals’ and teachers’ performances: by (a) investigating how they operated within the primary schools inspectorial system in Victoria; (b) investigating the issues, including strengths, weaknesses and difficulties as experienced and perceived by them; (c) investigating how they introduced, developed and performed professional in-service education for teachers within their districts; (d) identifying the linkages between their strategies and improved performance by teachers; (e) using these linkages to identify the strengths, weaknesses and difficulties perceived by them to analyse the appropriateness of
their actions; and (f) using the findings to develop a framework of ideas for future planning of quality assurance, assessment and educational standards.

This study will contribute knowledge to the current literature on inspectorial systems and supervisory practices throughout the world.

This chapter has introduced the main reason for and significance of the study, namely to investigate the recollections and perceptions held by the Inspectors concerning the PSIS in Victoria from 1960-1983 as to whether their role contributed to the enhancement or disengagement of the principals and teachers of the Education Department; to identify the Inspectors’ influences on any conceptual outcomes found from the analysis of this study’s data as they integrated the tasks applicable to their roles with the operations of the schools in their districts; and to document the distinct differences in the manner these tasks were interpreted and performed by each Inspector. The inspectorial system and the role of Inspectors reveal three conceptual outcomes, the result of data analysis from this study. These are fully discussed and exemplified, namely: inspectorate values; inspectorate culture; and inspectorate in-service education. The concept of educational leadership, increasingly evident and exercised, became an important ingredient in the fulfilment of the DI role; it was distinguished as being of a higher order than basic educational administration. The term ‘professionalism’, to the forefront in educational discourse at the time studied, was explicated in this investigation’s context before reflections on the demise of the inspectorial system were made, including an historical perspective. Three tasks complete the chapter: (a) summarizing the research findings, (b) answering the principal research and research guiding questions posed at the outset, and the three ancillary questions that emerged; and (c) making recommendations which highlight the implications and future planning for the assessment and evaluation of education.

Structure of the thesis

This chapter has introduced the study by outlining the origin, reasons and methodology behind the empirical research. Chapter 2 is an overview of relevant literature that informs the study. The literature is in large part contextual; the first section gives an historical background to the state system in Victoria before a similar background to the Inspectorial system in the state. There follows an overview of inspectorial system still in place in western educational jurisdictions elsewhere in the world.
The third chapter outlines the research design around the methodology proposed by Leahy (2011). Leahy’s design model was not part of the original design, but when discovered succinctly outlined the process that had been largely in place since the outset of the study.

Chapters 4 and 5 detail the findings that emerged from the analysis of the data and the findings are organised into three principal sections, reflecting the three major themes that emerged. In Chapter 4, following an introductory section on the Inspectors themselves, the main section is concerned with Inspectorate values. In Chapter 5 the two main themes that form the two sections are Inspectorate culture and Inspectorate in-service education.

Chapter 6 outlines the careers of three of the participants. This chapter was the result of one of the major themes to emerge from the analysis, that of the dualism between the prescribed roles of the inspector on the one hand and the highly individualised contribution that each inspector made to the role. It records the unique contributions of three of the Inspectors whose interviews provided particular colour to the inspectorial process and who exemplified this unique approach in contrasting ways. Illustrated are the diversity of personalities; the different academic qualifications; the breadth of expertise; and the variety of experiences which characterize these Inspectors. Each contributed in particular ways to the total impact made by the inspectorial system on education throughout Victoria.

In Chapter 7 the findings from the empirical research are discussed. This discussion revolved around three questions that had crystallised during the writing up of the findings, discussion around these questions developing the structure of this chapter. The dissertation concludes with Chapter 8 where the study is brought to an end by considering what the study had generated, and a consideration of its limitations and future direction for further research.
Chapter 2: Literature review

Introduction

This chapter focuses essentially on literature pertaining to the three research guiding questions which relate to: the historical background to the primary schools inspection system in Victoria prior to the period of the research from the mid-1800s to 1960; developing an understanding of the assigned regulatory and self-allocated functions as interpreted by Inspectors of Schools, including brief comparative information about inspectorial systems elsewhere; and gaining insights into the manner in which the Inspectors perceived and interpreted the changing prescriptions for their current role, given that the organization, structure and locus of control within the Education Department were changing in the era of the study.

The purpose of this study was, in part, to establish the historical context for the empirical research concerned with the interwoven activities of Inspector, schools and communities during the period 1960 – 1983, and to introduce some of the theoretical concepts that underpin, or explain, the findings emerging from the oral histories of a research cohort of primary schools’ Inspectors operating during the time of the research. Within this section, theories and models of organizational structure and culture, significant in maintaining and developing aspects of the inspectorial system, are reviewed. These include the related educational institutions, for example, primary schools, and how the educational bureaucracy influenced and controlled its inspectorial systems. It specifically elaborates on the literature around inspections, leadership, quality assurance, professional development and the interactive strategies required for such a system to operate effectively in influencing and enhancing teacher performance and pupil education. Culture which has been discussed prominently as it relates to various organizations can be particularized as educational culture, the dimensions of which are changed, strengthened and enriched at the district level by the Inspector, principals and teachers. The dimensions of what might be an inspectorate culture are also explored for a better understanding of this concept. The review further examines and identifies the relationships between inspectorial interactive strategies and the dimensions of school and teacher performance and pedagogies they espouse. The key ideas from the
inspectorial system and the review of literature are then integrated to develop an initial theoretical framework for the study.

In outlining the historical backgrounds of Inspectors elsewhere - in Australia, England and Wales, United States of America and New Zealand - this literature review is organized to draw comparisons and important links between the different systems. This encompasses a review concerned specifically with historical research that attempts to recapture systematically the complex nuances of educational administration by Inspectors, the contemporary schools’ population, the meanings Inspectors prescribe for the current educational condition, relevant particular extant social events, and emerging ideas of the past that have begun to influence and shape the present in the matter of school inspectorial systems, particularly in Victoria between the years 1960 – 1983. As the Victorian PSIS is the main focus of this thesis it is important that its evolution from its colonial heritage to the time being researched should be told.

**Background to schooling in Victoria to 1960**

The period of time this research encapsulates has its roots firmly entrenched in the system inherited from the United Kingdom; therefore it is of particular relevance that the historical background of the inspectorial system in Victoria be detailed to include an historical overview of the system of schooling that developed after the British settlement. The Victorian schooling system had its simple beginnings when in 1788 Captain Arthur Phillip disembarked British convicts and free settler migrants, including 36 children, at Sydney Cove. No documented provision for the welfare or education for minors was made until 1809 when the War Office was persuaded to appoint regimental schoolmasters; by 1833 the Colonial Office was prepared to sanction an experiment for the convicts’ children in Van Diemen’s Land. The early governors of New South Wales (NSW) realized that the future of the colony had to be built upon succeeding generations. By 1851 the severance of the district below the Murray River had become the proud and turbulent colony of Victoria; however events in NSW would still impact on the school system of Victoria.

Five main themes emerged from the analysis on the sources on the planning of schooling in Victoria after 1851. First education was to be compulsory (primary), secular and free. Second there was recognition that the quality of teachers was poor and had to be improved. Thirdly, ‘accountability’ in all its senses was important. Fourthly, value for money
was necessary, and fifthly the control of schools and curriculum had to be centralized. The last three themes gave rise to the future role of Inspectors (Austin, 1965). The five themes are embedded and the birth of the inspectorate is described in the narrative that follows.

In 1851 a Victorian scholar, J.S. Gregory (in Austin, 1965) outlined the history of the disputes between church and State in the early decades of the self-governing colonies. Gregory claimed that the move to secularism had begun in the Education Acts of the 1860s and became explicable in the Acts of 1870s and 1980s that ensured a state education system that was compulsory, secular and free. These disputes are only explicable, if the final, secular decision of the 1870s and 1880s was kept in mind; this he claimed, was the direction in which society was moving. The Education Acts of the 1860s were as secular as possible considering the declining, but still powerful, denominationalism.

In NSW between 1851 and 1866 there was a continuous battle of conflicting beliefs between the Churches who wanted to retain their traditional control of education and the liberal politicians who wanted more secular, educational measures. Two of the main protagonists, William Wilkins and Henry Parkes, worked tirelessly on the prolonged campaign to demonstrate to the public and the Parliament that only in a unified, State system of education would be a solution to the colony’s educational problems be found (Austin, 1965).

In the narrative which follows the focus is on NSW, but the outcomes impacted directly on schooling in Victoria. Austin (1965) relates that Wilkins arrived in Victoria to take up his position of headmaster of the National Model School in 1851. He became Inspector and Superintendent in 1854, Chief Inspector in 1860 and Secretary in 1864 in a system administered by an honorary board, the Chief Executive Officer having the future of the schools in his hands. Wilkins used this power to demonstrate the superiority of the National schools, and their right to be regarded as the foundation of a state system. In his campaign Wilkins had three lines of action. The first was to create efficiency within the schools; he organized and standardized every teaching procedure – methods of instruction, methods of inspection, classification of teachers, and classification of pupils and dispensing with the teacher’s individual judgement. Secondly in 1857 because of the problems with funding he persuaded the commissioners to sanction “non-vested” schools to avoid the denominational schools being driven out of existence, freeing money from charitable organizations or estates to be used for other educational institutions; this type of school was common under the National system in Ireland and Victoria and allowed the Board to double the number of
schools under its control in a few years. Wilkins’ third line of attack was for the Commissioners to personally visit funded schools to examine scholars and report on the state of education and the schools. In this action, the beginning of the inspectorial system can be seen. In NSW the condition of all schools was deplorable because the head teachers were wasting public funds. The Commissioners’ report made clear the urgency for educational reform and by 1855 the Wesleyans and the Anglicans agreed:

Much as we prefer schools of a denominational character, yet considering the scattered condition of the rural population and other practical difficulties in the way of the Denominational System, we feel it to be our duty to assist, to the utmost of our power, any system of Education which may be established by Colonial Legislatures. (Austin, 1965, p. 119)

In this statement is found the genesis of the protestant churches supporting a secular state education system in the colonies.

In 1866 Parkes, as a member of the colonial government, brought down his Public Schools Bill, revealing the fundamental nature of the changes he intended to make. These changes included the two existing Boards to be replaced by a Council of Education; denominational schools assisted, state funds were to remain, but only if they substantiated enrolments and placed themselves, under the new Council of Education, subjected themselves to inspection, gave four hours of secular instruction each day and accepted children of other denominations. In Colonial Parliament the vote was passed; 40 for and 5 against.

The National Board (1851-62) worked under difficulties created by the separation of Victoria from NSW, further complicated by the discovery of gold. The population explosion was unpredicted and the migratory situation caused the Board to be overworked. At the same time the situation that could not be resolved was the conflict between the church and the State, where rival claims between denominationalism and secularism about the nature of the educational system were foremost. It became obvious that the Churches saw only their schools as suitable and endeavoured to close the National schools by starving them of funding. In 1849 when George Rusden, a one-time agent of the National Board in NSW, was appointed by La Trobe to the Board in Victoria his colleagues soon learnt to respect his ability and zeal. It was Rusden who for ten years kept the National schools in existence. Despite restrictions and prohibitions, the number of National schools reached 181. A system of training and classification was established, a limited contribution was made to the problem
of education on the goldfields, the Board’s first Inspector was appointed and the beginning of a good inspectorate was established. The Master of Ceremonies, a clergyman who supported the National system, unveiled the foundation stone of the National School at Castlemaine before a crowd of a thousand people. As society was changing, politicians were no longer calling on the Churches to save the State and by 1857 it was possible for Archibald Michie to introduce the unsuccessful Bill to abolish State aid to religion. By 1862 there were two distinct parties: those who excluded clergy and religion from schools; and those who believed that a State system of education could be built on a “common Christianity”. A Bill to legislate for this was introduced into the Victorian Parliament by Richard Heales in 1862 and after much debate it became law on the last day of the session, known as the Common Schools Act.

Thomas Arnold’s acceptance of Governor Denison’s offer to operate in the role of Inspector of Schools formed the beginning of the inspectorial system of education that survived in Victoria until 1983. In the decade after the 1862 Act, free and compulsory education met with controversy from all social classes, truant officers finding their roles almost impossible to carry out. Ragged schools were established so that the poorer children would not impair the tone of the regular schools but secular education remained under the Common Schools Act of 1862. By 1872, however, the demands for further reform were growing and these priorities for education were documented in the new Education Act of 1872. The Act contained no reference to religious education, but had empowered the Boards of Advice “to recommend what use shall be made of school buildings after the children were dismissed”. Religious classes were conducted but the teachers were to have no participation. In 1876 the Irish readers were replaced by the Nelson readers that did not contain religious teachings. However, it was not until 1899 that the Legislative Assembly agreed to a cautious resolution: that the question of religious instruction should be referred to a direct vote of the people. The appointed Commission produced an “agreed syllabus”, but on religious grounds the Roman Catholic Church could not agree, so the Religious Instruction Education Acts remained unaltered at the close of the century.

The reforms mentioned so far affected primary schools, but underlying every weakness in the Colony’s public education was the failure to create a state system of secondary education this starved universities of talent, failed to provide technical education and affected primary education through the lack of suitable teachers.
The Education Department had taken over from the Boards of Education a system of teacher training containing three elements – the Model School based on the factory system, the pupil-teacher school and the Normal School. Young pupils were apprenticed to Head Masters for a period of five years, examined by an Inspector and paid a pittance to do an assistant’s work. Frank Tate, the Director of Education in Victoria in the early 20th century who stated his view on, “the evils of our wretched pupil-teacher system”, was regarded as a heretic, but the orthodox view was in favour. Occasionally an Inspector or Headmaster would admit that pupil-teachers were overworked, but the principle of putting immature, ill-educated, untrained adolescents in charge of children was vehemently supported throughout the nineteenth century. In Victoria these pupil-teachers made up 33% of all teachers as late as 1902.

Sir James Palmer and his colleagues on the Victorian Board of Education in 1875 introduced a system of ‘payment by results’ to Victorian schools, where teachers’ livelihood depended on the success of the three R’s. This system remained in place during the last quarter of the 19th century. The Inspectors during the period being researched sought to achieve high standards across the profession that was being paid equally. Grants to schools had become astronomical but ignoring the serious criticism from English educational circles, virtues that had never been contemplated for, “It induces regular attendance”, Palmer told the Higinbotham Royal Commission. Further he claimed,

It stimulates the teacher, it promotes organization, it ensures uniform progress unto the pupil and by an equitable distribution of this payment amongst the teachers, and by making this payment dependent on their exertions it enlists them all heartily in the service. This theory formed the basis of the inspectorial system for almost a century. (Austin, 1965, p. 248)

At the close of the nineteenth century Beatrice Webb the co-founder of the London School of Economics and a notable educational critic wrote in her diary, ‘The State Education here is in a deplorable state and remains where it was 20 years ago’ (Austin, 1965, p. 262). David Symes through the ‘Age’ was believed to have influenced Victorian politics on educational issues. He advocated that technical education was an important addition to the system and by the 1890s introduced the ideas of a kindergarten education. Sir Frederick Clarke was the first educationalist with a strong sociological orientation. He found expression in an important address, ‘The New Countries in Education’ given at a conference in South
Africa in 1934, where he identified some major characteristics of pioneering societies which were important to education. Positive characteristics included confidence, planning and financial generosity; negative characteristics included a dislike of intellectual discipline, distinction and a suspicion of excellence. This analysis was very pertinent to Australian education before the 1950s. Sociological theories were tested in the United States and Europe creating established models to which Australia referred.

In 1950 the Education Act had been amended to allow representatives of religious bodies to give instruction in state schools; previously most religious education was conducted in the denominational schools throughout Victoria. By the 1960s the antagonism between Catholics and Protestants was fading due to the moderation fostered by continuing prosperity and social-economic expansion.

The research cohort of retired District Inspectors interviewed for this thesis were on duty as teachers in Education Department schools when these changes were occurring, some saying that Inspectors whom they had encountered throughout the early stages of their careers had created positive and negative visions of the role that were part of the scaffold for their future careers as DIs.

**Background to school Inspectors in Victoria 1851-1960**

The purpose of this section is to focus on the institution of the inspectorate in Victoria and the roles that had emerged from its history in the 20th century. Holloway (1995), provided a narrative of this early history, recording that the governments of New South Wales in 1848 and Victoria in 1851 established central authorities to be responsible for the education regulated through their respective systems. The first two of these authorities were a Denominational Board and a Board of National Education established in Sydney in 1848, and a Denominational Board in Melbourne for the church school serving the Port Phillip District. In 1851 the new Victorian government established its own Board of National Education and took over from New South Wales the responsibility for the schools whose control was now vested in the new state. This Board operated alongside, and as it eventuated, in competition with Victoria’s own Denominational Schools Board. In 1862 in an attempt to overcome the rivalries of the several Church authorities regarding school provision, both Boards were replaced by the Common Schools Board. The Common Schools Board, however, was not
successful in overcoming sectarian rivalries, and it in turn was replaced in 1873 by the Education Department.

Each of the Boards had a chairman, and serving each Board was a secretary. The latter was its permanent head, its executive officer, and in effect, the controller of the system. After 1872, the secretary of the new Education Department was directly responsible to the Minister of Public Instruction as the executive officer until in 1902 the government appointed a Director of Public Instruction as head of the Education Department. That title was re-designated Director of Education in 1910, and then Director-General of Education in 1967.

For all those authorities, the responsibilities and tasks were the same; to provide and regulate a school system in the interests not only of the state, but the children, the teachers, the parents and the local communities. Even the details were much the same for the various authorities: to establish new schools and rationalize the location of schools and of new buildings; to close superseded schools; to supervise the operation of schools; to train teachers for schools; to employ a teaching force; to staff the schools; to provide for the continuing education of teachers and through it better learning in the children; to promote an equality of school provision throughout the state, and to promote education itself through the work of the schools.

Victorian society did not favour the higher education of women, so for over sixty years all Inspectors were men. However in 1914 Julia Flynn attained the eminent position of an Inspector, but notwithstanding this achievement, in the 20th century women were still reluctant to apply for the Inspectors’ positions. Most appointments to the inspectorates were made from among teachers, heads or deputy heads of schools, with a small number from lecturers in training colleges. In the latter part of the 20th century, however, specialists from industry were appointed directly to the inspectorate.

A significant number of Inspectors appointed in the first half of the century were from British universities, aged in their twenties and were the only persons qualified to be Inspectors. Inspectors often continued their studies after their appointments because qualifications the only requisites for early appointments. Later personal aspects were added to the other requirements: a stimulating personality, suitability for the work, organizing ability and sound judgement. Social background was never a criterion for appointment. Some candidates had worked under difficult circumstances such as lack of electricity, correspondence courses and evening classes that continued until the 1960s. By then many
teachers were studying University subjects in their own time, therefore under the new liberalized system some who were competitive applied for and were selected for the award of a nominated course comprising part-time teaching with study leave on full pay.

From 1862, when the Common Schools Board became the regulating authority for school education, appointments were made after representation by the Board, and in some later cases, by the Director, by Order in Council, and they continued to be made chiefly in that manner until the Teachers Tribunal, an independent statutory authority, began issuing its Certificates of Appointment from 1946.

There have been some 440 Inspectors in the service of the Boards of Education and the Education Department in the 132 years of the inspectorate’s existence. Seven organizing Inspectors and 260 District Inspectors have been appointed since 1851; about 110 secondary school Inspectors have been appointed from 1915; and 60 technical school Inspectors have been appointed since 1922. The first 120 Inspectors appointed were responsible to the Inspector-General and his successor, the Chief Inspector.

Inspectors worked for the whole system, examining and reporting on all schools under the state’s control: elementary, higher elementary, continuation, secondary, high technical, junior technical, as well as all schools registered with the state – the grammar schools and colleges of the various churches and private organizations. In 1911 a Chief Inspector of Technical Schools was appointed followed by a Chief Inspector of Secondary Schools in 1914.

There was a tradition of continuity and service within the inspectorate from 1851 to 1983 that survived the changes in control of the school system: some Inspectors of the two Boards of the 1850s served the Common Schools Board of the 1860s; and some from all three Boards went on to serve the Education Department in the 1870s and 1880s. District Inspectors who supervised schools of all kinds and all levels were the first Inspectors of high and technical schools but after 1925, since their work was chiefly with the primary schools, they continued to be members ex officio of Secondary Boards of Inspections and overseeing and assisting the post primary schools in various roles until 1983.
School Inspectors in other jurisdictions

The school inspectorial system has been part of the western formal education system since the 19th century, having been developed because earlier systems had no formal supervisory processes. In this system, designated personnel simply used their experiences or models based on Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of England and Wales (HMI) system (Learmonth, 2000; MacBeath, 2006; De Grauwe, 2007). After the British colonized the ‘new’ world in the late 18th century, including Australia, they brought with them the phenomenon of inspection, organizationally resulting in inspectorial systems functioning in each country. Many detailed accounts of how school inspectorial practices were carried out by Inspectors since 1862 in Victoria, Australia are available (Ball, et al. 1961; Holloway, 1995; MacNab, 2004; DeGrauwe, 2007). In Victoria the main purpose of the inspectorial system in the past was to ensure that schools complied with the appropriate regulations. The inspectorial system of monitoring regulations in factories was later adopted to improve the quality and accountability of schooling offered, and to raise the educational standards achieved by the pupils. It was a form of quality assurance carried out by an agency external to the school (Woods & Orlik, 1994). This fundamental purpose of the inspectorial system remained until its demise in 1983 despite modernizing and making changes to the details of its basic functions (Learmonth, 2000; MacBeath, 2006; De Grauwe, 2007).

The current practices in other developing countries reveal many similarities, including checking teaching documents, observing teachers’ lessons, inspecting school resources and monitoring the prescribed curriculum requirements. This legacy has remained part of the development of educational systems in many countries, some of which have been included above. The above authors, to whom is added Gurr (2003), confirm that in Australia, Netherlands and Singapore the inspectorial systems have been replaced by different and more comprehensive quality assurance systems consisting of specifications for teacher standards and enhanced roles for the school leaders. In other words, the original inspectorial model of quality assurance applied by specially designated personnel has been replaced by alternative processes. Earley, Fidler and Ouston, (1996) and Learmonth, (2000) have supported such changes and developments by incorporating new theories and models of school organization, leadership and management at the institutional level to support the ‘new inspectorial systems’. These changes have also allowed the details subsumed under the organizational cultures of educational systems, including schools and classrooms as sub-cultures, to change and adapt to societal and professional norms accordingly (Chapman, 2001; MacNab, 2004).
In England and Wales the HMI system, the original model for Victoria, has undergone major changes with the introduction of the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) in the late 1990s. Importantly OFSTED has not eliminated Inspectors although the original model has experienced changes to their approach and operational methods. The OFSTED style of external inspection facilitates inspectorial functions by reporting on four main areas (Dwyer, 1988; Fidler & Ouston, 1996; Webb & Vulliamy, 1998):

- the educational standards achieved in the school;
- the quality of education provided by the school;
- the efficient management of resources available to the school; and
- the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of students at the school.

The changes in the inspectorial system from HMI to OFSTED (MacBeath, 2006) in England and Wales were consistent with strategies introduced into the school system including school development and strategic planning for school improvement. In England, the school effectiveness/school improvement movement became an important issue. Reynolds and Cuttance (1992) stressed the ability of schools to ‘make a difference’. Much of the school improvement literature focuses on the ways of improving standards in schools, particularly working class schools (Ribbins & Burridge, 1994; Gray & Wilcox, 1995). England encouraged researchers interested in school effectiveness/school improvement to reflect the dominance under Thatcherism of relatively uncritical, practitioner-oriented research and teaching – what Moore (1996) called ‘sociology of education’. Although this research is heavily supported there are many critics (Ball, 1988; Lauder & Khan, 1988; Angus, 1993; Hatcher, 1996; Tomlinson, 1997; Thrupp, 1999). The school effectiveness/school improvement research agenda ignored the broader sociological problem of the relationship between social class background and school achievement. OFSTED researchers took its school inspection methods seriously documenting in the 1995 version of the handbook:

…key performance data about the school from earlier years to enable trends to be identified, information about the social and economic characteristics of the area in which the school is situated; and comparative data to help Inspectors to set the school data in a national context. (Office for Standards in Education, 1995b, p.20)
Gray (1997) and Fitz-Gibbon & Stephenson (1996), leading British researchers, raised issues about the methodological operations of OFSTED, both being involved in the development of the Office for Standards in Inspection (OFSTIN), and a committee set up to monitor OFSTED. OFSTIN reports have raised concerns that OFSTED methods might unfairly discriminate against low-socioeconomic schools (Boothroyd, et al. 1997).

Lately, further developments have incorporated school self-evaluation processes whereby schools and stakeholders participate in the inspection process. These developments emphasize self-evaluation, review, audit, self-assessment and self-inspection implemented by the school and the designated Inspectors or personnel to improve academic standards and the quality of education, while at the same time involving all stakeholders in the life of the schools (MacBeath, 2006). Currently, change has occurred with the appointment of a former principal, Sir Michael Wilshaw, principal of Mossbourne Academy, as Chief Inspector in 2012. This is an appointment from the ranks of the education system and not from the political aspirants.

New Zealand, in parallel with England and Wales, has approached school accountability, particularly school inspection similarly. England’s OFSTED and New Zealand’s Education Review Office (ERO) bear close resemblance, their policies and practices have clearly informed each other. Aitken (1996) has spoken about the position of the ERO within the neoliberal economy, where its documents reflect the ideology of economic rationalism (Codd, 1994). The ERO carries out ‘assurance audits’ to check compliance with regulations and ‘effective reviews’ to indicate teacher and school performance (Office for Standards in Education, 1995a). For effective reviews the ERO asks schools to prepare an ‘achievement statement’ which is taken into account when assessing school performance. The idea of schools contributing to assessment of student achievement has been questioned by researchers who have examined issues of school performance, tending to stress the structural limits of schooling (Lauder & Hughes, 1990; Nash, 1993; Thrupp, 1997). In New Zealand, the pervasiveness of an uncritical view of the importance of teachers and teacher expectations on student performance also suggests the need for counter-hegemonic forms of teacher education. This is because, unless teachers are given more critical perspectives on school processes, they are unlikely to resist ‘common sense’ understandings, even where they are unfair. Twelve years of educational reforms in New Zealand have resulted in the improvement of strategies in the inspectorial system. The changes have introduced a means of assurance through audits and effective reviews that
measure academic performance, and accountability reviews that judge whether schools are satisfying their chartered objectives (Kenen, 2000; Smith, 2000; MacNab, 2004).

In the United States of America development in education has resulted in a system-inspection approach where the Officer of Inspector General (OIG) assists and responds to educational issues and concerns at a national level including improving financial management, improving the management of information technology and improving performance measures, among other responsibilities (US Department of Education, 2001; US Department of Education, 2002). The OIG reports directly to Congress on mandated educational responsibilities. This advanced development is necessary because of the strong school-based systems of management now extant, including school-based curriculum, professional development and supervision, and strong institutional leadership.

In Queensland, Australia, Dwyer (1988) reviewed the inspectorial system of the Department of Education in that State. This resulted in the replacement of the Queensland school Inspection system with a system of ‘performance measures and performance indicators’. Heads of schools were empowered to plan and develop strategies collaboratively to monitor, appraise, evaluate and report on school and teacher performances through the Office of School Performance (Queensland Government, 2004). Other states in Australia have their own ‘inspectorial systems’, their main focus on accountability being through school self-review systems whereby student achievement and school effectiveness are the main agenda items reported to the State and Federal Governments, and to the school community for information and follow-up (Gurr, 2007).

Such changes to the inspectorial systems experienced in many countries have, it has been argued, led to improvements and developments in school organization, leadership and management with resulting new approaches to supervision, professional development and quality assurance. These changes have also embraced new monitoring, appraisal, evaluation and assessment practices in schools that allow for school cultures to evolve and adapt to the technological, social, economic and political environments of the times (Dwyer, 1988; Early, et al. 1996; Chapman, 2001; MacNab, 2004; De Grauwe, 2007).
The inspectorial system: an external supervisory system and its implications

The Department of Education in Victoria was not immune from this widespread development in educational administration and especially the effect on its unique inspectorial system. From the denominationally organized schools of the early 19th century, direct governmental involvement in the education of children began in 1872. The school inspectorial system in Victoria and elsewhere was regarded as an external process of assessment of the school system, its functions, strategies and processes including quality assurance, teacher appraisal, teacher development and school improvement. MacNab (2004) and De Grauwe (2007) argued that these functions, strategies and processes were to assist schools to improve academic standards and the quality of education, and to ensure there was accountability. Learmonth (2000) averred that school personnel be required to justify the academic standards and quality of education they provide to the students according to the resources available. However, while there are indications of positive impacts of such inspection processes on school planning, management, improvement and development to ensure the academic standards and the quality of education are sustained or enhanced, problems have also been experienced (Wilcox & Gray, 1996; Earley, et al.1996).

The complex, conflicting and dominant roles of inspectors (Ball, et al.1961; Dwyer, 1988; MacNab; 2004), the methodology, validity and processes of inspection including inconsistencies of reporting ( Wilcox & Gray, 1996; Watson, 2001), the demeaning effects of the inspection processes on teachers and inspectors (England, 1973; Learmonth, 2000), and the ‘no lasting impact’ on what teachers do in the classroom (Watson, 2001; DeGrauwe, 2007) are some of the problematic effects of the inspectorial processes on the teaching profession.

Such evidence has promoted the need to empower school staff so that they and their principal are more responsible for the academic standards and the quality of education at the school level. These have been major contributing factors for changes and developments to the inspectorial systems.

The question now becomes: how do inspectorial systems influence teachers’ professionalism (MacNab, 2004)? It is argued that if tangible outcomes of school systems have to be achieved through the inspectorial systems then it has to be the teachers who make the difference. Although recent studies have considered teachers’ perceptions of inspectorial systems undergoing many changes (Chapman, 2002; De Grauwe, 2007) including the impact
of inspection on classroom supervision (Chapman, 2001), and generally on the school (De Grauwe, 2007), there has been less consideration given to and evidence of the influence of the inspectorial processes on teacher professionalism. In other words, the notion of how specific strategies undertaken by Inspectors influence teachers and principals directly is an issue of contention.

In analysing the history, changes, developments, functions, strategies and processes of the inspectorial systems as external supervisory systems, it emerged that the main functions are to improve school systems so that schools are able to achieve their intended goals. This is consistent with the view that inspection is a tool for improvement (Woods & Orlik, 1994; Campbell & Husbands, 2000). However, in improving school systems the notion of maintaining and developing aspects of them also emerge as phenomenal issues. Thus, in reality, if improvements have to be made, current strategies need to be reviewed, maintained and developed so that tangible outcomes continue to be achieved and improved.

At the same time, developments taking place would indicate that these improvements result from teachers being influenced by the inspectorial strategies. These functions, strategies and processes are pursued through activities that involve direct interactions between inspectors and school personnel and other stakeholders. This further implies that when inspectors, as external supervisors, interact with teachers they employ strategies and processes that relate directly to supervision, that is, monitoring teacher development, performance, evaluation and assessment, professional development, in-service education and appraisal, and quality assurance, that is, audit, accountability, evaluation and assessment.

Supervision, professional development and quality assurance can be regarded as the interactive strategies of an inspectorial system. These together with related processes are interrelated and hold specific activities such as communicating and interacting with teachers, catalyzing and providing advice on the quality of teaching and learning, monitoring the curriculum as required, and auditing school finances and school facilities. For example, supervision and professional development are both concerned with the improvement of work performance for the benefit of teachers, pupils and the educational tone of schools. This is consistent with the view that inspection is a tool for improvement (Woods & Orlik, 1994; Campbell & Husbands, 2000). Maintaining, improving and developing the school system...
through supervisory, professional development and quality assurance strategies should result in desired academic standards and quality education being incrementally achieved.

However, the inspectorial systems involving the functions, interactive strategies and processes being applied by inspectors are not “simply a set of methods and procedures but a complex social practice which has developed over time (Wilcox & Gray, 1996, p. 127). It is this complex social practice within the inspectorates and schools, and between the inspectors and teachers that needs to be fully understood if the inspectorial systems are to sustain and enhance academic standards and quality education in schools.

Inspectors are external supervisors who carry out supervisory processes when interacting with school personnel. The history of supervision as revealed by Glanz (1994) described inspection as one of the seven models of supervision, the others being related to efficiency, democratic and scientific principles, educational leadership, clinical examination of educational standards, and incorporating changing concepts which define inspection as a managerial function. Various research studies have inclusively embraced supervision as an element of the inspectorial systems, implying that the processes invoked by inspectors in performing such tasks as, monitoring curriculum implementation, checking of teaching documents, observing lesson presentations, and evaluating and assessing teacher and school performances, relate directly to supervision (MacNab, 2004; De Grauwe, 2007). Thus, inspectorial processes are directly concerned with supervision of schools.

Supervision is ensuring that individuals, while complying with what is required of them, perform to expectations in order to increase productivity and to ensure schools achieve their intended goals. However, Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) also argued that productivity and outcomes are not only achieved through compliance but also through human relations management approaches that are applied by external (DIs) and internal supervisors (school principals). These authors contend that in many organizations, including educational institutions, supervision involves human relations and meeting the needs of individuals. This is consistent with the emergence of management strategies from a scientific management approach of the past, or a corporate management approach which considers supervision as ‘the means by which it [the organization] achieves its ends’, and to a human resources strategy which considers supervision as having ‘a higher regard for human need, potential, and satisfaction’ (p.14).
Supervision has also evolved from practices concerned with quality improvements, school development and the professional development of teachers (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). Studies reveal there to be many approaches to supervision. For example, the ‘developmental supervision’ direction which has explored approaches to improve instruction (Glanz, 1997); the author’s ‘Tao’ of supervision strategy with applications to educational supervision and seen as applied science; the interpretive-practical, critical/ emancipatory form of collaborative supervision from which a four-phase model emerges - the building of readiness, directed supervision, reflective supervision, and teacher inquiry to improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools (Yendal & Fichtman, 2001). Other supervisory approaches include mentoring, use of portfolios for differentiated supervision, peer coaching and action research (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000; Hillman, 2006); these approaches may also be considered aspects of professional development.

Despite the many divergent thoughts about educational supervision, all are concerned with improvements and developments of schools and their teachers. However, such activities require relations and interactions, that is, from an inspectorial perspective, between Inspectors and teachers. Significantly, supervision is vital to the survival of schools and the achievement of school goals. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) were supported by Howard (2003) in his investigation of a ‘Path Model’ of supervision. This model has a profound impact on teachers’ commitment and efficiency levels, emphasizing the need for an appropriate combination of supervisory approaches. Sergiovanni and Starratt had argued that “successful supervisions shaped by the circumstances which the supervisor faces and at different times different models may be appropriate” (p. 21). It emphasized this to be appropriate when the purpose of the supervision was to ensure that all schools were of a satisfactory standard. There was no feature of competition or marketization, and Inspectors worked to ensure that all children in whatever school had a broadly secular access to a quality education of egalitarian standards.

One of the purposes of the inspectorial system is to develop a school system such that the challenges and demands of the ever-changing society can be met. The development of the related aspects of schools relies entirely on the work of teachers (and other school personnel), school leadership and management processes. Thus the professional development of teachers is vital if changes and other multiple developments are to be pursued at the school level.
Organizational structures and cultures

This section introduces the theoretical concepts that underpin, or explain the findings that have emerged from an analysis of the oral histories, changing the focus to the second purpose of this research which was to identify the organizational components that structured the organization. It discusses organizational structure as a complex element of formal organizations and stresses its importance in achieving organizational goals. It is argued however that organizational goals cannot be achieved alone through organizational structure and changes, but that organizations must embrace organizational culture if they are to succeed in serving their purpose. To justify ‘why’ organizational goals must be considered it is known that the inspectorates are integral to the Education Department bureaucracy: they are units of organization within a much larger organization, a government department.

Organizational Structures

Hanson (2003) and Fincham and Rhodes (2005) contend that organizations generally exist as hierarchical structures and as social or open systems depending on the functions and nature of their existence. Organizations grow in size and complexity with changes and developments and by doing so, increase the potential for functions to be centralized or decentralized within their settings (Weber, 1984; Mullins, 2005). Organizations exist to achieve goals and to fulfil this purpose, but they must have structures that minimize problems and maximize performance. Mullins avers that elements of the organizational structure, including personnel, planning, management services, public relations, quality control and maintenance must have other structural factors such as division of labour, authority, departmentalization and span of control, all of which must be incorporated so that the positive effects on morale, productivity and effectiveness are sustained. Organizational structures can be conceived as dynamic, evolving phenomena, unfolding through dialectical processes, and providing a stable framework for control (Stacey, 1996, pp. 95-96). At the same time, a major theme in organizational theory is the interaction between the organizational structure and people within the organization or those accessing the organization from outside (Owens & Valesky, 2007, Weber, 1984). They imply that the structure of the organization can determine the behaviour of the people or vice-versa. In other words, organizational structures can shape the views, attitudes and behaviour of people within them, while “training people in a more effective group process” (Owens & Valesky, 2007, p. 124) thereby bringing changes to the organization. In enhancing performance, improving efficiency and achieving goals it is
essential that the relationships between the structural elements and their impact on anticipated outcomes are examined. Stacey further contends that organizations having good control mechanisms and management strategies that cater for human relations, processes for managing changes and developments, “enable strengthening of the organizations’ competitiveness, continuity and day-to-day activities that are carried out in an orderly and effective manner” (p. 132).

Ivancevich, Konopaske and Matteson (2008) reveal three structural models: a mechanistic model that emphasizes productivity and efficiency; an organic model that encourages adaptability and development; and a matrix model that superimposes project-based strategies. These models of organization imply that organizational structures must be consistent with changes and developments in society, but changes in structure or restructuring must consider human resource functions (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Thus in the field of education, organizational structures that consider human relations, human behaviour and values are significant to achieving organizational goals that meet the demands of the stakeholders and clients (Fincham & Rhodes, 2005; Mullins, 2005, Weber, 1984). However, irrespective of organizational structure theories and models, if the organization is to keep abreast of changes and developments, an organizational culture conducive to changes and developments is necessary. According to Fincham and Rhodes, if changes are to be made in organizations they have to be made at the cultural level to which Hatch (2006, p. 179) adds that any change in organizational structures alone cannot “ignore the human and emotional elements of organizational life”.

Organizational Culture

Fincham and Rhodes (2005) reveal that organizational culture can be analysed in terms of evaluative elements, material elements and social interaction. Evaluative elements concern social expectations and standards, that is, the values and beliefs that people hold and that unite them. Material elements concern signs and symbols by which groups are recognized, and social interaction relates to the medium of communication, including languages that constitute the particular group. Thus organizational culture, within this context, is both a product and a process because, as a product it represents accumulated wisdom from past members, and as a process it is constantly renewed and recreated as new comers learn the old ways and become members themselves (Keyton, 2005). Consistent with this Mullins (2005) reiterates that culture has influence over behaviour and actions of members of particular groups. Organizations are groups, thus culture in organizations is a
collection of elements encompassing traditions, values, policies, beliefs and attitudes that constitute a common framework through which members of the organizations think and act.

Organizational culture is based on a belief system, social interactions, group behaviour and individual psychology that are integrated to hold members together to achieve a common goal. Hatch (2006), Keyton (2005) and Mullins (2005) synthesized theories on organizational culture as being a “complex and continuous web of communication amongst members of organizations” (Keyton, 2005, p. 20); they believed that it emerged from interactions between members of organizations in order that they can pursue personal and professional goals that are related to the goals of the organization. These interactions include general artefacts or primary artefacts which relate to visible and tangible norms, that is, values which include goals, strategies, qualities, behaviours, wealth, control respect, commitment and prestige, and assumptions which concern beliefs that are taken for granted by members of the organization. Thus organizational culture sets one organization apart from another through the unique processes of personal interactions. Ivancevich, et al. (2008) argued that organizational culture cannot be seen but can be felt and sensed in members of the organizations through their attitudes, emotions and perceptions. It is how members perceive and how this perception creates patterns of beliefs, values and experiences within organizations that influence the organization’s life.

Organizational culture encourages stability by attracting, developing and retaining quality members of organizations. It maintains pride and fosters success through shared core values and beliefs by members. However organizational culture is difficult to create deliberately because creating a culture can result in adverse effects on staff, including decreased morale, increased turnover and poor performance (Hatch, 2006). As stated by Fincham and Rhodes, (2006), organizational culture can only evolve over time through carefully developed intervening conditions, and can change by redeveloping people’s behaviour through communication, socialization of new members and removal of existing members. Importantly for organizations, organizational culture is an important ingredient for improving performance, effective leadership and organizational development (Fincham & Rhodes, 2005; Ivancevich, et al. 2008).

Hatch (2006) further synthesized various theories and models of organizational culture into three perspectives – modernism, symbolic-interpretivism and post-modernism. A modernist perspective of organizational culture emphasizes that, only when members of
organizations see themselves benefiting from within the organizations, “values are taken for granted and absorbed into unconscious assumptions” (p. 189). This implies that assumptions and values can influence their behaviour; such behaviour being expressed in terms of norms and values by members of organizations communicating and interacting through artefacts including stories, symbols, traditions and customs. In other words, modernism “interpret[s] knowledge about culture as a tool of management, and culture itself as a variable to be manipulated to enhance the likelihood of achieving desired levels of organizational performance” (p. 213). Therefore, culture influences organizational performance through organizational members’ performances when it helps to adapt or anticipate change or interfere with adaptation. This means that cultural change must support adaptation by aligning relationships between strategies and existing culture.

A symbolic-interactionist perspective of organizational culture stresses that cultures are constructed “as interacting individuals interpret what is going on around them and thereby collectively create meaning. Thus meaning produces culture even as it is the product of symbolic behaviour” (Hatch, 2006, p. 192). This implies that organizational members make meaning from within their roles in their workplace and that meaning is dependent on the context in which the artefacts and symbols are encountered. In this way individuals produce culture through their social construction of reality. In other words when members of organizations use and speak about what they normally do, this has effects on them and others, and in doing so, culture is understood from within the organization. Thus a symbolic-interpretive perspective of organizational culture defines culture as a context for making meaning and interpretation that allows members of the organization to know themselves in relation to others and what is meant by various aspects of culture of the organization including objects, behaviour, and verbal language. As Owen and Valesky (2007) emphasize, culture is “not a study of behaviour but through observation of behaviour one can develop understanding of systems of knowledge, beliefs, customs, and habits of people” (p. 193).

A postmodernist perspective of organizational culture relates to the application of inter-textuality as “treating culture, identities, organizational members, symbols and actions as interwoven texts that create one another via mutual ongoing referencing” (Hatch 2006, p. 202). Inter-textuality implies that no text exists in isolation and that all texts are interwoven, meaning that there are many ways to challenge organizational cultures where language systems including quotation, allusion, description and inscription are used to create meaning. Other means of challenging organizational culture include the use of metaphoric forms of
analysis and fragmentation. In all these challenges, the idea of a shared understanding becomes an illusion. Thus, Hatch avers, understanding organizational cultures within the post-modernism perspective continues to be an illusion.

In summarizing the perceptions of organizational culture, Fincham & Rhodes (2005) simplified culture as the essence, the reality of the organization: what it is like to work there; how people deal with each other; and what behaviours are expected from members. As a process or product, culture is hardly planned or predictable. It is the result of social interaction. As a process, it evolves and emerges over time; and as a product, it is the residue of countless events and actions experienced by members of the organizations.

Organizational structure and culture in educational institutions

In educational institutions, organizational structures and cultures have similar characteristics or dimensions to structures and cultures in other organizational disciplines such as ‘production’ and ‘service-provider’ organizations. However, in educational institutions, including schools, organizational culture embraces organizational structure because of the nature of these institutions: they deal directly with people. The ideal relationship between structure and culture in educational institutions is summarized clearly by Schmuck and Schmuck (as cited in Owens & Valesky, 2007) when defining organizations as part of general systems theory:

An organization is an integrated system of interdependent structures and functions. An organization is constituted of groups and a group consists of persons who must work in harmony. Each person must know what the others are doing. Each one must be capable of receiving messages and must be sufficiently disciplined to obey (p. 124).

Organizational culture in educational institutions relates directly to shared values and what is important to people, belief in what they think is true, and having behavioural norms on how people here do things. In this sense culture is a process and a product, being of a practical nature to the members of the institutions. As Owens and Valesky (2007) emphasize, culture is ‘a body of solutions to external and internal problems that has been consistently working for a group’ (p. 193), and that has developed over a period of time. At the same time, as with organizations in other contexts, culture within educational institutions including schools, provides stability, fosters certainty, and creates meaning; it is a belief about what works and what does not work. It is observed behaviour through which people can develop
understanding of systems of knowledge, beliefs, customs and habits of people. Thus Owens and Valensky have identified two major themes of culture in educational institutions: the norms relating to the standards of the social system (organizational structure) which are pursued through unwritten rules expressed through group members’ appropriate and acceptable behaviour resulting in good standing; and assumptions which deal with what people in the organization accept as true or false in the world; what is sensible or absurd; and what is possible or not possible.

However, organizational culture in educational institutions must also evolve and adapt to changes in society including technology, and the economic and political environments if institutions want to achieve their goals (Fincham & Rhodes, 2006). Therefore cultural changes in educational institutions, including schools, are inevitable as they strive to address demands from stakeholders including better education and getting value for their money. These authors further advise that cultural changes must enhance networking and inter-organizational strategies if educational institutions are to sustain changes and developments. It is therefore significant for stakeholders in educational institutions to identify best practice processes for designing and installing comprehensive sets of norms and assumptions for the incremental development of organizational cultures that facilitate these changes. As Tam and Cheng (2003) contend, changes in organizational culture in educational institutions, including schools, happen when an environment of learning exists through appropriate internal and external supervision, quality assurance and professional development strategies that ensure educational institutions produce high educational standards and quality education.

Organizational structure and culture in the Victorian context

The Victorian education system leading up to the period of this research, 1960 to 1983, operated under the State centralized structure that had existed since the late nineteenth century. This was unlike America and England and Wales at that time, where their systems by now had been decentralized. The State’s provision of government education was firstly dominated by primary schools followed by a variety of secondary schools – academic, technical, commercial, home science and a few agricultural and conservatoriums which began evolving from the early 20th century.

Secondly, the state government through its Education Department influenced the increased size and burgeoning complexity of the educational bureaucracy, with more professional educators being engaged full-time in administration. As a result the number of
Inspectors, directors, senior officers, research officers and guidance officers increased. Thirdly, through legislation, the state controlled compulsory education, minimum school commencement and leaving ages, and registration of non-government schools. In Victoria registration of schools meant inspection of the standard of buildings and associated amenities, such as toilet facilities. It also meant registration of all teachers, state and non-state and limited supervision of the training and pedagogy of Catholic teachers, mainly nuns and priests.

Figure 2.1. The Education Department bureaucracy in Victoria in 1948.

Source. Barcan, 1993, p.77

This diagram was adapted from the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) Review of Education in Australia 1940-1948 and shows the growing size and complexity of the administration of the Victorian Education Department.
Barcan’s charts display the enormous administrative changes occurring from the 1940s to the 1960s. In 1938 there were seventeen categories of officers in the administration of the Victorian Department of Education, their main concern being inspection of schools; however, between 1948 and 1961 the category of officers had increased to thirty-seven, including the provision of guidance officers and ancillary services in 1950.

In the 1960s social changes were occurring (Barcan, 1993). Equality for men and women increased, the proportion of women teachers increased, and the union movement created a militant secondary workforce leading to strikes and disruption throughout the secondary schools. Inspectors were aware that social and educational change was occurring but DIs particularly did not comprehend a final outcome of the magnitude finally implemented, their own positions’ demise. They maintained the dictates of their role carrying...
out their mandated responsibilities, conveying and implementing directives from Head Quarters to the schools, and developing and maintaining a sustainable set of variously interpreted educational imperatives to the very end. They believed these were critical matters during this period of changing times if teacher performance and educational standards were to be maintained.

Inspectorial interactive strategies

The school inspection system in Victoria was generally regarded as external and independent, even though Inspectors were selected from qualified teachers who held outstanding teaching records. Inspectors changed allegiances being transferred from the Teaching Service Roll to the Professional Roll. Their new status encompassed many functions, strategies and processes including quality assurance, teacher appraisal, teacher development and school improvement (Ball, et al, 1961; Early, et al. 1996; Webb & Vulliamy, 1998; Grubb, 2000; Gurr, 2003; MacNab, 2004; De Grauwe, 2007). These functions and strategies were intended to assist schools to improve academic standards, the quality of education and accountability. School personnel were required to justify the academic standards and quality of education they provided to the students according to the resources available (Learmonth, 2000). However, while there were indications of positive impacts of such inspection processes on school planning, management, improvement and development to ensure the academic standards and the quality of education were sustained or enhanced (Early, et al 1996; Wilcox & Gray, 1996; Early, 1998), problems were also experienced. The complex, conflicting and dominant roles of Inspectors (Ball, et al. 1961; Dwyer, 1998; MacNab, 2004), the methodology, validity and processes of inspection including inconsistencies of reporting (Wilcox & Gray, 1996; Watson, 2001), the demeaning effects of the inspection process on teachers and Inspectors (Learmonth, 2000), and the ‘no lasting impact’ on the pedagogy of teachers in the classroom (Chapman, 2001; Watson, 2001; DeGrauwe, 2007) were claimed to be some of the problematic effects on the teaching profession. Such evidence gave rise to the need to empower school staff to be more responsible for the provision of academic standards and the quality of education at the school level. These were major contributing factors for changes and developments to the inspectorial systems.

However, the major, unanswered question remains: how do inspectorial systems influence teachers (MacNab, 2004)? It is argued that if tangible outcomes of school systems must be achieved through the inspectorial systems then it has to be the teachers who make the
prime difference. Though recent studies have considered teachers’ perceptions of inspectorial systems about changes taking place (Chapman, 2002; DeGrauwe, 2007), including the impact of inspections on classroom supervision (Chapman, 2001), and generally on the school (DeGrauwe, 2007), there has been less consideration for, and evidence of the influence of the inspectorial processes on specific dimensions of teacher professionalism. In other words, the notion of how specific strategies undertaken by Inspectors influenced principals and teachers directly is an issue of contention.

In analysing the history, changes, developments, functions, strategies and processes of the inspectorial system as supervisory and external to schools, it emerged that its main functions were to improve school systems so that schools are able to achieve their intended goals. However, in improving school systems the notion of maintaining and developing aspects of the system also emerges as a phenomenal issue. This is because, in reality, if improvements must be made, current strategies have to be reviewed, maintained and developed so that tangible outcomes are measureable and achieved. At the same time, developments taking place would indicate that these result from teaching improvements being influenced by these self-same inspectorial strategies. These are pursued through activities that involve direct interactions between Inspectors and school personnel. This implies that when Inspectors interact with teachers they use strategies and processes that relate to supervision: monitoring, teacher development, performance audit, evaluation and assessment, teacher development, growth and appraisal; and quality assurance measures such as audit, accountability, evaluation and assessment.

Supervision, professional development and quality assurance were regarded as interactive strategies within the inspectorial system and employed by Inspectors for specific activities such as communicating and working with teachers, providing advice on quality of teaching and learning, monitoring the curriculum, and auditing school finances and school facilities.

Woods and Orlick (1994) and Campbell and Husbands (2000) expressed the view that inspection may be a tool for improvement. Supervision and professional development are both concerned with the improvement of work performance for the benefit of individuals and schools, while quality assurance and supervisory strategies identify and prevent problems through the evaluation, assessment and monitoring aspects of schools thereby allowing for effective school improvement and development to occur. The inspectorial systems with the
functions, interactive strategies and processes being applied by Inspectors are not “simply a set of methods and procedures but also a complex and social practice which has developed over time” (Wilcox & Gray, 1996, p. 127). It is this complexity of social practices within the inspectorates and schools, and between Inspectors and teachers, that needs to be fully understood if the inspectorial systems are to sustain and enhance academic standards and quality education in schools. The connections between the functions, strategies and processes of the inspectorial systems are shown in Figure 2.1. From the literature, the researcher has created a model which summarizes the inter-connections and flow of the functions, inspectorate strategies and the processes used by the Inspectors throughout the Victorian inspectorial system.

**Figure 2.1: Connections between Functions, Strategies/Processes and Outcomes of the Inspectorial System**

**Professional development**

One of the purposes of inspectorial systems is to develop the school system in order that it meets the challenges and demands of the ever changing society. However, the development of different aspects of schools relies entirely on the work of the teachers, other school personnel, school leadership and management. The professional development of
teachers is vital if societal changes and developments are to be paralleled at the institutional level. Current developments in inspectorial systems provide the opportunity through professional development programs and appraisal practices facilitated and undertaken by inspectorial personnel when interacting with teachers (Ali, 1998; Learmonth, 2000). Professional development is therefore an interactive strategy of the inspectorial system because, irrespective of the process Inspectors use in their relationships with teachers, learning is expected to occur (Maclaughlin, 2001).

If professional development is conceived to be and incorporated as an inspectorial interactive strategy, both teachers and Inspectors have the opportunity to develop professionally, as indicated if there are positive changes by their respective performances, behaviour and attitudes towards their inter-related work. To achieve these changes the related strategies and processes for professional development must be perceived by teachers, principals, inspectors and other stakeholders as directed towards this end. Thus the need to relate to and understand professional development as an interactive strategy of the inspectorial system is critical to how its outcomes can ultimately influence the education of children.

Professional development is itself an historical term. It has been increasingly replaced by professional learning and later by in-service education as terms wherein the individual gives an opinion as to in what learning they need. This is consistent with the implementation of in-service education procedures intimated by the Inspectors in the research cohort. Professional development is a process that encourages teachers, principals and other school personnel to develop and improve in their profession in the interests of better educational outcomes for children. This is consistent with the current context of inspectorial systems as a mutual means for improvement and development (Dwyer, 1988; Earley, et al. 1996; Grubb, 2000), and is considered important because teachers are the “greatest assets” to the schools. As defined by Day (1994), professional development includes:

- those conscious and planned activities, which are intended to be of direct benefit to the individual, group or school and which contribute through these, to the quality of education in the classroom. It is a process by which, alone and with others, teachers review, renew and extend their commitment as change agents to the moral purposes of teaching and by which they acquire and develop critically the knowledge and skills essential to good professional thinking, planning and
practice with children, young people and colleagues through each phase of their teaching lives (p. 2).

In analysing problems in professional development from a philosophical, theoretical and practical point of view, Smyth (cited in Guskey & Huberman, 1995) summarizes the need for “teachers to become real partners in education by allowing them to reflect upon the social, economic and political factors that shape and reshape their work” (p. 87), if professional development approaches are to impact on teachers’ work. Professional development as an interactive strategy of the inspectorial system, contributes to the achievement of school goals if the approaches used by inspectorial personnel are focused on specific issues related to educational changes and developments within the school context, and where a school culture of learning and professional development exists.

Quality Assurance

Quality assurance interactive strategies of the inspectorial system related directly to the evaluation, assessment and monitoring processes implemented by the Inspectors in their concern for the pedagogy of teachers whose level of accomplishment is gauged through their pursuit of academic standards and quality education. This was achieved through activities that include communicating and interacting with teachers; using checklists to evaluate, assess and monitor quantitative indicators, such as required number of infrastructure facilities including classrooms, recreational areas and class sizes; and qualitative indicators of quality education, such as use of textbooks, teacher qualifications, and in-service education (Welch, 2000).

In many countries the processes of quality assurance have changed or been modified to embrace school-based strategies that include school self-evaluation and self-assessment which are also considered as processes of supervision (MacBeath, 2006). Despite such changes and modifications, the legacies and principles of inspection for quality assurance through the means of evaluation, assessment and monitoring for compliance and accountability have remained.

In New Zealand the focus of the inspectorial system has been, for more than a decade, on compliance with accountability for the provision of student academic performance and the quality of education (Kenen, 2000). In the United Kingdom and other European countries, the focus is on quality improvement, accountability and developmental aspects of school and school personnel (Maclaughlin, 2001). Some higher educational institutions including universities focus on quality assurance by evaluating internal improvement and external
accountability, or on the processes of evaluation and self-assessment. Such emphasis allows for institutional personnel to be answerable to and accountable for the academic standards and quality of education they provide.

While studies have revealed positive impacts of the quality assurance strategies of the inspectorial system on school management and development (Earley, et al. 1996; Earley, 1998; Wilcox & Gray, 1996), evidence is lacking for illuminating what the effects of quality assurance strategies and processes have on aspects of the teaching profession. The reality is that there are no clear demarcations between supervision, professional development and quality assurance interactive strategies and how these influence teachers.

**Professional Ethics**

Professionalism is an affirmation of expertise where specific knowledge, skills, professional conduct, autonomy and responsibility are applied in a particular field or profession (Whitty, 2006). Professionalism also concerns professional ethics within professional disciplines. Professional ethics are moral principles, rules and conventions that govern and guide what people do and how people behave and act; as such they cannot be separated from responsibilities. In general, the concept of professional ethics refers to ‘what is right and what is wrong’, ‘what is good or bad’, and ‘what ought to be done’. It differentiates between what is socially accepted and what is not. In other words, it is a commitment to good and is a concept of what makes up a profession’s purposes and the activities undertaken by members of the profession to produce what is expected by the community (Strike & Ternaskey, 1993; Becker, 2004). Professional ethics are influenced by “external ideological, political and economic factors that impose their own influences on personal, professional and organizational integrity” (Chadwick, 1994, p.145). These influences arise at all levels of organizations and involve individuals in the area of management, leadership and decision making. In other words, individuals in organizations, including schools, are always under pressure from social, economic and ideological forces requiring them to respond to societal pressures. At the same time, Chadwick notes, “constant concerns for fair resource allocation, identifying priorities and informed decision making, which will have many varied influences, are directly affecting members of the organization’s communities” (p. 155). Such a situation requires codes of professional ethics that provide guidance and instil confidence in the competence and standards of members of the profession, thereby ensuring the results produced can be measured for the public to redress and maintain the highest standards of the profession (Strike & Ternasky, 1993).
Professional ethics in educational settings relate to whether policies and practices are right or whether they serve the intended educational goals. They include moral education that models respect of law, democratic values and skills, tolerance, and norms and principles which govern the conduct of teachers, principals, and others within the education system. Professional ethics encourage fairness in monitoring, assessment and evaluation of performance, and address equitable distribution of resources, including time and money. Importantly, professional ethics are a dynamic process requiring personal and professional codes that influence actions by educational personnel, and that work in the best interests of the students (Shapiro & Stefkovic, 2005).

Ganser (2001) in his discussion paper on the observations of teaching as a profession from an international perspective, categorized the development of teacher professionalism into four phases: the pre-professional age (before 1960s) which reflects the improved status of teachers where new knowledge and skills became part of their daily practice; the age of the collegial professionals (beginning in the mid-80s) which includes the notion of teachers working in collaboration through “professional learning, especially teachers learning from one another, … to replace traditional methods of staff development” (p.5); and two aspects of the professional age (beginning in the late 90s) where teachers have been exposed to and influenced by social, economic, political and cultural transformations, and the predominant involvement and participation of parents and other stakeholders. These observations result from changes in the population of students attending schools, changes and innovations in schools, tensions between centralization and decentralization of schooling, and new unionism.

Professionalism

This section defines professionalism from an historical perspective and reviews the current status of teacher professionalism in the literature; in doing so, it identifies the dimensions of teacher professionalism. Historically, professions were defined as the “broad and privileged class of occupations characterized by highly trained expertise, selection by merit, and subject to peer surveillance” (Bacon, Groundwater-Smith, Nash & Sachs, 2000, p. 3). Professionals therefore were experts with specialist knowledge and skills in both economic and social power settings, separating them from ordinary groups of workforce. This early notion of professions and professionals became professionalism, a legitimated “high status which include prestige and esteem and well rewarded activity, where practitioners share common cultural capital with their clients based on class membership” (Bacon, et al. 2000, p.3; Hoyle, 2001). However, with different
developments of class structures of service industries the notions of “exclusivity and abstract
to knowledge have remained the foundation for determining what was to be a profession”
(Bacon, et al. 2000, p. 3). Despite this, professionalism also continued to be a form of
occupational control and is an affirmation of expertise where specific knowledge, skills,
professional conduct, autonomy and responsibility are applied in a specific field of profession
(Busher & Saran, 1995; Whitty, 2006). Furthermore professionalism relates directly to
persons displaying in one’s public and private life types of behaviour likely to meet with the
approval of the community in which one practises one’s professional skills. Robson (2006)
implies that professionalism evolves and is a collective symbol that consists of ideas that are
interrelated to produce a way of thinking about occupations. The teaching profession meets
these criteria.

Professionalism also concerns professional ethics within professional disciplines.
Professional ethics discussed fully above are moral principles, rules and conventions which
embody “constant concern for fair resource allocations, identifying priorities and informed
decision making, which will have many varied influences, are directly affecting members of
the organization’s community” (Chadwick, 1994, p. 145

Sachs (2001) and Robson (2006) discussed and identified teacher professionalism as a
collective symbol incorporating three concepts that are interrelated: the autonomy concept
that relates to the practice of teaching as having considerable scope for autonomous decision
making with the ability to implement knowledge and appropriate skills; the professional
knowledge concept which implies that teachers have a coherent body of ‘professional
knowledge’ that is unique; and the responsibility concept that requires teachers to relate and
be responsible to students, to employers, and to the values and practices of the teaching
profession.

Teacher Professionalism
The concepts of teacher professionalism indicate the continuous rethinking of teaching as a
profession resulting from the global changes in industrial, business and professional activities
that are consistent with social, economic and political developments (Bryan, 2004). At the
same time, the concept of managerial and democratic professionalism in the teaching
profession is coming into contention (Sachs, 2003). This means that teacher professionalism
in any given context can be influenced by various factors and evolves with developments. In
support of this, Sachs compares and summates the old ideas of teacher professionalism -
teacher knowledge and beliefs about teaching, learning and subject matter, accountability, responsibility, teacher performance, and the new teacher professionalism reflected as the ethics of truth, subjectivity, reflective integrity, humility and humanistic education. The latter argues that teacher professionalism is not static, stressing:

Developing new forms of teacher professionalism demands the development of new skills by teachers. In order to move beyond old forms of teacher professionalism the work of teaching needs to be re-defined. This is not only in terms of skills required in the classroom to ensure effective learning outcomes by students, but also in terms of the needs of teachers as adult learners (p. 4)

Teacher professionalism requires continuous rethinking in a way that is consistent with social, economic and political developments, implying that those involved with the teaching profession must negotiate and renegotiate meanings and processes in order to engage teachers in a ‘broader project’ of teacher professionalism (Sachs, 2000; Robson, 2006). Teacher professionalism therefore evolves and needs rethinking within each context and level of education in each setting. This point notwithstanding, Sachs (1999) appropriately summarizes teacher professionalism by emphasizing that:

the development of teacher professionalism is an ongoing struggle that goes beyond the struggle for meaning it is the struggle for the profession to be in control of its own future. It is the profession itself that provides the moral and intellectual leadership to ensure that students’ learning is of high quality and that working conditions of teachers are enhanced (pp. 85-86).
The following figure illustrates the dimensions of teacher professionalism as reviewed:

**Figure 2.4. Aspects of Teacher Professionalism in the Middle Decades of the 20th Century**

**Teacher professionalism – in the Victorian context**

The Victorian Education Department has continued to focus on reform, particularly in its latter years of functioning. However not enough consideration has been given to teacher professionalism: how it can be defined or re-defined, or even measured so as to play a pivotal role in the implementation of government policies as they relate to education? At the school level old practices remain, maintaining the profession through in-service education, and incorporating supervision and professional development strategies that have little or no sustainable effects on the teaching profession (Chapman, 2001; Watson, 2001; DeGrauwe, 2007). However, despite this situation and the many developments that have transpired over the years, there is scant evidence of any changes to the teaching profession. This study investigated the dimensions of teacher professionalism from the Victorian educational perspective, relating these to the strategies used by the inspectorial system of education as interpreted by DIs during 1960 to 1983. The possible development of a new, but relevant
conceptual framework for an assessment and evaluation system that enhances teacher performance and professionalism has always been in the researcher’s educational ambit.

Educational leadership

Leadership is one of the key elements of any organization. Goleman (2000) and Fullan (2002) have each recognised and identified a common set of leadership qualities and skills that can be applied to any context at any level of educational administration. Fullan (2000) describes five core components of leadership. First, there is a need for a leader to have a moral purpose and an understanding of how one treats all others or it can be simply moving the system forward. The second component of leadership is understanding change; it is the skill of understanding change that allows leaders to be good change agents. It is not enough to have morale purpose or innovative ideas the leader requires a broad understanding and openness to cater for other interpretations of the ideas. Building relationships is the third component, and according to Fullan (2002), is the single factor most common to successful change. Leaders must be relationship builders with diverse people and groups, especially those who are different from themselves. The fourth core component is creating and sharing knowledge; it is essential that leaders make sure information becomes knowledge through social processes. The final core component of leadership is coherence making; Inspectors as leaders must cultivate the potential of diverse ideas, focus energy and gain greater alignment while at the same time always looking to the future. It is the ability of leaders to recognise their own strengths and weaknesses and to continually strive to develop their ability to acquire these skill sets, to develop their capacity to read specific situations, and apply the most appropriate leadership style which maximizes results. Another perspective on educational leadership is given by Goleman (2004).

Conceptual Framework

The literature review has provided a conceptual framework based in organizational theory where the historical development of inspectorial systems enables Inspectors inter-relate with school, principals, teachers and latterly school communities. It includes historical perspectives of Inspectors, the organizational structure and culture of the institution they serve, the related matters of professionalism and professional development, the interactive strategies developed for interaction between personnel at the various levels in the organization and the underpinning ethics which must be practised. These systems or
institutions are not immune from the community and general culture which immerses them and the dynamic educational cultures they influence, adding to and reflecting the existing ethical and professional norms. From within this broad theoretical context a number of important practical features can emerge and be developed in accordance with the sociology of the times and the demographic imperatives of the personnel involved. The latter imperative is particularly apt because the Inspectors who form the research cohort are to be interviewed about their recollections of the roles they played during the years pertinent to the research. The research cohort’s long-closeted inner thoughts will emerge, informing the subsequent investigation with their retrospective perceptions. The raw data thus compiled will form the bed-rock basis for the analysis, the findings of which will answer the research questions posed at the outset of the research. These expected outcomes will dictate the research methodology chosen, this in turn informing the data compiled and analysed of the perceptions of the research cohort of DIs still living when the study was first implemented. Fundamental concepts which underpin all Inspectors’ modus operandi are expected to be unearthed as findings for interpretation and discussion; these will be recorded in chapters 4, 5 and 6.

**Summary of the Literature Review**

The historical perspective delineated initially this chapter shows that inspectorial systems have always been a form of dynamic external and independent means of supervision, professional development and quality assurance of school systems. While the inspectorial systems have remained in some countries, and these are discussed briefly, other countries have established new external and internal supervisory, professional development and quality assurance strategies that are consistent with related developments in education, economics and politics. The Victorian PSIS was abolished in 1983. Despite many changes, particularly during the period investigated by this thesis, the system in Victoria had for over a century three main functions variously implemented: maintaining, improving and developing aspects of the total school system. Thus, as external school supervisors, Inspectors interacted with teachers and principals in ways, cognizant of the times, through three major strategies: supervision, quality assurance and professional development of teachers and principals. These interactive strategies were intended to influence these school-based personnel so that the standards and the quality of education were improved and sustained. However, the extent to which the teachers and principals were influenced by the inspectorial interactive strategies is uncertain. Anecdotal and observational data indicate the influence to be positive.
This literature review reveals that Inspector/teacher interactions influence schools’ effectiveness, management, academic standards, curriculum, accountability, leadership, instruction, communications and relationships with stakeholders (Wilcox & Gray, 1996; Learmonth, 2000; De Grauwe, 2007). It is noted that teachers’ efficiency levels and commitment, and improved pedagogy have been major influences (Howard, 2003). Although the literature predominantly posits these general influences, there is insufficient evidence and knowledge about the specific relationships between the inspectorial, interactive strategies such as supervision, professional development and quality assurance, to ensure each of the specific dimensions of teacher professionalism are positive. This review has discussed and inter-related, from an educational perspective, such business-wide matters as organizational structure and culture with particular reference to the educative process in Victoria and the interactive strategies employed. Professional development was discussed as were educational leadership, ethics and professionalism, thus completing a literature review on the concepts underlying society’s institutions, especially educational enterprises. This review has encouraged the researcher to follow these concepts in depth, the findings documented in Chapters 4 and 5 justify and explain the meanings relevant to the inspectorates researched in particular, but also their generalizability to all inspectorates in general and to the Education Department and its individual schools, especially since much of the authority, formerly the province of DIs, has been delegated.

The literature reviewed above indicates there is a need for basic organizational concepts as they apply to education to be investigated and conceptualized through the perceptions of the Inspectors who functioned in the system in Victoria during 1960 through to 1983. Through oral history this investigation is expected to reveal that the concepts applicable to educational administration be discussed along with the plethora of individualized strategies or themes implemented by the Inspectors during this latter period of inspectorial history. The individual influence each Inspector had on school effectiveness, management, academic standards, curriculum, accountability, educational leadership, instruction and communications from their personal perspectives will be ascertained by employment of an interview protocol, documented and analysed to seek the common pillars upon which the Inspector’s individual implementation of mandated duties rest. In accord with narrative theory, it is compulsory that the effectiveness of the Inspector’s influence on the schools and staff in the district be established. The conceptual framework thereby construed completes the chapter.
Chapter 3: Methodology and methods

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the methods used to undertake this oral history research project, and to detail its design and conduct. Several of those writing about the design of an oral history research study appear to presume a beguiling simplicity with regard to the planning of a research study. A cursory perusal of several guides (Janesick, 2010; McMahan & Rogers, 1994; Perks & Thomson, 2006; Yow, 2005) reveals that they all, understandably, give primacy to the interview as the major source for evidence in oral history; and they offer advice and strategies for the successful conduct of interviews and addressing the complexities of them. However, there are few references about the overall design of an oral history study. In response to this, the research design for this study takes the appearance of a social science methodology, but this has been most helpful in formulating the approach to the empirical research. Leavy (2011), an oral historian working within a social science framework, has proposed a model for research design and methodological framing in oral history which has been adopted as the framework for this study. For the researcher, methodology encompasses a holistic or integrated approach to oral history that involves the elaboration of two contexts; these are the context of discovery and the context of justification.

The chapter outlines and justifies the methodological approach to this study, by using these two contexts as the framework. The chapter begins with the first of these contexts, the context of discovery; the second and larger part of the chapter deals with the context of justification. The former is concerned with what might be termed the ‘framing’ of the project, and the latter is concerned with the practicalities of the empirical research.

Context of discovery

Leavy (2011) states that “the context of discovery refers to the researcher’s role in the methodological process” (p. 70). One purpose is to tease out the agendas and perspectives of
the researcher and clarify the values that the researcher brought to, and invested in, the project. Four questions are posed by Leavy:

- how did you come to your topic; and what made you interested in it;
- from what standpoint did you approach your topic;
- what was the nature of your relationship with the participants throughout the process;
- and
- how much personal information did you disclose to your participants; and why? (2011, p. 70 – 71)

While these have in large part been addressed in the first chapter, in the light of the framework set down in Chapter 2 being used, each of these sets of questions will be answered below, in turn. Thus the questions that comprise the first of these two contexts demand statements about the personal approach had on the impact of the researcher on the research, the first person will be used to ensure that the language employed flows smoothly and avoids the passive as far as possible.

**Coming to the topic**

Undoubtedly, the reason for coming to this topic was a matter of personal investment. My own teaching career began in the 1950s and was concurrent with the period of interest in this study, from 1960 to 1983; furthermore the demise of the inspectorate coincided with a notable phase of my own career. To some extent, therefore, the careers and reputations of the participants in this study were known to me, but the details of their lives and their careers in their Inspectorate positions were not known. It is the role of the historian to move beyond reputation and hearsay and to find out as much as one can from the appropriate sources. For an oral history the appropriate sources are the memories of the actors themselves, and this was the inspiration for my research.

From a position in the first decade of the new millennium, it became painfully clear that the experiences of these people will pass away as their lives come to an end. As a result it became something of a personal crusade to contact as many of the surviving members of the profession and record their stories as a means of generating an oral history of the Victorian PSIS. At the same time, the opportunity of a doctoral study afforded me the chance to make deeper sense of the institution and its impact on primary schooling in Victoria at that time, by revisiting the topic though the personal memories of those who had held the position of DI. In
these two ways, the idea of generating an oral history of the inspectorate would allow the luxury of a reflective inquiry into a controversial institution which may be unlikely to re-appear in my lifetime.

Some earlier histories published by the Victorian Education Department have included sections on the inspectorate, but these have been based on written archival material retained at the Public Record Office of Victoria (PROV), the National Library of Australia (online catalogue) and the Statistics and Research Section, Office of School Administration, Ministry of Education in Victoria. One of the research cohort Inspectors, Holloway, published a monograph on the inspectorate but, while written by an Inspector, it was a history of the institution and does not capture the flavour of the Inspectors’ careers as that generated by an oral history. Therefore it became the intention in this project to develop an oral history based on the narratives provided by the people who once occupied this role.

Research purpose and assumptions

The purpose of this study, as outlined in Chapter 1, was to develop an understanding of the PSIS in the State of Victoria, and to understand its impact on primary schooling in the state through recording and interpreting the memories and perceptions of the people who held DI positions in the final two decades of its existence. As the participants represented the surviving members of the profession it was a further intention to record their memories and perceptions of the inspectorate position held before they passed away.

The study aimed to gain an understanding of the worth of the work of DIs through their own words and to investigate how they perceived and assessed the meaning of, and the effectiveness of their roles within the primary division of the Victorian State Education Department from the 1960s through to the first three years of the 1980s. The study also sought to gain a deeper understanding of the institutional features of the inspectorate, an institution that was peremptorily dissolved in 1983, under much controversy, in large part because of misunderstandings of the role by its chief protagonists. Therefore the study seeks to develop a better understanding of the role of the Inspector and the institution of the inspectorate by hearing the voices of those involved in the role.

Participants

The participants for this study were from among the surviving personnel who had been DIs in the State of Victoria from 1962 – 1983. By 2009, when this study had been
approved and the research began, these participants were already of an advanced age, the two youngest survivors being 68 and the oldest 85.

From the outset, my professional affiliations with the Victorian Education Department had been a major reason for choosing this study; this in turn allowed for ease in gaining access to prospective participants. The sole criterion for selection was that they had served as Inspectors in the Victorian Schools Primary Division of the Education Department; the time frame for the study was from the time of the appointment of the earliest office holder to the time when the office was ended in 1983.

Relationship with, and disclosure to the participants

My relationship to the participants had some importance on the nature and direction of the research. In qualitative studies, the researcher is ‘in’ the research rather than outside it (Holliday, 2007) and this can influence the handling of the process, with positive and/or negative implications.

My involvement in this research began with personal involvement in teaching in a number of primary schools in Victoria. My career began in 1953 as a classroom teacher, and finished in 1989; at that time I held the position of a District Liaison Principal, which ironically was one of the offices that emerged following the ending of the Inspectorate. During this period my career was closely connected to the work of Inspectors, who had considerable oversight and influence of teachers’ work and advancement. I had been monitored and assessed by DIs as a classroom teacher, department coordinator and later as a principal. However, being on the ‘receiving end’ of the Inspectors’ role led to my making a number of inferences and assumptions about their work and influence on a range of matters. The first of these, for example, was that I held the common belief that all Inspectors operated in the same way. Secondly, I was of the opinion that their role descriptions were simply to give a fair and accurate assessment of teachers; and third, I saw no discrepancy between country and metropolitan Inspectors. Therefore I came into this research with some prior knowledge, but as the empirical research has revealed, much of it was erroneous. However, I did have a knowledge and understanding of many of the contexts and practices that the participants were to talk about in the interviews, and this was important in facilitating the collecting, analysing and interpreting of data.

Despite personal experience, from the outset it has been my concern to rely solely on the evidence provided by the participants and to present an account and understanding both of
their roles and the institution through their words only. It is a genuine oral history in that it relies on the voice of the people themselves. I have disclosed my personal involvement and perspective knowing it is important to readers who wish to review the findings of this investigation. This issue of reflexivity is defined by Punch (1998) as a personal awareness of the researcher’s involvement in the world which they study. Essential to this concern is Holliday’s (2007) advice to ensure that:

“… nothing is taken for granted. Like the stranger learning culture, the qualitative researcher as writer should see every part of what she has done in the field as a fresh phenomenon… qualitative researchers must never forget to approach their own actions as strangers holding everything up for scrutiny, accounting for every action …” (p. 20)

The intention at this point is reinforce the acknowledgement and clarification of the relationship of the researcher to the research participants and their stories.

Elaborating the context of discovery has helped to set the scene for the design and conduct of the empirical research, which will be outlined in the major section and the subsections that follow.

**Context of justification**

The second of the two contexts advocated by Leavy (2011), the context of justification, is largely concerned with the design and features of the empirical inquiry of the study. The study is outlined below using Leavy’s structure which comprises the following considerations:

a statement of your research purpose;

a statement of your research questions;

your sampling procedures and a discussion of your sample;

data collection procedures (the interview process);

analysis procedures;

interpretation procedures; and

ethical issues (p. 71)
As in the previous section, each of these will be considered in turn.

**Research purpose**

The purpose of this research was to develop an oral history based on the memories and perceptions of District Inspectors (DIs). The intention was to collect primary data from participants who had been DIs and then to develop deeper understandings of the role of the Inspectors and the parts they played in the development of primary schooling in the State of Victoria. Together with personal artefacts and Education Department documents, the memories of these people would contribute to the recording of the historical knowledge extant during the period the inspectorate functioned before its demise. This study sought to discover, interview, document and analyse responses as viewed through the perceptions of the participants, and to understand the practices of the DIs with such a diversity of backgrounds, educational experiences and qualifications.

**Research questions**

*Principal research question.* It will be remembered that the main research question that formed the basis of the study was:

What were the recollections and perceptions held by the Inspectors relating to the Primary Schools’ Inspectorial system in Victoria from 1960-1983?

*Research guiding questions.* Following the advice of O’Donoghue (2007), three research guiding questions were formulated to direct the study towards its aim. These questions were:

What functions were carried out by the Inspectors, and how did the Inspectors carry out their officially assigned and self-allocated functions?

What were their recollections and perceptions around (i) their assessment of the teaching staff academically and (ii) their other duties associated with their roles?

What were the personal qualities possessed by these Inspectors that created and developed the unique cultures and values within their specific district?

The research guiding questions were selected to give greater focus to the empirical section of the research study.

*Data collection questions.* Four groups of questions were drawn up to guide the data collection, in accordance with the advice of Punch (2009) and O’Donoghue (2007). The
questions were derived from the general aims, the main focus areas and from some of the
documents and literature read in advance. These data collection questions were:

1: **Memories of your career history during the period 1967 – 1983**

   What demographics, life events were influential in preparing you for the DI role?

   What were your perceptions of the role of the DI (pre-appointment, initial, mature-age)?

   Were you overwhelmed by the significance and power that this role involved and how
did you perceive this responsibility? How did you exercise it?

   How many years were you a DI, and how did you perceive your future career?

   What perceptions did you have about the impact “official” inspections had on schools,
   principals and the community in your district?

2: **Recollections of official duties / self-initiated programs in your district**

   Were you completely cognizant of your new role description when you took up the
   position?

   Was your job description realistic?

   What priorities did you allocate to the different aspects of the DI role?

   Did you know colleagues interpret their roles in similar ways? Do you remember any
disagreements/arguments? If so, exemplify with some salient or known differences?

   How creative were you allowed to be in the way you organized the expected work load
   and any new initiatives?

   Did you implement any new initiatives? What were they? Were they accepted? Were
   they successful? Did they become embedded?

3: **Recollections of their responsibilities to teachers**

   What perceptions did you have about the value and significance of the inspections of
   teachers?
How did you go about assessing your teachers? Were assessments based on comparisons/ benchmarks or purely individual? Did these assessments create any consequent changes in the teacher’s mode of pedagogy?

The assessment had a significant impact on a teacher’s career. Did you have difficulty making “Private Reports” accordingly?

Do you have any other issues you would like to discuss, e.g., relationships with other Divisions’ Inspectors/ principals?

4: Opinions on the nature of their work in relation to events, issues and changes in line with political, social and economic changes?

As a DI can you describe what this role meant to you?

Did you see significant change during your term as DI?

Was the role rewarding personally?

What issues did you have with this role as it was performed in the 60’s to the 80’s?

What changes (if any) would you have recommended during your era in the role?

These questions informed the empirical research; however, once the data had been analysed and reported, as will be seen in Chapters 4, 5 and 6, further questions arose as to the meaning of the findings. This new set of questions informed the discussion in Chapter 7: they were:

- what did these Inspectors contribute to the good of primary education in Victoria in the two decades that were studied;
- how and why did the system end; and
- what was to be gained or lost in the ending of the inspectorate?

Answering these questions in the discussion chapter (Chapter 7) completed the main aims of the research project.

Sampling procedures and discussion of the sample

Because the focus of this study was to gain personal perspectives of DIs from the Victorian Education Department Primary Division, the pursuit of participants involved a search for survivors from the fifty Inspectors known to have been appointed between 1967
and 1983. Once participants were traced and contacted, there were ethical and practical issues around their willingness to participate in the research so long after the event and their preparedness to tell their stories which encompassed previous life and professional experiences, particularly as their careers ended suddenly and perhaps acrimoniously. There were also the logistical problems of reaching them and interviewing them in a place and at a time of their convenience and choice.

With regard to the sample of Inspectors that were located, there was an attempt to construct some form of representation across the cohort. The first characteristic was the age of the participants. Two distinct age groupings emerged: the first group comprised of Inspectors appointed during the 1960s who had applied for this role as possibly the ultimate promotion of their career; the second was of the younger Inspectors, appointed during the late 1970s and early 1980s who viewed the role as being more of an educator/mentor than an Inspector. The different ages of the participants brought with it varied personal life experiences that affected who the person was and had become, as well as prior professional experiences. The latter proved to be an important characteristic indelibly etched into, and influential on, the psyche of those interviewed.

A second characteristic of importance was the individual’s length of service which may have resulted in differing approaches developed due to the ongoing relationship between Inspector and the district schools, staff and community. A third characteristic was concerned with qualifications. Here the aim was the gaining of data about inspectorial practices which could have resulted from differences among academic experiences. It then became possible to ascertain whether this aspect of background had an influence on how the Inspectors managed district level leadership and assessments of schools and teachers. It was critical to this study to recognize and acknowledge the differences that existed between Inspectors of differing service length, breadth of experience and what they brought to the system with each appointment. These differences are inevitably dependent on such aspects of human nature as personal circumstances, personality types and movement between districts (Stroot, et al. 1998). A summary of the participants’ educational backgrounds and qualification is provided in Table 1.
Table 1: Initial and Final Educational Backgrounds of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Name</th>
<th>Sex M/F</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Qualifications and Positions</th>
<th>Teaching/Inspector Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ewart Anderson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Education, Master of Education, Administration, District Inspector Seymour 1965</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher 17 years, Technical Teacher 2 years, Teachers’ College Lecture 6 years, District Inspector 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Brown</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Trained Infant Teachers Certificate, Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Education, Relieving District Inspector 1978, Permanent District Inspector 1982</td>
<td>Primary School teacher 8 years, Teachers, College Lecturer 2 years, Vice-Principal/Principal 3 years, District Inspector 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Dawson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Education, Member of Australian Psychological Society, Relieving Inspector 1964, District Inspector Caulfield 1969-1978, Acting Assistant Director of Primary Education 1982</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher 11 years, Teachers College Lecturer 9 years, District Inspector 19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Francioni</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Education, Master of Education, Administration, District Inspector Bairnsdale 1972</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher 16 years, Primary School Principal 4 years, District Inspector 11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Goode</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Diploma of Education, District Inspector</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher 12 years, Teachers College Lecturer 4 years, Exchange Teacher United Kingdom, Vice Principal/Principal 2 years, District Inspector 7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Hobbs</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Diploma of Education, Member of Australian Psychological Society, District Inspector Horsham 1964</td>
<td>World War 2 Australian Imperial Force 3 years, Primary School Teacher 14 years, Teachers College Lecturer 1 year, District Inspector 19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Holloway</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Diploma of Education, Bachelor of Education, District Inspector Colac 1967</td>
<td>World War 2 Royal Australian Navy 1 year, Teachers College Lecturer 2 years, Primary school teacher 19 years, District Inspector 16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Ikin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Education, Masters of Education, Doctor of Philosophy, District Inspector Traralgon 1974</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher 20 years, Principal 1 year, District Inspector 9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Meyer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Education, Masters of Education, Art Certificate, District Inspector Melton 1973, District Inspector Scoresby 1977</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher 16 years, Principal 1 year, District Inspector 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This group represents 24% of all the Inspectors in the Victorian Primary Schools Inspectorate who held the position between 1962 and 1983.

Participants for this research project were initially identified by notifying the chairperson of the Institute of Senior Officers of the Victorian Education Services (ISOVES) of the researcher’s intentions. The request for ‘expressions of interest’ letter (Appendix 2) was then distributed to all its members and non-members. Forty-six DIs and four Relieving Inspectors had served the state of Victoria between 1967 and 1983. Eight retired Inspectors expressed their willingness to participate: however to address age, years of service, district (country/ metropolitan) and gender contact was made with other members including one of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education and Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colin Moyle</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Education, Doctor of Philosophy, District Inspector Mildura 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nunn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Member of Australia, Bachelor of Commerce, Bachelor of Education, Doctor of Philosophy, District Inspector Horsham 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Reeves</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Bachelor of Economics, Bachelor of Education, Masters of Education, Doctor of Philosophy (London), District Inspector Wangaratta 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher 2 years, Teachers College Student 1 year, Primary School Teacher 12 years, Secondary Teacher 3 years, Teachers College Lecturer 2 years, District Inspector 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher 2 years, Teachers College Student 1 year, Primary School Teacher 22 years, Vice-Principal 2 years, District Inspector 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary School Teacher, Teacher in United Kingdom, Principal 3 years, District Inspector 7 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the two women who had not volunteered. Finally twelve participants including one female agreed to form a purposive convenience sample, members of which being willing to be interviewed. These participants were contacted by telephone and email to discuss their responses and to re-establish their willingness to participate in an interview session of approximately one hour. In this regard, cognizance was taken of procedures outlined by Woods (1985a) who recommended that a detail of the broad aims of the research, the principles of the methods, and the potential implications of the research should be clearly understood by the participants.

Information sent to the prospective participants included possible outcomes for the researcher and a statement of guarantees (Ethics guidelines) such as anonymity at all times, respect for, and protection of, privacy, and the right of the participants to correct and/or withhold transcripts. All retired DIs who volunteered were included in the research project. The current ages of the participants were 70 - 85 years, thereby creating an urgent consideration as availability and willingness to contribute to this research was a crucial factor.

Included in the appendices are the ethics approval letter (Appendix 1); the invitation letter to the participants (Appendix 2); the consent form to participate in the research (Appendix 3) and the interview guidelines (Appendix 7).

**Data collection procedures**

The data collection procedures used in this research included: a structured questionnaire sent by post prior to individual interviews; open ended interviews guided by the structured questionnaire format; and documents both extraneous and personal gathered individually from the research cohort. While there are many ways in which data can be obtained, the three sources detailed above were appropriate because this study, in accordance with narrative theorists, documents “how stories help people make sense of their world, while also studying how people make sense of their stories” (Creswell, 1998). The next section outlines and justifies the use of these methods of collecting data.

**Interviews in oral history**

Authors identify interviewing as a complex process because it orchestrates many ‘acts’ and for qualitative research, it is a means of “depth probes for getting to the bottom of things” (Glesne, 1999, p. 87). At the same time, interviewing is a social process where data are generated and compiled for analysis. Glesne contends that a researcher using interview methods to collect evidence and data is doing justice to the complexity of the issue being
Three main types of interviews can be employed in research: open-ended, (unstructured, or non-standardized) interviews; structured interviews; and semi-structured (or focused) interviews (Glesne, 1999; Burns, 2000; Wellington, 2000; Yin, 2003). An open-ended interview is an in-depth interaction that enquires about facts and explores opinions and gathers an interviewee’s insights into events and situations. This interview process need not contain a list of questions and is very flexible. The interviewee or respondent becomes an informant and may propose propositions while the interviewer must prepare to develop new questions to follow unexpected leads during the interview. On the other hand, a structured interview uses standardized procedures or questions and has little or no option to deviate. It restricts respondents, to a large extent, from expressing their 'total’ opinions, facts and perspectives about particular issues in question. Instead it directs them to answer the measured questions posed by the researcher in a determined effort to collect data required rather than the unexpected.

In between these two lies the semi-structured interview (Burns, 2000; Wellington, 2000), or focused interview (Yin, 2003), or depth-probing interview (Glesne, 1999). It comprises both structured and open-ended interview questions and varies in its degree depending on the interaction and interview guides and checklists. In this type of interview all areas of interest are pursued with varied expressions such as ‘tell me more’ and ‘explain’ to probe the “‘unseen’ that was, is, will be, or should be” (Glesne, 1999, p. 93). This allows the respondents to express how they think and feel about issues in question; how they explain and account for what they experience; and to verify or validate certain facts about situation.

This oral history study used open-ended interviews, framed in accordance with the questionnaire protocols, as the principal research method to reveal the behaviours, thoughts, feelings and perceptions of participants (Glesne, 1999; Burns, 2000; Best & Kahn, 2003), and the various aspects of the relationship between the inspectorial system and its interactive strategies. The research explored participants’ behaviours, beliefs and understandings about their experiences as a result of the interactive strategies, values, culture, and in-service education relating to the inspectorial system and the understanding of the dimensions which affected the schools, their personnel and the communities in which it functioned.

In this interviewing style, the wording and sequence are broadly prepared prior to the interview (Patton, 2002). This process of developing the interview schedule was largely guided by the data collection questions developed earlier in the study. The schedule was also
refined by the questionnaire protocol posted previously to the participants. In each interview, the questions followed the same format and roughly in the same order. Patton advises that in this format each question was worded carefully so that it was open-ended. This interviewing technique suited this study as it was seeking each participant’s responses on the same topic around their perceptions of the practices and duties of a DI. At the same time the intention was to allow each participant to say things that might have been unexpected and to generate ideas and knowledge that had not been predicted.

Participants were all active members of the Education Department during the period being researched so it was essential that they respond and be interviewed both from an historical perspective and first-hand knowledge of this era. The totality of the information from individual questionnaires and interviews enabled the researcher to compare and validate data collected from documentary evidence. The experiences of the convenience sample which comprises this research cohort constitute the principal source of data for the study. The research of DIs perceptions and experiences of their role during this period thereby developed a collective data bank showing commonalities and differences faced by these participants and issues that were relevant to the changing times. The geographic separation of the participants and the researcher emphasizes the importance of obtaining optimal data, as follow-up interviews were impossible to arrange. Thus the recommendation of Seidman (2009) that an ‘interview’ as data collection has three different stages was never possible in this study. The process was rather like taking a photograph – one chance and the moment might be lost.

Another consideration, and potential advantage, of the open style interview guided by a previously submitted interview protocol is that of checking for understanding. Experimental studies have shown that different respondents sometimes read different meanings into the same question, and therefore are actually answering different questions. If the researcher is aware of this, additional questions may be introduced beyond the structure imposed by the interview schedule. The participants’ initial candid opinions given to the questionnaire protocol provided scope for probing for further details within these opinions; and the follow-up guided but open interviews were deemed the most suitable method of data gathering as this can capture a range of opinions about aspects relating to the specific role they performed (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998).

The use of open-ended questions, basic to the semi-structured interview, provided the participants with an opportunity to expand their thoughts and opinions around the initial
question. Open-ended questions also allow the researcher to delve into the participants’ responses to clarify any misunderstandings, ask for further explanations and make an accurate assessment of what is said (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000). The use of open-ended questions can capture unexpected and unanticipated responses, enabling the researcher to both probe and relate back to the broader question, or to narrow the participants’ responses to provide specific understandings. Silverman (1993) identifies the importance of open-ended questions:

This enables respondents to demonstrate their unique way of looking at the world – their definition of the situation. It recognizes that what is a suitable sequence of questions for one respondent might be less suitable for another, and open-ended questions enabled important but unanticipated issues to be raised (p. 121-122).

The importance of open-ended interview questions as described by Silverman became a reality as the interviews began to unfold. The possibility of the Inspectors providing unique perceptions of their situation was a deciding factor in using open-ended questions. The challenge at the outset, though, was to provide initial questions that focused on previously identified, key elements of the inspection system. Developing a questionnaire protocol was important to this outcome. As each participant was seventy to eighty plus years old, a copy of the questionnaire protocol (see Appendix 4) was mailed for completion as a prelude to, and in preparation for the individual interviews. This strategy was to elicit more thoughtful responses beyond simple recall of events and more straightforward detail, and to give the participants the opportunity and adequate time to prepare and collect any information such as reports, diaries, assessment papers, letters, documents, visual material and any other relevant information still in their possession that could add value to the data. All participants responded favourably for the opportunity to gather information prior to the interviews and arrived armed with important and valuable documents for the study.

Corroboration of interview data by information from other sources and documents may avoid contentious issues, but at the same time the differences in the various data sources added to the richness of the evidence that the participants provided in interviews. As Glesne (1999) puts it, interviewing, “as an interpretive tradition, can be the sole basis of a study, or it can be used in conjunction with data from participant observations and documents” (p. 68). Additionally, it gives the “opportunity to learn what one cannot see, and to explore alternatives amongst other advantages; it provides affective and cognitive underpinnings”
(p.93). This research was based on narrative research methodology utilizing the open-ended interview as the data gathering instrumentation, and informed by content and structure of the structured questionnaire protocol forwarded to the respondents of the research cohort prior to the interviews. The latter provided two sources of data, the first being from the responses to its structured questions, and the second from being the framework which formed the basis of the open-ended interviews conducted later as an integral part of this study. This allowed for the linkages between the interactive strategies of the inspectorial system and the districts’ educational performances to be identified and conclusions made about their relationships, thereby facilitating development of the conceptual and contextual framework of the inspectorial system as perceived by the participants as one of the main outcomes of the study.

Thus, the use of interviews in this study was appropriate and advantageous in gaining the quality of data that open-ended interviews can provide. Berg (2007, p. 89) defines interviews as “a conversation with a purpose” and extends this further referring to the term ‘dramaturgy’ therefore likening it to elements of “theatre, stagecraft and stage management”. In large part this is an accurate reflection of the interview process and skills required in the conduct of these interviews.

**Data collection procedures 1: the interviews**

**Use of an informal questionnaire.** Interviews are the ‘most prominent’ data collection tool in qualitative research especially oral history (Janesick, 2010; Yow, 2005). However, because of the age of the participants and because the research was exploring events that took place over 30 years ago, it was deemed advisable to send the questions from the interview protocol to each participant before the actual interviews so that they could jog their memories and perhaps look through any personal records that might assist them in renewing their memories. This was particularly valuable in the case of one more aged participant who clearly had difficulty recalling some aspects of his career and had relied on his wife to help him with developing his answers to the questionnaire and in the interview. Furthermore, the printed questionnaire was used by several participants to jot down notes which the end of the interview were submitted to the researcher, and being useful in the data analysis and interpretation later. This strategy therefore proved to be a very useful addition to the data collection process and is to be recommended when conducting data collection of aged participants required to recall events from three decades or more previously.
In oral history and other qualitative methodologies, interviewing as data collection commences with the idea that others’ perspectives are worthy of exploration, and the revelation of these should be as explicit as possible (Patton, 2004). Interviews allow participants to reveal their understanding of events and their values, attitudes and beliefs (Gaskell & Bauer, 2000). The interview has become a means of contemporary story telling (Gubrium & Holstein, 1998) where participants will share life stories in response to interview questions. This is important to this study to understand the stories surrounding the complex situations that the Inspectors confronted on a daily basis.

Oral history uses a method of interviewing where meaning emerges throughout the collection process. As the interviews were conducted early in the research process, due to the age constraints of the participants, the intention was to follow the process of a single semi-structured, open-ended interview; however as the research developed it was evident that an important approach to oral history was emerging so further contact with the participants evolved and will be described later in the chapter.

Obtaining information around specific research questions from interviewees was a critical component of the data collection process. As previously noted, the researcher possessed important personal background knowledge, in that she had known some of the research cohort directly and had served under most of the respondents in some way or other. This background knowledge meant that she could understand the fundamentals of the DIs’ roles and functioning, and could probe some of the participants’ responses more effectively. This helped to facilitate the data collection process and ensure the quality of the data gathered.

Nevertheless, to ensure the interview schedule was clear and concise to which participants could respond, a pilot study was conducted with three trial interviews of retired regional directors prior to the actual interviews taking place with the participants; this strategy is discussed under ‘Pilot Interviews’.

**Pilot interviews.** As Kvale (2007) has recommended, a pilot study assists researchers to increase the success of any research, although in itself it offers no guarantee. Prior to data collection in this research, a pilot study of interviews was conducted with three senior executives from Education Queensland, the aim being to ensure clarity of interview questions, to capture research aims, to identify areas in need of refinement and to practise interviewing techniques.
The benefits of conducting such a pilot allowed for an early diagnosis of possible problems with the questions and probes. The purpose of the trial interviews was to pre-test the interview questions to ascertain whether they were worded clearly and elicited the types of responses that were anticipated. The pilot study also provided an idea of how long the interview might take, this being another serious factor to consider.

Pre-test participants who had worked in similar situations were sought. Permission to record via an audio-device was gained prior to each interview. The recording allowed for playback and listening to the techniques employed. All pilot participants were encouraged to add comments to assist in the refining process of the final interview protocol. The pre-test participants were also encouraged to make comments about the suitability of each question and their ability to respond accordingly.

In summary, the process of the pilot interviews provided an excellent opportunity for the questions to be further developed, refined and clarified. The interview technique was polished and some minor changes were made to the questionnaire and interview protocols.

**Conducting the interviews.** Armed with a semi-structured, open-ended interview guide, the structure of which was underpinned by the questionnaire protocol, the researcher began to realize the complexity of the process of conducting the interviews. The researcher lived in Queensland but the participants lived in Melbourne, Victoria; Sydney, New South Wales and Perth, Western Australia. Remembering that all interviewees were elderly the researcher needed to commit to the necessary travel. Many hours of telephone conversations led to nine of the participants agreeing to scheduled, individual meetings at a hired venue in the Central Business District (CDB) of Melbourne. One requested that the researcher travel to a private home in an eastern suburb of Melbourne. A timetable was established to accommodate these requests (see Appendix 5). The participant from Perth agreed to visit his daughter in Brisbane where his interview was arranged, and the final interview was conducted at a ‘Symposium’ in Sydney at Macquarie University where the researcher was presenting a paper and the participant was visiting.

Prior to the interviews, the package containing information about the venue, time and a copy of the interview protocol which contained the main questions to be pursued was sent to each candidate allowing them time to recall their experiences as a DI and to collect personal documentation they believed would be relevant. Participants indicated their appreciation of the opportunity to review and recall their personal experiences from the 60s to
the 80s and to voice their opinions about the advantages and disadvantages of the inspectorial system as they remembered it.

On the day of the interview the session commenced with a casual conversation and introduction creating a relaxed atmosphere and an enjoyable rapport between the researcher and the participant. Once the scene was set, the formality of signing the approval paper (see Appendix 6), agreeing to have the interview recorded for transcript purposes and being assured of the confidentiality constraints, the interview began.

The researcher conducted the interviews knowledgably, enjoying and recording the stories the participants related about the relevant situations. The interviews were extremely pleasant because the participants were reminiscing about times very important to them. For example, Goode was anxious to express his point of view by telling this story of a humorous incident:

School visit by the Inspector was due. The principal told the teacher he was in charge of fire drill. When the teacher was asked what he had done it was obvious that nothing had been done. After his inspection was over the bell rang for fire drill. How obvious!

After each interview the participants were given light refreshments and a small gift before they embarked on their journey home.

**Data collection procedures 2: Documents as data**

Information was researched and collated about the inspectorate in which each participant had been employed – its history, location, social background, community, schools, principals, teachers and pupils. The purpose in generating such documented historical data was to assist in portraying the context within which each inspector worked and to compare and validate documentary evidence. Historians categorize methods of collecting data into primary and secondary sources. Primary sources are anything produced at the time or produced later by people who were there, while secondary sources are analyses conducted later by academics. Documents for collecting data in research are of two main types, those recording actual events such as annual reports, records of meetings, and initiated documents such as diaries and others such as letters, agendas, budgets, news clippings, photographs, government policies, syllabuses and books (Glesne, 1999; Burns, 2000; Yin, 2003). As documents are produced for specific audiences and purposes they may not be accurate or lack
bias in research topics (Wellington, 2000). Scott (1990) stresses the importance of documents being carefully treated in research, specifically in the areas of:

authenticity – whether the document is genuine and is of originality;

credibility – whether the document is free of a problem in history;

representativeness – whether there is evidence that it is typical of its kind; and

meaning – whether the document’s content is clear and comprehensible.

Documents can be used to establish meaning and as a main focus for analysis; by doing so they become the subject of systematic research.

However, in keeping with the research assumptions here as ‘social products’, documents are accepted as having multiple meanings that are subject to interpretation rather than search or discovery of realities. However, documents are important as a way to corroborate evidence and to specify events and issues in greater detail. Documents may raise questions about hunches allowing for new directions during observations and interviews. They provide “historical, demographic, and sometimes personal information that is unavailable from other sources” (Glesne, 1999, p. 58), and through this they enrich what is seen and heard. Documents can also be “substituted for records of activity that researchers could not observe directly – the recorder (in this case) is a more expert observer than the researcher” (Stake, 1995, p. 68).

In this study, the nature of the interviews initially relied on perceptions that the participants wished to express about certain aspects of their inspectorial role; however, documents produced by the participants as evidence were of value and often depended on the nature of the interview questions and the focus of the research. Documents were used to corroborate or triangulate evidence and data from the individual interviews. The main objective was to complement the interview data and to conclude and consolidate the research by enriching the write up (Wellington, 2000). Documents, as having a corroborative role, provided both historical and contextual dimensions to interviews. Documents such as duty statements, policies on inspectorial functions and supervisory programs, checklists used as a means of maintaining inspectorate values, and documents on inspectorial practices and school reports, were included as sources of evidence. The use of documents confirmed or improved
the quality of data and was also employed as a means of triangulation (Stake, 1995; Burns, 2000).

**Procedures for analysing the data**

Creswell (1998, p. 154) noted that analysis involves “pulling the data apart then putting them back together in more meaningful ways”. Initial data analysis begins with the transcription of the interviews, data reduction and coding recognizing connecting ideas and themes that occurred throughout the data collection process. In general, data analysis in research involves the organization and systematic presentation of data that are seen, heard and read. Information is organized, not only to record and count occurrences but also to describe, compare, examine, categorize, explain, hypothesize, theorize, test, tabulate and demonstrate linkages or evidences to address propositions emerging from investigations (Glesne, 1999; Burns, 2000; Yin, 2003a). Data analysis allows for information to be interpreted in order to make a “comparison of meanings within a category” (Burns, 2000, p. 430) so that insights can be made and demonstrated. It is a matter of giving “meanings to first impressions as well as the final compilation” (Stake, 1996, p. 17) of data during and after the process of conducting the research. Data analysis can also begin and simultaneously take place with data collection. This helps to focus, shape, reflect, organize and discover what is being told immediately.

Data analysis can occur during as well as after data collection as the researcher identifies concepts or central ideas within the categorized information. This is referred to as a process of coding which sorts out and defines the collected information (Glesne, 1999). The processes of analysing data are explained and the findings resulting from the questionnaire protocol and interview data analysis are summarized.

Marshall and Rossman (1995) and Wellington (2000) have suggested three stages of data analysis which allows data to be fairly, clearly, coherently and attractively accepted. However the most succinct and helpful overview of the data analysis procedure comes from Miles and Huberman (1994) who posit three phases of data analysis: data reduction, data display and drawing conclusions. Data reduction is the process where data are collated, summarized, coded and sorted out in themes, clusters and categories. Data display is the process where data are organized and assembled into pictorials, diagrams and visual form. This then leads to conceptualizing the data, leading towards interpretation and conclusion.
Finally, drawing conclusions is the stage reached after interpretation of the data has been carried out after its immersion, reflection, analysing, recording and synthesizing.

It was evident that the three stages of data analysis were now accessible and the researcher was in possession of the relevant information.

**Analysis of interview transcripts and other relevant documents.** This study has applied various strategies and techniques of data analysis: data reduction, data display and conclusion (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Wellington, 2000). Data analysis began in an on-going way, beginning almost immediately after the first individual participant’s interview and concluding at the end of the research process. This was achieved through the analysis of transcripts and records of interviews, and the contents of documents. Each participant’s data were analysed to establish initial empirical bases and themes to be compared with similar features of other participants’ data. As emphasized earlier, the analysis allowed for themes, concepts, meanings, explanations and interpretations of the data to support the propositions before the conclusions were made and the final analysis concluded.

Document analysis of public and private documents formed an integral part of the early data analysis. The researcher compared and contrasted data in order to identify concepts and the regularity with which they occurred. Ultimately, a number of concepts were identified through the coding process, these being developed into themes which in turn became the final research propositions.

According to Miles and Huberman (1994), qualitative data analysis works on the assumption that there are regularities and commonalities to be found in the physical and social world. In this research, a key process in analysing data involved coding, memos and systematically arranging data as a part of the interpretation by the researcher. Their mode of data analysis ensures the process of writing memos occurs simultaneously with coding. Memos are essentially notes which record suggestions from the data which supported the researcher’s formulation of concepts and the theoretical framework which were at a higher level of abstraction. This highlighted new patterns and, at times, led to higher levels of coding. It suggested ways of carrying out the analysis and related different concepts to each other. The relationship between coding and memo writing was such that in this research the former represented the systematic and disciplined portion of the data analysis and the latter represented the creative and speculative portion. The memos linked coding with the development of propositions and together, the coding and memos brought coherence to the
data. In line with Miles and Huberman’s mode, data from documents and interviews were collected, collated, reduced, displayed, verified and conclusions drawn through the process of constant comparison and constant questioning; and the practices were enacted in a non-linear and highly inter-relational manner.

**Stages of Data Analysis.** Four stages were used in the data analysis process of this research project, stage one being the context analysis of each participant’s transcript and other documented evidence presented by the participant at the interview. Recollections of similar experiences, beliefs and perceptions were identified and emerging themes for each participant were identified (see Appendix 8 ‘Coding and Memos’). The second stage clearly identified the emerging themes for each participant. These were further categorized into those of relevance to the Victorian PSIS. The emerging themes allowed the information to answer the ‘central question’ through the guiding research questions (see Appendix 8).

Stage 3 involved using the results from Stage 2, the information emerging from the various Inspectors’ perceptions and the official inspectorial system as evidenced in the data was identified (see Appendix 9,10 and 11 ‘Emerging Themes’). Within each Inspector’s district these themes were examined and compared for similarities and differences.

To answer the main research question better, four research areas were outlined:

- recollections of being a District Inspector from the late 1960s to 1983 when thinking about the impact official inspections had on schools in the district;
- recollections of official duties and self-initiated programs;
- recollections of responsibilities, relationships with teachers, influence on teaching performances and the significant impacts on teacher’s careers; and
- recollections of opinions on the nature of expected duties in relation to events, issues and role changes in line with political, social and economic policies.

The results from Stage 3 were used to identify and analyse commonalities and differences in each participant’s district to enable findings to be concluded for the study as a whole. These emerging concepts were then retested by constantly revisiting analysis, re-playing tapes, reviewing the transcript and checking that the developing codes and themes were appropriate.
Outcomes from the stages of data analysis. When reviewing the outcomes of the data analysis it became obvious that these findings presented many personal characteristics of the participant’s life history that feature in their oral history. To highlight how the attitudes, values and beliefs of the DIs influenced the daily operation of their chosen career, the researcher chose three Inspectors from different backgrounds, qualifications, eras within the 1960-1983 time frame and experience to illustrate the journey taken to fulfil their aspirations to become a DI. At this point the process followed so far was inadequate to justify the changes. The three people involved were contacted initially by telephone to gain their permission to personalize their experiences. Drafts of the stories were sent to the people concerned to correct inaccuracies and to suggest any additional material they would like included. This process continued through e-mails and telephone conversations until approval was finalized.

Within each stage the findings were synthesized to illustrate the perceptions of the participants. The findings were further utilized to develop ‘An Oral History of DIs’ Perceptions: 1967 to 1983’ when the substantive position was abolished. The outcomes of these four stages will be used to produce the findings discussed in Chapters 4, 5 and 6, namely, the underpinning concepts of inspectorate values, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education. Chapter 4 explicates the concept ‘inspectorate values’, and chapter 5 provides explanations for the other two concepts, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education. Chapter 6 gives life to the warp and weft of inspectorate values, culture and in-service education. This was assisted by examining the detailed oral histories of the three Inspectors who had diverse demographic backgrounds, individual stories to tell and educational philosophies to advance.

Interpretation procedures

Interpretation is taken to mean that part of the research process where meaning is given to the data that has been analysed and reported. Here the researcher as historian moves ‘outside’ and ‘away from’ the data in which she has been heavily immersed, to make broader sense of what the participants have said and what she has analysed. At the same time the higher order analysis can also be identified as a form of interpretation, as the researcher imposes her own structures to the ‘bricolage’ of data that emerged from the data and form the documentary data.
The interpretations of the findings have been largely discussed in the penultimate chapter, Chapter 7, where the interpretation revolved around three questions that guided the process. These questions were:

what did these Inspectors contribute to the good of primary education in Victoria in the two decades that were studied;

how and why did the system end; and

what was to be gained or lost in the ending of the inspectorate?

Considering and answering these questions allowed the researcher to link the data to issues and conceptualisations raised in the literature review and thus make a personal interpretation of data the participants had provided in the empirical phase of the study.

**Ethical issues**

Ethics and morality are important elements of social science research. An “ethic is a moral principle or code which governs what people do” (Wellington, 2000, p. 54) and relates to peoples’ behaviour and action. It refers to moral principles, rules and conventions held by a group of people or a profession that “distinguish socially accepted behaviour from that which is considered socially unacceptable” (Burns, 2000, p. 17). Thus it is important that researchers consider ethics in the subject matter, the methods and procedures, including the planning, conduct and presentation of the study (Glesne, 1999; Burns, 2000; Wellington, 2000). In other words “ethical considerations override all” (Wellington, 2000, p. 54) other issues related to the study being accomplished.

Ethical rules or guidelines in a form of ‘Code of Ethics or Code of Ethics Contract’, while they attempt to govern what people do and how they behave, may also “attempt to define limits” (Burns, 2000, p. 17). These may be too rigid, affecting the effectiveness of the research, and eventually denying the researcher knowledge of the human behaviour of the research focus. However considerations of ethical issues in research, and in particular that into the field of social science, go beyond scrutiny and justify means to focus and attain the outcomes of the study.

Ethical problems are likely to occur whenever human subjects are involved. Researchers must be aware of ethical considerations in voluntary and non-voluntary participation; there must be no deception, consent that is informed, privacy and
confidentiality, the right to discontinue, and obligations of the experimenter (Burns, 2000). These sum the main ethical considerations guiding the researcher in carrying out the research activities, including the actual writing of the thesis. Glesne (1995, p. 114) and Burns (p. 22) suggest the following code of ethics:

- risks to participants are minimized or eliminated;
- risks to participants are outweighed by anticipated benefits of research;
- rights and welfare of participants are protected;
- participation should be voluntary, participants being able to withdraw, without penalty, from the study at any time; and
- participants have the right to know the nature, purpose and duration of the study.

Furthermore, Wellington (2000), amongst other issues and in support of the above, reveals the additional responsibilities of researchers when conducting studies and when dealing with ethical issues:

- informed consent to be obtained (which contributes to empowerment of research participants as volunteers);
- permission sought from the right people using the right channel; and
- honesty and openness to characterize the relationships between the researcher, participants and institutional representatives (p. 56).

It can be concluded that in research ethical considerations cannot be ignored because they “are inseparable from everyday interactions with research participants and with your data” (Glesne, 1999, p. 113). However, the researcher is in the best position to describe what constitutes ethical dilemmas that can be addressed within certain established guidelines. If these ethical dilemmas are avoided or minimized, it is possible that the subjects of the research see themselves as partners in the research process and be empowered to contribute meaningfully without fear or favour.

Consistent with the University of the Sunshine Coast Code of Ethics applicable to the conduct of this research, this study considered ethical issues that have been emphasized above but in particular concentrated on the ethical issues below (Glesne, 1999; Wellington, 2000; Burns, 2000).
Voluntary participation: While the participants of the research “may not be free as the researcher may think”, they were informed that their involvement in the research was voluntary. Though usually voluntary participants may be more intelligent, better educated and expert in the focus of the research, attempts were made to ensure a variety of participants was encouraged to volunteer and participate.

Informed consent: Participants were informed of the nature and purpose of the research and consented to participate in it without being forced or coerced. Participants signed a form indicating that they had been informed of the purpose, procedures, risks and discomforts, its benefit and the right to withdraw.

Avoiding deception: This is common in studies that implicate participants’ ‘emotion, motivation, social behaviour and ethnography’. Every attempt was made to avoid deceptions that may result in the misrepresentation of the purpose of the study and false diagnoses, secret recording of behaviour that participants were not aware of, and negative attitudes and loss of self-esteem that the participant may have towards the research.

Debriefing: For each case being studied, a debriefing was undertaken to disclose the purpose of the research activities including interviews and checking documents, description of possible deception and why it may be used, and an attempt to make the research respectable and important amongst other issues.

Privacy and confidentiality: Participants were informed of their right to privacy (they would decide what was appropriate to communicate to others, including attitudes, habits, fears and guilt), and that the results of the activities would be kept confidential and anonymous.

Right to continue: The right of participants to discontinue with the research at any stage was respected if there were ‘forces’ that may influence participants to decide to withdraw.

Publication of findings: The results of the research were treated openly to allow for “disinterested colleagues to vet the research and implications” and misrepresentation and information to be debated. This was done confidentially.

All ethical rules were followed to ensure the integrity of the participants and the researcher were maintained. The first of these was informed consent. Secondly, the retired DIs were given careful and truthful information about the research, right to privacy (identities are protected) and thirdly, protection from harm (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 70). Initially the
research was assessed for suitability through the university appraisals of draft documents, including the procedure for confirmation of the study to ensure that the research was viable, the design adequate, and appropriate data collection techniques were chosen. All participants were provided with information (informed consent packages and synopsis of the research) from which they were reasonably expected to develop a clear understanding of the aims, objectives and methods of the research. Pseudonyms were used as necessary to ensure complete anonymity was maintained in conjunction with the elimination of material or information that provided any indication of the identities of the participants. All participants were informed of their rights to refuse to take part in the research or withdraw during the process. All parties were made aware of the published aspects of the research. Permission to conduct research and ethical clearance was sought and approved through the University of the Sunshine Coast ethics committee (see Appendix 1). Consent was sought from all participants (see Appendix 6) prior to the beginning of the study and the interviews.

As the research progressed it became evident that the emphasis of the study had shifted to embrace a form of oral history, thus requiring a change to the original ethics approval. A letter outlining the changes to move from pseudonyms to personal identification needed the approval of all participants. (see Appendix 15). Ten of the twelve participants responded immediately, saying they were happy with this. One of the participants has unfortunately died since the research began, but a personal letter was sent to his widow. After a telephone conversation with her, she asked that his transcript be sent to her. Having received the transcript, she then replied, giving permission for the change. Therefore eleven of the participants have agreed. However one participant did decline, and so the research continued as before, by making every effort to ensure that this person remains completely de-identified.

The consideration of the ethical issues that permeated all aspects of the research concludes this chapter. The details of the empirical processes have been carefully outlined, and now the thesis moves on to report on the findings that emerged from the interviews and other data, and their analysis. These findings are contained in the next three chapters.
Chapter 4: The Inspectors and their inspectorate values

Introduction

This chapter is the first of three revealing the findings from the interviews with the research cohort of twelve retired Victorian Primary School District Inspectors (DI), these chapters forming the scaffold for the respective oral accounts of the participants’ perceptions. In the preceding chapter the analysis of data identified three major themes at the highest level of analysis: inspectorate values, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education. This chapter explicates the first of these, inspectorate values, providing a broad overview of the idiosyncratic values identified by the research cohort, thereby underpinning the manner in which they, or all DIs, unconsciously directed the interpretation their roles. Chapter 5 discusses aspects of the unique inspectorate culture to which the Inspectors and the educational personnel contributed and shaped, and the nature of the inspectorate in-service education developments distilled from the data recorded in the transcripts. Chapter 6 documents the oral biographies of three DIs whose different experiences, qualifications and opportunities led them to common challenging, rewarding and successful careers as Inspectors, based on the three unconsciously promoted underpinning concepts above. In doing so, these three chapters identify, discuss and explain the research findings and how the interaction between the three categories influenced the inspectorial districts’ organization and operations.

The first of the three major concepts, inspectorate values, is the main focus of this chapter, but before focusing on these values, the chapter begins by establishing important information the participants provided with regard to these roles. These include: the backgrounds of the Inspectors themselves; the three types of district in which they operated; and the manner in which they interpreted the designated responsibilities as related to their inspectorates’ values.

At the outset, the chapter begins by considering influential aspects of the individual Inspector’s background, including comments made with regard to the overview of their work. Second, the Inspectors were representative of the three types of districts in which they were
the Education Department’s senior officer: country, country-metropolitan and metropolitan. Although the position of DI appeared to be identical in all three groups, the demographic and geographical elements of each grouping impacted on the manner in which they operated. This was to have further impact on the values they brought to their roles, leading to the differing inspectorate values they inculcated and which will be explained throughout the chapter. Individual stories relating to the manner in which they executed their duties in each of the three categories verify and consolidate their role perceptions as indicative of the values which typified inspectorates.

The final, and largest, section of the chapter is focused on explaining how inspectorate values influenced the Inspectors’ actions. This is one of the major findings from the interviews as these values, unconsciously provided by the participants themselves, gives a depth and breadth to overall inspectorate history which another type of historical approach might fail to do. Principals, teachers, students and the broader community were all influenced by the status and position of the DI who was identified as a mentor, an educator, and an educational leader who emphasized unconsciously the importance of the inspectorate’s unique values being upheld in the district. The result was that these underpinning values had a considerable mutual impact on the methods of primary school pedagogy in the inspectorial district.

**Who were these Inspectors?**

These Inspectors interviewed comprised the research cohort of twelve retired DIs most of whose lives and careers were affected when the inspectorial system of the Education Department in Victoria was abolished in 1983. They were relatively unaware of the momentous crisis about to descend on them and did not envisage the savage form it was to take. In the end they lamented that their voices had not been heard regarding this career destroying issue. The significance of this research is that it allows the Inspectors to voice their perceptions orally and to support, defend or question the inspectorial system as it had operated for over a century. The cohort although limited in number because of the twenty-seven years that have elapsed since the event, were all volunteers who felt honoured to have the opportunity to speak to the researcher in person. As individuals they told their stories about their career journey before becoming DIs, relating their experiences with conviction and emotion; their dedication to the position was unquestionable and their memories
accentuated their enjoyment of the achievements and influences they perceived as having contributed to the education system in Victoria. Each participant’s interview became richer and more comprehensive as detailed information was offered and documents relating to each individual’s retrospective background and career as an Inspector were discussed. A platform of knowledge was therefore developed to correlate with and exemplify the main concepts relating to inspectorate values. They all believed that the standard of children’s education was lifted as improved teaching skills and knowledge were introduced throughout the schools in their districts by their interactive strategies as each left their individual marks upon what was finally deduced as three underpinning inspectorate concepts from the data provided by the interviews and documents: inspectorate values, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service training.

To establish the atmosphere and sensitivities of the Inspectors’ influences from their career histories, the following quotations excised from the transcripts indicate the various attitudes and beliefs held by some of the Inspectors. Moyle described his position as one of satisfaction and pleasure:

I have no doubt that my period as a DI was the most exciting, creative period of my career with the Ministry. I had no perception of the fabled Regulation III, the job description notwithstanding, then (or now) of what a DI’s role was mandated to be, but relied on the wisdom I had accumulated from my various previous postings and life experiences, and the teachers with whom I worked. For me their tenets unfolded; each day was another of excitement – what next would so many of these challenged teachers confront me with – only to find themselves confronted in return with ideas to extend their thinking further. I had been a teacher, and to me teachers are the “salt of the earth” and they have remained so, influencing my administrative actions until I retired.

Most of the Inspectors interviewed were experienced and had established networks with their colleagues. Unlike these experienced Inspectors, Reeves, appointed in 1977, was relatively younger and inexperienced and found operating through the established network onerous. His initial perceptions and the implementation of the tenets ascribed to the position were unclear. He relied strongly on his previous experiences in schools and the collegiate group of principals to develop his own style of operating his district. To clarify his perceptions he stated that:
I probably didn’t know what I was going into had I not been a school principal. I have reflected over the years and believe that I was lucky to have had the experience as a principal. My school was burnt down and I had to run it on three sites, I had to deal with some fairly challenging staff at times, and so I reckoned it was a good grounding before becoming a DI. I was really a DI on my own and I was probably one of the youngest DIs in the late seventies so I did not have a strong collegiate network of other DIs elsewhere. My relationships came more from principals, that’s how I found it. I was also very careful to keep the friendship separate from the professional relationship.

Meyer, coming from a family of educationalists, viewed his appointment to the position of DI as the pinnacle of his career. His ambition to share his expertise with as wide an audience as possible and to fulfil the requirements of the Education Department’s inspectorial system to the best of his ability was expressed as:

I thought it was the most motivating position that I could ever aspire to. My experience in schools and particularly my short time as a principal was a good training for DI. These experiences gave me prior knowledge that I could fall back on. They allowed me to put myself in problem situations that were occurring in the schools and be realistic about my advice and decision making. It was a job worth doing. Like a school principal leading his staff, as DI, I was the leader of district principals. I motivated them to benefit children’s education and to improve schools. It was an invigorating time and exciting work.

Anderson, an Inspector with twenty years’ experience gave an account of his activities from the mid-1960’s making him one of the older participants. His teacher training included a year as a student teacher and a one year college course. His studies were completed during his primary teaching years, and he explained how the extra qualifications permitted him to apply for this rewarding role. Expressing his gratitude at the opportunity bestowed on him he revealed that:

I got a lot out of the role personally. I read more than I had ever read before and talking to other people. It was very valuable experience where you had great mate-ship with your colleagues.
Dawson summarized his career as an opportunity to work with schools and share with teachers the knowledge he had gained in his years of teaching. He had faith in his experiences and believed he could make a difference to the education of the children in his district. He commented thus: “It was a very rewarding position. You had the opportunity to share your expertise with a range of professionals.”

Goode expressed his priorities by using a more subtle approach - not the Inspector assessing the teachers but rather the mentor and friend still achieving the same end result. Goode relied on the traits of his personality to achieve the trust and co-operation of his principals and teachers in the district, revealing:

The role was rewarding and satisfying, well prepared and created great friendships. I believe I was an advisor, a mentor and a critical friend. I did not see it as a monetary gain but rather a love of the job.

Holloway saw his position as being related to the requirements set out in the job description. He believed these requirements were his basic priority but his role expanded as he realized that:

I knew straight away that I wanted to help teachers teach better. I didn’t think that up for myself, I had read an article by an Inspector in 1856, he wrote that: “he emphasized what had been written before, that an Inspector was to help teachers to teach better so that children could learn better”.

In summary, the main features of the perceptions held by the DIs in relation to their career history were: the Inspectors believed that it was a rewarding, satisfying and prestigious position both personally and educationally; and principals, teachers and students benefited from the district organization, school visits, in-service training and the collegiate framework that developed between schools and the Inspectors. Although there were prescribed requirements for the position, each individual brought his/her own style and approach. It was this individuality, expertise and experience that allowed a unique style to emerge and a particular learning environment to be created in each inspectorate. Within each inspectorate ideas promoted and developed by inspirational and forward thinking teachers were encouraged by the DI these creative ideas spread to become new initiatives in their schools, and sometimes beyond, these initiatives often flowing over to other districts before becoming permanent features of the state system. There was a common, shared belief among nearly all
the participants that the position of DI created the optimal career opportunity for promoting their creative contributions to the Victorian primary school education system.

**Inspectors and their districts**

Until May 1967 the inspectorates numbered 50, 25 metropolitan and 25 country districts. As populations grew and changed, the 25 country inspectorates diminished to 22 and as the suburbs of Melbourne encompassed a greater area, the number of metropolitan inspectorates increased to 28. Metropolitan districts were very popular among appointees, but few Inspectors achieved these priority positions without being appointed initially to a country position. Although the position was identical in relation to the job description, the reality was very different. The amount of travel was an obvious difference. The remoteness of the smaller schools in rural areas subjected Inspectors to managerial, organizational, supervisory and inspectorial challenges. As the research reveals, five of the Inspectors who contributed to the research were appointed to the country inspectorates; one chose to live the country lifestyle for his entire career, three applied for positions at Head Quarters and one became a Regional Director in a country area. Two operated entirely in metropolitan districts; the others experienced being both a country and metropolitan DI; thus a balanced account of the similarities and differences across the types of inspectorates was obtained in the interviews.

The research cohort comprised twelve retired DIs who held the position of DI severally between 1960 and 1983, when the inspectorial system in its current form was abolished and DIs were offered other positions in the Education Department. The participants’ qualifications and training all included the basic requirement of Teacher Training, a Bachelor Degree and Diploma of Education. However, all participants continued to study what they believed were relevant courses such as Bachelor of Education and Masters of Education, Administration, Art and Music. Four Inspectors completed their Doctor of Philosophy degree during their career enhancing their knowledge and experiences to the benefit of their clients. Experience varied from primary, secondary and technical teachers to teachers’ college lecturers, vice-principals and principals. Inspectors who had been school principals believed that the experience had enriched their performance as a DI; others maintained that a breadth of educational experiences suited their new career direction well. Two expressed the opinion that if they had experienced the role of principal of a school then their position as DI would have been clearer and more meaningful. The participants’ experience as DIs ranged from four to twenty years, their perceptions of the role being impacted upon by the societal and political issues and educational changes created during
their respective years as DIs. They approached their roles in a variety of ways, but always aware of the compulsory criteria such as inspections of schools, staff assessments and the Annual/Biennial Reports required by the Education Department. But it was each individual’s personality, manner, expertise and mode of operation that influenced how effectively their district functioned unconsciously in accord with the three concepts found basic to the professional activities of these, and by extension, all DIs. Inspectorate values were underscored and new non-core values appropriate to the times modelled.

From interviews of the research cohort members, data were categorized into operational and professional issues. An analysis of the information led to eight emerging themes; inspection system; knowledge and skills; selection and appointment of Inspectors; Inspector’s roles; individual planning; school visits; resource allocation; and other influences. Further analysis of these emerging themes identified the first of three inspectorate strategies—inspectorate values.

The information collected and documented covered a range of comments from Inspectors throughout Victoria. As previously explained the requirement of the position were identical but the logistics and demographics of the state-wide inspectorates formed three distinct categories, the first being ‘Country DIs’. This group comprised of former teachers who had mainly lived and taught in country districts throughout their career and become comfortable with the lifestyle. Country districts consisted of larger schools in country towns, surrounded by smaller schools in the hinterland. These numerous rural schools created a travel and time issue when planning their school visits. The country lifestyle demanded a commitment to the community from the DI. He was expected to be an active member of clubs such as football, golf, bowls, Rotary or Lions. Some Inspectors became local council members, thence becoming prominent identities in the community, establishing themselves permanently in a country town where they remained until retirement and beyond.

The second category, ‘Metropolitan DIs’, plied their trade in metropolitan districts. In the later years covered by this thesis many new DIs had the good fortune of a first appointment in a metropolitan district. In their metropolitan posting, the demands of the community were not as obvious. Many metropolitan DIs did not leave the residences they may have formerly established to live in their allocated district and were not embraced by the community in the same way as the ‘Country DIs’. The districts were more compact with a greater number of schools, teachers and students. Although the basic roles were the same the
geographical location was more manageable and less arduous to organize. These Inspectors were appointed to their preferred location, either through the passage of time or good fortune, therefore differentiating them from the third group who took a country appointment prior to a metropolitan position becoming available.

The third group, ‘Country/Metropolitan DIs’ came from those who were ambitious for any DI role, a successful appointment being anonymous, but usually in the country. Aspiring DIs would accept any country position to further their career until a city vacancy became available. Some DIs transferred back to the city, this becoming a stepping stone to the acquisition of a position in Head Office as an Assistant Director or the equivalent. In any event, they experienced the relative demands of the broad spectrum of community mores.

**Country District Inspectors**

This section examines the first group of Inspectors, those whose whole service was confined to the rural areas of Victoria. The backgrounds of the country Inspectors in the research cohort are summarized in the table below, and a paragraph or two in the section that follows adds colour to this information. This introductory information forms an integral part of the how and why lives in education evolved be teasing out their individual careers over a period of time. Each person’s unique situation embellishes understanding of the individual and gives greater depth to the themes that follow.

### Table 4.1

**Demographic Characteristics of the Country Inspectors Interviewed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Career Experiences</th>
<th>District Inspector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hobbs</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Diploma of Education, Member of Australian Psychological Society</td>
<td>World War 2 Australian Imperial Force, Primary School Teacher 14 years, Teachers College Lecturer 1 year, District Inspector 16 years</td>
<td>District Inspector 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikin</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Education, Masters of Education, Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher 20 years, Primary School Principal 1 year, District Inspector 9 years</td>
<td>District Inspector 1974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Moyle  | Male | 80 | Bachelor of Arts  
        | Bachelor of Education  
        | Doctor of Philosophy  
        | Student Teacher  2 years  
        | Teachers’ College  1 year  
        | Primary School Teacher  12 years  
        | Secondary School Teacher  3 years  
        | Teachers’ College Lecturer  2 years  
        | District Inspector  5 years  
        | District Inspector  1967 |
|--------|------|----|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Nunn   | Male | 76 | Bachelor of Commerce  
        | Bachelor of Education  
        | Doctor of Philosophy  
        | Member of the order of Australia  
        | Student Teacher  2 years  
        | Teachers College  1 year  
        | Primary School Teacher  22 years  
        | Primary School Vice Principal  1 year  
        | District Inspector  6 years  
        | District Inspector  1977 |
| Reeves | Male | 68 | Bachelor of Economics  
        | Bachelor of Education  
        | Masters in Arts  
        | Doctor of Philosophy  
        (London)  
        | Primary School Teacher  10 years  
        | Primary School Principal  3 years  
        | District Inspector  3 years  
        | District Inspector  1977 |

Hal Hobbs’ early education was in a regional country district but later he moved to University High School and later Melbourne Teachers College. His career was disrupted by his service in World War 2 when he served in the Australian Imperial Force with the Occupation Forces. He returned to teaching taking grades five and six for fourteen years, before lecturing at a Teachers’ College prior to appointment as DI in the country in 1964. He returned to Melbourne where he was seconded as assistant to the Minister, Lindsay Thompson to oversee the School Buildings Program. He was later appointed as Assistant Director of Primary Education (Buildings).

Ron Ikin’s early education was in the western suburbs of Melbourne. He later attended University High School where he completed his secondary qualifications. He taught in primary schools both country and city for 20 years. He was promoted to Principal in 1973 where he operated for 1 year before being appointed DI in a country district. He remained in this position until it was abolished.

Colin Moyle grew up and was educated in the dairy country east of Melbourne. He was formally educated at Nilma Primary School and Warragul High School, a Junior Scholarship encouraging continuation of his education at the latter. As a Senior Scholarship...
holder he attended the University of Melbourne for a year in 1948 before taking his first student teacher lesson in early 1949. It was a salutary occasion, teaching the “Laws of the Pendulum” to 18, Year 10 Domestic Science girls during the busy early weeks of school enrolment. Soon he was to become a Student Teacher at the Sunshine State School as a prelude to entering Melbourne Teachers College in 1950. On graduating TPTC he then taught in country primary schools for 12 years. For the next three years he was a secondary teacher in Mathematics and English at Melbourne High School and the Police Cadet School respectively. During these years a Nominated Course enabled him to become more highly qualified. Then followed two years as a Lecturer in English at the Melbourne Teachers’ College before his appointment, in late 1967, as DI of a district in the far north-west of Victoria, Mildura.

John Nunn was educated in the country district of northern Victoria where he was born. He joined the Department in 1950 as a student teacher at a school he had attended. His qualifications were acquired during his teaching career with the completion of his Doctor of Philosophy towards the end of his career. He taught in country schools for many years then acquired promotion to a city school where he became senior teacher and later vice-principal until 1977. In 1977 he was appointed Inspector of a country district and remained there until 1983.

Don Reeves commenced his primary education in the eastern suburbs of Melbourne, Victoria, continuing his education at the local technical school. His qualifications gave him entry into Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT) where he studied to be an engineer but teaching was his real interest. Unfortunately his qualifications did not admit him to Teachers’ College so he returned to studies in order to realize his ambition. In 1959 he entered Teachers’ College and in 1961 was appointed to a small country school. He taught in various primary schools, and ten years later he became a school principal. His principalship was to be re-advertised so he started looking for a new challenge. The position of DI was advertised, he applied and was successful. He remained as DI until the position was abolished three years later.

**Metropolitan District Inspectors**

Most people who were born and educated in the Melbourne metropolitan area enjoyed the suburban lifestyle and had little desire to work in the country. Very few Inspectors experienced the pleasure of this metropolitan appointment without being appointed
to a country district initially. When a vacancy occurred they were eligible to apply for transfer thus usually becoming one of the third category ‘Country/ Metropolitan’ Inspectors, which explains the third group. This small group comprised the two Inspectors who only served in a metropolitan setting and this impacted on their experiences, and thus their perceptions of the nature of their work.

Table 4.2

Demographic Characteristics of the Metropolitan Participants Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Career Experiences</th>
<th>District Inspector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goode</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Diploma of Education</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher 12 years, Teachers College Lecturer 4 years, Exchange Teacher UK, Vice-Principal 1 year, Principal 1 year, District Inspector 7 years</td>
<td>District Inspector 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Masters of Education, Art Certificate</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher 16 years, Principal 1 year, District Inspector 10 years</td>
<td>District Inspector 1973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two Inspectors of the metropolitan grouping were fortunate to be appointed to districts on the outer fringes of Melbourne thus operating freely from their family home. George Goode was born and educated in a northern suburb of Melbourne. His teacher training of two years commenced at Melbourne Teachers College from whence he taught in various primary schools for twelve years. He lectured at a Teachers’ College for four years before accepting an exchange teaching position in the United Kingdom. On return to Australia he became vice-principal then principal of a city school over the next three years. The opportunity arose for him to be a Relieving Inspector in his area and a year later, in 1977, he was appointed as DI of the Coburg District remaining there until 1983.

Peter Meyer was educated at Sale and in Melbourne high schools before obtaining his Trained Primary Teachers Certificate at the Toorak Teachers’ College. His first teaching
appointment was as Head Teacher at Pearsondale for two years; he then transferred back to Melbourne, teaching in primary schools for the next sixteen years. In 1973 he was appointed an Inspector of Schools and continued in that role for ten years.

**Combined Metropolitan and Country District Inspector**

The third career path distinguished among the cohort was that of country/metropolitan DI, where these Inspectors were initially appointed to a country posting before being transferred later to metropolitan districts. The significance of this group is that they experienced both aspects of the position, these being determined by the demography, geography and social environments of the two different types of districts.

Table 4.3

*Demographic Characteristics of the Country/ Metropolitan Participants Interviewed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Career Experiences</th>
<th>District Inspector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Education, Masters of Education, Administration</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher (city/country) 17 years, Technical Teacher 2 years, Teachers College Lecturer 6 years, District Inspector 20 years</td>
<td>District Inspector 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Education, Trained Infant Teachers Certificate</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher 8 years, Teachers College Lecturer 2 years, Vice Principal 2 years, Principal 1 year, District Inspector 4 years</td>
<td>District Inspector 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Education</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher 11 years, Teachers College Lecturer 9 years, District Inspector 19 years</td>
<td>District Inspector 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francioni</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Education, Masters of Education</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher 16 years, Primary School Principal 4 years, District Inspector 11</td>
<td>District Inspector 1972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ewart Anderson taught in primary schools throughout Victoria for 17 years; later he taught in a technical school for two years before applying to become a Teachers’ College Lecturer where he remained for six years before being appointed DI in a country district in 1965. He later transferred to a metropolitan district. His teacher training was as a student teacher for twelve months followed by a one year course at Teachers College. His additional qualifications were gained during his teaching career- B.A, B.Ed., and Masters of Education Administration. This Inspector represented the one year trained primary teachers, who with extra studies were encouraged to promote themselves to a level where their experiences, beliefs and perceptions benefited teachers and principals across a district.

Mary Brown attended Coburg Teachers’ College (CTC) from 1961-1963, teaching in metropolitan primary schools for ten years, before becoming a lecturer at CTC in 1971. Brown was appointed to the role of vice-principal in 1977 before becoming principal of a primary school for the next two years. She was qualified to become a DI having a B.A. B.Ed. T.I.T.C, had lectured in Infant School Method and was a Field Consultant in the operation of a Disadvantaged Schools Program. Subsequently she was appointed Relieving Inspector in the country in 1978, before being transferred back to a metropolitan district in 1982. Brown was the last permanent Inspector appointed in Victoria. In this position, her experiences, beliefs and perceptions were typical of those of the less experienced Inspector who did not have the informal networking structure that more experienced Inspectors had created. Significantly she was the only female in the research cohort, and one of the few females appointed to the DI role. Of the two female DIs, Brown responded to the request for an interview, stating that her one year’s experience as a permanent Inspector could be a constraining factor. Many factors had contributed to the lack of female involvement at the DI level. In the late forties and early fifties it was compulsory for women to resign to be married, therefore being able to continue teaching on a non-permanent basis. Later when married
women were accepted for ‘Permanent Status’, they had still to resign from the service for family reasons before returning to the classified role but being listed numerically after current graduates. It was not until the 70s when a common teaching service roll was established that the opportunities for women became available. The first woman, Elaine Grose, was appointed permanently as a DI to Broadmeadows, a western suburb of Melbourne in 1976. The status was noted by the Office of the Director –General in a letter of congratulation. Grose unfortunately was unavailable for any interviews.

Harry Dawson was an experienced DI who completed his teacher training in 1945. He was appointed as head teacher of several small rural schools. In 1955 he transferred to Melbourne Teachers’ College as a lecturer, remaining in the position for nine years. He was a member of the Music and Speech Training Staff and influenced schools with his expertise and skills. He was appointed Relieving Inspector in 1964 and gained permanent appointment to a metropolitan district in 1969. This Inspector’s music, speech and literary talents, his experiences, beliefs and perceptions represented the depth and quality of influential leaders.

Ralph Francioni was educated in the metropolitan district of Malvern and later went to Melbourne Teachers College. He taught in metropolitan schools for 16 years and was a primary school principal on the outskirts of Melbourne for four years. He was appointed Inspector to a country district in 1972. His interests in art led him to be chairman of the Primary Arts Committee and during that time a creative set of curriculum guides was produced. He later transferred as DI in the Greater Melbourne area, remaining there until the closure of the position.

David Holloway, born in Brisbane, was educated in Brisbane, Canberra and Melbourne. He served in the Royal Australian Navy in 1945-6 before entering Teachers College in 1947. After teaching in Primary Schools for 17 years, he became a teachers College lecturer for the two years prior to his appointment a DI, a position he held for 16 years.

The cohort of twelve retired Inspectors interviewed had varying schooling, training and qualifications which were related to the era in which they were born. The teaching service’s academic requirements for advancement changed over the period of time, initially forcing teachers to upgrade qualifications for promotion. Appointment to the position of Inspector required applicants to have a track record of outstanding teaching assessments and high tertiary educational standards. Although they worked in three geographically different
districts that influenced how they operated, their goals and duties were controlled to a large extent by the Education Department’s Regulation III, a document of which most DIs were aware but heeded marginally.

**Roles and regulations**

The country, metropolitan and the country/metropolitan Inspectors all realized their role to be controlled by Regulation III- Inspection and Examination of Primary Schools (Commissioners of National Education, Victoria, 1862). Following the end of World War II in 1945 and the establishment of the Teachers Tribunal in 1946, the conditions of school examinations and inspections were revised and published in 1950, remaining the legal basis of an Inspector’s official school visits to schools for nearly 40 years. These regulations detailed areas the Inspector was to supervise, explaining what to audit during their visit. It detailed the expectations of the Head Teacher stating that he must examine his school fully at the end of each of the school’s three terms, reporting and recording the results in the **Examination Register**. These annual results were to be scrutinized by the Inspector who officially visited annually each school in the Inspectorate and as soon as possible after the visit, write an **Official Report**. As part of this official visit the ensuing report recorded details of all official records and accounts connected with the school. The Inspector was to appraise thoroughly and comment on the organization of the school, the classification of the pupils, the work programs which should show the methods and character of the instruction, the discipline and tone of the school, the aptitude and working habits of the pupils, and the place that the school fills in the community. It was truly a posting with administrative connotations.

At the same time as the **Official Report** was compiled, the Inspector assessed the value of individual teachers taking into account the time and contribution each had provided the school. The organization of a school reflected strongly on the capacity of the Head Teacher in such areas as: the distribution of staff; actual teaching done by the Head Teacher; the allotment of duties to assistant teachers; class sizes; methods of grading pupils; measures adopted to prevent or remedy retardation; training of student teachers and training for teachers having difficulty; and generally, the arrangements made by the Head Teacher for securing concerted and progressive efforts throughout the school. Finally the Inspector had to give consideration to the circumstances of each school, to the classroom and school environment and to the inculcation of such habits in the pupils as willing co-operation, self-activity, regularity, punctuality, neatness and cleanliness. After the annual inspection of the school was completed the Head Teacher’s responsibility was to make a copy of the
Inspector’s report and send it along with a form containing the full name, the classification, and the record number of each member of staff to the inspector concerned. If any member of staff had a personal issue to be discussed with the Inspector this was to be included. (Appendix – Regulation III). This format of Inspector’s visits had continued for a hundred years, sometimes the schools were notified prior to the visits, but often difficult circumstances prevented it.

Major-General Alan Ramsay, Director of Education produced ‘The Ramsay Report’ (Ramsay, 1960) wherein he expressed a real interest in what constituted a worthwhile education for children, and how best to have school programs take advantage of increased knowledge in the fields of science and technology. Some recommendations were particularly relevant to school inspections, chief of these being the retention of the existing system of inspection and assessment of teachers, combined with the advisory function, and the reiteration of the DIs’ place as the representative of the Director and the Minister.

In accordance with the Ramsay Report, Holloway (2000) wrote and reiterated on interview that:

The Inspector was the Department’s representative. He was the employer’s representative and as such the Department had the rights of an employer.

Most teachers were unaware of the Official Document in the form of a passport that was presented to DIs’ on their appointment. It authorized them to enter and review all schools public and private, within the State of Victoria at any time, Nunn stressing:

My perceptions had to be guided by the requirements of the job. I had the authority to enter and inspect schools and the obligation was to report upon them. The authority was in the form of an official passport which I still have. It has not been cancelled.

Inspectors knew their role was guided by the job description but in all cases the Inspectors’ main aim was to improve educational standards in the schools in their districts. Individually they planned and organized ways to improve the children’s learning opportunities. Holloway expressed his ideas about how he approached the job:
There were certain requirements for the job so that had to be my base, but I knew straight away that I wanted to help teachers teach better, so they could help children learn better.

Although Inspectors were operating along prescribed guidelines, the variations in each district depended on each individual’s knowledge, expertise, interests and experience. All participants interviewed were cognizant of their strengths and weaknesses and according to their special interests introduced innovations unique to their district, thereby playing their part in the unconscious functioning of the major constructs isolated by this study. The basic regulation was an appropriate guideline whether being operated in a country or metropolitan district. The data show that issues related to inspectorate values were identified anonymously by all the participants. These Inspectors perceived that, if the district stakeholders had confidence in the processes and outcomes of the inspectorial system, then their position would be more effective. In the early 1960s teachers were not familiar or comfortable with the Department’s inspectorial system and it was this unknown factor that had some teachers to believe various myths, a stereotype which totally misrepresented the DI. Dawson revealed:

> It was obvious to me when I started teaching that the Inspector was someone who knew about teaching and that the Inspector coming to the school to bother the children was a myth. After eleven years in the classroom I also knew that the Inspector could tell everything about the teacher by working with the children.

Holloway in his interview also referred to the myths that were still alive in some of the schools where teachers were questioning the validity, fairness and judgment of their assessments by the DI. He said:

> Inspectors were great encouragers; I can see the myths that were created about the Inspector. The idea that the Inspector was a troglodyte who entered the classroom and ran his fingers along the top of the cupboards was bunkum.

> The Inspectors were chosen from the best teachers in the service.

The Inspectors all supported and believed in the roles and responsibilities they were expected to administer throughout their inspectorates. Without exception they expressed their goals to be an improved learning environment, consisting of high quality educational programs and a competent staff to deliver it. As outstanding teachers and principals prior to their appointments as DIs they were fully aware of the anxieties teachers were enduring.
throughout the school inspection. Each DI viewed the situation from their own perspective, individual approach, expertise, knowledge and style, thus creating a unique set of values for their own inspectorate.

**Inspectorate Values**

This section of the chapter moves from a consideration of the Inspectors themselves to the way they went about their role. Inspectorate values related to the manner, conduct and behaviour of Inspectors as they implemented their interpretation of Government policy as expressed in Regulation III. Each Inspector’s career history emphasized how the career path to becoming a DI varied according to the period in which he or she entered the service, political influences, the period of World War II, and compulsory National Service in the early 1950s that affected those who were within the age appropriate range for enlistment. Additionally, a Parliamentary Act was in vogue disallowing women the right to continue in the service as permanent employees after marriage and the lack of a common male and female roll contributed to women not filling the role of DI in the primary division until 1978. Qualifications were more difficult for women to attain as they were expected to follow qualifications relevant to teaching infants, that is, the three grades up to Grade 2 instead of university subjects. Male personnel fulfilled the requirements of the DI position prior to the 1970s, whereas women, after the formation of a common roll, had to upgrade their departmental subjects by commencing additional studies at university level to be eligible for principal or DI positions. It was the responsibility of the individual to confront and overcome the obstacles that impeded promotional opportunities within the Education Department which led to the awareness of the extra personal attributes required to be successful DI applicants. Teachers who were ready to challenge themselves academically, professionally and personally believed themselves to be suitable candidates to influence and lead education in allocated districts so as to improve the standard of children’s education throughout the State of Victoria. As the Inspectors reiterated, their outstanding career progress glittered with the qualities required to be a successful Inspector. These could be collectively summed by the category, ‘Inspectorate Values’ which the Inspector personified as exemplars for educational personnel to emulate.

The research cohorts’ perceptions, noted during the interviews, were that the various facets of Regulation III were comprehended, but given added value by each individual’s
approach, manner and experience. It was from this plethora of individual traits that enabled
the three main categories to be distilled and identified from a detailed data analysis of the
interviews. Inspectorate values, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education
embody the major, but intertwined, separate areas extracted from the data collated after the
research cohort expressed individual opinions for the interview protocols of this research.
These perceptions reflected their interpretation of Regulation III during their term of office,
and how each engineered ingenious changes which developed the basic tenets of the
regulation into the valuable innovative programs implemented throughout individual districts.
Often these became a distinguishing feature, an inspectorate value endorsed and practised by
teachers and sometimes adapted for state-wide implementation.

The first theme, inspectorate values, incorporated the manner in which Inspectors
behaved, conducted and portrayed themselves and teachers responded, principally in the
schools. This included such observations as those made by principals, teachers and the
community indicating confidence in: the processes and outcomes of the inspectorial system;
the Inspectors’ broad pedagogical knowledge and demonstrated skills; the acceptance of the
particular DI appointment; the DI’s detailed planning and organization of the inspectorate and
for school visits; the incumbent’s provision of communication about their responsibility to
ensure resources were distributed fairly; and the influence on their mode of operation allowed
by teacher unions and political powers.

Core and Non-core Values
Inspectorate value was a composite of core or non-core values, which influence
educational personnel of inspectorial districts, a Schools Division, or the Education
Department. For example, the schools of the Primary Division might emphasise a core value
“Teach the child”, whereas a Secondary Division schools core value might emphasise,
“Teach the subject”. The research data clarified the substance of inspectorate values, but these
can be more clearly understood from the definitions of Posner (n.d, p.37) who states, “A
value is a belief, a mission or a philosophy that is meaningful. ... The core values are those we
hold which form the foundation on which we perform work and conduct ourselves”.
Generally, some educational inspectorate values were inviolably ethical, foundational and
core; whereas another strand of inspectorate values, could be non-core values which varied
with the incumbent’s personality, particular competencies, generation or era, and be more
relevant to that particular inspectorate. The former instance exemplified core values which
incorporate the inspection system format that had been in place for almost a century. The
system itself that established the core values of the districts, DIs being committed to the formal processes as prescribed for their role by Regulation III; but as individuals their modes of interpretation varied somewhat, allowing for the establishment of individual inspectorate, non-core values. For example, a non-core value of Moyle’s inspectorate was that teachers should be supported in their individual introspection of pedagogical practices they implemented and be prepared to challenge them.

Data recorded and paper documents presented during the interviews indicated that the Inspectors’ credibility in their district depended on the manner in which they performed their duties. The participants’ perceptions clearly defined a marked difference between the city and country Inspectors mode of operation. Inspectors operating in the metropolitan district were protected from the scrutiny of the community; they would visit a school for an inspection and school report, complete their task and leave perhaps without the school community knowing about them being there other than an offspring saying, “The DI came into our room today!” The country DI lived with his community and was being judged continuously by teachers whether he was shopping, participating in a game of golf or attending a local rotary meeting; thus his actions and behaviour needed to be exemplary. In the country, an Inspector’s values related directly to those of the inspectorate which in turn reflected those of the community, falling into the two categories discussed above: abiding core values; and non-core values varied according to circumstances pertaining in that area or era.

Stemming directly from and overlapping with inspectorate values was inspectorate culture. Nunn characterized his unique inspectorate culture by asserting: “This is the way we do things educationally in this inspectorate”, and when describing the inter-related inspectorate in-service education he insisted, “This is the way we improve the way we do things educationally”. Dawson and Francioni added to their inspectorates’ culture by developing a more coherent situation involving all stakeholders by posing these questions to teachers: “How can we create a positive environment educationally in this inspectorate; and what in-service education activities do you recommend to improve things educationally?” It was imperative that the Inspectors acquired current information and skills proactively so they could undertake their responsibilities more effectively with genuine teacher acceptance. DIs to be appointed to this important role required the basic qualifications of teacher training, first degree or equivalent, a Diploma of Education and a track record of years of outstanding teaching performances, which included community and teacher personal relationships.
Many Inspectors sought higher academic qualifications in education such as a Master’s Degree. Ikin, Nunn and Reeves went further actively involving themselves in PhD studies in educational areas, their quest for knowledge and betterment always being of high priority. Nunn reiterated the importance of further self-education and additional qualifications for Inspectors and teachers when he opined:

I must lead by example encouraging teachers to continue studies throughout their career. Knowledge is the greatest asset a teacher can ever possess.

The data from the DIs interviewed clearly identified the need for such aspects of inspectorate culture as teacher confidence in the processes and outcomes of the inspection system. Goode believed that he was accepted in his district and teachers had faith in the system because:

I was from the district where I was known. There were no shock waves. I brought respect to the teachers and the principals; in turn a confidence in the system was reciprocated.

Hobbs stated that:

When teachers built up a positive rapport with the DI and a confidence in the system then it was possible to operate effectively. When teachers had negative attitudes in general it was difficult to embrace them into the system. Therefore a confidence in the processes was critical to the whole inspection system.

Confidence in the processes and outcomes of the inspectorial system was essential if the DI was to be accorded the professional status that his position warranted. His experience and skills formed a scaffold for his decision making as Reeves explained:

I was lucky to have been a principal for three years before I became a DI. It was an excellent training for dealing with everyday issues and difficult people.

Inspectors’ personalities, management, organizational skills and creativity were the key components in the formation with teachers of a unique inspectorate culture. Entwining values, culture and in-service to construct an effective, progressive and educationally sound environment was the challenge facing all DI’s.
Leadership/Confidence in processes

Inspectorate values encompassed the many operational and professional issues identified from analysis of interview data provided by the research cohort which ensured that the Victorian primary schools inspectorial system operated effectively. These values were unique to each DI’s interpretation of the role prescription, which in the latter years of its operation increased the opportunities for the administrative function to open avenues for educational leadership to be mandated. Seven specific categories were identified and documented from the participants’ interviews linking the manner in which they performed their role with the wider community perception of their performances as educational leaders. In general, confidence in the processes and outcomes of the inspectorial system were recognized by principals, teachers and the community as being executed administratively correctly and demonstrative of a personal educational leadership style which fostered or created new initiatives thereby recruiting followers. Anderson believed that:

Educating teachers was his main aim, making them aware of information that they did not have and introducing them to skills that would improve their pedagogy and ensure confidence in the inspectorial system.

Meyer reflected on his feelings when he visited a school by reminiscing:

I felt it was a highly motivated role and when I was working in the principal’s office I tried to be their friend and leader.

Because Ikin was an outstanding teacher, he was approached by an Inspector to set up and organize a Teachers’ Centre in the eastern suburbs of Melbourne. The aim of the Centre was to offer training courses in skills and knowledge of current and new curriculum initiatives. This first Centre was so successful similar venues were set up throughout Victoria. Ikin was recognized for his work and was approached to apply for a DIs position. He was successful in his application and continued to develop similar initiatives in his district. He commented that:

My leadership role was to create situations in the district that developed best teaching practice throughout the schools. Outstanding teachers were encouraged to take the lead regardless of their position developing an excellent educational environment.

Each inspectorate created its own inspectorate values through demonstration of an administrative style which incorporated the Inspector’s real and attempted leadership. His and
the inspectorate’s core and non-core values were the priority but their manner of performance related distinctly to the personality, experience and knowledge of the Inspector and the receptiveness of the teachers. The fundamental criteria for a successful district could be similar or different, but the final outcomes were the same: improved pupil education by more competent teachers in better learning environments.

Selection and Appointments

The appointment and selection of the DI involved advertising the vacancies in the Victorian Education Department Gazette. These advertised vacancies of Inspectors had varied little over the years, as the task had not changed, only the emphasis. In 1976, the advertisement of vacancies for Inspectors of schools (Primary Schools Division) was worded as follows – The successful applicant for a country district will be required to reside in the district. Yearly salary: $18,671 minimum, $21,797 maximum. Duties are to provide educational leadership, advice, and consultation to teachers; to evaluate and review the educational effectiveness of schools; to assess the professional competence and aptitude of teachers; to investigate and report on matters requested by the Department; to report on matters affecting education; to advise concerning school accommodation and the closing of schools; and to carry out any other duties that may be assigned by the Director-General. Applicants must have an approved degree together with an approved course of teacher training, preferably a degree or diploma in education. Additional post-graduate studies in a field of education would be an advantage; an outstanding record as a teacher; a sympathetic and stimulating personality, sound judgment, proven ability as an organizer, interest in educational thought and practice, and general suitability for the work of an Inspector.

Applications are to be submitted to the Teachers Tribunal. Although applicants were not limited to the Education Department Teaching Service, there has never been an appointment granted outside the service.(Holloway, 1990)

A contender’s application was first vetted by a committee of senior departmental officers who advised as to the person’s acceptability as a DI. The procedure included the relevance of qualifications, teaching assessments, breadth of experience and suitability of personal qualities. The normal competitive application procedure with appeals resulted in a successful appointment by the Teachers’ Tribunal. The latter independent body was established in 1946; it issued its Certificate of Appointment to the successful applicant. After this procedure the successful applicant was notified of the inspectorate’s location. Some
Inspectors were appointed to relieving positions before actual application for a vacant position when an unexpected vacancy occurred; Goode was one such appointment initially, explaining:

In 1975 I was principal of a Special Class School the most senior position in the Department. I was approached in 1976 to take up an Acting Inspector of Schools role. In 1976 I became an Inspector of Schools (Relieving) and in 1977 was appointed to Coburg Inspectorate as Inspector of Schools.

Appointment as a Relieving Inspector allowed the Education Department to fill vacancies created through long service, sick or travel leave, or when inspectorate assessments were overloaded. Relieving Inspectors often applied for permanent positions and became Inspectors in their own districts.

**Skills and Knowledge**

The basic requirements as described previously in the selection process qualified would-be Inspectors with knowledge, training and experience. These teaching skills and leadership knowledge prepared them to advise on, demonstrate, and encourage pedagogical changes to benefit changing teaching techniques required. Inspectorate values, culture and in-service training revitalized by the Inspector were influenced by their own particular interests and highlighted the individuality of each inspectorate. Holloway and Moyle strongly believed that language and literature were the basic ingredients for children’s learning and developed programs accordingly throughout their districts pertaining to these subjects. Additionally, Moyle sought to change subtly teaching methodologies, being thanked profusely by John, an older teacher of set ways for being a supportive partner and stimulus for changing his teaching methods, and giving him a new, life-enhancing enthusiasm for the education of children. Holloway introduced foreign language programs. Greek, Italian and German speaking teachers conducted lessons, often using team teaching wherein teachers shared the grades. These language sessions were extended to parents and the community on a Saturday morning to breakdown the communication barrier. Meyer introduced the use of Australian texts for the teaching of English to new arrivals in Australia. Anderson and Dawson introduced music programs to develop an appreciation of the Arts. These programs were adapted throughout the State of Victoria and the concept of Music Festivals was born.
Personal Qualities and Professionalism

The data collected from the interviews indicated that the personal qualities and the professionalism of the Inspectors allowed their acceptance co-operatively by their inspectorate clients. All research participants referred to and identified important factors such as personal qualities but could specify them further. Some believed it to be the breadth of prior experiences, the relationship to their performance levels or their presence generally that created the likelihood of their general acceptance. Some teachers had negative attitudes to the inspectorial system, sometimes Teacher Union induced and at other times from the negativism of the pre-service training; this created difficult situations in the school environment for Inspectors wishing to perform their duties. However, the personal qualities and skills required of Inspectors allowed any negative situations to be defused, often producing positive results. Their willingness to be introspective and self-critical was a crucial trait; to pursue self-development was an admired quality. Anderson expressed his opinions about the staff with negative attitudes towards Inspectors and inspections thus:

Ill-informed and detrimental to their own causes as they were not prepared to self-evaluated and improve their own situation. He was saddened by the situation as he believed little could be achieved to change their outlook.

Because Inspectors’ roles were dependent on their integrity, personality and use of supposed power became critical issues if their meanings were not conveyed to their clients with genuine concern for the system and personnel. Their modus operandi could be stimulating, valued, supportive and challenging – a component of inspectorate values and culture. All respondents expressed their belief that, for their status in the community to be accepted, they had to perform their duties with the professional approach and attitude that was properly accepted of them by principals, teachers and the community. They offered their knowledge and skills to enhance educational operations and programs within their districts. Anderson expressed his thoughts as:

Educating teachers would be the main drive. Making them aware of information that they didn’t have and introducing them to skills they didn’t have.

Goode believed it necessary:
to improve teacher competence, to make good teachers better and better teacher outstanding. I also thought that the essence of the school was what happened in the classroom. I always talked to teachers and tried to give them ideas and hints.

The cohort identified the need for Inspectors to perform their responsibilities with genuine acceptance, and to be appointed with suitable qualifications, experience and personal qualities deemed acceptable to the school and the wider community. Dawson encapsulated this general thought:

The personal qualities of a DI played a vital role in how they were accepted within their district, they needed to be involved at school as well as community level and have the qualifications and expertise to carry out their district functions with respect.

Goode commented further:

It was my personal approach that allowed me to gain the respect of the principals and teachers. I used a mentor approach but still related the job descriptions to all actions that I administered.

Francioni had been a teacher for sixteen years and a principal for four. His approach to the role of DI was based on experience as well as qualifications, stressing:

My experience as a principal gave me the grounding and understanding of the functions of running a school and the issues that arouse teachers, students and parents. I therefore had previous knowledge to assist me in my decision.

The Inspectors being researched explained the importance of principals and teachers being comfortable with Inspectors’ presence in their schools and classrooms. When inspecting a school, Hobbs gave precedence to spending time in discussion with teachers in their classrooms, using his knowledge and teaching skills to demonstrate that he was a human being who had been in similar situations as they and that he understood their predicaments. His attitude was:
I would consciously try and spend the better part of a half day in with the teacher in so much that I believed that the teacher should be seen to teach but also see the Inspector react with the students.

Ikin averred:

When I entered the classrooms I saw a lot of mediocrity, but after ten years I realized that the teachers were good people, conscientious workers but just needed someone to say you are going to lift your performance by 25% and this is how you are going to do it.

The planning and organization of the Inspectors daily, monthly and yearly schedule set the scene for effective operations. Principals and teachers respected the Inspectors integrity and supported his leadership. All Inspectors agreed that their modus operandi was stimulating, valued, supportive and challenging, and that their individual planning and organization was performed effectively both formally and informally. They indicated their role to involve more than the stipulated requirements, value and respect compelling them to be creative and challenging when assisting and presenting information to principals, teachers and students. As Goode reported:

I was accepted in schools because I had worked in the district before my appointment and had been a respected principal who introduced many initiatives into my school. I know this was a positive to my success as a DI.

Within the boundaries of prescribed requirements each Inspector developed an individual style of organization, operation and performance level. Hobbs, interpreting the official Inspector’s role, outlined Official Reports as a priority because they identified the key issue addressed by the Inspector.

The Official Report on a school was written at the time of the inspection; it had a structure, variously interpreted by Inspectors: tone, discipline, grounds and buildings, curriculum development, teachers and so on. It was discussed with the principal and staff at a staff meeting before the visit was completed. The Official Report was accompanied by teacher assessments and stamped self-addressed envelopes, a very important issue for teachers as it determined their future careers. These teachers’ assessments were used for compiling promotion lists on the Classified Roll.
When asked about the importance of the school inspection visit Dawson commented:

It was a worthwhile event. I know that teachers were very pleased when you had an inspection go through the school and give a positive report. School Councils liked to get a good report as well.

This data analysis for this thesis was complemented by other organizational issues pertinent to overall inspectorate functioning, namely that the distribution of resources to the schools as part of the Inspector’s planning and development of their district was based on an awareness of the facilities required to conduct educationally sound programs equitably in schools. The Inspector serviced schools on a priority basis as resources were limited; an individual school’s organization depended heavily on the experience, ability and expertise of the Head Teacher or Principal. If the school leader was entrepreneurial and a forward thinker then the school would experiment and introduce new and exciting ideas that completely changed how it would be organized. For example, experience sharing by teachers in the school to improve the standard of learning in other grades was a challenge for the DI to cross-fertilize this new or changed idea to other receptive schools in the inspectorate. To deliver this knowledge, communication skills, experience and credibility were important if the information disseminated was to make all schools more effective places of curricular and extra-curricular learning.

Clerical/Physical

Those Inspectors appointed before, 1970 such as Anderson, Dawson, Hobbs Holloway and Moyle, found individual planning and organization and communication challenges to be overcome without clerical or physical resources, the home office resources gap being filled often by the Inspector’s wife; these constraints had the potential to hinder many of the important duties attached to their roles. An important and compulsory DI role during the era of school and teacher inspections was to visit schools solely for the purpose of assessing the school and teacher performances. In the 1970s and beyond an expectation of the Inspector was a commitment to visit schools as a catalyst bringing ideas which help teachers and ultimately improve children’s education, to report succinctly in the form of an educational document, and to ease and then spread the burden of teacher suitability assessment. All schools, particularly small rural schools, grappled with limited resource allocation. It was how the Inspectors’ manipulative skills controlled this unenviable task without disadvantaging the educational standards in the schools that became a challenge.
Frank Tate, Director of Education, in his 1906 report stated that school visits should be: “… organizing and stimulating the schools …” This impression has not changed as Inspectors have continued to challenge with new initiatives to help teachers and ultimately improve children’s education as an achievable goal.

Ikin commented:

There was a lot of mediocrity in classroom. They were good conscientious teachers who just needed someone to encourage them to lift their performance and suggest how this could happen. I saw the DI as the catalyst to encourage and introduce methodology and new ideas to make this happen … If you were going to raise the standards you had to lift the morale by upgrading the conditions of the schools that teachers had to work in.

Ikin, Hobbs and Anderson believed the commitment of Inspectors to visit schools was a catalyst to bring ideas to help teachers and the enlivening of the Inspectorate had to be a positive experience for teachers, principals and students. Activities such as the above meant that Inspectors were creating their own inspectorate values and culture as it became known in schools that each DI favoured a certain pedagogical approach, not as an imperative, but as an idea, individually applied, which would enhance pupil education. The value of teachers being prepared to question educational orthodoxy and one’s own teaching methods/personal approaches becomes ‘owned’ by the Inspectorate and hence a value enshrined in the inspectorate culture. Inspectorate values and culture are elevated subtly throughout, with higher standards, both ethically and pedagogically, pervading all educational personnel from the DI to the most junior of teachers.

A country Inspector would be responsible for several one or two teacher schools in his district known as “Rural Schools” in Victorian parlance. In these schools the Head Teacher taught up to eight grades depending on the enrolment (seven or more children was acceptable). These schools were built in isolated areas; long distance travel became the norm; and communication with other schools and colleagues was difficult (almost impossible). Without technology as it is today these teachers relied on the Inspector’s formal and informal visits for pedagogical support and re-assurance. Nunn reiterated the problems of a rural school teaching, confirming:
As the Inspector I would spend a whole day in a rural school giving feedback on how the teacher was managing the teaching load as well as the organization of the school. Teachers were receptive to information that pointed them in the right direction.

Hobbs when visiting schools enjoyed involvement in the classroom observing both teachers and students; he would often take over the teaching role to demonstrate skills to the teachers.

Another important role receiving the Inspector’s attention was distributing and allocating district resources fairly. For example, how could the expertise of the inspectorate’s super numeracy Physical Education personnel be equally shared? This could not be achieved without the complete overview of the inspectorate’s schools by the DI.

Nunn prescribed standards for DIs to perform their responsibilities efficiently:

Inspectors required a comprehensive time table that allowed them to familiarize themselves with a detailed knowledge of all schools in the district, curriculum, facilities and resources. Smaller schools in rural areas relied on larger schools to assist in completing their educational package. The sharing of specialists, travelling for combined music and physical education lessons and the important ongoing training of teachers.

Ikin advocated that best teaching practices could only be achieved if the facilities with which the teachers were working were upgraded:

If you were going to raise the standards you had to lift the morale such as upgrading of broken floor boards and walls.

The facilities had not been well managed in Ikin’s district so there needed to be a complete overhaul of buildings including demolition of those unsatisfactory and rebuilding new classrooms and schools

**Other Influences: Unions and government**

All participants commented on the outside influences gradually impacted on the inspectorial system, listing politics, unions, education teaching divisions and Teachers’ Colleges as important. Outside the Education Department’s influence was the worldwide social revolution of the 1960s. Previously known and accepted dress codes and behavioural
standards were diminished; and authority was ignored resulting in regrettable staffroom and classroom behaviour by some teachers who believed that men and women were equal; therefore courtesy receded.

Meyer saw the union influence as destructive, commenting;

It was the Labor Party based Victorian Teachers’ Union (VTU) that influenced the changes to the DI’s role. The system had stood the test of time 1850-1959 when subtle changes started to emerge. It seemed that constant VTU opinions had an effect when the assessment process was changed.

Hobbs reflected on the political changes opining:

I became disappointed with regionalization as it was, I could see the political issue of it but I did not believe that the authorities had thought through the fact that the region was larger than a district. Virtually they tried to make the Regional Director the DI of a larger district.

Reeves was studying in England at the time of the trials and tribulations of the inspectorial system, returning to Victoria in the midst of it being disbanded. He was seconded to the regional office where he believed the DIs had been publically devalued by the Labor Party-orientated Unions in their campaign against them. Inspectors were unfashionable and their professional identity was lost, teachers believed in the fruits of professionalism, but seniors in the Education Department seemed to be negatively complicit. There was no consultation, no voice from the DIs as to their educational value with a sense of betrayal echoing as the voice of the teacher association said they had to go.

Politics and the teacher unions’ influence often became issues and these made it difficult for Inspectors to control formally relevant situations. Ikin affirmed:

The DI as the Education Department’s representative in the district was more aware of and involved in political and economic issues than most schools realized. The involvement could compromise a DIs personal and political views but the obligation was to provide the Department with frank and fearless advice. It was a rewarding, but challenging role.

All Inspectors genuinely believed that their role was to create in their district a situation whereby the highest values were practised by them, the teachers and pupils. They accepted
that the standard set was created by their own persona and how they carried out their duties in the eyes of the community.

Finally, influences outside the Inspectors’ jurisdiction that affected their functioning occurred when government elections and educational policies changed, creating uncertainty because of teacher associations’ ideologies and influences, competing educational teaching divisions, and operational changes to Teachers’ Colleges.

**Summary of the Findings of Inspectorate Values**

The personal values of Inspectors, their conduct in carrying out their responsibilities either professionally, pedagogically or administratively, and the image they displayed in the community, directly related to the inspectorate values displayed and emulated by principals and teachers. This implied that the Inspector’s work practices impacted positively on them in the performance of their responsibilities. Inspectorate values resulted from an ethical framework within which the pedagogical individuality of principals and teachers produced and sustained their professionalism through their creative examples. The professional qualities of Inspectors, their qualifications, knowledge and skills, and their clear focus throughout their official and informal school visits were paramount for their knowledge of the impact inspectorate values had as manifest by their various administrative and leadership activities. These had an underlying vision for improved pedagogy thereby enhancing teacher performance and noticeably improving the educational standards of children. An Inspectors’ conscious concerns for performance of prescribed duties in an ethical manner contributed to the principal, teachers and community having confidence in and recognition of the DI’s status in the inspectorate. However, it was also apparent in hindsight that a growing hardening, even institutionalized resistance, towards their role was abroad, leading to their demise. Faults in the departmental organizational structure had been developing over a long period of time, but particularly since 1972. The style of leadership at the most senior of levels, the ambition of Ministers of Education for executive control, the advent of regionalization, and the reluctance of teacher unions to acknowledge an obligation of accountability meant that the organization of educational delivery as structured could not be sustained. One teacher organization, the VSTA had been advocating the removal of the inspectorate system of central control for several years. Initially secondary level Inspectors changed the nature of their role to become advisory by invitation only. This was but a stepping stone to the eventual demise of the inspectorate system in general. Control of the school system in 1981 from the professional to
the political gave the unions and others of like mind, combined with a change of government, the opportunity to dismantle the system.

All participants interviewed valued the position of DI as a rewarding, worthwhile and inspiring role. They interpreted it as a challenge to encourage principals, teachers, students and communities to improve the quality of teaching and children’s education. Although some foresaw the role to be a promotion, many believed and envisaged the role to be an opportunity, licensing them to share their expertise as a leader, communicator, mentor and educator with a wider audience.

Inspectorate values, created incrementally, comprised the framework upon which Inspectors built and owned their own resulting and unique inspectorate culture. It was their personality; their presence, knowledge and skills; and level of organizational expertise that determined the extent and acceptance of their leadership and operating styles. The second of the three chapters expands upon the other two major concepts derived from the data of this study, namely, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education. The three concepts are believed to underpin the operation of all primary school inspectorates. The next chapter therefore explicaes the concept inspectorate culture that developed in individual inspectorates throughout the inspectorial system, thereby setting the scene for a variety of particularized inspectorate in-service education programs to be established.
Chapter: 5 Inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education

Introduction

This chapter is the second of three that reveal and bring order to the findings from the interviews of the twelve former Inspectors and expands further the “backward glance” operational perceptions held by them in relation to their inspectorates. Each of the Inspectors described the culture and in-service programs that evolved throughout their individual inspectorates so becoming clear that each had created distinct and sometimes unique settings that reflected their personality, expertise, interests and educational administrative/leadership qualities. At the same time, the findings challenge the myth of the stereotypic DI which had been developed and promoted over many years by the teaching community. Stories told by the participants explained and verified the significance of the differences between the inspectorates and how the cultures and in-service activities related to the leadership and capacity for innovation of the Inspector. As described previously the geographic position of the inspectorate influenced how the Inspector operated and how the inspectorate culture changed according to the environment, the district, the population and the specific needs required to develop a progressive education system for the benefit of all children. Nevertheless, of special interest here is the contribution each Inspector made to the distinguishing educational features in their area of responsibilities.

The first of the two major themes reported in this chapter is the inspectorate culture. Analysis of the data from the transcripts and other documentation presented by the participants identified five themes that contributed to inspectorate culture: the monitoring of teaching standards and curriculum requirements; teacher appraisal; assessment and evaluation carried out by the Inspector; quality control and assurance; and monitoring and reporting policies to authorities as Inspector- disciplinarians. These themes will be considered and illustrated through the Inspectors’ reminiscences and documented evidence in the first section of this chapter.

The second section of this chapter will detail the second basic concept, inspectorate in-service education with its variety of Inspector-initiated implementation strategies. Analysis of
the transcripts revealed four themes emerging in this category, these being Inspectors interpreting their individual roles in: assisting teachers and principals in their professional development; advising and helping teachers with personal and professional issues; performing the role as agents of change; and reporting to headquarters both their own initiatives and those instituted with assistance. This concept also includes suggesting supervision for professional development through advisory and training roles performed by the Inspectors assisted by consultants from the Curriculum and Research (C&R) Branch. These two sections will demonstrate how and why the inspectorates, although being administered in accordance with Regulation III and prescribed departmental instructions, varied in culture and in-service activities with the diversity of necessary human qualities possessed by the Inspector appointed to that district.

The significance of the findings recorded in this chapter is related to the oral histories of the research cohort. Previous historical writing on the Inspectors has been based on the analysis of official documentation, not personal reminiscence. Thus this chapter meets the intention of this research project to discover and make sense of the perceptions held by these retired Inspectors about their contributions to the education system of Victoria from 1960 until the demise of the inspectorial system in 1983.

The concluding section of this chapter will explain how the Inspector influenced the inspectorate culture and in-service education procedures by motivating principals, teachers, pupils and the wider community to think differently with a changed attitude and approach to developing these all-embracing areas in education.

**Inspectorate culture**

Fletcher (1999) provides a useful definition of culture, appropriate for this study, defining it as:

the ‘social heritage’ of a community: the total body of material artefacts, of collective mental and spiritual ‘artefacts’, and of distinctive forms of behaviour, created by people in their ongoing activities within their particular life-conditions and transmitted from generation to generation. (p.191)

In an inspectorate, the body of material artefacts refers to the tools, houses, place of work, schools and the government, while the collective mental and spiritual ‘artefacts’ are the ideas,
beliefs, perceptions and values held by these people. Distinctive forms of behaviour are created through the institutions, grouping, rituals, and modes of organization created by people - sometimes through unforeseen inter-connection, consequences and degrees of change.

For the purpose of this study inspectorate culture can be seen as a pattern of shared basic assumptions developed by a given group which learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration (Jenkins, 2002). Thus inspectorate culture is in part a product of the Education Department’s imperatives but very much part of encouraging the educational leadership of the DI at district level who has challenged and melded the inspectorate’s educational community, particularly schools’ personnel, to interpret individually and meet the inherent educational challenges posed both from without and within. The DIs’ perceptions were that, with interference from unions, a clash of ‘cultures’ between the Education Department, DIs, principals and teachers would develop. Areas identified by the participants in the transcripts of their interviews verify that the variables to be addressed form the basis for the concept inspectorial culture as defined above. In monitoring teaching standards and curriculum requirements Holloway concluded:

The best teachers and principals always knew that there was a necessary control of the system, and that it had to be exercised. The DI fulfilled that position. I enjoyed my time as DI and believe I implemented new initiatives and was a confidant and mentor to personnel. My career was satisfying and rewarding.

Inspectorate culture through quality assurance such as the checking of teachers’ work programs, lesson plans and the children’s work books ensured that the monitoring and advising on teaching standards and curriculum requirements were audited. Resources and financial accountability guaranteed that facilities were used correctly and effectively. Appraisal and assessment formed a key factor in the role of the Inspectors’ duties and influenced the future and career prospects of all teachers. These last requirements monitored the schools’ educational standards and developing culture as it was the quality of the teaching staff that affected and motivated the children’s educational progress. An inspectorate’s schools cultures coalesced to create a unique inspectorate culture, the influences of the DI’s unique personality and background giving rise to specific cultural artefacts which defined this culture and under the umbrella of which improved pupil achievement was progressed. The inspectorate became clearly identified because of these particular cultural artefacts being identified in the modes of operation Inspectors performed. For example, Hobbs insisted on
teaching by example; whereas Nunn seemed to concentrate on role responsibilities; Goode was always realistic not looking for the unachievable; Anderson was concerned with educating teachers and introducing teaching skills; whereas Moyle encouraged a widespread personal challenge to teachers’ pedagogy through frequent informal, supportive visits. Reeves, appointed in 1977, when completely altered reporting procedures were in vogue, could adequately stamp his approach on a school’s preparation for this event. Demonstrably, then, each DI had a unique method of discharging inspectorial procedures, giving rise to a unique cultural artefact: “This is the way we do things around here!”

**Monitoring teaching and curriculum standards**

The first of the five emerging themes which comprise the concept inspectorate culture concerned the monitoring of teaching and curriculum standards. The DI was responsible for the quality control and assurance of the children’s education in the schools by monitoring and advising teachers on teaching standards, pupil achievement, curriculum requirements and the organization of records. As Anderson stressed:

> Educating teachers would be the main drive. Making them aware of information and introducing them to skills they did not have. What the children were doing and what the teacher was doing about it was how I monitored the teaching.

Thus all Inspectors became known for the type and quality of the interaction they initiated both between schools officialdom. Meyer in his role as the DI saw the interaction as highly motivating but he concentrated on working with principals to lift the standard of the teaching in their schools, so ensuring that the curriculum requirements were being achieved. A subsequent challenge ensued when a glitch appeared in the processes and the responsibility to correct the weakness confronted the Inspector. According to Meyer:

> I offered my assistance to principals that were confronted with a lack of knowledge about any new initiatives. My visits to the schools always allowed teachers to present their best performances and I am sure this benefited the school. Teachers were observed daily during the visits so could not just perform in their classroom.

The culture of the school depended strongly on the principal and the leadership that he displayed; and the culture of the district depended on the DI – the quality of his status in the schools and community, his innovative pedagogical initiatives; and educational leadership
style. Meyer stated that being a DI was comparable to being a principal of a school. The principal was the leader of the teachers, the DI was the leader of the district principals and as such had the same responsibilities: to inspire them; and to disseminate any information or directives from the Education Department.

Hobbs, in talking about his work in supporting teachers revealed his emphasis to be on demonstrating pedagogical techniques to teachers in the classrooms. He would enter a classroom take control of the class and proceed to teach the children in the manner to which he was accustomed, achieving excellent outcomes due to his successful style of teaching and belief that all teachers could do the same. This clearly was an aspect of his inspectorate culture, the goal of classroom involvement unconsciously usurping the Principal’s responsibility:

My priority was being in the classroom with the teacher. I was told that I did too much teaching and not enough inspecting. Teachers complained that Inspectors spent too little time in their classrooms so I consciously would try and spend the better part of half a day in with the teacher in so much that I believed that the things that had to be seen were the teacher displaying some knowledge of curriculum and implementing it reasonably well, the rapport between teacher and the children and what extension past the basics is the teacher displaying. To acquire this knowledge I needed time to confirm and establish the climate of the classroom and ultimately the tone of the school.

Hobbs thus saw himself as a hands-on Inspector and operated his inspectorate in that way, but at the same time in his interview, he was clearly aware of the criticisms made of his style.

Goode illustrated yet another approach to monitoring and assisting teachers in his schools. He had been a principal in the district where he was appointed DI. His knowledge of the area and the curriculum requirements that had been reviewed were familiar territory; thus his practice involved developing teacher competence, making good teachers better teachers, and better teachers to be outstanding practitioners. Goode advocated the essence of the school being in accord with what happened in the classroom. His emphasis was on sharing teaching methods directly with individual teachers. In his case, “one size fits all” was not a guiding technique:
I always talked to teachers and tried to give them ideas and hints. The myth that Inspectors were only Inspectors was a very small part of the role. In the case of a child being sick the teacher would look after the child and the Inspector would take the grade. This helped to keep the Inspector’s hand in. All I wanted to do was to help and share my experiences and knowledge.

Anderson, Meyer and Goode opined that they saw their roles, each with different emphases, as mentors, role models, educators and the department’s liaison officers for any new policies, curriculum initiatives or changes to the organizational structure.

All former DIs interviewed expressed the opinion that it was their responsibility to ensure that all schools were notified of any curricular changes the system required to be implemented. The inspectorate culture to which they subscribed was seamless and common, but it was the individual manner of the Inspector’s implementation that gave each inspectorate a unique identity. Whatever this identity, inspectorial in-service education sessions conducted by either the DI or a specialized consultant were inextricably and mutually linked to the successful development of an inspectorate culture.

**Teacher appraisal, evaluation and assessment**

The second theme emerging from the data was appraisal, evaluation and assessment to be carried out by the Inspector. These terms were used frequently by the Inspectors, but each was given a different, nuanced meaning; thus some definition of each is required. The definition of appraisal was perceived as estimating the value or quality of the school operations in relation to the organization, management, curriculum issues, and the state of the grounds and buildings. Assessment and evaluation appear to have similar meanings. However, to the Inspectors and those who were in schools at the time, they were quite different. Appraisal of the school level operations was referred to as part of the Official School Report that was read and discussed at a staff meeting, followed up by an evaluation process to assess and appraise before presenting future recommendations. Assessment, according to the Inspectors was a performance review of teachers’ pedagogical practices. The Inspectors also confirmed that these terms were inter-changeable when discussions occurred to clarify what follows.

Assessment gave official recognition to teachers who operated effectively, creating an environment that was conducive to the excellent education of children. It reflected how the representative of the Education Department viewed a teacher’s performance in light of its
educational value to the children, questioning what tasks and energy were being directed to
the classroom situation and what was irrelevant. Meyer described his position as a
representative of the Education Department, one who had knowledge of the role and was fair
and impartial judge with a clear understanding of his responsibility. He reflected on the
negative components of assessment:

Official recognition of teaching competence coming from someone recognized by
the Education Department, who considers you are doing a good job. In actual fact
the mark you received was important for your next stage of advancement. My
concern was teachers seeing community activities as important, yet not related to
teaching e.g. serving on School Council or sponsoring pre-school activities, but
not keen on work programs or planning their teaching. Actually seeing the teacher
teach, but having no order or organization; or discussing pedagogy with such a
teacher who saw outside classroom activities as more important than being in a
classroom.

Although the inspection of teachers was mandatory, each Inspector undertook the task
individually. However, they were still bound by the fairness and common ground that
affected the rights of teachers throughout all districts. Assessment of teachers was
acknowledged by all Inspectors as a critical and important part of their role. Holloway a
member of the cohort gave expression to the DI’s challenges, thereby emphasising the
dilemmas:

The assessment had a significant impact on a teacher’s career so from the
teacher’s point of view assessment by Inspectors was highly significant and
sometimes divisive. Often decisions were easy to make if a systematic collection
of ‘evidence’ was carried out. It was always necessary to go through the process
to ensure teachers believed that their appreciation had been considered seriously.

In this comment Holloway referred to the assessment of teachers as significant and sometimes
divisive. This statement was supported by all the Inspectors interviewed. It was the attitudes
of the teachers and sometimes principals that created unpleasant conflict between staff and
DI. When a teacher was not satisfied with their assessment and assumed it to be unfair they
would turn to the union for support. The unions, led by those who represented the secondary
division, were not in favour of the various inspectorial systems’ performances and supported
the teacher even if there was a serious breach of educational standards of teaching.
Confrontation and the questioning of the Inspector’s judgement caused tension between the DI, the teachers and the unions. In retrospect such issues contributed to the demise of the inspectorial system in 1983.

Nunn saw assessment of principals and teachers as a genuine commitment to the education of children. For him, if the learning process was to be effective, the best teachers must be recognized, rewarded and given the opportunity to influence the teaching profession by sharing their expertise with a wider audience. Teacher assessment was vital to Nunn’s responsibilities who contended specifically:

You were looking for the top people. The outstanding teachers needed to be assured that they were going to be placed where their influence could benefit the education of the children. There were two difficulties; making sure that the top marks were recognized and avoiding hurt for those who were struggling.

Nunn also believed that if he made a contentious judgement of the teacher he would discuss with them the reason for the assessment and the areas that needed improvement. During the discussion if the teacher was amicable and positive in their response then he felt reasonable about his decision; however if the teacher’s response was arrogant and abusive then his decision was confirmed.

The inspection of teachers for assessment purposes formed an important part of a teacher’s promotion opportunities. All Inspectors said that there were certain curricular areas requiring more advanced pedagogical skills than others, and the teachers were encouraged to demonstrate their ability to perform these functions at the appropriate levels to achieve the desired assessment. Francioni explained how he delineated the various aspects of his role in this process:

You were to give the mark relevant to the situation. If the teacher appeared to have ability in each of the appropriate areas then the suitable mark was to be given. Senior teacher assessments you had to demonstrate extra school organizational abilities, the classroom teacher was to have demonstrated what they had done. I would always ask, “Can you tell me where you have demonstrated this particular expectation in your current role?” The fact that the assessment did have a significant impact on a teachers’ career meant of course it could never be taken lightly.
Francioni was very precise in his evaluation.

Nunn expressed his concern at the attitudes of some teachers in the profession, particularly when teachers applied for their first promotion. The role description was unclear and the school culture often prevented the position from having its rightful authority. These influences dictated the teacher’s success or failure and could be viewed differently by individuals as this Inspector revealed:

‘Assistants with Responsibility’ was another area of concern, it was the first level of promotion and they did not operate very effectively. You always had teachers with negative views across the Inspectorate this was very difficult to change.

When assessing, Nunn observed but used reference points from other schools. He looked first at how teachers treated the children and secondly whether they had something of relevance to tell the children. Nunn believed that it wasn’t just rapport. For him, teachers had to be great constructional designers and leaders who led by example. Nunn had no problem writing a report, but finding the appropriate words to convey properly what had to said to help the teacher was difficult.

The following statement by Ikin aptly summarizes the assessment process from the DI’s perspective. The ratings were decided through understanding, knowledge, vision and a concern for the future leaders of the education system in Victoria. Moderation of that was a task of the peripatetic Staff Inspectors, but in most cases the Inspector in situ held to his assessment decisions. He knew:

From the teacher’s point of view assessment by Inspectors was highly significant and sometimes divisive. Often decisions were easy to make if a systematic collection of ‘evidence’ was carried out. It was necessary to always go through the process to ensure teachers believed that their appreciation had been considered seriously.

Outstanding teachers were often very different in their teaching practices and the educational benefits to the children multiplied. The success or failure of any organization is defined by the individuality of the performers. The Education Department relied on the DIs to make sound and reliable judgements of principals and teachers in their assessment process in order to create a sustainable and effective state system of education. Although each Inspector helped to create an inspectorate culture unique to their individual personality and leadership,
the end products were compatible. Each interview revealed the individual styles of the DI’s assessment process. Whether they were using benchmarks, comparison or individual ability all stated that the standard of teaching, rapport with children and preparation, planning, presentation and relevance of content were the important issues. Anderson revealed that:

I firstly looked at the individuals’ ability for the assessment class they were in, then if it was for promotion, I would evaluate for comparisons with teachers from other schools.

Hobbs remarked:

Comparisons! You were looking for the top people, outstanding, assured they were going to the top. I had difficulty with this sometimes as it did not fit in with the school report. Sometimes in writing a personal assessment report for a person who was not performing well it was difficult being critical to the point that it was going to hurt them. They were the two difficulties I had, making sure the top marks were recognized and avoiding hurt for those who were struggling.

Goode in discussing his style of assessment technique said:

I used a combination of comparisons, benchmarks and individual observation. Firstly the individual created the classroom atmosphere, secondly they achieve the benchmarks and thirdly where did they fit into the big picture.

The manner in which the Inspector went about the assessment program was purely individualistic, but the goal for each was the same: to find and promote the outstanding teachers to positions of leadership so that high education standards were maintained. Unfortunately, Inspectors’ loyalties were not viewed by all teachers in the way DIs were perceived, thus creating tension and disrespect for the role. The assessment role was one of the areas which brought Inspectors into a confrontational mode with teachers and unions that unfortunately devalued their role.

**Quality control and assurance**

The third theme, quality control and assurance, encompasses the accountability and supervision mechanisms carried out by the Inspectors to ensure resources were being used correctly and effectively; it was critical to the culture of the Inspectorate. This theme outlined
the manner in which the Inspector operated in specific ways to achieve his goals, identifying
the tone and relationship throughout the schools that created a positive working relationship
between the Inspector, principals and staff in the inspectorate. Whether through document
checklists, administrative checklists, reports or training programs, the Inspector’s operations
had to be viewed by all the schools in the district as a worthwhile and productive.

Reeves described his position as one of empathy with the schools, principals and
teachers. He saw the school review as an area where the need for facilities was examined and
dealt with. Reeves’ report revealed a commitment to auditing a school’s positive relationship
with him in such a way that the audit was useful as a positive in-service education tool. This
empathetic approach was a positive inspectorate cultural artefact which centred on his unique
approach to quality control and assurance:

I tended to write comprehensive reviews and reports on the schools rather than
just the two or three pages of the official report form and use it more as an
educational tool and a document that teachers might digest.

Quality assurance activities carried out by the Inspectors influenced principals and
teachers to comply with the requirements of their duty statements as well as being in harmony
with educational, professional and administrative policies. Coincidentally, activities
implemented as a means of quality assurance impacted on the pedagogy of teachers and the
administration by principals as well as in the academic performance of the children.

Brown related to the school inspection as:

My position as an Inspector was challenging. I had little experience in the role but
believed that my presence in the schools had a lot of impact on teachers in terms
of their performance.

Francioni saw the inspection system thus:

A check and balance system to see what our schools were doing and how well
they were doing it. I was not there as a leader or boss but rather as an assistant to
give guidance and information to improve teacher performance and help improve
the education of children.
Quality assurance also was directly related to teacher knowledge implying that Inspectors contributed to enriching principals and teachers with the appropriate knowledge required to manage administrative aspects of the school and teach the pupils appropriately.

Reeves stated that, in the early stages of his career:

I developed educational tools and documents that I presented to the schools along with any Education Department policies that the schools needed to familiarize themselves with. During the inspection visit I would suggest meetings to inform them on the relevance of the information to the work place.

Holloway, an experienced Inspector, was always conscious of the educational value of the performances delivered by the principals and teachers:

When visiting principals I tried to advise them on things that should be done to improve their schools, such as developing their managerial skills so as to become good planners, managers and administrators and to be confident in leading their schools. When visiting teachers I would discuss and demonstrate teaching skills to assist them in improving their techniques.

Dawson, Hobbs and Anderson also related quality assurance directly to principal and teacher leadership. They claimed that leadership qualities were enhanced when these educators identified and acknowledged problem areas in school leadership. They all agreed with the following statement recorded by Dawson:

The principals must have the knowledge to plan and run the school; too often they are working but not focusing on the real issues. They have not familiarized themselves with their job description and as a result their performances are mediocre. ‘Assistance with Responsibility’, a teacher’s first promotable level, is not defined clearly for the principal or the teacher; therefore the role cannot be implemented effectively. Clear knowledge of the position statement and more training for these teachers could assist their performances.

Quality control and assurance formed the basis for most of the Inspector’s input relevant to the inspectorate. Through the impact and variety of teaching methods in this performance area the unique inspectorate culture was enhanced. Principals valued the leadership, the knowledge, the fairness, the advice and the willingness of the Inspector to be
available when required. The values the Inspector modelled as a leader and a mentor contributed to a positive and harmonious inspectorate culture.

**Monitoring and reporting of policies to the authorities**

The fourth theme identified in the analysis of the data was the role of the Inspectors in monitoring adequately and reporting on the actions undertaken to implement departmental policies in the schools. As part of their job descriptions Inspectors were to ensure that departmental administrative requirements were carried out correctly in all schools in their districts. As part of their annual inspection they reported any discrepancies and what actions they recommended to eliminate them. The Annual Inspection was the catalyst for providing information to the Education Department and motivation for school staffs; it involved all aspects of the Inspector’s duties as mandated regarding the Official Report, thereby playing an official part in the composite evaluation of the effectiveness of the education system.

This mechanism provided information which allowed the authorities to overview the status of education in the State of Victoria, report to the Minister of Education, and to review detailed evidence of the organization, curriculum requirements, methods of instruction, discipline, the aptitude and working habits of the pupils, and the esteem schools held in their communities. Generally, evaluating the performance of the principals and schools to secure concerted and progressive efforts in educational standards throughout the districts became an important component in the evaluation of a successful system. Reeves summed up the school’s concerns:

- In relation to the actual inspection there was anxiety and trepidation on the part of some principals and teachers before the review started. So to assist in the preparation I would visit the schools weeks before hand and talk about the key things they would like me to look at. I knew what I wanted to look at. Based on these discussion issues that were discussed as a precautionary measure to ensure the mandatory tasks required by the Education Department were completed satisfactorily. Because of my approach, the school review became less onerous, becoming a more collective and collegiate group experience. However, the rural school review where there were only one or two teachers was a more personal event. I always spoke to the School Council and other key persons who might have had some sense of school ownership.
Reeves, appointed DI in 1977, was introduced to the new format of reporting indicating that he was comfortable with the collegiate approach. However, these changes overwhelmed some of the Inspectors who had been in the position for twenty years or more. All Inspectors interviewed had similar culture-enhancing perceptions to those of Reeves about reporting to authorities. They expressed the opinion that principals and teachers viewed annual inspections as intrusions into their schools and classrooms; however, the individual personalities and approaches of the DIs changed attitudes and, although the occasion was an inspection and assessment, it was also seen as comprising in-service education activities for the school to assist with educational ideas. Goode elaborated on this issue, commenting:

I found that although it was difficult to truly evaluate the changes made because of the annual inspection it was evident from the previous report that many changes were operating. I believed that the reporting showed that this process was successful.

Dawson explained:

Depending on the circumstance! I know that principals and teachers were pleased when you had an Inspector go through the school and give a positive report. School Councils liked to get a good report as well.

The mandated inspection incorporated reporting to the authorities on the implementation of education department policies, educational progress, the school organization in place, the distribution and use of the resources, the success or failure of the teaching staff and the recommendations to overcome negative situations. Teachers were often unaware of the implications resulting from an inspection and the importance of the evaluation and reporting by the DI to the authorities.

**Inspectors as disciplinarians**

The fifth theme to emerge from the data analysis was that of discipline for pupils and teachers, an area that many Inspectors were inexperienced at handling. Discipline in schools could be a difficult area to manage. School organization was controlled under the auspices of the Education Department; however the nature of the school population and the calibre of students were unpredictable. Principals were faced daily with situations that could potentially be dangerous for students and teachers; therefore issues such as teacher ineffectiveness,
uncontrollable children, parent complaints and union issues that could not be solved at the school level were passed on to the Inspector.

Ikin gave one graphic illustration of how a DI could become involved in an unexpected, high-tension school. A child was swinging a cricket bat at a teacher and other children in an uncontrollable rage. The parents were contacted but on arrival at the school could not calm the child. The DI was notified of the incident and was then asked to solve the situation. Negotiations took place with principal, teacher, parents and students and the recommendation was that the child should attend another school with extra supervision provided. This was an example of the DI being the disciplinarian and problem solver in extraordinary cases.

The time and effort necessary for such an incident was not appreciated by other stakeholders. No specific time was set aside in their busy schedule for them to be concerned with disciplinary issues, particularly in rural areas where time-consuming travel over long distances became involved. Situations such as these were unpredictable; they could flare up at any time, becoming a lengthy and difficult process for solution. School-based problems such as truancy, unruly behaviour and suspensions could become common problems in a district because of the number of schools involved. Placement of children with unacceptable behaviour into neighbouring schools created unpleasant situations for both principals and teachers. As the interviews progressed, reminiscences of different situations were told expressing the importance of this aspect of the role.

The other aspect of discipline was that related to teacher issues; these were difficult because there were no prescribed formula for coping with wrongful acts by teachers. When sexual acts involving children were brought to the attention of the DI they were treated seriously and dealt with in the appropriate way, usually by police. Dawson was bewildered by the claims asserting:

The action taken was immediate suspension until the issue was proven or dismissed. This proved to be an arduous task and very time consuming. If the teacher was eventually found guilty, dismissal from the department was included in the penalty.

All disciplinary matters too difficult for the principal to handle were referred to the DI. It might involve simply the moving of a disruptive child from its school to be placed in a
neighbouring school. The solution appeared simple but it often proved difficult to administer! Ilkin admitted:

The child had to be reallocated as the situation had become intolerable to the school, students, teachers, parents and the community. The problem was: ‘What principal wants to accept another problem?’ I had to use my negotiating skills to resolve such problems as this amicably.

Meyer commented that the core requirements of the Inspector’s role were overtly displayed, but covertly the psychological depths to which the DI descended were not revealed.

I had to hold an investigation into a smash at a school bus stop where a child was killed. This involved several attendances at court and a lengthy inquiry. This was not something you could plan for or timetable into your schedule, I just coped with it.

All discipline issues were difficult, time consuming and often unpleasant to deal with; there were no prescribed formulae as all situations were unique. Experience was the main support with collegiate help from other DIs and ultimately the support of senior officials in the Education Department. While principals and teachers often complained about the presence and intrusion of Inspectors, in these cases they were more than happy to invite the Inspector into their school to solve a problem that was beyond their control.

**Conclusion**

Inspectorate culture as an operational concept rested upon achievement by Inspectors of the five practical themes discussed above: monitoring teaching standards; teacher appraisal; teacher assessment and evaluation; quality control and assurance; and monitoring and reporting policy implementation to HQ. The success of these depended on the leadership qualities of each DI and how they operated in their districts in idiosyncratic ways. The concept of inspectorate culture that emerged from the transcript analysis was substantiated by the perceptions held by the Inspectors which gave rise to the five practical themes The ‘Annual Inspectors School Report’, that was forwarded at the end of each year to the Education Department, permanently recorded the performances of the schools, principals and teachers, thereby enabling the authorities to check all stakeholders’ progress instantly. Monitoring teaching standards and curriculum requirements gave an indication as to whether all department policies were in place and operating effectively.
The classroom inspections created the opportunity for the Inspector to confirm that the policies advocated by the principal were operative, while at the same time teacher-effectiveness was evaluated. This effectiveness varied with the ability, experience, training, personality and the organizational skills of the teacher and became the basis for each teacher’s assessment, comparatively made, leading eventually equality of opportunity for promotion throughout the system. A regular school report reiterated or otherwise that quality control and accountability were in place by observing the principal’s organization of the school in terms of resources, buildings, grounds, equipment, staffing, finances and the implementation of the policies and curriculum statements. The DI gave advice and support to principals who were confronted with disciplinary issues but the ultimate responsibility throughout the inspectorate rested on the shoulders of the Inspector.

The role of the Inspector was not always seen as a positive by some principals and teachers which often led to conflict throughout the Education Departments inspectorial system. Teachers with strong union backgrounds resented this intrusion into the privacy of their classroom, often becoming indifferent cooperatively. Performance assessments for underachieving teachers who were not aware of their failings became a problem as they became more disgruntled. Although some principals and teachers were against the inspection system they always accepted a positive school review with pleasure and were also relieved to hand over the difficult discipline issues to the DI. Although Inspectors were aware of these conflicts, they were unaware that it was these issues that would eventually lead to the demise of the inspectorate system.

The second section of this chapter concerns the concept inspectorate in-service education; this was closely related to the school inspection routine. The observations and decisions of the DI determined the most comprehensive plan for and style of in-service education required to improve the educational standards in the inspectorate’s schools in general and teachers in particular. However as clearly stated in the next stage, the introduction of new initiatives varied according to the interest and expertise of the DI, often supported by teachers with creative ideas to enhance their pedagogical performance.
Inspectorate in-service education

“In-service education is a basic component of the continuing preparation of teachers as they extend their professional knowledge … it is job oriented to meet conditions of immediate employment. … It is a means of continual professional growth”. (Woods & Orlik, 1994, p. 97)

This statement clarifies perceptions held by the cohort of twelve retired DIs interviewed for this research project. During the interviews a myriad of ideas flowed in conversation about the initiatives they had implemented during their reign as Inspectors, many of which were documented in their transcripts. It was from the transcripts and documents presented that the four practical themes emerged, defining the scope of the concept inspectorate in-service education and the overall role of Inspectors in progressing these themes: to assist principals and teachers in their professional development; to advise and help teachers with personal and professional issues; to be agents of change, reporting on departmental initiatives to headquarters and suggesting their own; and, sometimes assisted by consultants, supervise professional development through advisory and training roles.

Two types of inspectorate in-service education were clearly defined: the official or formal, and the unofficial or informal. The former were compulsory programs provided by the system which Inspectors organized on demand, and were delivered by expert consultants, usually from the C&R Branch. Informal programs were often conducted through contacts with C&R Branch personnel for an “unofficial” trial of forthcoming curricular changes, and to address needs identified by DIs. DIs themselves informally cross-pollinated both inspectorate and teacher initiatives, and encouraged teacher inter-school visits.

As outlined in previous sections, an underlying theme in this section is that the imprimatur of the individual Inspector left its mark on the nature and impacts of the concept inspectorate in-service education, often initiating a new or creative process. For example, in the early 1960s, Anderson had advocated the sharing of ideas and information by publishing a formal district ‘Newsletter’, thus networking with other schools. However, as this became an arduous task without clerical assistance and because of the demands of the compulsory requirements of the position, he decided to publish articles in magazines and journals that
were distributed throughout Victoria and read by educators. In the late 1970s when funding for in-service education ventures became more generous and available, Hobbs used the same principle of sharing ideas by taking his principals interstate to observe the school protocols and operations implemented by principals in other states. He believed his schools benefited from these new experiences to which the principals were exposed.

Goode, an Inspector controlling a district in which many nationalities were represented, expressed his belief in the value of in-service education training by reiterating:

To give these children a flying start we introduced ‘team teaching’, where two or three classrooms would combine so that you had two teachers, one a qualified Italian speaking teacher and the other an English speaking teacher. Instructions being presented in both languages English/Italian as a dual role assisted the children and helped the parents to understand and cope.

Teachers needed to understand the processes involved in the team-teaching program so a series of in-service education sessions was conducted to enable the school to operate effectively and to improve the educational standards of the children. Goode spoke of the ‘Disadvantaged Schools Funding Program’ that allowed him sufficient finance to create such initiatives from 1974 till 1980. This program will be further clarified in the section on Government initiated in-service education.

The values, cultural and in-service education activities which characterized inspectorates led to creative interactive strategies being driven by the Inspector’s personality, experience, knowledge and leadership. Although the requirements of all districts were identical in theory, their execution relied entirely on the DI’s personal qualities, initiative and approach. In his district Hobbs created the cultural artefact reflecting insistence on teaching by his example; this coloured in-service education activities with which he was at ease. Nunn insisted that role responsibilities were foremost in the minds of the teachers and conducted many of his in-service education sessions following the Education Department manuals. Holloway, who was noted for his excellence in literacy, introduced foreign language teaching into his schools, encouraging children in the infant grades to develop a basic knowledge of the language they were using. Proactive thinking Inspectors such as Moyle and Ikin were prepared to open the way to creative ideas by principals and teachers and develop in-service programs around these educationally sound initiatives.
Inspectorate in-service education became a vital component in the organizational planning of each district, encouraging principals and teachers to further advance their knowledge further. Many teachers had the basic qualifications required for employment as teachers but were not self-motivated to undertake further studies. The diagrammatic representation below, labelled ‘Inspectorate Strategies’ indicates the importance of the coordinated interaction of inspectorate values, culture and in-service education. Targeted in-service education became the cement for this necessary interaction and so consolidated the unique identity of each inspectorate and its educational personnel. The strategies employed were inter-woven, relying on each other to create an educationally sound base and framework for the benefit of the inspectorate. Targeted instructions came from the Education Department to organize sessions to be conducted by their personnel to disseminate information to principals and teachers concerning centrally mandated change requirements late in the inspectorial era which circumscribes this research. To assist principals in implementing the changes, the DIs organized district workshops in accord with the existing district in-service education frameworks in order to cross-pollinate the information. Inspectorate strategies, underpinned by the expertise, knowledge and skills of the respective DIs, initiated the changes so strengthening the underlying values extant in progressive inspectorates.
Since 1925 the hierarchy of the Education Department had a Chief Inspector and two Assistant Chief Inspectors, so allocation of responsibilities was made on a needs and interest basis, but with the increasing complexity of the work the allocations were adjusted. By 1959 a third Assistant Chief Inspector had been appointed. The Chief Inspector dealt with all matters of policy, matters relating to the director’s office, and the other Schools Divisions.

In 1959 Joseph Greening, was appointed as Chief Inspector. He held this position for less than two years until April 1961 (Holloway, 2000). After his appointment he saw the need for the re-organization to his office increasing the number of Assistant Chief Inspectors being necessary for specific aspects of the administration of the Primary Schools Division – finance, buildings, staffing, inspection and curriculum. He followed the policy now adopted of continuous review of curriculum, establishing subject committees chaired by DIs from 1960. He was responsible for raising a committee to establish an annual conference for the Inspectors and residential seminars for heads of schools at ‘Somers Camp’ held at Queenscliff.
on the Bellarine Peninsula, south of Melbourne, via Geelong. Inspectors’ in-service training became an annual occurrence from 1961 onwards and was the catalyst for the introduction of inspectorate training for principals and teachers. These seminars for Inspectors consisted of a five day residential conference, held in the school vacation period, at a venue removed from Head Quarters (HQ). It revolved around a theme chosen initially by senior staff at HQ but in later years by the Inspectors. It became customary for the Director-General or the Minister to grace the occasion. Inspectors were informed of the up-coming ‘official’ in-service education for that year enabling them to timetable it into their overloaded schedule. The Inspectors ‘official’ in-service education paved the way for the inspectorate training. Although Greening held his position of Chief Inspector for less than two years, it was clear that his impact on in-service education was enormous.

**Assisting principals and teachers in their professional development**

The first of the four emergent themes buttressing the concept, inspectorate in-service education, referred to Inspectors assisting principals and teachers in their professional development. Inspectors in conjunction with principals identified areas of concern where principals required training in advisory activities, changes in the school system, curriculum issues, administration and management of schools and the professional development of teachers. In-service education formed two categories, Education Department requirements and inspectorate initiatives was related to the organization of schools, whereas inspectorate in-service education could involve the implementation of departmental policies such as curriculum issues, or it could be Inspector-based or school-based initiatives. The inspectorate initiatives included music, reading and mathematics courses to be implemented in all particular inspectorate schools. A school-based initiative might be team teaching or the ‘Do it Daily’ physical education program carried out in situ.

Some teachers were not always positive towards in-service education, believing their comfort zone was being invaded; however many senior teachers regarded these sessions as an opportunity to keep abreast of educational developments, including changed emphasis towards aspects of the curriculum and advancing technology. As this latter facility was a new initiative teachers were cynical about the value of the relevant sessions believing they were better employed in their classrooms. Within a short time span many teachers had taken the opportunity to introduce a new style of pedagogy into their teaching and the domino effect started to overcome any doubt as to the value of in-service education. This was a major breakthrough and the beginning of retraining for experienced teachers.
Formal inspectorate in-service education programs for inspectorate principals of three to five days duration were conducted once a year. The aim of the conferences was to challenge principals personally as well as professionally. Management skills, departmental changes or curricular initiatives were topics for discussion. For example, Moyle’s first conference in 1968 for principals, senior staff and some Head Teachers of small rural schools was about the intellectually challenging topic of Creativity led by the newly appointed head of the Faculty of Education, Latrobe University, Professor Ronald Goldman. By this means he signalled his intent to lift the standard of in-service education for senior schools’ personnel. Dawson an advocate of in-service education explained one of his important purposes:

The in-service sessions carried out with district principals assisted and improved their leadership skills particularly in areas of management responsibilities. The difficult principals were those who had been excellent teachers but had difficulty with the principal’s role. In-service training for these principals was essential.

To overcome funding issues neighbouring districts would plan together and organize presenters of a professional calibre to add value to the in-service education program. This cooperation was particularly apt for city inspectorates where finance was important. These presenters could be unpaid Education Department personnel invited to introduce change in policies, curriculum and finance, and paid external experts in areas such as management, personal wellbeing, or in being recognized worldwide for relevant expertise.

Inspector or school-based initiatives often developed from the initial training into a series of follow-up school based sessions where the work in the classrooms could be monitored. Nunn, a country DI responsible for 58 primary schools, 44 of which were one or two teacher schools, discussed his in-service education program from a different perspective. A Rural Schools Advisory Committee (RSAC) for rural schools of which he was a member was activated, these schools being organized into groups, the children and teachers in those groups meeting on a regular basis for group activities and professional interaction. The rural schools were grouped into three groups for in-service education activities, these occurring for a half or full day once a month for ten months of the year. On these occasions, the teachers were replaced by emergency teachers who were funded through in-service education funds. Nunn genuinely believed:
It was essential to develop in-service training for these rural areas in the 1970s because access to the communication chain was very limited. They relied on correspondence from the Education Department to inform them of any changes.

Nunn provided in-service education sessions for the remaining 14 larger schools in his district in regular fashion similar to other inspectorates.

Ikin had operated as a teacher in primary schools for twenty years and had been a principal for one. He was conscious of the fact that the best teachers were seldom heard and the vocal teachers were likely to have pedagogical inadequacies. As DI he built on his prior school knowledge to plan his in-service education for principals. In introducing role-model sessions to identify the different teacher personalities they could expect to be leading he realized that the principals who were complaining most about their staff were those who needed training the most, stating:

The challenge for the DI was to be ahead of the game, fully versed in the required knowledge and to have the skills to lead and work with the district principals to uplift the educational standards.

Assistants with Responsibility (AR) presented a major problem for all DIs, the extra duties to be performed being a major concern for the effectiveness of the schools’ functioning. The AR was an important position in that the teacher, now experienced, had responsibility for a class and also covered aspects of curriculum training for other teachers. If the incumbents, teachers who had gained promotion to a responsibility role, and who had now achieved the first level of promotion, did not operate effectively overall after accepting the additional responsibilities attached to the position then promotable marks at the new level were not granted. The DI’s dilemma was that both principals and ARs were not clear on how the position should evolve or whether the ARs had the appropriate skills to accomplish the task. Ikin introduced a residential training program to overcome these problems. This program was so successful it was accepted as a state-wide program. Ikin commented:

This form of in-service was invaluable for learning how to handle adults (teachers) as opposed to children. ‘What is it like to be with other adults?’ was the topic for the residential program.

Inspectors believed that principals and teachers were willing to perform their duties with optimal intentions but often lacked the knowledge and skills to achieve their aims. Armed
with these observations and information the DIs took responsibility to develop training sessions or operational initiatives to assist in overcoming any problems.

**Inspectors help for teachers with personal and professional issues**

Inspectors advising and helping teachers with personal and professional issues was a common theme. Anderson commented with emphasis:

> Teaching must become a profession where teachers are respected and they have set high standards in all aspects of their community life. …We can only put into place a structure that trains and educates principals and teachers to be efficient and rely on the individual to be as trustworthy and capable as possible.

Teachers were believed to be isolated in their classroom; this made it very difficult to detect the classroom problems or personal issues with which they were dealing. It was important to the academic standards in the classrooms of the affected children that any such issues were discovered and acted upon. Principal and co-workers or friends were encouraged to support and notify persons qualified to support such teachers; however, it was often the Inspector who provided the support. Goode in his interview emphasized his responsibilities for the wellbeing of his teachers. He believed that to improve teacher competence, to make good teachers better teachers and better teachers outstanding he had to give ideas and hints that would build their confidence and self-esteem and improve their wellbeing. Goode explained:

> I was from the district where I was known so there were no shock waves. I brought me some level of respect by the teachers and certainly with the principals. I had been the chairman of the principals association so the principals felt comfortable to request a period where no great changes were taking place. I believed it was in the interests and wellbeing of the staff to honour their request for a limited time. I introduced new ideas and initiative when I believed they were ready and able to cope.

Goode used his initiative and common sense to be realistic about the timing of major, introduced changes. His personality allowed him to achieve his goals in conjunction with principals who believed they were contributing to the decision making process. Dawson in his interview explained how DIs were sometimes exposed to unusual circumstances outside their immediate competence with a schedule imposing extreme
pressure on them to be reactive yet supportive of the wellbeing of a school’s staff.

Dawson identified different concerns:

There were always relevant personal problems but occasionally you would be confronted with the most devastating incident a teacher had to confront such as a suicide in the immediate family. The DI arranged counselling and provided personal support to the family.

This exemplifies the difficulties faced by Inspectors particularly in country inspectorates where the DI was viewed as a pillar of strength in the community; the two situations are illustrative of contrasting possibilities of the DI’s work in this regard.

**Agents of change: to report on departmental initiatives to headquarters and suggest their own.**

The third category of the concept inspectorate in-service education was that Inspectors must be agents of change, reporting to the Education Department through the School Report any particular school initiatives or implementations they have instituted both with particular reference to successful inter-inspectorate cross fertilizations. This responsibility enabled Inspectors to initiate or support schools’ organizational or pedagogical changes by using their regular Official Reports to comment on these educational successes. Inspectors unconsciously reported on the underlying uniqueness of their own inspectorate’s culture and values inadvertently exposing their own personalities and individual style.

The Disadvantaged Schools Program (DSP) was implemented in the 1970s as part of the Australian Government’s social justice agenda. The DSP commenced in 1972 and concluded in 1997. It was the longest running Australian equity program, focusing on socio-economic disadvantage, schools’ practices and management. This program created the opportunity for many in-service education programs to be funded throughout the inspectorates. Brown, prior to her appointment as a DI, was a field consultant with the DSP, describing her role thus:

As member of the Supplementary Grants Committee (SGC) I had the task of allocating the Schools Commission recurrent grants (non-capital) to disadvantaged schools. Until the end of 1975 the Supplementary Grants Program operated from a central location. Given the nature of Regional Directorates, it was expected that the decision to devolve the operation of the DSP to a regional level
would provide further opportunities to develop initiatives which would assist in alleviating educational disadvantages.

These grants gave extra funding to the schools qualifying but also incorporated many initiatives that could be implemented in other schools, for example, teachers developed an integrated approach to curriculum development within the school’s organizational structure and promoted community-home participation and parsimonious use of resources. The task of allocating Schools Commission recurrent grants (non-capital) to disadvantaged schools was the responsibility of the Victorian Education Department’s Disadvantaged Schools Committee – known as the SGC. This committee was supported by a team of field consultants and eighteen Area Committees. Until the end of 1975 the SGC operated from a central location. However given the nature of Regional Directorates, it was expected that the decision to devolve the operation of the DSP to a regional level would provide further opportunities to develop initiatives which would assist in alleviating educational disadvantage. Brown believed that this enlightening experience of planning, creating and implementing new initiatives was the foundation of her district planning during her short time as a DI.

Meyer developed a culture wherein his performances were faultless and precise in every detail and the workforce within his district knew how he worked and what he expected of them. There was freedom within the boundaries he set but principals knew there to be a check list at inspection time which must be met. His in-service education sessions were conducted in the same manner. Initially Education Department initiatives were always conducted by the officials from the central office with the follow up sessions supervised by the Inspector. This supervision for professional development through advisory and training roles was performed by the Inspector, assisted by consultants. In compliance with his detailed thinking, Meyer introduced and conducted conferences on Rural School Management Systems and Accounts, an important issue for small schools struggling without any clerical assistance. For his district he also produced a handbook on reading and spelling methods with ideas that were accepted in other districts.

**Supervise professional development through advisory and training roles assisted by consultants**

The final basic theme to emerge from the transcripts was the professional advisory and training roles performed by the Inspectors and consultants. These roles could be departmental
or inspectorate initiatives, strengthening principals’ and teachers’ skills, knowledge or competency, and re-assuring them of their ability to fulfil the requirements of their positions and to evaluate their pupils’ education. Departmental initiatives to be introduced to teachers included new curriculum approaches, new pedagogical emphases and implementation of changed subject courses. Dawson explained that during the 1960s the Cuisenaire (a box of coloured sticks representing numbers to 10) approach to arithmetic was introduced to schools; children were taught addition, subtraction, multiplication and division by manipulating the sticks. This change of pedagogy was difficult for teachers to perceive; therefore inspectorate in-service sessions were set up throughout the district and indeed the state. Experts from C&R branch initially introduced the topic. Follow-up workshops were conducted by teachers who had trialled the approach with their grades, qualifying them to impart the knowledge they had acquired.

As the 1960s progressed, immigration from the Mediterranean countries had introduced new cultures to the school system, with challenges and problems different from previous decades. Shortages of both teachers and classrooms were acute, with parents and teachers responding to a growing political awareness combining to express their needs. The educational administrators were finding it necessary to adapt to the new demands. The educational climate was changing, emphasized by the changed nature of the school population. The Victorian Readers, grade level readers had become outmoded and were unacceptable by the 1960s when the cry, “Each one in different” led to their disbandment thereby creating a whole new way of thinking – reading levels. What texts, interest levels and pedagogy could replace the practice embedded formerly? Metrication had also been introduced, the decimal currency and the continental system of weights and measures meant the traditional knowledge of teachers and Inspectors was out-dated. They needed to be retrained incorporating new skills to which they had not been exposed previously. Inspectors had to adapt to these new pedagogical approaches if there was to be any justice or validity in their reporting on schools and teachers. They adapted to enforced changes, while keeping the essentials of good teaching and pupil learning in mind. These imperative new departmental initiatives required planning strategies and teaching methods for change, creating the need for Inspectors to upgrade their skills and to arrange in-service sessions for all teachers at all grade levels. Meyer reminisced:

The introduction, organization and planning of this approach to reading created massive changes throughout the schools. Funding the reading material was
difficult and for many teachers a major shift in their teaching methods. The shift was the forerunner to individualizing the reading pedagogy. In-service training was essential if teachers were to understand this technique and continue to sustain the children’s learning standards.

The social revolution of the 1960s changed the thinking and expectations of society. Schools were coerced into change by community pressures and education as such required change. Dress codes, language, respect for others and values developed in inspectorates were being eroded. Principals and teachers needed to rethink and re-train adding another dimension to the Inspectors’ role - that of ‘inspectorate in-service education’.

Once the revolution gained momentum and in-service education sessions became the norm, Inspectors became creative, introducing their own initiatives that were welcomed by teachers. Ideas established and performed successfully in many districts were eventually adopted state-wide. The Inspectors in their interviews detailed new initiatives they had introduced to their inspectorates, opining that these valuable contributions to education had never been credited to their endeavours.

Ikin, who had two spare classrooms at a school and was very interested in nature, utilized the facility to create a nature hub incorporating a nature trail around the area. Children from schools in the inspectorate would visit twice a year, the first time going on the trail and recording what they saw at different places. Six months later they would take the same trail and record the changes, then discussing why. This program incorporated social studies, history, language, mathematics and so on, creating a living, growing education centre for many years into the future. Brown assisted teachers to develop an integrated approach to curriculum development within the school structure and to promote community and home participation utilizing the district resources to the advantage of everyone. Dawson, however, introduced a program that he referred to as ‘PORTS’ - personal, organization, relationships, teaching abilities and special qualities. He used this framework as his scaffolding for in-service education within his district. Teachers of excellent practice in these areas were encouraged to lead the training sessions and often operated as visiting specialists in other schools.

Goode set up a physical education program ‘Do it daily’. Although he initiated it, he admitted there to be pressure from the Physical Education Department. This program was introduced to other schools in Victoria. Moyle, an extremely creative DI, challenged
principals and teachers at all levels of the system. Different pedagogical approaches were encouraged and in the era of Clegg’s “Each One is Different” inspirational call, reading levels became central, the inspiring Nuffield Science Program was introduced with genuine teacher fervour, the multisensory approach to language teaching blossomed, fresh thinking about multi-aged classroom groupings appeared, and team teaching and other alternative means of classroom organization were encouraged and supported. He believed that support and encouragement for the teachers who enjoyed freedom to innovate within the new curricula and their overlapping boundaries, brought out the best in them, changing their pedagogical practices forever.

When the Biennial Report system was introduced in 1980, it meant that annual inspections no longer existed; if a teacher wished to be assessed they now had to make a request to the DI. The new reporting system was driven by a new requirement at HQ, personnel asking all DIs to obtain from their senior principals a simple, practical statement of the school’s philosophy and their broad plans for implementing and evaluating it. Moyle complied but challenged a number of active younger Head Teachers to do the same unofficially. As a result he read many excellent philosophies of education for their schools from the younger brigade, but those developed by their seniors were less inspiring, even clichéd.

The scope, evaluation plans and practicality of the younger Head Teachers’ schools’ educational philosophies opened the minds of educators to the more progressive thinking that included thoughts of the community’s involvement, and was highly instructive as to the future of education in Victoria’s schools.

Moyle, in his creative mind as far back as the late 1960s and early 1970s, had faith in the pivotal role of the principal; his basic idea being that principals, as educational leaders, should be able to articulate their school’s progress towards practical goals, organizational or other innovation, and curriculum areas needing further creative emphasis. These ideas later became accepted, successful and embedded as they were integral to the professionalization of the teaching workforce. Although all DIs interviewed relayed plausible stories of innovation, some confessed to being less creative than others, but willingly admitted that initiatives developed in other inspectorates were taken on board as soon as they were noted.

In summary, the concept inspectorate in-service education was the third component of an inter-woven set of strategies implemented by DIs in each inspectorate. Fundamental to
the DI's achievement of this concept were its pillars: to assist principals and teachers in professional development; to advise and assist teachers with personal and professional development issues; to be agents of change reporting initiatives to HQ; and supervising professional development. The strategies of this component were inter-related with and gave substance and meaning to the two other concepts, inspectorate culture and inspectorate values. The inspectorate culture encouraged and inculcated by each Inspector was only achieved if the practical underpinning themes, inspectorate values and inspectorate in-service education were promoted and effectively implemented. These pillars of inspectorate in-service education took decades to flourish. Training and professional development began with the Inspectors’ Annual Conference where departmental information was imparted to the DI's and in turn related to principals and teachers in their districts. This was followed by the principals’ live-in seminars where they were trained in the basic knowledge of how to manage and administer their schools with confidence, knowledge of the current curriculum changes, new pedagogical approaches and the initiatives necessary to be outstanding leaders in the community. In-service education for teachers was conducted firstly on information days where experts would introduce an overview of any new initiative. Such sessions were followed up at the school level with workshops allowing the teachers to have hands on experiences. These professional development sessions were mainly the result of departmental initiatives; however many inspectorate initiatives were nurtured at the local level by the DI and outstanding teachers, thence becoming embedded at inspectorate level and ultimately in state-wide programs. The growing numbers of these outstanding teachers were a testimony to the results DI's had achieved in what was arguably the most significant area of their work.

**Summary of the findings of inspectorate cultures and inspectorate in-service education**

Perusal of the second of the three chapters incorporating the findings from the transcripts of the research cohort of retired DI's show the inter-related nature of the three constructs revealed. Inspectorate values, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education were the three interactive concepts which provided the umbrella for total inspectorate outcomes. Inspectors promoted and supported the underpinning themes variously, deeming them as basic to the functioning of all Inspectors of Schools, however they were implemented and achieved for establishing educational credibility within schools and the wider community. These three interwoven basic constructs completed the conceptual underpinning of educational leadership at school and inspectorate levels. The researcher believes the three concepts to be fundamental at all levels of the educational leadership.
However, it must be remembered, the three constructs have been derived from comprehensive oral data provided by the interviews of the research cohort comprising twelve retired Inspectors whose retrospective glance enabled their derivation.

An Inspector’s values were based on widely accepted ethical standards and were operationalized by dint of their personality, experience and qualifications, and the era during which they worked, thereby laying the basis for the unique combination of the three basic concepts emerging in each inspectorate. Its uniqueness inspectorate-wide was determined by the introduction of pedagogical shifts particularized to the inspectorate; interpretations of centrally driven policies; and community expectations for the whole education process. The positive outcomes of these features relied entirely on the manner in which the Inspector delivered this uniqueness to his wide, principal and teacher audience. This ‘manner’ depended on the Inspector’s various acknowledged qualities for they consolidated the threesome: inspectorate culture, values and in-service education.

The ingenuity of the Inspector created a positive and productive educational program for children’s learning. To this end he variously established in-service training sessions and workshops for teachers, cross-pollination mechanisms, and the giving of meaning and support to any policy or pedagogical shifts introduced by the Department or the Inspector. The uniqueness and individuality of each inspectorate was further identified by the Inspector’s creativity and management of new, innovative ideas introduced either by them, teachers, or both. The Inspector’s creative thinking was more prevalent in some districts than others, each interview transcript documenting these differences; however all Inspectors introduced innovative ideas based on their personal interests. All were open to ideas developed in other districts and introduced to them once they became public property.

The contribution to education by the DIs was never evaluated as them being separate identities; they were accepted as a dispensable cog in the all-encompassing political and union revolutionary changes occurring at the close of the time span covered by this thesis. The perceptions of many of the research cohort were that their voice was never heard or considered. Twenty-seven years after the inspectorates’ political demise, some of the retired DIs believed that education is currently suffering. They now refer to the lack of assessments for teaching staff by an external supervisor with outstanding credentials to help judge on request, accompanied by expert personnel if desired, and the need to spread the innovative pedagogical responses assimilated through study and reading of creative teachers.
Chapter 6 completes the empirical research findings with three biographies identifying the essence of being an Inspector. The three stories pinpoint the differing backgrounds, socio-economic circumstances, qualifications, era and opportunities of the three Inspectors. It illustrates how the diversity of life circumstances could not deter the dedication or determination of the born teacher.
Chapter 6: What made a District Inspector?

Introduction

Chapters 4 and 5 detailed research findings that emerged from the interviews and transcripts of twelve retired Inspectors. The analysis of these data suggested that DIs from all districts country, metropolitan and country/metropolitan had identified three major common aspects of their work which could be categorized into inspectorate values, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service. These were buttressed by a number of practical themes. It is important for this thesis to explain the significance of the chosen case studies in substantiating and demonstrating the broad commonalities which permeate aspects of their work; but more importantly, how the differences in approach, philosophy and attitudes of individual DIs in their implementation of the themes analysed from the interview data, have supported the relevance of the three inspectorate concepts which have emerged.

This chapter takes the study in a slightly different direction, in that it moves from themes to biographies. It documents three individual case study stories telling why participants interviewed for this research chose to be Inspectors in the Victorian Primary Schools Inspectorate, and how each one approached that role. The importance of documenting this information is that it describes the incumbents, their backgrounds with the trials and tribulations faced in their early years, their qualifications, teaching experiences and inspirations, and in some cases, the difficult decisions they made in order to achieve their goals. Each participant’s background disclosed the diverse manner enabling them to achieve their individual expectations, despite profound individual differences, which led eventually to their achieving the position of DI which marked in some instances a step in the continuous advancement of their careers. Each also provides an interesting case study of how they responded to the decision to terminate the category Inspector of Schools in 1983, thus bringing this significant part of their careers to an end.

Tosh (2006) contends that oral material can be investigated in two ways, both apposite to the research methods used in this thesis. The first and more familiar category is oral reminiscence – the first hand recollections of people interviewed by the historian, usually
referred to as *oral history*. The second is that there is an *oral tradition* of the narratives and descriptions of people and events in the past which have been passed down by word of mouth over several generations. The three narratives of this thesis fit into the first category, oral reminiscence, as they convey something of the qualities which recommend ‘oral history’ to historians. Oral history allows the voices of ordinary people to be heard alongside the careful marshalling of social facts in the written record. As exemplified by the then Minister of Education, Lindsay Thompson (Holloway, 2000) this oral history has focused purely on the Victorian Primary School District Inspectors who were willing and able at such an elderly stage of their life to be members of a research cohort and reminisce, focusing on their perceptions of their careers during a period of intense change, 1960 to 1983. Thus the researcher chose these three participants to document in detail their biographies during this period, explaining their diversity of backgrounds and experiences. Each story highlights and gives meaning to the findings described in Chapter 5 by telling the life story of real people and their environments. It describes how these people interpreted inspectorial regulations so as to guide, affect and influence other people, and to provide anecdotes clarifying how they operated during their careers as DIs.

Peter Meyer grew up in an environment surrounded by ‘old school values’. His parents were involved in education as were his grandparents. He was encouraged to strive for perfection, and as his personality in adult life showed, these early teachings remained the catalyst for his thinking throughout his entire career. His admiration for his grandfather who in 1926 was appointed to Chief Inspector of Primary Schools and remained in this position until 1932 played an important role in encouraging him to aspire to a similar position. Peter was born into a family of educators thus predetermining his career path.

Donald Reeves unfortunately had no prior knowledge of the requirements for a successful career path in teaching. Rightly or wrongly he was encouraged to enter the technical stream of education to train him to become an engineer. After a period of time, teaching, not engineering, was constantly in his thoughts. This was the first of many complications that he would need to overcome. His qualifications did not include the compulsory subjects necessary for entry into a teachers’ college, but, undeterred he enrolled for the requisite subjects, studying at night to qualify. This enabled him to enter the teaching profession where his successful career in Victoria ended unexpectedly with the abolition of the administrative role of DI in 1983. His life’s journey, his determination, his decision making and finally, his achievements, became an inspiration to others, proving that, no matter
what one’s aspiration, it can be reached with the ability, the drive, the incentive and the dreams of self-belief.

Colin Moyle, the subject of the third biographical sketch was from a country family of low socio-economic status who battled through the era where one traditionally left school at age 14. He had aspired to be a teacher almost from the day of commencing his formal education - he had a goal. There were no doubts as to his future; he knew he could become a successful teacher and carve out a successful teaching career. His personality, charisma, teaching ability and academic competence as a primary, secondary and tertiary level teacher had him promoted unexpectedly to become a young DI, his first administrative appointment on a not yet clearly defined career path. In hindsight he believed he had been strongly mentored by anonymous seniors.

The oral biographies that follow detail the successful journeys of these three DIs who with foresight, determination, hard work and ability wove a valuable educational web throughout their districts influencing principals, teachers, students and the community. Each one, through their own individual style, developed inspectorate values, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education as the outcomes of manifesting the basic goals expected of the DIs’ role.

Following the three biographies, the chapter will conclude with a reflection on the value of the three biographies to the nature of the study, and how they have contributed to a better understanding of the roles and contributions that DIs in general have made to the education system in Victoria during the final decades of the institution being in place.

1. ‘Sitting in his grandfather’s chair’: Peter Meyer

Peter McRae Meyer commenced his education at Sale Primary School in Victoria and completed his secondary schooling at Melbourne High School. He knew from a very early age that he wanted to be a teacher and to model his career on that of his grandfather, James McRae, Chief Inspector of Primary Schools 1926-32. It was a prestigious job to which he aspired to, seeing the DI position as the stepping stone to achieving one of the highest rankings of the Education Department as his grandfather had done early in the 20th century.

This strong family tie stayed with Peter throughout his career. To have seen him sit in his grandfather’s chair, now in his own office, and recollect memories from a small boy to
adulthood, illuminated a life history of overwhelmingly sincere achievements. This background and family relationship created a very precise, genuine, thorough, kind, friendly person who dedicated his actions with textbook precision.

Meyer trained to enter his teaching career at the Toorak Teachers’ College. After completion of the course, he taught at several metropolitan schools, before being appointed Head Teacher at Pearsedale Primary School. After two years as Head Teacher he gained promotion to a metropolitan school as assistant with responsibility. He continued to teach in various schools until 1973, when he was appointed as Principal at Killoura Primary School in Victoria. Later that year he was appointed to Melton as the DI. Although he was a principal for only a short time he believed the experience to have been an invaluable pre-requisite to his becoming a DI. It allowed him to have prior knowledge to fall back on when finding himself in the problem situations occurring in schools, and to be realistic about the advice he gave or decision making he made and administered. Meyer expressed his thoughts about his new role as:

After being appointed DI in November 1973, I was full of excitement and motivation, seeing the Directors and getting on with the task as soon as I could. I worked every night, all weekend and every day in the schools, I never stopped. I saw the role like a principal in a school only you were the principal of all the principals in the District.

Meyer realized that this promotion was a stepping stone along his career-goal path. It was the most motivating position to which he could aspire. He had completed extra studies to allow him to progress to the highest ranks in the Education Department, and as a teacher he had worked consistently to be awarded outstanding teaching marks, another pre-requisite for the role of DI. His subsequent appointment was to an outer metropolitan district, thus moving house and family to an entirely new environment was not entailed. This was a bonus in many respects but it did mean a dedicated commitment to long hours of travel and a great deal of early and late night being on the road. Travelling early in the morning to all the small schools in the hills was in his words, “it was just lovely”. He saw the role of DI as a prestigious position of which he was proud to be part. It was full of excitement, motivation, meeting the Directors and getting on with the job as urgently as possible; this made the hard work worthwhile. Meyer conveyed his perceptions retrospectively as:
I saw it as a job well worth doing. I was the leader of the principals. I did assess well and seemed to work for the benefit of the children and teachers. I changed a lot of schools, you would ask them to do something and off they would go. It was an invigorating and exciting time.

Through his self-confessed and overwhelming determination to be as effective and successful as he could be, Meyer created an extremely stretched workload for himself:

I worked every night, I never stopped, and all weekends and every day in schools. I would constantly be writing and preparing at home. It was demanding, constant, and appeared to never end.

Meyer believed that he related well to the principals in his district and they respected his meticulous mode of operation and compliance with directives from the Director of Primary Education. His timelines were infallible, his reports were always in on time, and any extra demand, such as that made by the supplementary grants program, was treated with dedication and perfection.

Meyer was totally aware of the roles played by the DI as members of his family had previously held administrative roles; he knew it was both demanding and responsible. The job description displayed the core requirements but it did not convey the extremities of the work to be done, for example, a smash at a bus stop after which he had to conduct a time-consuming investigation; or an unexpected court appearance. His mother who was watching his career advancement with pride offered sound advice when she said, “You will get used to it: past experiences and conditioning will guide you through”.

Meyer recalled teacher assessment as being his major task, demanding the major part of his time. Meyer took over five districts in the western areas of Melbourne where previously teachers had been assessed by five different Inspectors; now they were to be inspected and assessed by him. To organize this huge load of assessments Meyer programmed four assessments a day, four days a week. The remaining day was dedicated to meetings and other educational business. Assessments went on throughout the year until November so including teachers who had been on leave. Inspectors were given a basic formula for assessment of teachers; they were to give an assessment mark relevant to the situation. If a teacher appeared to have demonstrated ability in organization, planning, curriculum, pedagogy, presentation and rapport, then the suitable assessment mark was to be given. Senior Teacher assessments,
apart from continuing to improve their teaching competency, included demonstrating extra capacities in principal-directed, school organizational matters. The less experienced classroom teachers had to show their improving capabilities. As assessment had a significant impact on teachers’ careers, it could not be taken lightly, so Meyer always asked, “Can you please tell me where you demonstrated this particular expectation in your current role?” thus ensuring teachers had the opportunity to explain and demonstrate anything that the Inspector may have overlooked.

The buildings program was enormous, particularly in the western suburbs where population growth was accelerating. During his time in office, population growth had created an urgent problem for the Department to provide adequate school accommodation. Meetings were held with Principals, local council and community members to establish enrolments and the distribution of portables to accommodate students for the ensuing years. Principals were never satisfied with the decisions because transfers over the holiday period led to changed school enrolments. As the DI mediated the resolution of such problems, it was imperative that he had the organizational ability to manage the required tasks, the enormous diversity and range of criteria imposed being almost overwhelming.

Meyer was not a risk taker but introduced many outstanding new initiatives throughout his career as a DI. His talents in organization and management supported and constructed the opportunity for him to introduce and implement conferences on Rural School Management Systems and Account Keeping methods. These ideas were implemented throughout the Department for many years. He produced a handbook of reading and spelling methods, the ideas that becoming an important reference manual for schools.

The St Albans Curriculum Development Project introduced by Meyer during 1973 -76 was thwarted at first. It took a long time to be accepted but achieved much in the process. This project was developed with the use of Supplementary Grant monies in several large Primary Schools located in the St Albans and Stevensville areas of the Inspectorate with the disbursement of Supplementary Grant Money. The migrant content of the school populations was almost 80% and the languages spoken by the children were as varied as the countries in Europe. Through drama, play acting, direct teaching and many other co-ordinated activities the recently arrived migrant children all developed language skills in English and through their other school activities became fluent in speech.
The Supplementary Grants Program funds were disbursed to the majority of Primary Schools in St Albans and Stevensville areas because they were classified as ‘disadvantaged’. The program was co-ordinated by a visiting University Professor of Education, plus two additional staff members in each of the designated schools. It was a program seen to be successful as it provided profitable activities from a just and accountable use of the Program’s money in the designated schools within the St Albans area.

The Children’s Week Program’ conducted in Victoria was a priority area for Meyer during his six year involvement in its organization. Significantly it influenced the use of his text on teaching English to new arrivals in Australian and English Language Schools. Meyer saw this as a major breakthrough in the language barrier for parents and children who had no previous knowledge of the English language.

During Meyers’ time as a DI he was granted overseas study to visit U.K. in 1975-6 and U.S.A. in 1979-80. These study visits encouraged him to be more pro-active in his district and to implement ideas drawn from these experiences. In 1983 he was awarded a travelling scholarship to visit school systems in the U.K., Europe and India as Education Department delegate to the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) Committee. It was during this travelling scholarship that the position Inspector of Schools was abolished and the demise of the inspectorial system occurred. Meyer was totally unaware of what was happening in Victoria and was given no opportunity to converse with the authorities. On arrival back in Australia he was appointed to Eastern Region where his title became Educational Officer.

The section of the inspectorial system operated by District Inspectors of the Primary Schools Education had stood the test of time for more than a century and, in his opinion, had provided the state with an organizational and educationally sound structure for children, teachers and the community.

Meyer’s greatest disappointment in the structural change was that there was no longer a structure for teachers in primary schools for them to gain promotion. He believed that the political decision to abolish the assessment process impeded teachers’ ordered movement to different schools, thereby neither benefiting them nor the school they taught.

Meyer’s contribution to the Primary Section of the Education Department was acknowledged in the Melton and Scoresby district during his ten years as a DI. His dedication and support to principals, teachers and communities won the highest level of respect; and the tireless effort and perfection that he projected in all aspects of his role created an
exceptionally high standard of inspectorate values. He was renowned for the professional status he modelled, his demonstrated commitment, and his leadership in strengthening such aspects of his inspectorate culture as: curriculum standards; teacher appraisal, evaluation and assessment; quality control; policies and necessary disciplining of teachers and students. Meyer was a traditionalist in every aspect of his work making his inspectorate a secure and comfortable place for all principals, teachers and communities to work together and operate effectively. He was actively involved in the Health Curriculum Committee and represented the Primary Schools Division on environment to the Children’s Week Committee, promoting new ideas in a handbook for reading and spelling. He was the Department’s delegate to the United Nations International Children’s Educational Fund (UNICEF) Committee contributing to its activities and disseminating information to schools. Although Myer was devastated by the demise of the inspectorate he moved on to serve as a Senior Education Officer at Ferntree Gully, Ringwood and Ashwood until he retired in 1990.

In summary, Meyer was a conscientious, thorough, perfectionist whose contribution to the Education Department was that of complete dedication and involvement. His tireless efforts to create the perfect district were well recognized and teachers who operated under his guidance were adequately prepared to approach future challenges with confidence. Outstanding teachers were encouraged to take on leadership roles and in-service responsibilities to assist in the advancement of their careers. Peter Meyer’s contribution to literature, spelling and reading as well as his dedication to the UNICEF organization were also recognized.

2. ‘Consume your own smoke’: Donald Reeves

Reeves’ story clearly identified the diversity of one DI’s journey. His educational background varies from other Inspectors in that his schooling, qualifications and expectations were changed by circumstances which he overcame by his passion to become involved in education.

Donald Reeves acquired his primary and secondary education in the suburbs of Melbourne, Victoria. Being a very practical person, he explored the possibilities of entering a trade rather than a profession, these vocations being of a world neither he nor his parents had
any connection. During this phase of his secondary schooling at Ferntree Gully Technical School continued academic success changed any of his former aspirations to the one driving ambition – that of becoming a teacher.

After four years of study he gained his Intermediate Technical Certificate (Diploma Entrance), and was offered a scholarship which would then enable him to commence an Associate Diploma of Mechanical Engineering at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT). His teachers encouraged this move, advising him that the Education Department was desperate for mathematics and science teachers, and this was the avenue for recruitment of technical school teachers. Even though thoughts of teaching still appealed, he dropped out after two years of uninspiring physics and chemistry, and went to work for the Victorian Railways as a junior clerk at North Melbourne locomotive depot. Realising he was destined to be more than a depot clerk. He had his supervisors arrange a transfer to the Secretary’s Branch at the Victorian Railways Head Office at Spencer Street. After working there for a short time he realised that becoming a teacher was still his ambition, so he began what turned out to be a long journey to improve his then limited qualifications. His partial RMIT qualifications were assessed by the Education Department as the equivalent of the Matriculation Certificate, thus enabling him to gain entry into Burwood Primary Teachers’ College.

Reeves completed his two year Trained Primary Teachers Certificate (TPTC) and was appointed to a small two-teacher school on the outer fringe of Melbourne. It was at this stage that the words of Dr Lawrie Shears, the then principal of Burwood Teachers’ College - later to become Director General of Education - continued to ring in his ears: “Don’t get trapped in the back waters of specialist teaching; try to get to a university, and from there the career opportunities will be much broader”.

Universities were an unfamiliar entity to Reeves but the words of the Dr Shears exercised his mind which kept questioning, ‘What is required of me to be accepted into this unfamiliar institution’? Instinct told him to continue with external studies and complete the engineering diploma he had commenced at RMIT.

Teaching in the ‘bush’ meant that his journey to a study venue was proving lengthy, and still not very satisfying, Reeves made enquiries about admission to University, soon ascertaining that he needed ‘formal Matriculation’ to enter university - his technical studies and his subsequent TPTC were not acceptable! Undeterred, Reeves, determined to qualify for
university admission; he had now become obsessed, and his determination and drive would not retreat. Therefore he planned to return to Melbourne in order to enrol at Taylors Business College to undertake the required study. Thence a transfer to Thomastown East Primary School enabled him to complete his matriculation in two years of evening classes.

The University of Melbourne required a language subject to be included among those completed in Year 12 studies; his studies did not include the requisite language; however Reeves’ was relieved to know the burgeoning Monash University was prepared to accept his qualifications. He enrolled completing his first two subjects by attending lectures after a day’s teaching. He then applied to the Education Department for part-time study leave to complete his degree. This was granted and subsequently he gained his degree whilst continuing to teach part-time.

Reeves’ reflection on his technical background was that, while it created many problems for him academically, the technical system exposed him to applied learning experiences for which he was grateful in the furtherance of his career. Thus he acquired many of the tradesman skills which he was able to utilize for the many building projects he subsequently undertook. Further, he believed that the closing of technical schools had been detrimental to the education of students who aspired to work in industry. Reeves opined:

"Tradesmen are a necessity for the existence of any civilization and unfortunately with the closure of these institutions in the 1980s the opportunity for students wishing to take up apprenticeships did not exist and they were compelled to remain in the High School academic and general education environment that was unsuitable to their future career options. Behavioural problems and truancy were on the rise and a generation of disillusioned students faced a future of failure, uncertainty and a lack of educational fulfilment. Thirty years later there is a shortage of tradesmen as a result of the closure of all Technical Schools in Victoria: perhaps governments should revisit this issue and rethink the logic of the current times and more appropriately prepare young people for vocational training."

To broaden his educational perspectives, Reeves seized the opportunity to apply to be a teacher representative on the newly established Teacher Registration Board. Once again keeping in mind the advice of the Director General, he was aware that it allowed him to attend meetings in the city and be noticed by those who made decisions about the
appointment of future educational leaders. He commented, “I guess I was ambitious as well as being keen to enhance the teaching profession”. Being noticed led to him being seconded to Head office attached to the Buildings Task Force, a new initiative in the 1970s funded by the Whitlam Government. Soon Reeves was to be known as the ‘Dignitary’ in Head Office. And by this stage of his career he believed he should seek the responsibility of being Principal in a large metropolitan school to further his career opportunities. His application was successful and he became Principal at Ruskin Park – surprisingly a rather senior position for one a youthful 32 years of age. However, his situation was to change dramatically when the school burnt down two years later. Staff issues were a priority due to the disruption to classroom management, placements of classes in neighbouring schools, temporary on-site accommodation, and the close liaison necessary with the local community. The lack of teaching facilities and industrial overtones brought on by the difficult working conditions created a challenging situation for the young Principal, exposing him to events that would later assist him in his role as DI. After being re-established, with plans afoot for a new facility, Reeves’ school, with its continual growth, became re-classified and therefore re-advertised, and was likely to be filled by a more senior principal applicant. While scrutinising the advertised positions Reeves became aware that five DI positions were also advertised at around the same time, commenting, “That was the catalyst for me to apply. That is how I became a DI”.

Reeves’ was appointed as the District Inspector of Schools in 1977 to the Wangaratta District. When he arrived in Wangaratta he realized that this prosperous country area was far removed from his previous working environment. He now recognized the importance of actually being a DI, and he knew there to be many Principals, teachers and community members relying on his direction and advice. To be further involved with the broader community he became a member of the Rotary Club thereby involving himself more deeply in community activities.

As a DI he became cognizant of the fact he was actually committed to a role with which he was not familiar, asking himself: What do I know about this role? He answered in a very personal way saying:

I had always enjoyed the Inspectors’ school visit. I suppose I was hungry for ideas and I was looking for reinforcement that I was travelling in the right direction. I always saw the DI as a positive influence and appreciated the experience, the
feedback and suggestions that were offered. It was now my turn to become the mentor for other Principals and teachers.

The written job description was published but Reeves thought that, unless a DI was known personally before his appointment, the job statement was somewhat of a mystery, describing it as somewhat like teaching, averring:

Jobs were never well defined in education because each teacher is a unique individual and they relate to their class in different ways.

DI training at the time consisted of a two week induction period at Head Office, and two weeks each of working with a city DI and with a rural DI. During the induction, Reeves met an experienced country Inspector, a mentor, confidant and friend who was to become a guiding professional force in his career. The role of DI was viewed as a highly individualized position, each Inspector bringing personal strengths to the Inspectorate, encouraging his personal dimension to be absorbed into the educational culture of the district. But, “I would have appreciated more input from Head Office in the on-going development of DIs”, he said.

Reeves believed that his time as Principal at Ruskin Park had been valuable preparation for him in this new role, especially in the wake of his school being burnt down as this required him to organize the school now on three different sites. This created many tensions amongst the staff, parents and the community. The experiences he confronted then were similar to problems that he later encountered as a DI. Reeves illustrated how ‘the nuts and bolts of pedagogical activities happening at the coal face’ were important to him, and remained so for the rest of his career. He described his role as DI in the Wangaratta District as ‘a principal without a school’, but in reality there were sixty-seven schools, involving much travel in visiting them all during the course of the school year.

Three years after his appointment, with his thirst for learning still unquenched, he applied for, and was granted, a Commonwealth Relations Trust Fellowship that involved studying at the University of London for his Master’s Degree. He extended his stay there, commencing a PhD in Comparative Education. Reeves demonstrated by his determination to continue studies the theory of ‘life-long learning’, well in advance of this newly coined phrase of modern day thinking.

The Inspector fulfilled an important role particularly in country districts where they were seen by the community to hold a prestigious position with significant responsibilities.
Reeves honoured this role with respect, acknowledging a large load to be on his shoulders in upholding the role of ‘the Education Department in the bush’. He explained:

I can remember the words of Harry Nixon, who was then an Assistant Director of Primary Education and responsible for the DIs at the time. His words during the induction phase were “consume your own smoke”. In other words, you put out the bush fires: you represent the Department ‘out here’, you are the Department out in the country and we essentially expect you to do the job for us. You make the decisions locally to manage your patch effectively and efficiently.

When Reeves was appointed as an Inspector in 1977 he did not have a strong collegiate network of other DIs. He was younger than most and unsure of how he would be accepted into the cohort of DIs. His lack of experience and the support of a broader collegiate group in these early stages of his role compelled him to rely on collegiate relationships mainly from among Principals both in his inspectorate and beyond. At times this became difficult locally, as he needed to separate friendships from professional relationships, for without this separation he believed his status in the educational community was in jeopardy. Reeves learnt that a DI did have a great deal of power over teachers’ futures and he was very conscious of the need to choose words carefully. For him formal school inspections became very comprehensive, ensuring a detailed evaluation was inherent in the official school review. This review was supplemented by educational documents involving curriculum implementation and organizational activities which could be used as educational tools for training teachers to address weaknesses apparent to him and his review team.

The process of school inspections in the late 70’s had changed from an appraisal by one DI to that of a panel of people with an interest in the local school. He opted for review panels of three to five people, comprising members such as the local GP (General Practitioner), a businessman, a neighbouring Principal, a School’s Council member, and a teacher representative.

It was during Reeves’s era as a DI that school inspections and teacher assessments were changed from a well-established format to the newer self-evaluation model, thus opening the reporting to a more constructive and positive feedback system where creative teachers were encouraged to present their strategies and ideas openly, and to welcome the opinions of others. Reeves’ approach to inspections changed; he would visit the school prior to the actual inspection date, asking both the Principal and the staff, “What value can I add by
coming to your school and classroom?” To Reeves this was his idea of making teachers feel comfortable in his presence and building a pleasant working rapport with all school-based personnel. Through this process he believed he was contributing to learning of all, offering ideas and suggestions that he had observed in other schools, and affording the opportunity to influence the manner in which the four major school elements interacted professionally.

Assessing teachers by reviewing their performances was an important part of the DI’s role. The overall education of children depended on teachers performing to their maximum potential so this was vital to the Inspector’s responsibilities. Reeves commented:

Every teacher’s contribution to the effectiveness of the children’s education was noted by relevant classroom displays, organizational skills, rapport with children and management of the curriculum for their level of learning. The continuous flow of basic skills from grade to grade and the ability of individual teachers to ensure this was happening made the inspection system a productive and worthwhile process.

Reeves diligently carried out these duties by visiting classrooms to check work programs, observing teachers teaching, noting the interest and responses of the children as lessons progressed and delving into the children’s written work. He then prepared constructive and positive feedback to discuss with the teachers giving suggestions and ideas to improve or value add to their performance.

All DIs conducted their Inspectorates differently but, fundamentally, Inspections, School Reviews and Reports had to be those of professional educators, presented on time and completed within the year. Restricted only by these boundaries, a fairly open arrangement allowed creative thinkers to develop interesting and innovative ideas. The Inspectors introduced programs around their own strengths such as fostering work through Teacher Centres, developing curriculum, leadership training and generalist studies. DIs each had views about their own role as educational leaders, and whether or not this included community education.

Reeves, in describing how he perceived his appointment confirmed that:

Being a DI was the pinnacle of being in the teaching profession. I saw it then and I still do, as the most rewarding phase of my career. It provided me with the opportunity to continue to be a teacher in the sense of being a mentor, a guide and
a learner. I was looking to grow myself and wanted to access all the opportunities afforded me. As a younger DI, I brought youthful ideas into schools and I think I had a positive impact on most teachers in the sense that they could relate to me about how being a practitioner in a school meant something to them as practitioners – from classroom teacher to school principal. To give career directions and see teachers move upwards and onwards was to me professionally rewarding and stimulating. I thought the DI could be influential and I could also see, depending on one’s personal style, that you could be very positive/negative according to how you related to teachers in your position as you were essentially unchallenged locally on the educational front. That was a position that some of my colleagues did not understand, and so we were polarized because some never saw themselves as unbending when it came to educational ideas and approaches.

In the 1970s Reeves had been an active teacher unionist; he was quite involved with the Victorian Teachers Union, but he believed in retrospect that he was a naïve unionist in the sense that he believed unions were a professional development organization. He became involved as president of the Metropolitan Primary Men’s Branch – very sexist in organizational terms in those days! However, upon being appointed DI he presented his resignation, reasoning:

In Trade Unionism, it was largely a ‘them versus us’ mentality: you had bosses and there was a wide gulf between them and teachers in the classrooms. Teacher Unions were built on the premise of defending the ‘them’ no matter what. In the main, as a DI, I worked well with a couple of local union organizers who often organisers had limited ‘all of school’ experience: they had not been school Principals so their approach really was based on ‘we will always help the ‘down and out’ - the underdog’ when there clearly were instances where the person being defended should never have been teaching in the classroom.

Reeves believed that the Inspectorate was politically and industrially naïve. Generally, Inspectors did not work with, or alongside, the unions to help shape new directions for the future; and when it did come to shaping the future of the school system they were ambushed because they had isolated themselves. They had ‘few friends’ in the school system. When elected in 1972, Prime Minister Gough Whitlam heralded an era of reform in schools, and education became far more politicized, yet Inspectors in the main did not recognise that
things were changing, and their lack of political awareness meant the opportunity to become modern managers disappeared. Reeves saw the modern day Inspector as a manager of people and change; however most Principals and DIs had neither the experience nor the expertise to compete with the outside world in change management.

Although the opportunity was not seized upon, Reeves advocated:

Management training for Inspectors should have been presented in the form of seminars and workshops. University sponsored sessions involving overseas practitioners in management styles should have been implemented prior to the changes.

Reeves had been in London while all the trials and tribulations of system-wide change, including the abolition of the Inspectorate in 1983, were finally taking place in Victoria. He was disappointed by the abolition of the inspectorial role as he believed that being a DI had been his best three years in education and the pinnacle of his teaching career. His opinion of the option offered to him to work with the Education Department post-abolition was that:

I spent the next five years in purgatory working as a Senior Educational Officer in the Victorian Education Department - doing a job that was a ‘non job’. Yes, there were some interesting projects while working in the Regional Office but DIs had been publically devalued by a fierce union campaign. Inspectors had become unfashionable and our professional identity had been taken away.

Reeves returned from his studies in London with enthusiasm to share and implement the knowledge he had gained from writing his PhD. However, he was shocked to be confronted with the aftermath of the demise of the Inspectorate, commenting that it was like returning to what was essentially an ‘educational desert’. The period afterwards was professionally disastrous. Reeves concluded:

There was no consultation, no voice from the former DIs as to what value they were. It appeared to be the trenchant view of the union movement, particularly the post-primary teacher unions, that all Inspectors offered no value. I felt a sense of betrayal that, during this momentous upheaval, certain officials in key positions were evaluating the changing situation from a political point of view to gain
personal career advantages, therefore sidelining the DIs; they did not advocate for the retention in some key educational role.

It was at this stage, after five years of dissatisfaction with the revamped Education Department of Victoria and the unfulfilling roles he was assigned that Reeves decided on his resignation as there was now no personal or professional satisfaction from the work he was doing. At this time the New South Wales Education Department was going through educational reform. The Premier, Nick Greiner, and his Education Minister, Terry Metherell, were looking to modernise the operations of the largest school system in Australia by introducing a new curriculum and improving the recruitment, professional development and management of teachers. The human resource management side of their proposals appealed to him greatly, so he applied for the position as Director of Human Resources in the Riverina Region, winning the appointment. In so doing he was the first of the former senior Victorian educational administrators in the reconstructed system to leave and move to another state. (Ikin and Chapman followed his move to NSW). He spent the next five years familiarizing himself with another state system that, formally, was seemingly run by the New South Wales Teachers Federation. After less than one year into his Wagga Wagga appointment his position was abolished due to financial constraints in the Riverina Region, but, fortunately, a similar vacancy arose elsewhere and he was offered a Director of Human Resources position in Newcastle. His time in the New South Wales Department of School Education gave him insights into alternative ways of managing a large school system. He concluded that:

Victoria had a stronger school review system and a more broadly based teacher inspection system. In NSW they tried to reform a hugely bureaucratic system but the reforms were bitterly opposed by the powerful teachers’ union.

Whilst Reeves had reached what he classed as the pinnacle of his career when he was appointed DI, and was bitterly disappointed when this career avenue was cut short, the subsequent change of career proved immensely rewarding. Unlike many of his colleagues, after attempting to build a satisfying and worthwhile ongoing career in Victoria, reform with rewarding new challenges was not forth coming, so he chose to leave the Victorian Education Department and become part of the NSW Education Department reforms. His contributions in New South Wales were welcomed. Many talented and experienced people were lost to the Victorian system through either premature retirement or by being professionally sidelined,
and he believed the situation could have been avoided if alternative solutions had been considered initially through a closer liaison between the Department and the DI’s.

Subsequent blatant party political interference in senior appointments could have been avoided, but such changes were taking part in the broader context of global organizational change and in hindsight, such political change in government organizations was fast becoming a reality.

Reeves’ contribution to the Primary Section of the Education Department of Victoria began when he decided to become a teacher. His journey had many ‘ups and downs’ and a myriad of challenging decisions to be brought to fruition. His initial appointment to the administrative service was as DI in the Wangaratta district. He knew, through personal experience, that the pathway to a successful career was dedication, study, outstanding teaching performances and the willingness to achieve at all costs. He continued to project this thinking to staff and principals in his district, giving incentive to many disillusioned teachers. His strength of character and communication skills with principals, teachers and the community were hallmarks of his excellent leadership style. He relied on principal support to fulfill the aspirations he had for his inspectorate, thrusting forward the concept that: ‘The Principal as leader is the person who knows best’. By relinquishing the role that “The DI knows best” he showed himself as being well versed in educational leadership. He encouraged the ideas stemming from and being implemented in Teacher Centres, thereby organizing many in-service sessions for his district. In his relatively short time as a DI he built on projects from other inspectorates that were to become state wide programs.

His educational leadership of the Wangaratta Inspectorate exemplified the three basic tenets of extant former DIs who contributed during the period being investigated in this research: 1967 – 1983. In the matter of educational values he exemplified the importance of commitment to a goal and the dedicated work which accompanies its achievement. He pursued avidly his community role through becoming a member of its social structures and introducing community involvement to previously coveted realms of educational administration. The educational culture of his district was enriched by his purposeful, creative pursuit of newly-minted Departmental procedures and the work ethic as demonstrated in the short section above on values. In the matter of inspectorate in-service education he combined needs identified during the regular school reviews with the needs for in-service training clearly marked on the broader scale by the growing professional power of Teachers’ Centres.
3. ‘Weaving educational magic’: Colin Moyle

Colin Reginald Joseph Moyle was born of Cornish/Welsh migrant parents at Warragul in 1930 during the Great Depression. He was educated at the two-teacher Nilma State School and Warragul High School where a Junior Scholarship took care of his scholastic needs, a 7-year part-time job in the local bakery taking care of the rest. He attended the University of Melbourne in 1948 before becoming a student teacher at Sunshine Primary School in 1949, and entering Melbourne Teachers’ College in 1950. He started his teaching career being the Head Teacher for seven years in outback rural schools, Ensay North, Barwon Downs and Murroon, where he learnt the importance of individual pupil differences, the value of being well organised and keeping detailed records, and the absolute necessity of community support and involvement. He was assessed as an outstanding teacher. This was followed by promotion to be an assistant teacher for several years in a large country primary school at Maryborough to teach Year 6 pupils and to undertake some of the many responsibilities devolved by the Principal. In this case he was to be the Art Education Co-ordinator throughout the school, one hitherto disinterested in Art education, after having gone to Melbourne at his own expense and in his own time to embark on a program which introduced the new Primary Art Course. This maintenance of educational currency at his own expense was to become a mark of Moyle’s educational future; his was not to be waiting in turn for some senior administration-given, paid opportunity for professional development.

During the several years of assistantship at this level, further promotion beckoned but only for the qualified who had continued their studies to obtain First Class Honours or a university degree. A subtle qualifications decision had to be made; thus, with the encouragement of the older, parallel, outstanding Grade 6 teacher, himself an External Studies Arts Degree holder, he enrolled as a similar degree student of the same status at Melbourne University. Several years later he was anonymously mentored to apply for an Education Department Nominated Course to complete his Arts Degree at Melbourne University while fulfilling a suitable part-time teaching appointment. His outstanding teaching ability and breadth of pedagogical capacity were challenged strongly by his subsequent appointments: first as a mathematics teacher to Melbourne High School; then at the Police Cadet School where he taught English to the Years 11 and 12 students; and finally
as a Temporary Lecturer in English Literature and Method at Melbourne Teachers’ College (MTC), Early during his second year at MTC, (1967) he was appointed to take up a similar position at Bendigo Teachers’ College the following year; but being appointed as a DI later that year took precedence. During his second year at Melbourne High School his strong sense of self-worth as a teacher was reinforced. He explains:

During mid-year, a severe bout of virus pneumonia had laid me really low for three weeks. I shakily returned to duty and whilst waiting in the staffroom to go to my first class of Form 4 boys, the vice-principal, a craggy, hard-nosed teacher came in saying, “I’ll walk you down to your first class!” We entered the classroom me leading to spontaneous standing and prolonged cheering and clapping: the boys had genuinely missed my teaching, and my teacher’s heart leaped as the import of this rarity suddenly dawned on me.

The renewal of his thirst for challenges in the teaching field was explained by Moyle in interview:

I have been driven in all my educational endeavours by a penchant to satisfy my own increasingly informed, common sense conscience.

This inner drive was reinforced immediately before Moyle took up his posting as DI Mildura at the close of his appointment to MTC. The scope of his pedagogical knowledge meanwhile had been broadened immensely and further informed. But the human quality of his teaching and human relationships was again exposed when, at the close of his final lecture to a second year group of whom he was particularly fond, he announced his imminent departure to become a DI. He remembers the occasion vividly:

My announcement immediately brought the dismayed group to leave their desks and surround my teaching position at the front of the room to gaze, in awe, for they had received from some other lecturers negative vibes about the ogre-like behaviour of the DI in their future. Their eyes were saying, ‘How could this man we have had academic fun with for more than a year become an ogre?’ Mutual answers came as a furtive rustling and slamming of car doors in the Court where my family lived, had the whole group, with my wife’s connivance, descend on our humble home one evening the following week with a parting gift, and the necessary accoutrements for an enjoyable evening.
These accumulated preludes to his appointment as an Inspector of Schools in 1967 had been strengthened unconsciously over the years by the dawning realization of the guiding hand of silent, supportive mentors, and of “chance favouring the prepared mind”. Moyle did not have any precise, preconceived ideas about what the position and role of District Inspector would entail. His ambition had been to remain as a teacher at Melbourne High School for the rest of his career, a Mr Chips, with the added challenge of introducing and nurturing the first Indonesian language course in Victoria and perhaps some teaching of English. An application for the position of DI had not crossed his mind until one day, during his teaching appointment at MTC, he accidentally met and was given further encouragement by the senior officer, whom he had met previously as a Grade 6 teacher years ago, and whose advice he had heeded then – it was the elected, gentlemanly Primary Classifier, Phil. Dwyer.

Retrospectively, mentoring is viewed in a different light – this man who had visited his classroom with the encouragement of the Principal, and who had written, suggesting that a bright future awaited well qualified teachers in the Primary Schools’ Division, had become a person of anonymous importance to Moyle’s career. He also suggested that Moyle consider applying for the award of a Nominated Course to complete an Arts degree. Subsequently Moyle traversed this suggested career path successfully, enjoying successive experience-broadening, temporary teaching appointments in which he suspects the Public Service Head of Primary Teachers’ Branch, Reg Biggs, was in cahoots and also complicit. After being convinced he should apply for the next DI vacancy he was interviewed by a panel of Senior Education Officials. To his complete surprise one smiling member on the panel was the Primary Classifier who had for so long been encouraging him. He made no preparation for this interview, but where he sincerely explained when questioned by the panel:

During my short period as a Temporary Lecturer in English, I have seen enough quality and naïve enthusiasm amongst the student-teachers I taught to know I could be a help and support to any of these neophyte and other inexperienced primary teachers.

Moyle was the type of person the Education Department’s panel believed could make a difference, district-wide as the Department’s representative to the schools and their management for official purposes, and to the education of the students throughout a district. He was selected and subsequently appointed to the country district of Mildura. His response was, “Mildura - such a remote area - it was like being assigned to the Simpson Desert”.
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He was immediately attached for short terms of induction to DIs Harry Cummings and Allan Hird. He remembers little of the educational blur that represented these two weeks, but the enormity of the task in the former’s case to inspect officially a large school made a solid impact. On the other hand, the enjoyment of inspecting an outer-fringe rural school of 4-5 teachers enabled breathing spaces. During lunch time, on the final day, when report-writing should have been occupying their thoughts, Hird decided to make a quick but necessary visit to a nearby school. Moyle took it upon himself, after weighing alternatives, to draft an Official Report on the school. Hird, returning at approximately 3 pm, announced that an Official Report on the school must be written to complete the visit. Being told by Moyle that he had already drafted a report, Hird was surprised and delighted, immediately accepting most of it. Apparently he wrote a very favourable personal report on Moyle to the DPE, Bob MacLellan. Subsequently dispatched to assume his duties at Mildura he remembered his awe-inspiring perceptions of this first senior administrative appointment, particularly his first Official Report on a school:

I know I did not take any of my many previous DIs as a role model for either emulating or eschewing, although I must say that from my life as a teacher, I carried no baggage of negative DI experiences. I chose a nearby school of four teachers, mirroring the Hird experience, for my first official visit and Annual Report. I was bolstered by the assumption that the Principal might have an innate fear of the traditional DI, but I listened, was helpful and kind, and wrote a very acceptable, traditional style Official Report. This first official school visit “broke the ice”; I no longer worried about visiting schools - the latter occurring frequently both officially and informally.

He was blissfully unaware a Regulation III existed covering a DI’s basic responsibilities, so working within broad parameters of the advertised vacancy for which he had applied originally, Moyle was challenged to carve out an individualistic role, immediately demonstrating his incipient educational leadership potential. This suited him as a free-wheeling, seat-of-the-pants type. The only set accomplishment for that time seemed to be Annual Inspection, Private Reports and, every two years, a look at what the Catholic Private Schools were up to. The latter visits became eagerly accepted by the teaching Nuns who hungered for support, educational discussion and advice, with each school’s physical needs being pin-pointed so that an officially sponsored request could be made to the church authority. He carried out the mandated tasks with a minimum of distraction to the rhythm of a
school’s life, notifying the staff well in advance of a proposed official visit. He placed importance on informal visits to lessen the anxiety created by annual visits, disconfirming any stereotypic view of the DI role that the teachers might have. He was not afraid to confront metaphorically the personnel within the educational diaspora, and quietly challenge teachers especially to “hold up the mirror” to their own classroom practices. The thinking together of both DI and teachers encouraged most to change their pedagogical outlook creatively. He never stinted on the time he gave to schools before the school day, during it and afterwards. In this he was aided and abetted by his wife, Dawn who, like all DI wives of the time, was the unpaid, part-time Inspectorate secretary, taking responsibility for preparing the office documents. His prime task, as he saw it, was to create and develop personal relationships with his Principals, teachers, personnel from local secondary schools and the various communities. As an example of his teacher relationship theme, he encouraged an excellent, Primary Year 6 teacher to teach his class for two weeks late in each year in the nearby secondary school with the connivance of equally creative Principals. The secondary teachers in that school were enabled to see, experience and question the teaching methods used prior to pupils’ transition.

Country districts created a certain educational culture within the Inspectorate. He recalls explaining and answering pointed questions to a community gathering interested in “multi-aged grouping” being more deeply integrated into the organisation and teaching of their five-teacher school. Another instance involved acceptance of an invitation to talk about education in general to the pupils’ parents who lived in a small rural area. Many schools had been in isolated areas with many miles of formerly indifferent roads between the schools. Then, DIs would travel from school to school, sleeping in their cars to be on time for their next school visit. Moyle followed the same basic itinerant practices, save for staying often in small, friendly hotels, and occasionally having a quiet, social beer with local farmer/parents. Like former DIs, he would spend the Official Report time according to the number of teachers on staff, but added “drop-in” visits with the Head Teacher and teachers who often felt forgotten and lonely, even though the past era of “Consolidation” had mitigated the loneliness somewhat; even so many of them were fresh out of Teachers’ College, others lacked experience and needed assurance in their practice. Gone were the days of the long communication chain formerly experienced by DIs, where even a once-a-week mail delivery was a luxury and telephones were unknown. For the teachers in these remote schools, no networking was possible or prior knowledge passed on to support them. Moyle remembered
and reacted positively to the professional loneliness of his first rural school situated deep in the mountains of East Victoria where an appointed Senior Teacher, caravan in tow, informally visited information-starved, remotely situated young Head Teachers in lieu of similar DI lifeline visits, so vast and rugged was the inspectorial district.

Reminiscing, Moyle spoke of his feeling of complete emptiness during the first school vacation of his tenure as the Mildura DI. He explained:

The sources of his perpetual adrenalin rush in this remote district, the teachers and their students, were temporarily removed.

At the time he was credited with 15 days annual recreation leave, five of which were debited automatically on the assumption that the Inspector had not been on duty between Christmas and New Year. When the school year finally began Moyle, knowing that he must not feel the same mental anguish again, resolved this lonely personal issue as he whimsically recalls, “I applied to the Teachers’ Tribunal for Long Service Leave which was granted but never taken! This strategy routinely occurred annually for the next 18 years, neutralising any inner conflict I might have had”.

He knew instinctively that, beyond routine educational matters, other high-visibility, community-oriented involvements were expected of him; these he fulfilled as a member of the Mildura Rotary Club and Vice-President of the Mildura Golf Club where many a relaxing but thought-provoking hour was spent.

Moyle categorically described the status, the meaning and the position of DI with intensity and compassion when he spoke of the role:

This position allowed me to enjoy the most educationally creative years of my life. I took literally the DPE’s (Director of Primary Education) initial charge that Melbourne didn’t want to hear from me (unless there was a matter of genuine emergency - like cooking the financial books). Behind what I called the “veil of distance”, I wove educational magic with the “connivance” of principals and so many teachers of my own vintage. I had no detailed perceptions both then (or now) of what a DI role should be. I created my own cavalier role, saying often to teachers, “You will make me the DI that you want!” I challenged the schools’ personnel to be introspective about their individual professionalism. Certainly there were basic official requirements, but for me the possible extended tenets
were revealed as I became embedded more deeply into and then influencing the prevailing inspectorial district culture; each day was another of excitement – what next would so many of these challenged teachers confront me with, and what educational fun it would be to gently confront them with ideas to extend their thinking further. I had been a teacher, and to me teachers, especially primary teachers, are the “salt of the earth” (and they have remained so, influencing my administrative actions until I retired).

The position of DI in Mildura was a far cry from the comfort of the city schools, where minimum travelling and a close network of colleagues was the norm. His nearest colleagues were hundreds of kilometres to the east and the south. He did not eschew the friendship of teachers and principals who respected their potentially compromised position. However Moyle instinctively knew in his adventurous manner that in inspectorate work this was the greatest educational challenge of his career, so he reflected on his experiences to drive his enthusiasm. He intuitively evaluated every situation, even deciding that he too should seek inspiration from others, especially from educational giants of his past. The family name of his predecessor was Tate: immediately the memories flooded in. This is what he had to say:

My predecessor had been in the Inspectorate for a number of years. Bill Tate was the most gentle of men, being a direct descendant of the legendary, early 20th Century Director of Education, Frank Tate. As a teacher at Melbourne Boys High School, I had climbed the stairs to the staff room, passing daily under the enormous stained glass window dedicated to this icon of the past, with its caption, “He builded better than he knew”. How could this simple, but powerful eulogy not unobtrusively penetrate to the core of my being? How could I not build better than I knew? So I set about unpacking the unknown challenges of a traditionally based Mildura Inspectorate – equipped with the educational wisdom gained from vast but limited experience, and buoyed by the very force of imprinting surreptitiously my genuine self, here and there, upon the teachers and community of that distant area. School visits formal and informal, community meetings both large and small, meant education had become a serious matter of concern so the DI’s influence filtered over the entire district.
Acceptance district-wide of vision-like challenges the DI had given teachers became a catalyst for him to suggest the implementation of new initiatives, and reinvention of the old as the pathways to clarifying change. The Inspector was acting as a role model and leader demonstrating unconsciously the importance of the concepts inspectorate values, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education. Moyle revamped the Principals’ Annual In-service by ensuring the agenda was substantive. His first in-service professional development of this nature had “Creativity” for a theme. Not only were the workshops on its practical relevance to the school curriculum, but the subject was led, addressed by and given even more substance by the recently appointed Professor of Education at the new La Trobe University, Dr Ronald Goldman who gave his services free. Value added initiatives such as this were driven by the collaboration of all stakeholders, not power driven by the Inspector; therefore a higher percentage rate of success was the reward. When asked about his comfort with the powers now bestowed upon him, he replied:

My memory of the role emphasises its significance as a carrier of professional release to many teachers. The power was not “upfront” in my mind – it was enough to be with so many exciting teachers. My first real “wake up” was to have reinforced that, though I’d been a well-regarded teacher at primary, secondary and tertiary levels, I was able to meet, work with, encourage and support some teachers of extraordinary, but little recognized talent, for they dared to think outside the perceived pedagogical “square”. My first early act of real educational significance was to précis, then to disseminate the official Primary Schools English Curriculum Document so as to show “a bus could be driven through it”. Teachers were challenged to exercise their creativity in meeting their interpretations of its major requirements.

This demonstrated the attitude of the Inspector in his beliefs that teachers should be aware of and grasp the opportunities they are given to enhance their teaching by value adding to the curriculum requirements. He debunked accepted and stereotypic norms when necessary. The Infant Mistress of a large school “heard” the DI, took him under her wing, and together they plotted a favourite pedagogical method of his: the multi-sensory approach to reading and writing. Over time she was intensely supportive, having teachers in her department “on song” with the most amazing reading, writing and spelling results imaginable. The pedagogy of the teachers she supported was emulated among many infant grade teachers throughout the
Inspectorate; this teaching approach was abetted by the theme of individual differences, and preliminaries to the official introduction of the New Primary Science Course.

Moyle had a strong sense of responsibility that had threaded through his life and so it was with education. His prime responsibility was seen as helping teachers (and hence their pupils) to be as good, or be better than they could be. So:

I gave myself, and the various experiences afforded me, to them to share - and accept or reject - without my being judgemental. I was not omnipotent – knowing all the answers! For example: I was DI to a wonderfully comprehensive “traditional-type” senior teacher whom I assessed as “Outstanding” and who diversely taught his pupils in a highly organised manner; on the other hand a creative “non-traditional” senior teacher whose students went into the community for their interviews, costs, communication methods (hence English, Mathematics, Social Studies, Human Relationships etc.) was also assessed as “Outstanding”. Though these teachers were as different as chalk and cheese, their students were indelibly positive for having passed their teachers’ way.

Moyle in his assessment process examined each teacher on their personal approaches as well as their intentions to educate their pupils and concluded that both approaches, although completely different, were equally effective and should be recognized as such. In retrospect he realises he de-emphasized teacher assessment, educational outcomes for pupils was the main game. This Inspector reinforced the evidence that assessments were given fairly, unbiased and intuitively; they were but one way of ensuring the employment of sound teaching techniques and the achievement of sound pupil outcomes. He always gave advanced notice of impending official visits, but often visited teachers unofficially to build a rapport with them and to let them see that the Inspector was human. His mutual trust with principals and teachers allowed him to approach his situation positively by challenging, “You want to try this or that? Let’s go for it together!” Thus he avoided the stifling negative implication of, “Do it my way or else!”

The perceived power of the position was not relied upon by this Inspector. He believed there to be a perceived power in the role and that he could influence the daily tasks of school personnel - but he chose not to. He preferred to give advice and support to what teachers were attempting additionally to achieve of their own accord. He described a situation where he informally visited a grade six teacher who had provided a small motor cycle engine
for his three disruptive, dysfunctional, ex-Special Grade students and had thereby created a

centre of interest from which flowed a wide-ranging curriculum, meaningful to them. The
troublesome three were engrossed, even eschewing the morning break. The teacher and
principal were worried that the DI may not approve of this deviation and wondered how he
would react to such a deviance from the “prescribed” curriculum. “Great stuff” was his
reaction, for here was a teacher brave enough to think beyond the traditional in the interests of
very particular individual differences. This anticipation of the DI’s expected reaction to some
teachers’ different pedagogical approaches varied by school. Many had the predetermined
attitudes of previous teaching service appointments. Their challenge was first of all to intuit
the reality of the Inspector’s work. Moyle’s often expressed informal rejoinder to individual
teachers was to remind them, “I am what you want me to be”!

This was also a period of rapprochement between the major educational divisions
particularly when it came to the matter of transition. Apart from being a member of visiting
Boards of Education the DI became the public mouthpiece of competing Divisions at a time
when volatile teacher-Principal relations were beginning to fray. In spite of this, Moyle’s
specific academic background enabled a reaching out with the establishment, in co-operation
with a progressive secondary principal, of an Indonesian language course, perhaps the first in
the state, at the Mildura High School. A dearth of qualified teachers in this discipline was
apparent but a Monash graduate teacher with two years of Indonesian language study was
obtained to start the program.

Assessments of teachers with posted private reports were determined during
this period as Outstanding (ready for accelerated promotion), Very Good (promotion
available in turn), Good (not ready for promotion), and Unsatisfactory. Moyle conveyed his
opinion on assessment by indicating that if he was to be responsible for the “unsatisfactory
teacher’s rehabilitation”, then the worst course he could take would be to undermine the
person’s confidence by issuing an officially recorded “Unsatisfactory” assessment. Having
“accentuate the positive” as one of his many mottoes, he always found something positive in
a teacher’s performance for emphasis as a starting point. However, the opposite can occur: he
inherited an Assistant Teacher assessed as “Unsatisfactory”, but abided by his self-imposed
rule of making no inquiry into a teacher’s past. He assessed the teacher as “Very Good” but,
before the Private Report was issued by HQ, Moyle was reminded of a possible “oversight”.
He insisted that the assessment stand, subsequently reinforcing this assessment by ultimately
awarding the teacher an assessment of “Outstanding”.  In support of his attitude to assessments Moyle contended:

I was conscious of the fact that the ‘outstanding’ teacher was a rare beast; that the ‘very good’ were the “mechanics”, many of whom could be encouraged by encouragement and the contents of their private reports to strive for higher accolades. Assessment became, to a large part, a process of comparison. In fact in all my private reports, the positive features of teachers’ pedagogy were noted with the implied challenge that these positives form the basis of further, confident pedagogical shifts. I was also conscious of the broad tenets of job prescriptions, for example, I expected the Senior Teachers to undertake serious responsibilities beyond the classroom (and the Principal to ensure these were given). Assessment was purely individual, the outstanding teacher being one who plies his pedagogy with understanding and conviction to ensure its massive, positive, democratic effect on all aspects of student behaviour.

Moyle believed that the DI should act as a mentor and advisor to all teachers in his Inspectorate, his personal confidence coming from the fact that he was sufficiently formally and informally educated; widely read and broad enough of experience to have a mental storehouse of opinions and attitudes to encourage teachers; and competent in realising that the many bright and progressive teachers in the classrooms had enthusiasms ready to be released and supported. He let teachers know subtly of their worth. An ADPE on a brief visit was taken late morning and unannounced to a medium sized school where team teaching was implemented, commenting:

After a short period of discussion the wily old administrator teased the group of near 80 children, “But can you sing?” This challenge was too much! Mild, organized pandemonium briefly ensued while each one became armed with a percussion instrument before being accompanied by one of the class teachers with guitar in rendering an extraordinary version of “Yellow Bird”! Stunned, the visitor asked a young girl sitting close by, “When did you learn this beautiful song?” “This morning, sir!” was the innocent reply

Moyle was becoming increasingly aware of the paramount importance played by the Inspector’s support, encouragement and creativity. He knew intuitively that Inspectors must, if possible, find “cushions of time” as think time if they were foster new initiatives apart
from such “extras” beyond scheduled statutory “in-school” responsibilities as: unexpected visits by dignitaries, un-scheduled meetings, media requirements, sudden mini-crises, sports meetings, and attending to official correspondence and reports. For Moyle such time was mainly in his car as he hurtled his cathedral-gold Toyota from school to school in his vast Inspectorate. In addition there was a positive, questioning, teacher reaction to Moyle’s attitude, exemplified by a Senior Teacher’s prophetic, personal comment, “Are you trying to work yourself out of a job, Colin?” And the query had a ring of truth, but it was an intuitive observation: the task, as this DI portrayed it, had to change.

Moyle was extremely pro-active in introducing many new initiatives throughout his inspectorate. He promoted the idea of a less traumatic transition for children entering secondary schools. Inspection Boards, unofficial visits, curriculum planning and implementation with the secondary schools in his district created a positive working environment that encouraged him to develop relationships with secondary and technical school Principals both in and outside the Inspectorate boundaries. These relationships allowed him to examine the transition process from primary to secondary schooling in an inquisitive and thought provoking way. His creative mind supported implementation of a program where teachers not only communicated across these sectors with curriculum standards, children’s performances and reports, but also experienced the opportunity to teach in a different setting. The primary-secondary school initiative mentioned earlier exemplified this approach. Moyle was always looking for better practices and strategies for principals and teachers. He questioned himself constantly as to how he could create situations that improved the quality of education in his district. He did this by asking questions of himself such as:

If education is to be more effective, the DI will need feedback and advice from the senior officers in the secondary division, the primary principals and influential members of the community on the considerable needs of the district.

To answer his question, he worked with Principals to form the Mildura and District Education Committee (MADEC) comprising senior secondary and primary principals and influential members of the community to provide relevant information. Thus projects to investigate the compatibility of school-based, office procedure equipment, and the development of a case for an additional primary school were implemented. MADEC still exists today and is now functioning as a vibrant Adult Educational Centre.
Broad educational experiences for children were issues that Moyle desired to foster throughout his Inspectorate. These educational activities were to be incorporated into the curriculum and were to operate at external venues. As an example, the Year 5 students throughout the Inspectorate over an eight weeks period enjoyed a week’s organized school camping at the RSL Camp, Lake Cullulleraine. It was patterned on a successful, one week Year 5 School Camp in 1967 for Mildura Primary School pupils to which he had added his administrative weight. Initially organized by John Nunn and Ron McColl for their school, it was replicated by them from 1968 for the whole Inspectorate. Staffed by shearers’ cooks and volunteer parents, and creatively used Inspectorate Physical Education staff and Emergency Teachers, this wonderful success was repeated annually giving the go-ahead for senior school camping throughout Victoria, and indeed Australia. Bob McLellan, DPE, smilingly observed, “We gave you enough rope to hang yourself – but you didn’t. Congratulations!” He suspects that the DPE had also become a mentor! This venture typified some of Moyle’s approaches to his official duties – identify and support some innovation, add to it creative administrative strength, then disseminate it to fertile ground.

Reports on schools had always been written by the Inspector at the end of the annual visit. To Moyle this appeared to be an unproductive exercise, so his annual report writing became more succinct, a short treatise of motivational educational substance, the main points of which had been discussed previously with the principal for later presentation by the district’s senior educator, the DI. A moment of levity occurred near the close of an Annual Inspection of a medium sized school when Moyle teased the Principal, “I have to go home to write the Report we discussed, Jack. Why don’t you let me off the hook and write it for me?” The following morning Moyle was met by a flustered Principal who reported the throw-away remark of the previous day had caused him considerable angst in his attempt to write a Report, but couldn’t! At an Annual January Meeting of DIs, prior to the implementation of the new Biennial Report System, the DPE read out an example of senior school report writing that should be emulated – the words sounded familiar. As Moyle passed before the podium on the way to lunch, the DPE leaned forward and in a whisper said, “I hope you didn’t mind!”

The Mildura Inspectorate under Moyle’s guidance became a unique progressive Inspectorate, new ideas and different pedagogical approaches being encouraged. This was the era of Clegg’s challenge, “Each One is Different”, which emphasized the notion of students’ reading levels, and the inspiring Nuffield Science Program. These inspirations burgeoned
multi-aged groups, team teaching and other alternative means of classroom organization for trialling and supporting. Moyle intuitively knew the injunction that each one is different, applied equally to students and teachers. Those who took advantage of this freedom to innovate were changed forever.

Officially designated Inspectorates were chosen by the Curriculum and Research Branch (C&R) to trial new curricular proposals. Mildura Inspectorate slipped unofficially “under the radar” with the connivance of DI and C&R staff. The teachers, supported by the Inspector, ran a year’s “unofficial” trial of the proposed New Science Course with far more enthusiastic results than those from the “officially” designated locations. Moyle after ascertaining details, had organized, implemented and supervised these unofficial trials encouraging the many enthusiastic teachers who shared ideologies, to work together in a cooperative manner to ensure the success of the proposed new course innovation. The DI’s professional values, leadership style for ensuring personal development, support for teachers in their further self-development and the in-service education teachers identified, contributed to the dynamics of the programs. C&R personnel “did what they were told” but always they took opportunity to use their cash-strapped expenses allowance to breathe the fresh curricular air of the Mildura Inspectorate. Annual visits by C&R personnel also concentrated on recent curricular thinking and development. Mathematics education was undergoing a re-think and one such in-service training program, implemented early in Moyle’s career as a DI, gave rise to an unforgottably favourable incident. The team leader, Marj, was explaining to a large group of teachers the challenging complexities of relevant 3-D puzzles. One such puzzle was at hand and in this instance not solved after a cumulative 26 hours of a team member’s endeavours. Cheekily she tossed the puzzle to the DI teasing, “Solve it before the break, Colin!” A few minutes investigation of the object and the ‘spare’ pieces, and several rearrangements had Moyle solve the puzzle and toss it back innocently to the team leader. It did not take long for the Inspectorate’s “bush telegraph” to buzz with this amazing feat and Moyle’s reputation towered.

In the year prior to commencement of the Biennial Reports System, senior Principals were given the challenge of composing a practical philosophical statement outlining where each school was heading and the plans for its implementation alongside school-based evaluation. Moyle seized the opportunity to challenge unofficially the Head Teachers of smaller schools to do the same. He continually challenged himself, principals and teachers unobtrusively demonstrating his strength of character, knowledge and educational leadership
qualities. The result was many excellent philosophies of education for their schools with practical applications and evaluation plans, but overwhelmingly from the younger Principals of smaller schools.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s Moyle’s thoughts were to the future of the principalship, and the pivotal role of the incumbent. The basic idea was already germinating for him, when he averred, “Principals, as educational leaders, should be able to articulate their school’s progress towards practical goals, organizational or other innovation, and curriculum areas needing further emphasis. They are at the coal-face”! The Biennial Report System was the initial, officially sponsored “coming out” of Principals as educational leaders, planning for the future directions of their schools. Moyle, the visionary, had already shown he believed the Principals’ responsibility to extend beyond the reporting stage, encouraging them to become ‘new age thinkers’ promoting their educational vision for the future of their schools.

As outlined above he exemplified in his own way, facets of the three basic tenets found in this investigation: inspectorate values, culture and in-service education. Many of his innovations became accepted, successful and embedded because they were integral to what he saw as a professionalized teaching work force.

A “rear vision look” leaves the impression of his move to humanize unconsciously the DI role. Moyle’s “free-wheeling” administrative style burgeoned as some of his creative initiatives took root at Head Quarters and were disseminated as policy: Year 5 camping; shorter, pithy School Reports as agreed educational statements for schools; and the DI being seen to exercise the role as the senior educational leader of the inspectorial district were but some of these. Principals in turn, were expected to know more of what went on in their school given they were expected to have formulated its definitive policy.

Moyle’s contribution to the Primary Division of the Education Department when DI of the Mildura Inspectorate cannot be under-estimated; he approached every challenge with intense involvement, especially with teachers and school leaders. He thought and reacted in ways ultimately progressive and influential. He saw the DI’s role as very individualistic, but definitely not stereotypic, and was therefore able seriously to engage in a highly personalised, but professional manner. After five years as DI in Mildura, an opportunity arose to confront him with yet another challenge: Government policy to regionalise the centralised Education Department was announced. He decided to compete for
one of three inaugural positions, Regional Directors of Education, this opportunity changing his life forever. This is what he had to say about the situation:

This was a promotion from Inspector level to the level of Regional Director. I made the decision alone to apply, intuiting the future direction of state-wide educational administration. The new Government policy represented an unexpected opportunity “to fly a new kite”; it was the way of the future - a challenge to be met – and definitely not because of any disenchantment whatever with the exciting DI role. One of the questions asked of me, unprepared as is my want, by the powerful interviewing committee was, “Mr Moyle, you are the youngest applicant; your reaction please?” Moyle’s sotto voce reaction, “Maybe I’m lucky – one RDE to each of the major education divisions! Who knows?” I was appointed! And the mentoring, I’m sure began again, for the new Director-General of Education was Dr Lawrie Shears, an educator I had met in his capacity as Assistant DG when he was investigating Mildura as a possible site for the fourth Victorian University. Subsequent to this challenge Moyle was appointed inaugural Director of the Institute of Educational Administration (IEA) another Government policy initiative to provide training for all those interested in schools’ administration. His fulfilling role as DI prepared him well for both these new roles.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has presented a detailed image of the Inspectors’ personalities, operational skills, creativity and their mode of educational leadership. A basic role description was promulgated with the position’s advertisement having non-negotiable terms of reference such as assessment of teachers, annual reporting on schools, and informing teachers of any official changes to policies or curriculum. These instructions were all carried out correctly and precisely by the three Inspectors but blurred absolutely by the individual style of each DI – exemplars of those in the research cohort and typical of the situation which pertained throughout the state. Meyer and Reeves used check lists to obtain the information they required for assessments whereas Moyle used the casual but personal conversation, questioning, challenging and evaluating the responses of the Principals and teachers. All three Inspectors operated at a high level of competence achieving the prescriptive goals; and they all added to and influenced their inspectorates’ values, culture and in-service education by the strength and depth of their own personalities, experience and abilities.
Meyer and Reeves were naive towards the emerging changes that were happening politically, socially and educationally, believing that the system would remain as it had for almost a century. Moyle divined a changing future with the potential advent of the horizontally organized regional director role, but did not foresee the drastic fate of a service he held in high esteem. When the demise of the inspectorial system occurred in 1983 all DIs were devastated, having no idea that this was the future. Each had been intensely involved in and highly respectful of the system as it was; they were totally surprised, being neither consulted nor informed prior to the change being announced. The least impacted of the three was Moyle; he was astute, with creative and ‘out of the box thinking’, preparing for the future by looking towards the politically inspired regionalization and intuitively knowing that the foretold horizontal organization of the Department was incompatible with its decades old vertical organization. The adventurous, always looking forward, nature of operating displayed by Moyle throughout his DIs career indicated that he was different and would be prepared for and accept any challenges that confronted him. It almost appeared that he knew or sensed the demise of the DIs was going to happen and was prepared for it. His intuition may have been proved correct but the scope of the change perplexed him completely.

The three biographies documented clearly show the diversity of the three Inspectors working during different periods within the years detailed in this research. Their backgrounds, qualifications and experiences varied enormously, yet their official goals at the inspectorate level were achieved variously in all cases and performed at a high standard. Meyer was driven to emulate the illustrious career of his grandfather; Reeves found diverse, obstructing challenges to overcome in order to reach and carve out his Departmental role before becoming a talent lost to Victoria; and Moyle, goal-oriented since he entered upon formal education, was humbled by the faith so many senior administrators had in his potential – he could not let them down. Their backgrounds and personalities influenced their mode of operation as DIs, yet still their work distinctly illuminated the findings from the interviews, both written and oral, with the other participants in the research cohort (Chapter 5).
Chapter 7: Discussion and conclusions - personal reflections

Introduction

During the past three years, the empirical study reported in this thesis has been driven by the research question, “What were the recollections and perceptions held by the Inspectors relating to the Primary Schools Inspection system in Victoria?” Furthermore, the research was directed by three research guiding questions, as suggested by O’Donoghue (2007). These were:

What functions were carried out by the Inspectors, and how did the Inspectors carry out their officially assigned and self-allocated duties?

What were their recollections and perceptions around (i) their assessment of teaching staff academically and (ii) their other duties associated with their roles?

What were the personal qualities possessed by these Inspectors that created and developed the unique cultures and values within their specific district?

The research question and guiding questions have reflected and driven the oral history methodology employed and the presentation of the findings. From the findings a variety of perspectives, ideas and outcomes was obtained concerning the realistic, complex situations of the PSIS of Victoria. In this chapter the aim is to explore these findings more deeply, and to make meaning of what was found so as to answer the main and research guiding questions. As consideration of the findings began, three ancillary questions came to notice, these questions directing the development and thrust of the discussion which forms the structure of this chapter. These three ancillary questions were:

What did these Inspectors contribute to the good of primary education in Victoria in the two decades?

How and why did the system end?

What was lost by the ending of the inspectorate?
The discussion that follows in the remainder of this chapter also requires some contextualising with regard to the development of one’s thinking throughout this study. The research began by questioning how the Inspectors went about their work, and met their responsibilities; in so doing, the aim was to explore how they influenced educational standards, quality of teaching practices and what their overall benefit was to the school community. However, early in the study it became clear that the Inspectors’ responsibilities had influenced and impacted enormously on the pedagogy of the teaching profession while seeking to achieve improved educational standards and better quality education. This led to further investigation of the relationships between the inspectorial system, the inspectorates and the District Inspectors’ perceptions of their role in these responsibilities. The initial research, focusing on the data from the interview protocols and the written responses of a representative cohort of living DIs who functioned during the period being researched, led to the identification of three emerging themes, principally in the stages of data analysis. These were initially classified as ‘professional ethics’, ‘quality assurance’ and ‘professional development’, thereby creating a scaffold for understanding the professional dimensions of the work of the research cohort. However, as further exploration and continued interrogation of the data, it became clear that the focus had been on researching the ‘typical’ Inspector who completed his/her duties according to Regulation III and that the study had completely missed, or perhaps ignored, the diverse personal qualities that had been clarified by the participants in their interviews.

This re-appraisal of the data analysis and the early findings being made was the point at which it became clear that the study was dealing with real people and, as such, needed to give the respect to each research cohort member to which they were entitled. Clearly, the initial core category ‘professional ethics’ of Inspectors appeared as all-embracing and almost inhumane, ignoring the importance of the several personalities, the context of time, and the generation which these Inspectors represented. To overcome this apparent misrepresentation, the category was re-labelled ‘inspectorate values’; this seeming more reflective and embracing of the core values of the participants as they carved their own identity and represented the values demanded by the inspectorate, a Schools Division, or the Education Department. The second category emerging from the findings was initially termed ‘quality assurance’, but after reconsideration, it was renamed ‘inspectorate culture’ to cater for range of related themes emerging from pedagogical volatility and DI-inspired inspectorate initiatives. The third theme, ‘professional development’ was also considered inappropriate
because the themes described practical outcomes of an Inspector’s overarching role and responsibilities. The improved title was ‘inspectorate in-service education’ which encompassed both formal programs delivered by experts at in-house conferences and the informal, such as the DI suggesting a range of new ideas and cross pollinating pedagogical activities. The principle underlying these changes encouraged a greater focus on the oral history methodology of this research, in which the emphasis was on the characters themselves as much as the broader themes with which the participants engaged daily. The focus on the contributions that each inspector made, through force of personality and unique attributes possessed of personality, beliefs and knowledge, foregrounded the main issues were being studied.

Having explained this changed trajectory to the study, the focus now moves to a discussion of the findings and their possible meanings. One of the aims in this chapter is to synthesize the findings from the oral history research with the substantive themes from the literature review. This approach means that specific answers could be drawn together to produce new information which will assist in answering the questions which follow. By linking the findings of Chapters 4, 5 and 6 with the substantive theory of Chapter 2, it attempts to go further to the development of higher order meanings. It begins with an integrated review of the impact of the functions and responsibilities of the PSIS Inspectors in Victoria and reflects on the interactive strategies employed by the Inspectors during the period being researched. This is followed by a review of the dimensions of teacher professionalism from the standpoint of the Inspectors, and an account of the unique values, culture and in-service education which characterized each inspectorate. Issues leading to the demise of the inspectorial system in 1983 and valuable aspects of the system that were lost in the process are then reviewed.

**The contributions of the inspectorial system to primary education in Victoria**

One is left in no doubt from an examination of the interview transcripts that the participants modestly believed that their impact on Primary schools in their districts, and in the State overall was significant. These views are extended by a deeper analysis of what they said. The Inspectors’ main purpose was to maintain, improve and develop the school system so providing better education for the children (Ball, et al. 1961; Gurr, 2003; MacNab, 2004; De Grauwe, 2007). To understand their role and their impact, the political context of the
period needs to be borne in mind. This was an era when the underpinning ideology was that every school should provide a consistent, if not uniform level of education to every child under that State’s care. This meant that Inspectors were required to ensure that standards were as universal as possible in all State schools, and that their role was to achieve this to the best of their ability. At the same time, each Inspector added their personal mark, or stamp, as they interpreted the mandated requirements of their role, thus adding the human dimension to the bureaucratic requirements.

**Inspectors in schools**

Inspectors performed their duties with authority, particularly in monitoring, assessing and evaluating teacher performance, evaluating or introducing new curriculum, uplifting teaching standards, and implementing the State government’s educational policies (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). The three main ways they went about their duties were crystallised from the research data of the interviews with regard to the interactive strategies they employed. Inspectors interpreted their roles individually in their relations with teachers and principals during the era. It was clear from the Inspectors’ perceptions, as recorded in the findings, that their roles embraced much more than the officially required and documented activities. Anderson, who was appointed early in the period, in 1965, operated his district with a strong commitment to children, explaining:

Each teacher had a pro-forma that they filled out explaining what they had taught. From this pro-forma I could see from the children’s books who had been taught and who had been neglected. I could also tell what the teacher had been doing about the issues and on that basis could do something about it. My advice was based on ‘what the children were doing and what the teacher was doing about it’.

Anderson’s style was very correct and reflected the traditional values still extant in the 1960s. By way of contrast Ikin, who was appointed towards the end of the period, in 1974, when greater financial resources were still more readily available, expressed his priorities as: lifting the nature and upgrading the poor physical conditions of schools. Both Inspectors had the educational standards of children as their first priority but operated differently because of the conditions prevailing at the time. The effect was that each inspectorate had its own underpinning individual culture, values and in-service education which interacted with each other, and were dependent on the era, experience, expertise and personality of the District.
Inspector. Without adherence to a code of ethics, the pervasiveness of these fundamental inspectorate concepts could create difficulties for principals and teachers in performing their responsibilities effectively (Strike & Ternaskey, 1993). Therefore any such situation had to be covered by teacher education and training developed through the professionalism of the Inspectors. In this is revealed the blending of the bureaucratic with the personal, somewhat in contrast to the general interpretation of bureaucracy and the negation of individuality proposed by Weber (1962).

**Inspectorate values**

In the same way, discussion of the values represented, and espoused by the Inspectors reveals a similar dualism. The Central Office values that the Inspector, a loyal employee, represented to the principals, teachers and school community. At the same time there were those values that reflected the personal beliefs drawn from the unique life experience of each Inspector. As a result, the effect was to create an underpinning layer of ‘centralised’ values in schools, coloured by the individual values that each Inspector brought to schools under their care.

Members of the research cohort opined they were operating in a more creative and indispensable manner by introducing educational initiatives into their districts. With few exceptions they all continued to further their academic qualifications and by the early 1970s had embarked on a more active educational rather than administrative leadership role. Meyer commented: “As a former principal in a school I was the leader of many teachers, as DI I was the leader of principals. This experience was not essential but beneficial”. Reeves said: “Being a school principal was invaluable training for a DI as the issues were similar”. Reeves also commented on the new approach to school reviews and assessments, rural schools being visited officially once a year and larger schools up to every four years. Reeves stated that his reviews became very comprehensive reports that he used as an educational tool and a document people might use to improve their performance. This was the difference between the DIs educational/administrative role and educational leadership. He described his perception of the actual inspection as:

You were aware that there was anxiety and trepidation on the part of some teachers, so in preparation for the review the DI would go to the school and talk about the things that the teachers would like him to look at. Based on that information he would interview three or four people for the panel. The local
doctor, a neighbouring school principal and a businessman from the community formed the inspection panel. This team created a situation where the review became a collective collegiate experience and a much less onerous task. Leading a composite team to evaluate a school’s performance required acceptance community-wide of Reeves’ educational leadership status.

This change in performance management was never discussed or given recognition as part of the DI role.

Inspectorate values, a sub-set of community-wide values was further inculcated by Inspectors when implementing their interactive strategies by: personal knowledge and skills; operational planning for school visits, advisory and training duties; advanced administrative requirements and auditing; implementation of state-wide educational policies; improvement to schools’ physical learning environment; accountability of district-wide educational resources; the receipt and compilation of official reports; support of community and parents reciprocally; and overt discipline of teachers and recalcitrant pupils. The inspectorate values as varied and expressed by the Inspectors appeared similar in nature but it was the delivery of their duties by individuals that created the unique additional values and culture apparent in each inspectorate. The personal skills, knowledge and experience of the Inspector instilled a common philosophy about work, people and human relations centred around shared values, exceptional performance and an emphasis on public accountability, thereby encouraging inspectorate schools to serve their functions effectively (Lim, 2001; Travers, 2007), each with a unique, school-based interpretation. Coincidentally, inspectorate value strategies identified with and addressed state-wide indicators of quality education such as qualifications, curriculum resources, including teaching and learning materials, and teacher development programs thereby enhancing educational standards (Welch, 2000).

The inspectorate interactive strategies associated with the inspectorate values emerging from this study revealed positive images and status for the inspectorial system. The manner in which the Inspectors behaved and conducted themselves while interacting with principals and teachers when carrying out inspectorate-wide responsibilities was most important. Such visits to schools formally or informally concerned implementing the totality of the inspectorate in-service training dimension whether divined or sought, individual or group, supporting the evidence that Inspectors were pedagogically and academically equipped with demonstrated classroom talents and wide experience, comprehensive human management skills, curriculum
knowledge and understanding, and qualities of educational administration with leadership potential. The study revealed, according to the perceptions held by the research cohort, that the Inspector’s credibility in the main was accepted by principals, teachers and the community. Teachers and principals were encouraged by the comfort of inspectorate values both held and being inculcated; this was reflected in the professional status the Inspector was afforded within the schools. This plethora of inspectorate values encompassed how they behaved and conducted themselves in performing their responsibilities, including being co-operative, collaborative, involved and supportive of each other, and being respectful, loyal, dedicated and committed to sharing in each school’s practical vision circumscribed only by the boundaries of the inspectorate’s agreed values, culture and commitment to professional development. Though working conditions were often basic but incrementally improved during the era being researched, teachers and principals were aware of the limits imposed by official financial commitments, and were prepared to make compromises while prioritizing teaching resources for the benefit of children’s educational standards. Teachers and principals appreciated the inspectorate values both imposed and encouraged by the Inspector whose major challenge always was to ensure they performed their responsibilities effectively (Strike & Ternaskey, 1993). These values were often revisited and reinforced by Inspector example and during teacher in-service education programs both at school and inspectorate level. This study indicated that the working and living conditions over the period of time being researched changed significantly particularly in country districts. Communications in the early 1960s were limited to a very moderate telephone service and a slow mail service with transport being often non-existent. Therefore, the Inspectors’ values and integrity were sometimes questioned and often relayed by ‘bush telegraph’; their reputation and credibility depended on how they espoused and demonstrated individual variations of the three major concepts this study has identified. Most cohort members expressed their recollections of these challenging times of nascent professionalism as memorable and worthwhile – examples of educational inspiration for the teachers, principals and the community.

In general, the central government agency had shown respect for how significant the inspectorial system was in the maintenance, improvement and development of the school system, the educational standards, and the professional standards maintained in the schools. However, the position that the Inspectors played in the overall credibility and standards of the education system appeared to be taken for granted and under-valued when politically the climate changed. After regionalization of education in the seventies and the stealthy events in
1983 which resulted in the demise of the PSIS, few Inspectors were prepared to accept the precipitous disbandment of what they perceived as their valuable contributions to education without consultation or recognition; their more than century-old role had disappeared forever.

**Inspectorate Culture**

Culture within the inspectorate was based on scientific management approaches where monitoring, assessment and evaluation of teacher and principal performance were the basis of the Inspectors’ responsibilities (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). However it was the individual and personal skills of the Inspector that inspired the unique composition of an inspectorate culture. To ensure ‘the culture’ was appropriately managed Inspectors needed to have qualifications that encompassed relevant pedagogical skills and knowledge, a sound competence in curricular skills, management capacity and leadership potential. Embracing of a human resource strategy that catered for teachers’ and principals’ needs, potential and satisfaction was important in allowing Inspectors to perform their responsibilities and achieve tangible outcomes. Sergiovanni and Starratt contended that without such professional skills problems for an Inspector would surely emerge.

The unique culture of each inspectorate was encouraged and promoted by the Inspector, supported and understood by schools’ personnel to whom it had been variously communicated in the form of purposeful strategies to be applied and outcomes to be achieved. The ultimate outcome, however, was that inspectorate culture, because of the practical involvements which impacted on educational standards and the quality of education provided in the schools by improving the standards of teaching and learning. The study data revealed that the representative cohort of Inspectors, through the unique cultural frameworks of their inspectorates, individually monitored, evaluated and made recommendations on management practices, administrative processes and physical environments existing in the schools. Although the DIs’ resources were centrally controlled by the Education Department it was their vigilance, persistent observations and reporting that enhanced the imperatives of inspectorate culture which filtered to the Public Works Department, the body hitherto controlling and funding all school maintenance, urgent building needs and the rotation of yearly maintenance for all schools. The interview protocol data also indicate that Inspectors’ reports were influential in the acquisition of funding for new schools in developing districts. These strategies became embedded in the inspectorate culture in the sense that an inspectorate became known as progressive or stolid, so relating directly to the quality of education provided (Welch, 2000). The research cohort believed their impact on the culture of
individual inspectorates as positive, being manifest variously through their knowledge of the managerial and educational functions of the schools, and through their reporting, assessment and quality control policies which assisted the schools. In the anonymous inspectorate culture they individually espoused, schools served their functions well if a philosophy about work, people and human relations were centred around shared values, exceptional performance and accountability (Lim, 2000; Travers, 2007).

Another arm of inspectorate culture resided in an Inspector’s professional status in the community, especially in the country districts, of being respected and held in high esteem through activities within and without the school environment. Professional visibility required identifying, addressing and improving such indicators of quality education as teacher competence, curriculum implementation and resources, including teaching and learning materials, and teacher development programs designed to enhance education standards and the quality of education (Welch, 2000). Identified throughout was that the inspectorate culture, driven by the Inspector, had embraced internal school improvement and in some cases encouraged school self-evaluation, self-assessment, self-inspection, self-auditing and self-review (MacLaughlin, 2001) alongside the Inspectors’ review and assessment.

Educational culture at all levels had been based on the ‘scientific management’ approach in vogue since early in the 20th century wherein Inspectors ensured that teachers and principals complied with the expectations of the Department. This approach required that quality assurance and culture as developed in an inspectorate must monitor, assess and evaluate the quality of ‘inputs’, the processes involved, and the quality of ‘outputs’ if quality outcomes were to be achieved (Welch, 2000). This was necessary so that deficiencies were detected and problems prevented before they occurred, a cultural outcome impacting on the teachers and principals. Until the demise of the PSIS many Inspectors managed and administered their inspectorates, confined by a known, stereotypic interpretation of the regulation which guided them; but even so, positive individual inspectorate cultures were manifest, these being dependent to a large degree upon the many personal qualities and experiences brought to the task by the incumbent DI.

**Inspectorate In-Service Education**

In-service education introduced to an inspectorate took many forms as exemplified in the research interviews. It was often driven by the Department, through the Inspector, as a source of information and knowledge on government and educational policies.
In educational settings, in-service education is concerned with introducing the new or improved quality of education by applying professional development strategies that improve the quality of teaching and learning (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). It became a crucial part of the information exchange which encouraged teachers and principals to develop strategies to cope with the rapidly changing society, technology and economy. The research cohort recollected in-service training in their inspectorate as the development of sessions from teachers’ identified needs which would benefit the teaching workforce as a whole. As funding was very limited, Inspectors were compelled to organize a district session to which a limited number of teachers from each school attended before returning to their schools to share their newly obtained knowledge with others. Changes to curriculum, new methods and pedagogy, school management and leadership were major issues. The research cohort also perceived professional development as a process that required identification of a need before being initiated and facilitated, often by outside factors and sources.

In-service education up to the 1960s in an inspectorate was very limited and not a priority for funding. Teachers were overwhelmed with large class sizes, managing with minimum teaching resources, and with little free time for preparation. Under the Inspector’s guidance, principals and co-ordinators from individual schools, instigated their training session in after school time slots. Progressing into the seventies, finance, especially from the Commonwealth Government, became more available for in-service activities enabling Inspectors to take a more active part in the in-service education of teachers through seminars and occasionally residential programs. They also introduced many excellent district initiatives that eventually became state-wide programs. These initiatives were related to the individual Inspector’s expertise hence becoming driving part of both the concepts of inspectorate in-service education and inspectorate culture hat typify that inspectorate’s uniqueness.

Leadership

Inspectors, principals and teachers all perceived leadership as directly related to district and staff performing responsibilities when occupying promotional and formal teaching positions in schools. While such perceptions were true it related more to the concept of formal leadership that encompassed management qualities concerned with administrative responsibilities and guiding others in carrying out matters of their concern (Reid, Brain & Boyes, 2007). This perception indicates the common understanding that management, administration and leadership cannot be isolated from each other and all are related to power and authority that maintain and reinforce dependent relationships between responsibilities and
personnel in schools (Lambert & Harris, 2003). Scholars indicate that the terms educational management and administration are interchangeable but educational leadership has a different and overarching connotation (Bush, 2006). The difference between educational management and leadership can be easily distinguished according to Bush: educational management/administration is “maintaining efficiently and effectively current organizational arrangements … leadership is influencing others actions in achieving desirable ends (p.1).” Other scholars contend there are no ‘correct’, but only useful definitions of educational leadership. As I read and re-read data from the interview protocols I became increasingly aware of the Inspectors’ detailed, regulation-guided administrative role as defined above, and uncomfortable because an awareness was dawning of something beyond, ill-defined but tangible, better known now as educational leadership. Thus incipient educational leadership revealed itself, examples being: Moyle in the late 60s challenged teachers to avoid the stereotypic and mould him to be the DI they wanted; Nunn in the late 70s requiring that Rural School teachers meet regularly with him to share their newly discovered pedagogical ideas; and Reeves in the early 80s whose role now demanded that he lead a composite group of citizens when an Official Report on a school became scheduled.

Educational leadership can be exercised in different contexts and settings, for example, in instructional leadership, the concerns and practices relate more to improving student and teacher achievements; strategic leadership is exercised when the concerns are practices related to teamwork that ensures teachers are ‘integral agents for change’; and organizational leadership, in which the concerns and practices encourage the nurturing of leadership that ensures ‘leaders are both teachers and learners’. This study indicated Inspectors to encourage all three forms of leadership to a greater or lesser degree within their district schools, performing as role models to develop a more coercive set of leadership values within their inspectorates. Educational leadership qualifies Inspectors as principled, honest and ethical, organized, fair and forward thinkers (Gabriel, 2005). These traits encompass both formal and informal leadership qualities because the nature of the teaching profession requires all teachers, principals and Inspectors to be leaders in all aspects of school/ inspectorate life. The research cohort was reluctant to admit that their role was one of leadership; however as the major concepts emerged from the data it was obvious that their roles were undeniably underpinned by administrative strategies with incipient leadership connotations. The Inspector set the scene for the inspectorate values, culture and in-service education and in those overlapping contexts acts of leadership were bound to occur. Planning,
implementing and evaluating of programs throughout the schools were assisted by outstanding teachers who were exposed to different styles of leadership including: interpersonal leadership that encourages communication and networking, setting goals and making policy as the key elements of success; adaptive leadership that navigates and effects change through relationships; and motivational leadership that encourages professional climates, support for teachers and cultivating a learning community which caters for both formal and informal aspects of the schools (Gabriel, 2005). The research findings crystalized the strategies Inspectors used to inform teachers and principals in their quest for better leadership and eventually better academic outcomes for students. The in-service education strategies applied by the Inspectors interviewed focused on issues that address specific educational changes, an agenda which included the moral purposes of teaching. Different strategies, including models and theories were reported as being applied within a particular school context, so that the benefits were reaped, then shared by teachers and the principal concerned. The study also revealed that the expertise and personal interest in a particular subject area by the Inspector was a major factor in successful in-service and leadership outcomes.

Professionalism

The consolidated data of this study revealed there to be five dimensions of teacher professionalism: teacher compliance, teacher knowledge, teacher leadership, teacher in-service education and teacher professional ethics. These were subsumed under the overarching concepts: inspectorate values, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education. The geographic location or the type of school became irrelevant when consideration was being given to the professional elements of the work force.

It is important to re-affirm that teacher professionalism, as with other professions, is culturally and socially constructed and as such is prone to evolve with social, economic and political developments. The first element concerned with professionalism refers to compliance with the professional, educational and administrative requirements of the education system. The professional requirements include standards of dress and behaviour as required in general, or by the educational enterprise in general or the school in particular. The educational requirements include successfully implementing educational policies relating to the curriculum, teaching standards, assessments and in-service education; and the administrative requirements concerned with performance of responsibilities as prescribed in duty statements and keeping the necessary comprehensive records. Inspectors perceived
compliance as directly related to teachers’ job descriptions that spelt out appropriate qualifications for each teaching position, teaching responsibilities, counselling of students, good working relationships, reporting to appropriate sources and being accountable and responsible for the consequences of their actions.

Professional knowledge, the second element of professionalism, was related to initial teacher qualifications, curriculum knowledge and teacher competence. Teacher knowledge encompasses knowledge of subject contents, teaching and learning methods, and the classroom management employed when imparting knowledge to children. The Inspectors interviewed believed that ‘knowledge is what we know and how we impart this to others’.

The third element, teacher leadership is an important component at all levels in the education system. Inspectors exhibited high levels of administrative skills when operating within their districts, some of these skills being instinctive while for others the skills have to be learned. The investigation showed that in many cases the Inspectors did not necessarily see themselves as leaders but rather organizers and managers who used sound strategies to relate to school personnel. The individual personality of each Inspector gave a clear indication of the manner in which they operated. The Inspector who had army training had a very different style to that of one who was quietly spoken, had a placid nature and led mainly by example; however both types of leadership were equally effective.

The fourth element of professionalism, teacher in-service education, was directly involved with the Inspectors’ relevant strategies as these were vital to the advancing success of the teaching profession. The massaged data revealed that, irrespective of whether teachers were inexperienced or experienced at any level, continuous in-service education of varying types was an essential feature of the teaching profession because such an activity in any form, whether skill development, mentoring or networking, kept Inspectors, teachers and principals current with changes in the system, and with forward thinking of pedagogical experts worldwide. Any reform agenda or change initiated as part of educational development required in-service education for the processing of new knowledge and skills needed to perform the responsibilities consistent with the changes.

The final element of professionalism is matter of professional ethics. It was clear from the data treatment that the research cohort of Inspectors believed they played a role by setting an example for principals and teachers to emulate. They also perceived that their school visits, either formal or informal, gave teachers a measure of logistical support which
encouraged commitment and professionalism in their work and that of principals. These grass roots educationists performed with a commitment which set lofty expectations if their performances were being encouraged, supported, monitored and evaluated by Inspectors.

How and why did the system end?

The second guiding research question to be answered by the findings which emerged from answers given by research cohort Inspectors to the interview protocols and from the documents tendered in support of inspectorial activities was: “What were their recollections and perceptions around (i) their assessment of the teaching staff academically and (ii) their other duties associated with their role?” In general a very positive attitude existed towards the primary school inspections in the 1960s -1970s; in 1967 the number of inspectorates was increased. In the very early 70s inspectorial practices were liberalized, the school’s Official Report becoming a short educational statement made biennially and teachers’ private reports being given on request. Clearly the schools were being given the opportunity to take stronger charge of their aims and the evaluation of them. However, many factors came into play thereby influencing the demise of the inspectorial system in Victoria when the potential for educational leadership was at its most promising both for Inspectors and principals. Social change, ideological change, political change and economic change were the driving forces influencing the thinking of the Minister, other politicians and senior educationalists at the time. It is important to understand how the position, Inspector of Schools, was passed from generation to generation and finally to the cohort of Inspectors interviewed for this research. Until the inspectorate’s finalization in 1983, the guidelines which directed the functions of an Inspector relied heavily on Frank Tate’s early 20th century Education Department policies; but while subtle important changes were being mandated the Frank Tate DI model remained paramount. For many commentators the demise of the inspectorial system marked the end of the influence of Frank Tate on the Victorian Education Department (Holloway, 2000).

Frank Tate, Director of Education from 1902-1928 controlled and influenced the entirety of the Victorian Education Department. He used the power invested in him under the Act to re-structure the administration in a series of events in which his goal was to reform the education system in the interests of better schooling for the state’s children. As with any re-structured positions appointees were from among the more favoured applicants. Tate declined to have the chief officers of the Department named in the banner of the Educational Gazette.
until May 1905. The Committee of Classifiers in 1902 was listed as the chief inspector, the assistant chief inspector and a head teacher. Until 1925, the chief inspector was known as the ‘Chief Inspector of Schools’, and all other Inspectors served in schools regardless of type, this system persisting until the passing of The Teachers Act in 1925. An Inspector worked in his own district, being responsible for all state-owned schools of whatever status. It was a requirement that the Inspector reside in his district, particularly in the country (Holloway, 2000).

At the same time as Tate was reforming the administration his other major project was curriculum reform. He insisted that children learn by doing, introducing his 1902 course of study where the school work was allied with reality and knowledge that could be applied to everyday situations. This curriculum ‘innovation’ was to be reinvented in the 70s. Tate also advocated the abolition of the infamous “payment by results”, introducing in-service training for teachers through conferences and summer schools (Holloway, 2000). This introduced the Inspector’s assistance to teachers through a lecturing role for the first time, marking the Inspector to be an educationist, and the beginning of the inspectorate in-service education dimension as a regular feature of the DIs’ responsibilities up to the time period covered during this research. These activities placed the Inspector at the forefront of local educationists and represented a real attempt to bring new educational developments, trusted teaching strategies and subject knowledge to a poorly trained teaching force lacking in educational and pedagogical depth of understanding.

Tate held conferences with the Inspectors discussing his policies and the need for teacher morale and standards of classroom practice to be raised. In 1904 he revealed the General Rules for the Inspection and Examination of Schools which stressed that “every visit paid to a school by an Inspector shall result in some definite gain to the school...” Tate spent the next 25 years of his reign working towards the recommendations he had documented in his first report to the Minister. After a visit to New Zealand, he added to these recommendations – a committee for each school, a maintenance allowance for building repairs, school grounds of at least three acres, better quality residences, dual desks, and 6-14 as the age of compulsory attendance. In 1905 Tate introduced the Diploma of Education course whereby 20 selected teachers were nominated to this university course. Many Inspectors began their tertiary education through this process (Holloway, 2000). The demise of the inspection system in 1983 was the end of the legacy of Tate’s Education Department. The departmental vertical organizational structure had developed faults over a long period of
time, but in the end with regionalization rampant a horizontal structure was imperative: thus a number of forces and circumstances combined to bring about the end. The style of leadership at Headquarters, particularly of the Secondary School administration, the ambitions of the Ministers who worked toward their control of executive functions, and the reluctance of teacher unions to acknowledge an obligation of accountability to anyone, all coalesced to form a situation that could not be sustained. The secondary teacher’s union (V.S.T.A.) had long worked for the removal of the centralized secondary inspectorate, eventually playing a significant part in achieving it through, in part, preventing Secondary Inspectors entering numbers of High Schools. Changing control of the school system in 1981 from the professional to the political, while not necessarily implying abolition of the inspectorate, gave a combination of unions and other forces, especially after the change of government, the opportunity they wanted.

Regionalization of the Education Department was implemented from January 1st, 1972; it came about following the 1971 state elections when the Premier Rupert Hamer gave an election promise to set up Regional Offices of Education in Ballarat, Bendigo and the Latrobe Valley. After three years of “beating the bounds” the original three Regional Directors of Education (RDE) reported favourably to the Minister on the feasibility of regionalizing the state so that educational decision making could be made close to where implementation was to occur. The impossibility of retaining a vertically organized system when a horizontal one had been introduced was noted. By 1975 the state was regionalised with the total number of regions now reaching 12. Operational efficiency to make regionalization function better saw the educational regions reduced to 9 by 1982. The majority of the directors and assistant directors of the regions came from the ranks of the inspectorate. Regional directors met occasionally with DIs who worked within their geographical boundaries to discuss matters of common interest, but the essential work of the primary inspectorate proceeded with Inspectors introducing modernized changes inculcated by senior centralized staff, reporting on schools in a different manner; assessing teachers on request; resolving complaints; and attending to problems of discipline. District initiatives remained the province of the district. However, the initial advent of regionalization saw many DIs accepting the reality and co-operating with the Regional Director who generally did not interfere with a system which was operating smoothly.

Alan Hunt, Dawkins the Minister for Education in 1979, a stranger to education, set out to have the Education Department reviewed and restructured. A management group of
five functioning as the “go between” Minister of Education and practitioners was favoured. This had been suggested during the Inspectorial Board days of the last century and again in 1936. This move appeared to be a developing plan for the Director General to establish his own corporate management structure modelled on the mining sector at Broken Hill. The Minister engaged business consultants to advise him on the total dismantling of the Education Department and its eventual emergence as a Ministry of Education. The restructure team of 1981 produced a report for a completely new administrative system that involved the abolition of the existing organization and the displacement of Senior Officers at inspectorate level and above. However, in spite of this upheaval the primary inspectorial functions continued as usual until 1983, a vacuum being an impossibility.

Holloway (2000) confirmed that in 1982 the state election brought a change of government and the unfinished restructure process was taken over and adapted to different ideologies, new opportunities, and long nurtured ambitions. The abolition of the inspectorate was imminent. The new Director-General announced in September 1982 that, “The position of Inspectors of schools in the Education Service will be abolished as from December 31 1982…” On April 4th 1983, after 132 years the inspectorate ceased to exist.

The research findings of this thesis indicated there to be no consultation, no communication, no thankyou and no farewell. The schools were simply directed to address to the regional office any matters previously referred to the teaching divisions. This study has revealed the disappointment that DIs felt being neither consulted nor having any communication about the important matters to which they had contributed, and had profound knowledge about, relating to the continuous improvement of children’s formal education.

**Why did the system end?**

This study has revealed that throughout the history of education many educational institutions contributed to the education of our society. These were family, workplace employer, church, political parties, the media and the state. Barcan (1980) states that such influences led to ‘education not schooling’ and to the state being interested in children as future citizens and in the schools’ facilities upon which they relied.

In the late 60s and early 70s Western civilization underwent a remarkable metamorphosis; many political, social and economic changes were happening throughout the world. The characteristic features of the new hedonistic culture included cosmopolitanism, the liberation of women, the restriction of population, local rather than national allegiances, a concern with
the individual, inflation and a vast literature covering many facets of knowledge. During these years Victoria experienced the full force of cultural and social change that was influencing education in many countries. The permissive society featured a new ideology and a new morality. The foundational concepts, inspectorate culture and inspectorate values were being eroded, for example, dress codes, behaviour patterns and morale. These changes were the silent beginnings to the demise of the inspection system.

From 1974 special interest groups exerted powerful influences on Australian education, some more than others, but all contributed in some way to the changes occurring. Neo-Marxism, institutionalised in small political sects and their journals must be considered one of the special groups. The second group was the radicalised teachers’ unions that were sometimes under neo-Marxist leadership. Other major active groups were feminists, the Aboriginal diaspora and the various ethnic groups.

Branson (1980) stated that the sociology of education had been pursued in the 70s by two distinct groups – sociologists under the rubric of educationalist working within the context of education, and sociologists who had pursued research into education. Edgar (1974) stated that the sociologists of education must ask: Who designs the education system as a whole? Whose ends is it supposed to serve? These tenuous questions were followed by the warning that sociology ‘must focus on what is under the teacher’s control rather than what is beyond it’.

In 1981 the Senate Committee report stated that schools did not appreciate the educational needs of industry or commerce; and that 20 - 25 % of school leavers lacked an adequate standard of education, in particular, the fundamentals of literacy and numeracy. Although this report was quite explicit as to the failings of the new curriculum planning and pedagogy there was no interest in pursuing the skills and standards Inspectors had been inculcating in their districts. Teacher unions particularly those representing secondary school teachers, wanted assessment to cease and eventually played a major role in the demise of the inspectorial system in general. Rod Cavalier, a Minister in New South Wales, and John Dawkins, his counterpart in Canberra, introduced the 1987 Education and Public Instruction Bill, Cavalier claiming that while the government listened to the major interest groups it led and shaped the agenda for educational reform. “We are in control of events,” he said.

The politically socialistic era was replaced by the neo-liberal period with the 1974 election of Margaret Thatcher in 1979 and the election of Ronald Reagan in the United States in 1980 fore-telling the spread of the neo-liberal thinking. They claimed that the self-
interested opportunism of bureaucrats and government officials would create conflicting
loyalties and interests which would interfere with the implementation of policies in the
genuine pursuit of public interest. These two influences working parallel to each other finally
changed society politically and socially and eventually were the forces that brought down the
inspectorial system in Victoria. This paralleled the 1983 the changes occurring in Western
Australia, when the new Labor Government conducted a Ministerial Review (Beasley, 1984)
and the school system was largely overhauled.

What did Victorian primary schools lose as a result of the ending of the
inspectorial system?

The third question to guide the discussion around the findings was: What was lost by
the ending of the inspectorate? This study has revealed from the interviews and documents,
the perceptions held by the DIs about the value of their roles within the Department, and also
in the communities they were serving. These characteristics of the role have been
undervalued and never documented as part of their job description, nor by any scholar
interested in the disbanding of this social structure that had served education well for more
than a century. Therefore the future of either the organization or personnel affected was never
considered in the new educational structure other than the ex-DIs being given the opportunity
to apply for the new positions created. Of the latter some were successful, others demeaned
by small sub-committees raised to make the appointments. Among these sub-committee
members were those who had long memories. Described in this section are the official and
unofficial benefits of the Inspectors’ role before the position was abolished in 1983. The
documented requirements for the position of DI were important but it was the ‘extras’
presented unexpectedly almost on a daily basis that made this position an exciting one to
hold. Each Inspector became a community member, especially in the country areas, taking on
community leadership roles, joining sporting clubs and becoming prominent members of
community institutions such as the Apex, Lions or Rotary Clubs. Their status was that of a
professional who was highly regarded throughout the district as its senior educationist. Their
education and personal contributions to their inspectorates made them valued resources both
academically and professionally. Relationships that developed between Inspectors, principals
and teachers were often a secret to the success of promoting district educational initiatives.
The DI as the official representative of the Education Department was the pillar of strength
that all principals, teachers, parents and the community relied on for direct access to
Headquarters. The knowledge, experience and expertise gained during the DI’s long probation period initially as a teacher, allowed him to deal with and fully understand educational matters, buildings and maintenance requirements, enrolment issues and disciplinary matters, all incorporating the human factor, especially when personal issues became priorities. School visits in most cases were welcomed and set the standards that were expected, not only in a particular school, but throughout the district. Reporting to Head Office on all school matters was a major and very important part of: the distribution of finances and facilities; enrolments issues when problematic; curriculum development appropriate to a school’s demographics; moderating teacher performance assessments; and ensuring the educational standards throughout their district were being improved. Equitable arrangements and improved standards in all aspects of the educational enterprise were their unspoken goals.

The impact on principals, teachers and the community

The abolition of the inspectorial system impacted personally and professionally on the Inspectors, their positions had been de-valued and their career paths were in turmoil. Serious implications followed for principals, teachers, students and the communities they had served. The principals throughout the districts were unaware of the burdensome impact of this situation; they no longer had a confidante to support them during difficult events such as lack of facilities, staff allocations, and paucity of finances, difficult parents and disruptive students. Inexperienced principals had been ‘thrown to the wolves’ and in some cases never to recover. They were no longer being supported and evaluated by internal Education Department mechanisms but felt rather exposed to the political arena where any inexperienced, but influential school council members could dictate the organization and educational standards of the schools. Their direct link with the Department through the Inspector had disappeared creating a time wasting and fruitless exercise of continuous telephone conversations by each individual principal who had to interpret and act upon policy changes being implemented state-wide in the schools. Principals had the extra burden of planning their own in-service training for teachers and community without a Department representative who took the responsibility and visualised the totality of the schools’ in-service education needs from various discussions and observations in their districts. They were yet to become aware of educational leadership themes with the resultant concepts deduced from this study’s interviews that were now devolved to them.

The initial loss of an external supervisory person may have been relished by some teachers who saw the inspectorial system as a violating their privacy. The supervisory
imperatives are now the province of a principal who likewise must violate classroom teacher privacy more often and, more importantly may be limited in experience, expertise, training or the time to perform this duty fairly and impartially. Outstanding teachers soon realised that the recognition of their pedagogical skills by an experienced and qualified person had been removed and that their opportunities for promotion could be affected.

The impact on school communities appeared negligible but on examination these communities realised there to be no senior educational figure-head present now to whom families may address their concerns; no direct access to a senior departmental representative; and no widely experienced official available to support isolated schools in rural areas where the Head Teachers often lack experience in teaching and administrative strategies, and dealing with other complicated issues.

With the abolition of the inspectorates in all three divisions (Primary, Secondary and Technical), and the political and social changes occurring, principals were given more authority and independence; but at the same time they became vulnerable to public and political scrutiny without the Departmental supports of the Inspectors, particularly DIs, whose widespread experience gave a familiarity to the necessary processes and modus operandi.

**What has the State Education Department lost from the abolition of the inspectorate?**

There have been changes in management, responsibility and accountability. Schools have now become autonomous in the development of their own charters, financial accountability for funds now allocated directly to school budgets, compulsory national testing requirements, adoption of the national curriculum, teacher self-assessment and school self-evaluation, the latter being driven mostly by a political agenda rather than an educational one. The Director-General of Education is no longer a political selection from among senior teacher members of the Education Department but from the members of the current ascendant political party who may have no experience of education apart from their own schooling. The introduction of technology has seen the Commonwealth Government developing NAPLAN programs (standardised testing throughout the Commonwealth) to inform parents of the status in a narrow, but important, subject band of all schools throughout Australia. This is presumed to allow parents, on the basis of this information, to make comparisons and choices about their children’s schooling in spite of the pupils’ mobility being inhibited by schools’ boundaries, fixed in most metropolitan and large rural cities. Assessment of teachers is non-existent apart from the self-evaluation and their relative success in NAPLAN’s national tables.
of results. There is no accountability as to the legitimacy of the manner in which these tests are being performed, thereby creating questions about their credibility. Principals have very little support from the authorities; they are controlled by the parent associations and the unions. Research has shown that in other countries, where similar policies have been adopted, the inspectorial role to support fairness, equality and an independent evaluation of the system has been retained (Barcan, 1993).

The data of this research finding show that if communications had been on the agenda in 1983 when the inspectorial system was abolished, many positives from that system could have been incorporated into the new thinking and planning to produce a more cogent, progressive and valued education system.

Conclusion

Departments of Education, not just in Victoria, have struggled to find a process of accountability that openly supports high quality standards of education. The criteria that support these standards are the quality of teacher performance, the planning and development of curriculum and the organizational structure of the institution being evaluated. The Inspectors evaluation, through the anonymous lens concepts of inspectorate values, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education, of schools’ practices of similar underpinning educational administration concepts was aimed at promoting quality education for all children regardless of their socio-economic backgrounds or whether they lived in the metropolitan or country areas.

The current system of teacher accountability as measured by NAPLAN and as happens in the USA, violates all theories of quality teaching standards, quality teachers and a quality education for all children; in fact the three basic concepts which underpin educational administration determined by this study are violated. One of the sad outcomes, already evident is a pedagogical regime of “teaching to the test”, a close relative of “payment by results”.

Angelo Gavrielatos, Federal president of the Australian Education Union, at the ACSSO National Conference in 2008 said: “bring back the Inspectors” because the unfortunate outcome of NAPLAN with its implications of extra payment for the good teachers whose classes and schools perform in superior fashion according to the narrow
dictates of NAPLAN, is educationally limited and stifling. The Education Department of Victoria by using NAPLAN as an assessment tool is now threatening to revert to a version of the ‘payment by results’ regime of the early 1900s.
Chapter 8: Implications and conclusion

Introduction

The main purpose of this qualitative oral history was to investigate the phenomenon of the inspectorial system and the perceptions held by Inspectors carrying out their duties during the period 1960-1983 when the system was abolished. This chapter concludes the study and highlights the possible implications of the findings for future educational evaluation and assessment systems throughout Australia.

The aims of the research

The researcher over the past three years has interviewed, transcribed and constantly re-visited the research transcripts in an attempt to discover the ‘real’ Inspector. The experience and involvement with this research cohort of retired Inspectors has been challenging, informative, and at times surprising, but ultimately rewarding. To discover and identify how each interpreted and achieved the mandated role using their unique personality, expertise, experience, inter-personal relationships and leadership capacities has led to three important concepts resulting from the interview data analysis: inspectorate values, inspectorate culture, inspectorate in-service education; these concepts could equally relate to the role of school principal whose sphere of influence could be interpreted as a microcosm of an inspectorate. The duties performed as described by their retrospective perceptions have allowed the researcher to view the Inspectors’ role with an enlightened vision of their success or failure to perform according to the mandated requirements of the PSIS. The researcher has viewed and documented relevant primary and secondary resources most of which were presented by the research cohort during the interviews or mailed later to clarify, triangulate and validate their information. The three common driving concepts derived from the common themes directly related to each have been evaluated for their relevance to the inspectorial system. The findings have revealed elements highly relevant for future teacher and school assessment programs which promote school excellence.
The research questions

This chapter, as seen in the preceding discussions (see chapter 7), has answered the principal research question: What were the recollections and perceptions held by the Inspectors relating to the Primary Schools’ Inspectorial system in Victoria from 1960-1983? Chapter 7 has specifically addressed in detail the research guiding questions as introduced earlier in Chapter 1. Those research guiding questions are reiterated below:

- What functions were carried out by the Inspectors, and how did the Inspectors carry out their officially assigned and self-allocated functions?
- What were their recollections and perceptions around (i) the assessment of teaching staff academically and (ii) their other duties associated with their roles
- What were the personal qualities possessed by these Inspectors that created and developed the unique cultures and values within their specific districts?

The study concluded that the defunct system possessed many qualities, now lost to education.

Futures of an inspectorial system

One would be hard pressed to believe that the Inspector will ever return to the education system in Victoria; however, as parents and employers are questioning the quality of education and the standards achieved by their children maybe another investigation of the history of education is necessary, and a review conducted to evaluate some of the valuable qualities and innovations discarded. Great Britain and New Zealand have restructured their systems, but have maintained their Inspectors. Victoria with its political agenda has given power and authority to the schools but has not provided the support to principals and teachers after the manner of the inspectorial system. This research has provided information that could assist in supporting the current thinking about further educational improvement and development, particularly in ensuring higher pedagogical standards are manifested in teacher performances, and in the inculcation of children’s personal and educational standards. Additionally, this study has provided the conceptual basis and the practical themes which re-interpreted directly could form admirable advice for principals of schools who want to provide fine administration at the school level.

What did these Inspectors contribute to education?
In the seventies ‘Inspector’ was a word that was unacceptable to the new social movement. It was seen as encroaching on the individual rights of teachers and especially in the case of teacher members of the militant secondary division unions who were adamantly opposed to any form of teacher assessment. Unfortunately, the demise of the inspectorial system did not allow for any input from the DIs who had served the PSIS well, all pressure for changed procedures being motivated both politically and from militant teacher unions. No information of the kind found by this research was sought by political or senior system administrators at the time of the inspectorial system’s disbandment. This thesis has revealed the diverse extra-curricular duties, in addition to those mandated, undertaken by the DIs which contributed to continual educational improvement in the schools. The clear message from all the interviews was that educating children was the main focus of their role. To achieve this, teacher professionalism, teacher performance and quality of curriculum were the main priorities which automatically brought into focus improved facilities, equality of opportunities and an overall high educational standard of education. Their message to future educationalists was that: ‘the children of today are the leaders of tomorrow’; therefore the Inspectors’ perception of their duty was to maximize the educational opportunities of children through improved schools’ organizational procedures and improved pedagogical practices of their teachers. Thus pupils were to be given the best opportunity during school life by providing them with enhanced basic learning skills and equipping them with the higher order skills required to perform to the best of their ability later in life.

**What did the three stories tell us?**

The oral histories of the three DI’s were selected for their diversity, the individuality of their educational journeys, and the particular achievements in their inspectorial role which gave them status in their professional lives. Each one had a message to relate to future educationalists: ‘If you have a goal and are prepared to work hard, are dedicated and genuine in your intentions then no matter what your background or educational training anything is possible’.

Meyers was born into a family where family tradition played a prominent role in his future career. His silent pathway was planned from birth and his personal and family expectations were never questioned. Meyers as a student knew that if he was to achieve his family goals, his work ethic had to be one of dedication and perfection. These attributes were
reflected in his role as DI and surfaced in the concepts of inspectorate values and inspectorate culture being prominent and developed by example.

Reeves, on the other hand was unsure what he wanted in life. His first priority was to be a teacher, but the pathway he took through secondary schooling did not give him the qualifications he required to enter a Teachers’ College. He was prepared to follow other careers but continually returned to teaching. His determination and persistence to achieve drove him to undertake extra study, which finally rewarded him by his being appointed to the DI position he really enjoyed. His inspectorate reflected his personal struggles by understanding the problems that others faced and his compassion in very difficult situations. It incorporated a different set of values and formed an inspectorate culture that was unique because of his leadership style.

Moyle, an excellent student from a working class background was successful in achieving his ambitions by his ability to perform at an extremely high level academically. His personality and casual but knowledgeable style created a relaxed atmosphere that teachers and principals could relate to. As an Inspector he was always ready to challenge teachers and principals in a manner that was encouraging to them. His leadership style and creative inspectorate initiatives developed team co-operation where the ownership of educational ideas’ ultimately belonged to everyone. The three concepts isolated by this study were exemplified in his story. He believed anonymous mentors to be behind his unsought, meteoric advancement.

These three stories have uncovered important issues supportive of the themes which led to the concepts identified after data analysis in this study – inspectorate values; inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education. Though they are subsumed by the above concepts the practical attributes below could be considered when positions of authority are being reviewed: irrelevance of social status; clarity of goals; self-determination to achieve; evident leadership potential, thirst for knowledge, creative of thought, and appropriateness of personality.

The three Inspectors’ potted life histories related how each arrived at his position; how he operated; and what he contributed to his inspectorate and the PSIS. The narratives clearly illustrated that DIs were responsible for much more than their role as educational administrators indicated: they showed elements of educational leadership, becoming judges, mentors, mediators, educational advisors, adjudicators, public figures and role models for principals, teachers and communities to emulate.
Significance as Educational History

As documented in this thesis, the background of the organizational background of the Inspector originated from the factory floor and evolved as part of the education system throughout the States of Australia. It was from the Frank Tate era in the early 20th century that the Inspectors’ position was developed as the fore runner of the Inspector’s role as exemplified during the time of this research. An integral part of the Victorian PSIS the DI role carried the authority to assess and report on the administration, facilities, teaching staff and academic standards of the schools; but also the Inspectors’ role, as a “strict” regulatory requirement, was as the representative of the Department of Education, who was viewed to be superior because of his qualifications, demonstrated competence, pedagogical knowledge and breadth of experience. The Inspector’s school visit became one of carrying out mandated tasks and conforming to Regulation III. The research cohort ranged in ages which individually overlapped during the periods of this study, and which saw the range of role performance from strictly as mandated to that in which the incumbent “free-lanced” not knowing that a regulation governing the Inspector’s responsibilities existed. Thus it was important from an historical point of view that the wide-ranging interpretations of the variously evolving roles of these DIs be recorded, verified and evaluated before the knowledge was lost forever.

The information presented in this thesis shows how the Inspectors’ position changed from the authority figure to the friendly assessor, facilitator, a cross fertilizer of pedagogical innovations, one less likely to claim knowledge of all the educational answers, one who acted sincerely as “we are in this together”, an educational administrator who took on a practical educational leadership role as distinct from community acknowledgement of being the District’s educational leader by dint of being appointed as such by the system.

The individual Inspector’s interpretation of the statutory requirements influenced and confirmed the research findings of three underpinning concepts and their practical themes: inspectorate values, inspectorate culture and inspectorate in-service education. These three concepts theoretically buttress not only the educational life of the latter day DIs researched here. These concepts, by thinking further retrospectively, underpinned the work of all DIs, and other educational leaders. As each of the research cohort expressed the perceptions and memories of their role it became obvious that the time was right for change. The thinking of educational administrators at Head Quarters, and the attitudes of the Inspectors wanted more
realistic freedom to approach their roles in a more cohesive manner. Thus the view was projected that principals were “equals” most of whom were well qualified and widely read and well prepared to accept greater administrative leadership of their schools.

The Inspectors were moving in the direction of educational leadership as distinct from being educational administrators, becoming, mentors, initiators, advisors and a source of information rather than the ‘dreaded Inspector’. They encouraged principals to take responsibility for their schools and build upon the hitherto unknown basic concepts extruded as being fundamental to inspectorate educational administration, now metamorphosing from their former roots to impinge on the principals of schools who, as microcosms of the former Inspectors, embrace the fundamental concepts underpinning their school administration to be interpreted as principal values, principal culture and principal in-service education.

The research cohort identified the role of the Inspector as having changed over the period being researched from the strictly regulatory school visitor who performed according to the regulations and assessed according to a set of stringent rules, to the Inspector who valued the experiences and expertise of the principals and teachers operating in the district schools. Therefore, developing a collegiate workforce who shared and managed new initiatives to achieve the common goal for all students was paramount: better education for all children.

These Inspectors were all motivated by the positive influence they could have on teachers – particularly the inexperienced to create a better learning environment and improved educational standards for all pupils.

**Limitations**

The events of this research were redolent of an era which closed almost thirty years ago; therefore the availability of living participants aged between 72 and 85 who had the capacity, and the willingness to be interviewed limited the scope of the primary information sources. Taking into account the age of the retired Inspectors and the fact that many had moved interstate, the desired balance of male/female, country, country-metropolitan, and metropolitan participants was limited; however this was satisfactorily addressed overall.
The interviews were conducted very early in the research program to address the possible constraints of the participants being aged. Unfortunately one Inspector passed away during the period of this research.

The structure of this thesis narrowed the range of data that could be documented. The possibility of a book or publication, or the thesis being archived in the Government Archives to really honour the memories of the research cohort and their contribution to primary education in Victoria would be historically valuable.

**Implications**

This study has unearthed the three essential concepts which have underpinned the educational administration and leadership of a cohort of 12 vastly experienced Inspectors of Schools: inspectorate values; inspectorate culture; and inspectorate in-service education. It is believed these three concepts to be equally relevant at the various levels of all forms of educational administration. Of special interest to this study has been the slow elevation of some DIs to higher order responsibilities and the simultaneous delegation of increased areas of administrative responsibility to the principals of schools. The latter personnel have become independent educational administrators, under the pervasive umbrella of the Ministry of Education, responsible in their own right for school philosophy, administration of the centrally prescribed curriculum, educational standards in all its aspects, teacher assessment and so on. The three concepts basic to educational administrators of the inspectorial system analysed from the data of this investigation have herein been recognized as equally pertinent to the enhanced responsibilities of school principals. The outcomes of this study endorse the importance of the principals’ heightened awareness of school administration being better informed by these concepts and their themes which indeed underpin the administrative functions of all schools’ leadership.

The second implication is that one and two teacher rural schools, potentially the most seriously disadvantaged by the inspectorates demise, be attached to local senior principals for the inculcation of the fundamental administrative and pedagogical concepts and themes isolated by this study, and that these principals monitor the resulting practice of these inexperienced teachers.

A final implication is that the findings of this study be transmitted to and heeded by those who may be contemplating some form of future school and teacher assessment.
Conclusion

Education Departments throughout the world struggle to identify the perfect assessment tools for schools. This research cohort has identified through its memories and perceptions three basic concepts that, if given the flesh of practice by principals, will likewise illuminate their school leadership, and encourage outstanding teaching performances, positive classroom environments and a dedication to the teaching profession that is unquestionable.

All educationalists of the future could incorporate many facets of the Inspectors role which are their legacy for future planning for educational improvement. Respondent Holloway summed up succinctly an answer to my principal research question:

The best teachers and principals always knew that there was a necessary control of the system, and that it had to be exercised. The DI fulfilled that position. I enjoyed my time as a DI and believe I implemented new initiatives, was a confidant and mentor to personnel. This was a satisfying, rewarding career.

My gratitude is extended to the Inspectors who gave of their time and knowledge to ensure that their contributions to education be passed on to future generations.
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Appendix 1

Approval letter from the Ethics Committee

25 November 2009

Ms Norma Gray
Unit 902 The Duporth Riverside
6 Wharf Street
Maroochydore Qld 4558

Dr Bill Allen
Faculty of Science, Health and Education

Dear Norma and Bill

Expedited ethics approval for research project: A History of the Victorian Education Department’s Inspectorial System from the 1950’s to the 1980’s (S/09/232)

This letter is to confirm that on 3 November 2009, following review of the application for ethics approval of the research project, A History of the Victorian Education Department’s Inspectorial System from the 1950’s to the 1980’s (S/09/232), the Chairperson of the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of the Sunshine Coast granted expedited ethics approval for the project, subject to certain specific conditions.

The Human Research Ethics Committee reviewed the Chairperson’s grant of approval and the conditions of approval at its meeting on 10 November and ratified the approval.

The period of ethics approval is from 3 November 2009 to 7 September 2013. Could you please note that the ethics approval number for the project is HREC: S/09/232.

Following receipt of a modified NEAF and a modified Research Project Information Sheet, the specific conditions of approval have all now been met.

The standard conditions of approval for this project are that you:

1. conduct the research project strictly in accordance with the research proposal submitted and granted ethics approval, including any amendments required to be made to the proposal by the Human Research Ethics Committee (except as subsequently amended and approved by the Committee or approved by delegated authority exercised by the Chairperson or a Sub-committee)
2. inform the Human Research Ethics Committee immediately of anything which may warrant review of ethics approval of the research project, including: serious or unexpected adverse effects on participants; proposed changes in the protocol; unforeseen events that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project; and a written report of any adverse occurrence or unforeseen event that might affect the continued ethical acceptability of the research project must be submitted to the Chairperson of the Human Research Ethics Committee by no later than the next working day after recognition of an adverse occurrence/event.

3. provide the Committee with a written Annual Report on the research project by 3 November 2010, 3 November 2011, 3 November 2012 and on completion of the project on 7 September 2013 using the proforma "Annual Report on Approved Research Project Involving Humans".

4. If the research project is discontinued, advise the Committee in writing within 24 hours.

5. make no change to the project as approved in its entirety by the Committee, including any wording in any document approved as part of the project, without prior written approval of the Committee for any change.

6. comply with each and all of the above conditions of approval and any additional conditions or any modification of conditions which may be made subsequently by the Human Research Ethics Committee.

You are advised that failure to comply with the conditions of approval and the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans may result in withdrawal of approval for the project. You are required to advise the Committee in writing within 24 hours if this project does not proceed for any reason.

Should you require an extension of ethics approval, please submit a written request for this purpose using the proforma 'Annual Report on Approved Research Project Involving Humans'. An Annual Report on this activity will be due by no later than 3 November 2010.

An electronic version of 'Annual Report on Approved Research Project Involving Humans' may be accessed on the University of the Sunshine Coast portal at: Research and Research Training>Research Ethics> Human Research Ethics>Forms>Annual Report Form.

If you have any queries in relation to this ethics approval or if you require further information please contact the Research Ethics Officer by email at humanethics@usc.edu.au or by telephone on +61 7 5459 4574.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Don Macnachrie
Director, Teaching and Research Services
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Invitation letter to the participants

Unit 902/6 Wharf Street
Maroochydore
Queensland 4558
April 6th 2010

Mr. Ewart Anderson

Dear Sir,

My name is Norma Gray and at one time I was a teacher and principal in Victoria. Now I am a full time student at the University of the Sunshine Coast (USC), Queensland, Australia. I am carrying out a Research Project as the thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The Research Project is titled: "A History of the Inspectorial System in State Primary Schools of Victoria from 1950's to 1980's". I want to try and identify how the Inspectorial System, through its functions and strategies, enhanced and/or hindered the educational effectiveness of the schools and how it contributed to the historical change that occurred. I was employed as a teacher and principal during this period of time and appreciated the assessments and personal feedback that was offered. It was through this Inspectorial System that I became a Principal at Knox Park Primary School and then District Liaison Principal in the Llydale District.

I hope I will be able to interview Director Generals, Regional Directors and District Inspectors from this era and record their perceptions and memories as a primary source of information. This valuable contribution to history can only be achieved if data collected and analysed from these participants are recorded before the information is lost forever.

Involvement in this Research Project is voluntary and you are at liberty to withdraw at anytime, however, you will be asked to sign a consent form provided by the researcher before you participate in the project. The interviews will take place between February and July 2010 at a time and location convenient to you and will be conducted by myself. These semi-structured interviews (approximately 1 hour) will be based upon open-ended questions that will allow you to freely express your retrospective perceptions and engage in dialogue about professional experiences and report events and activities related to years of service in the role. I will send you, prior to the interview, a list of questions to assist with your preparation. A typed transcript of the interview can be sent to you on request. At all times your privacy will be protected and anonymity and confidentiality will be maintained before, during and after the research project. If you have any further questions, feel free to contact me on (07) 5443 7825 or 0417038813 or via email: norma.gray@bigpond.com

My ethics approval number for this project is: HREC: S/08/232.

If you have any concerns or questions about the research project or its conduct, you can ask Dr Bill Allen, my principal supervisor on (07) 5430 1202 or via email: ballen@usc.edu.au or if you prefer an independent person, contact the Chairperson of the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of the Sunshine Coast (cf. the Research Ethics Officer, Teacher and Research Services, University of the Sunshine Coast, Maroochydore DC4558, telephone (07) 5459 4574, facsimile (07) 5450 1177, email humaneihcs@usc.edu.au

Your assistance in this project is appreciated.

Norma Gray.

[Signature]
Appendix 3

Acceptance to participate

Dear

I have had several replies to my initial letter that I sent to Peter Meyer. He forwarded it to Jim Sonnemann who distributed it to some retired DI’s. Your name has been mentioned as a possible participant, so I am wondering if you would be interested in assisting me with my research project. I strongly believe that information relating to your personal perceptions of the role will enable my research to add a valuable perspective to the history of Inspection in Victoria.

I am sure that if you agree to be interviewed it will be a very pleasant and valuable experience. I will travel to the venue of your choice and arrange a date convenient to you. I look forward to having further communication to finalize these arrangements.

Regards Norma Gray

______________________________________________________________

Please sign and return the expression of interest form below.

If accepted, I will contact you to arrange an interview time and venue.

Thank you for your co-operation in assisting me with my research project.

☐ I accept your offer to participate

☐ I DO NOT accept your offer to participate

Signature:

P.S. Please indicate where you would prefer your interview to take place. I am offering a home visit or a venue in the CDB of Melbourne to the Victorian participants.
Appendix 4

Letter for appointment for interview

Unit 902/ The Duporth Riverside
Wharf Street
Maroochydore
Queensland 4558

Dear

    Thank you for agreeing to participate in my doctoral research project. I am now forwarding the information about the venue, date and time of your interview as discussed during our telephone conversation.

Venue: Unit 705
233 Collins Street
Melbourne

Date: Thursday 27th May

Time: 1.00pm

    I am honoured to be given this opportunity to record your perceptions of the role of the District Inspector. I believe this will add another dimension to the already published records of this important era of the Victorian Education Department.
I can be contacted on 0417038813 at any time and look forward to this pleasurable and informative experience.

Yours sincerely,

Norma Gray

P.S. I have also attached some suggested questions for you to reflect upon. However, I expect the interview to flow according to the participants views and should be reasonably flexible to enable me to collect as much relevant information as I can.
## Appendix 5

### Interview schedule

Interviews held at: Unit 705/233 Collins Street, Melbourne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friday 21.05.2010</th>
<th>Saturday 22.05.2010</th>
<th>Sunday 23.05.2010</th>
<th>Monday 24.05.2010</th>
<th>Tuesday 25.05.2010</th>
<th>Wednesday 26.05.2010</th>
<th>Thursday 27.05.2010</th>
<th>Friday 28.05.2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrive Melbourne</td>
<td>Preparation Day</td>
<td>9.00am Ewart Anderson (Tape 1)</td>
<td>9.00am Peter Meyer (Tape 2)</td>
<td>9.00am Don Reeves (Tape 8)</td>
<td>Leave Melbourne 8.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am David Holloway (Tape 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Hobbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tape 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tape 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954 @ home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tape 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tape 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Francioni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tape 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview with Colin Moyle conducted at his daughters’ home at Chermside, Queensland. 12th July 2010 (Tape 11)

Interview with Ron Ikin conducted at the Macquarie University, Sydney, New South Wales. 28th July 2010 (Tape 12)
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Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

Research Project Title: "A History of the Inspectorial System in State Primary Schools of Victoria from 1970's to 1980's".
Ethics Approval Number: HREC: S/09/232

Consent to participate in research:

I understand that:

- Participation is voluntary. I can withdraw from the study at any time and I do not have to give any reasons for withdrawing;
- If I do choose to withdraw from the research study at any time, information received from me or pertaining to me that was obtained prior to my withdrawal may be used only with my written permission;
- I will not be penalised or treated less favourably if I do withdraw from the study;
- I understand that I will be provided (on request) with a typed copy of my interview for my approval;
- I understand that all information obtained from me or pertaining to me will be kept strictly confidential to the researcher and supervisor and that there will be no means of identifying me personally as a research participant in any publication, presentation or other means arising from the research;
- I will create a code name to protect my privacy, anonymity and confidentiality.

I understand the contents of this research project from the information presented and the implications of this Consent to Participate in Research form. I agree to participate in the Victorian Education’s Primary School Inspectorial System during the 1970’s to the 1980’s research project and give my consent freely. I realise that I can withdraw from the project at any time and that I do not have to give any reasons for withdrawing. Any questions I had about this research project and my participation in it have been answered to my satisfaction.

Participant  _______________  Date ____________
Researcher   _______________  Date ____________
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Suggested questions for interviews

Interview Guidelines

Interviewer:                                                                                                       Interviewee
Code:                                                                                                                   Date of
Interview:

Introduction:


I want to identify aspects indicating how the Inspectorial System through its functions and strategies, enhanced and/or hindered educational effectiveness of schools and how it contributed to the historical changes that occurred.

I will be interviewing inspectors from this era and recording their perceptions and memories as a primary source of information. This valuable contribution to history can only be achieved if data collected and analysed from these participants are recorded. The significance of this research will be that the perceptions of District Inspectors will be communicated through direct personal conversation with those who functioned according to the job requirement during this era, therefore contributing historical knowledge to current and future reforms in education.

Focus on four areas:

1. Recollections of being a DI in the 1960 - 1983 when thinking about the impact official inspections had on schools in their district.

2. Recollections of official duties/self-initiated programs in your district.

3. Recollections of their responsibilities, relations with teachers, the influence on teaching performances, and the significant impact they had on teacher’s careers.

4. Opinions on the nature of their work in relation to events, issues and role changes in line with political, social and economic change.
Need to confirm some preliminary details

University/teacher training

Some details on teaching career

Career in Ministry/Department

Significant community impact(s) - if any

Awards, e.g., travelling scholarships, teacher exchange

Related extra – curricular, e.g. Scout/Cub Master

1. Memories of your career history in the (60’s – 80’s)

- What were your perceptions of the role of the DI (pre-appointment, initial, mature age)?

- Were you overwhelmed by the significance and power that this role involved and how did you perceive this responsibility? How did you exercise it?

- How many years were you a DI and how did you perceive your career in the future?

- What perceptions did you have about the impact “official” inspections had on schools, principals and the community in your district?

2. Recollections of official duties/ self-initiated programs in your district

- Were you completely cognizant of your new role description?

- Was your job description realistic?

- What priorities did you allocate to the different aspects of the DI role?

- Did your colleagues/Inspectors that you knew interpret their roles in similar ways? Can you remember any disagreements between Inspectors on organizational matters; if so, exemplify with some salient or known differences?

- How creative were you allowed to be in the way you organized the expected work load and any new initiatives?

- Did you implement any new initiatives? What were they? Were they accepted? Successful? Become embedded?
3. Recollections of their responsibilities to teachers

- What perceptions did you have about the value and significance of the inspections of teachers?
- How did you go about assessing your teachers? Were assessments based on comparisons/benchmarks or purely individual? Did these assessments create any consequent changes in the teacher’s mode of pedagogy?
- The assessment had a significant impact on the teacher’s career. Did you have difficulty making “Private Reports” accordingly?
- Do you have any other issues you would like to discuss, e.g., relationships with other Divisions’ Inspectors/Principals?

4. Opinions on the nature of their work in relation to events, issues and changes in line with political, social and economic changes?

- As a DI can you describe what this role meant to you?
- Did you see significant change during your term as a DI?
- Was the role rewarding personally?
- What issues did you have with this role as it was performed in the 70’s and 80’s?
- What changes (if any) would you have recommended during your era in the role?

Conclusion / Review

Assessment of teachers forty to fifty years ago was very different from that of today. Since the late 80’s information published on assessment procedures indicate self-evaluation for performance enhancement is the current practice. Do you perceive this to be a positive/negative move towards the outcomes of more effective pedagogy?

What would your recommendations be if you were contributing knowledge to assessment of the teaching profession in the current and future reforms of education?

An opportunity to discuss any other points of view, observation, comments was allowed for at the end of the session.
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Sample memos and coding of transcripts

*When you eventually got there what were your perceptions of it then?*

Full of excitement and motivation and seeing the directors and getting about my task as quick as I could. I worked from home and had a secretary until I got an office in the district.

*So in your nature - age looking back at it, how do you perceive it?*

I saw it as a job well worth doing. I didn't mess up at all, I was the leader of the principals, I did assess well and seemed to blossom for the benefit of the children. I changed a lot of schools. You would ask them to do something and off they went. It was an invigorating time. It was exciting work.

*Were you overwhelmed by the significance and power that this role involved and how did you perceive this responsibility? How did you exercise it?*

Overwhelmed with the workload. I worked every night. I never stopped all weekend and everyday in the schools. I constantly would be writing and preparing at home. Never stopped.

*Did you see power in the role?*

Well, I don't know Norma; it was like being a principal in a school. You were the principal of a district. I did relate well to all the principals in the district and tried to achieve all directives that the director set me. Got all my reports in on time, did the supplementary grants program till I nearly went crazy.

*How many years were you a DI and how did you perceive your career in the future?*

Well I was appointed when I was 39 and I was there till the finish at 59. Twenty years. I was overseas when the big action happened. They changed the regions in Greece to the letters of the alphabet. The department wanted someone to go there so Dawn and I looked at the schools together.

*While you were a teacher you saw your goal as a DI. As a DI did you have another goal or was that where you wanted to be.*
Yes, I was very happy to be a DI, I suppose the only other thing would be to be the director. I did not want any regional responsibility. Our primary director would not let us respond to the regional director we had to report direct to him. When I went to Ferntree Gully I was still in a district, we just changed offices.

Were you completely cognizant of your new role prescription?

Totally aware of the job because there had been people in my family in the administration role before. My grandfather was James Me Rae the director in the early 20th century and I still sit on his office chair in my study. I knew it was a very demanding job.

Was the job prescription realistic?

It displayed the core requirements but it did not tell you the depths that you sometimes had to go, go to court, so dreadful things happened when I was a young man. A smash at a bus stop and I had to hold an investigation.

You were not aware of the hidden side of the job.

My mother always said, (and she was alive for quite a long time after I was appointed) "You’ll get used to it". I suppose you used past experience to get you through it. Conditioned to it. Accepting what the role was

What priorities did you allocate to the different aspects of the job?

The priorities were given according to the aspects of the job. The assessment function was enormous in the west. I took over five districts, people had been assessed by five inspectors in the past and now they were all coming in to be assessed by me. I had to do four assessments a day except Wednesdays they were for meetings and other business. The assessment went till November and even longer if teachers had been away. Building program was enormous you had to keep tab on the population growth in the west. I had meetings with vice-principals one from each class one school to count the houses, meetings with the council to collect their files on the population growth to establish the enrolments for the following year. Portables - caused arguments between schools because enrolments had increased in the holidays.
Priorities: assessment; welfare of the children; welfare of the teachers; and accommodation was extremely important.

Did your colleagues /Inspectors interpret their roles in similar ways?

The job prescriptions were there, the districts would vary on the demands that were there. It depended on the districts. Some country districts only had ten inspections for the year but they justified this by the quality of the work and the fact that they had to travel two or three hundred miles a day.

Because of the variance in the districts there was a difference in the way the role was performed.

Yes, they had a formula for work load and they tried to change districts every four years but it could never be done due to the low populations in the country then the districts would get bigger and they would bring in the new metropolitan ones. They were supposed to have legally fifty inspectors and four relieving ones. They were the constraints in running the whole system.

Can you remember any disagreements or arguments that came out of this formula?

There would be jovial remarks made about the country inspectors as they thought they should take on more of the system jobs. They said, "they were not near the central office to help!"

How creative were you allowed to be in the way you organized the expected work load and any new initiatives?

You had to complete all requests for assessments. You could do it the way you wanted as long as it was done on time. To solve all problems in the district and not let any troubles come up to the head office, it was impossible. So I would sit down with my secretary and we would work it out on the basis of four teachers a day and have meetings on Wednesdays. This varied because the teachers may be sick and you would have to go back and see them. This still seemed to be a good formula. I worked in a very orderly fashion. Yes, I was very organized. That was one of the job prescriptions to be able to display organizational ability. The load was enormous so you had to be organized.
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Outcome levels from data analysis: Inspectorate Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 Analysis</th>
<th>Stage 2 Analysis</th>
<th>Stage 3 Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities derived from transcripts and documents examined</td>
<td>Emerging themes</td>
<td>Emerged theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational and Professional Issues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Power exerted when necessary.</td>
<td>• <strong>Inspection System</strong> requires confidence in its processes and outcomes</td>
<td>• <strong>Inspectorate Values</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District variances: each DI made his own way; for some innovation went into the too hard basket.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any admonitions came from head office NOT colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Net- working between stakeholders - Education Department, inspectors, principals and teachers to address educational issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policies were developed in isolation - this affected inspectors, principals and teachers when it came to implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Best appraisal system decided and then maintained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inspectors’ integrity and work ethics.</td>
<td>• <strong>Knowledge and skills</strong> must be proactively acquired for DIs to perform their responsibilities with genuine teacher acceptance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inspectors fully versed in the acquisitions of skills and knowledge to be catalyst to help teachers and principals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inspectors must be familiar with potential departmental changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inspectors contribute indirectly to children’s education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sense of responsibility, informed common sense consciousness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inspectors provide good role model leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality and naïve enthusiasm to help and support inexperienced and struggling teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attributes diverse and positive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inspectors challenging teachers with ideas to extend their thinking. Inspectors as bringers of professional release to teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inspectors qualifications and depth of experience and training..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Head office (Melbourne) two weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Inspectors’ roles are dependent on their integrity and personality.
• Clarity of roles.
• DIs roles are important.
• Inspectorial system ensures schools operate effectively.
• Documents relating to DI’s role involving educational and professional issues taken seriously.
• DIs ensure good relationships are maintained – mutual trust.
• DIs ensure that teachers ethical values are maintained.
• Prime Inspector responsibility: to assist teachers and ultimately pupils.
• Acknowledgements by principals and teachers of the DIs school reports.
• Official Education Department representative.
• Relationships with Curriculum and Research Branch (C&R) to assist in introducing new curricula.
• Staff Inspector’s role (a small cabal of senior DIs were denoted as Staff Inspectors and visited with the DI on his planned ‘round’ for that week, advising and ensuring general statewide inspectorial standards were fairly even.

• Inspectors work load – teacher ratio, inspectorate geography and school distribution.
• Commitment by inspectors to visit schools both officially and unofficially.
• Planning and organization by an Inspector to fulfil responsibilities.
• Inspectors being resourceful using innovative means to accomplish their operational plans when logistics and support are unavailable.
• Advanced notice to schools of official visits.
• Annual inspections, private reports have been an imperative, but of a lesser demand following new policy requiring a biennial school report and private report on demand.
• The weekly diary to Head Office but

| training (country/metropolitan) with experienced DI. | experience, suitable personal qualities, a willingness to be introspective and self-critical and to pursue development of self (both official and unofficial) |
| Inspector’s roles are dependent on their integrity, personality and use at times of supposed power. Their modus operandi can be stimulating, valued, supportive and challenging |
| Individual planning and organization by Inspectors to perform effectively(both formally and informally) without clerical or physical resources |
• Ensuring forward planning was not restrictive.
  • Senior principals challenged to compose practical statements on planning and school based evaluation resulting in varied philosophies of education—some excellent, some platitudes.
  • Visiting teachers and students informally promotes DI as human but requires a selection appointment compatible with the capacity of gaining mutual trust!
  • Supervision of Catholic Schools every two years helped to maintain a compatibility of educational standards.
  • DI's presence in a school, officially or unofficially should be minimally disruptive.
  • DI sensitivity to the impact of the multi-faceted changes on the lives of teachers in both rural and metropolitan schools.
  • Negative reports were person to person, not conveyed to headquarters under the impossible pain of the DI being responsible for the teacher’s improvement.
  • Regular visits to rural schools are difficult due to constraints and logistical problems.
  • Inspectors respect for principals is encouraged through protocols and the recognition that many of these people are excellent practitioners.
  • Principals are often reluctant to show the Inspector their management and supervision processes and outcomes because of previous negative experiences.
  • Teachers can benefit from the DI being a stimulus who suggests different but relevant pedagogical ideas from DIs visits.
  • DI meets and works with teachers to encourage them.
  • DI supports teachers of extraordinary unrecognized talent.
  • New DI (younger) trepidation of principals and staff acceptance.

• School visits are a commitment by inspectors to be a catalyst bringing ideas which help teachers and ultimately improve children’s education.

• Resource allocation both to schools, particularly small rural schools and Inspectors.

• Other Influences such
- Lack of DI’s documentation in schools, DI’s office and at Head Office relating to the operation of the inspectorial system.
- Provision of documents by the DI on inspectorate values and Inspector’s operational obligations.
- Educational reform and the reformed curriculum challenge the inspector when interpreting these to teachers.
- Authorities undermining the roles of the DIs, e.g. unions and political movements, and Teacher’s College staff result in adverse attitudes towards inspectors.
- Lack of support and coordination of the various educational sectors by authorities affects Inspector’s work.

| as politics and unions, educational teaching divisions and Teacher’s Colleges |
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### Outcome levels from data analysis: Inspectorate Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 Analysis</th>
<th>Stage 2 Analysis</th>
<th>Stage 3 Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities derived from transcripts and documents examined</strong></td>
<td><strong>Emerging themes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Emerged theme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inspectorate Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supervision for quality control and assurance through monitoring and advising teachers on teaching standards, pupil achievement, curriculum requirements and organized records.</td>
<td>• Monitoring teaching standards and curriculum requirements.</td>
<td>• Inspectorate Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Check work programs, work books, the roll and lesson plans.</td>
<td>• Teacher appraisal, assessment and evaluation carried out by Inspector.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appraise and evaluate teachers and principals performances for promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitor and write reports on teachers, principals and school performances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Observe teachers lessons suggesting improvements. Principals to follow up Inspectors suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure support exists from parents and community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess principals as curriculum leaders and forward thinkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supervise for accountability to ensure resources are used for children’s education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use management and organizational skills to carry out DIs responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality control and assurances achieved by Inspectors through document checklists, administrative checklists, reports and training programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure administrative requirements are done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure school based supervision is effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure school councils carry out their responsibilities and occasionally meet representatives or attend school council meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide information to allow principals to abide by policies in managing schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Receive and compile reports about the school for authorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DI confidant and colleague.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review and deal with teacher and student discipline as necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Liaison with principal on matters related to teacher and student discipline.
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### Inspectorate In-service Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 Analysis</th>
<th>Stage 2 Analysis</th>
<th>Stage 3 Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities derived from transcripts and documents examined</strong></td>
<td><strong>Emerging themes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Emerged theme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inspectors review the area of teacher professionalism and assist teachers professionally and personally.</td>
<td>• Inspectors assist principals and teachers in their professional development</td>
<td>• Inspectorate In-Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organize in-service sessions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct involvement with teachers and principals professional development through in-service programs, conferences, meetings and workshops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduction of initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creative challenges supported and encouraged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use relevant documents including Teaching Service and the Education Acts to in-service teachers and principals on issues they are unaware of.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service and the Education Acts to in-service teachers and principals on issues about which they are unaware.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discuss with principals the issues related to supervision of teachers and provide information and assistance where appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct meetings with teachers and discuss common issues as observed as well as new development in the education system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide good leadership to teachers and principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual in-service Principals Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning, organizing and supervising professional development to advise teachers on teaching standards, curriculum requirements and the recording of results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strengthen teachers and principals roles by ensuring the confidence in the supervision and curriculum implementation including teaching methods, knowledge and competence so that teachers value children’s education highly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduction of a second language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Regulation III: Inspection and Examination of Primary Schools

Following the end of the war in 1945, and the establishment of the Teachers Tribunal in 1946, the conditions of school examinations and inspections were revised and published in 1950, and remained the legal basis of the inspection visit to schools for nearly 40 years.

Regulation III – Inspection and Examination of Primary Schools.

1. (a) The head teacher shall examine his school fully either at the end of each half-year or at the end of each school term, and shall record in the Examination Register the results in each subject in each grade, and shall write a report therein in the space provided.

(b) The examination papers of the pupils, a copy of the questions, and the results and reports shall be kept in the school ... for twelve months or for such further period as the inspector may direct and shall be closely scrutinised by the district inspector at his next visit ...

2. (a) An inspector shall pay an annual visit and as many additional visits as may be necessary to each school in his district and shall at an early as possible after each visit furnish an official report ...

(b) ... the inspector shall, among other things –

(i) inspect all official records and accounts connected with the school and

(ii) investigate thoroughly the organization of the school, the classification of the pupils, the work programs, the methods and character of the instruction, the discipline and tone of the school, the aptitude and working habits of the pupils, and the place that the school fills in the community.

(c) The work programs ... 

(i) shall show in detail the amount, the order of development, and the nature of the work presented, and

(ii) shall be retained in the school and made available for inspection.

3. In gauging the progress of pupils, the inspector shall –

(a) attach due importance to the examinations conducted by the head teacher...

(b) take into consideration the course of study followed by pupils up to the time of his visit ...

(c) take such measures as he deems necessary and desirable to enable him to estimate the efficiency of the instruction.

4. In respect of any subject or subjects, the inspector may assign in the Examination Register a numerical value or its equivalent ...

5. When assessing the value of the work of any teacher, the inspector shall take into account any special circumstances affecting the work of the school, including the length of time the teacher has been in charge of the school, of the grade, of the group of subjects, and shall make such allowances in respect thereof as he may consider necessary.
6. (a) In considering the organization of a school and particularly of the larger schools, the inspector shall take into account—

(i) the distribution of staff,
(ii) the amount of actual teaching done by the head teacher,
(iii) the allotment of duties to assistant teachers,
(iv) the size of classes,
(v) the methods of grading pupils according to their attainments and mental development,
(vi) the measures adopted to prevent or remedy retardation of pupils,
(vii) the means for dealing with backward pupils,
(viii) the training and the work of student teachers,
(ix) the help and training given to weak teachers, and
(x) generally, the arrangements of the head teacher for securing concerted and progressive efforts throughout the school.

(b) The inspector shall ... give consideration, to the circumstances of each school, to the classrooms and school environment and to the acquisition by the pupils of habits of willing co-operation, self-activity, regularity, punctuality, neatness, and cleanliness.

General Instructions. Inspectors' Reports on Primary Schools, add these provisions:

89. Immediately after the inspection of the school the head teacher should make a copy of the report as entered in the Inspector's Report Book, should enter, in section 8 of the Form H or H2, the full name, the classification, and the record number of each member of the staff, and should forward the form thus completed to the inspector concerned.

90. If the teacher desires to communicate with the Department on the subject of the inspector’s report mentioned above, he should attach his communication to the copy of the report forwarded to the inspector.

91. If an inspector considers that a teacher should give an explanation of shortcomings pointed out in the report, he should instruct the teacher to forward to him such explanation attached to the copy of the report mentioned above.

The format of the inspector's visit continued much as it had done for a hundred years. Sometimes notice of the visit was given, sometimes not. Too many factors made notice difficult, if not impossible.
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Letter to the three Inspectors requesting permission to write up their career stories

Unit 902,
6 Wharf Street,
Maroochydore,
Queensland 4558
20th September 2011

Dear Peter,

Thank you for accepting my request to tell your story. I believe these three stories will value add to my thesis, and include an oral history section. I am sending a draft of the information that I gained from your interview. Please check that the information is correct.

Maybe there are other areas that you would like me to include such as: incidences that occurred while inspecting schools (something that a principal or child said to you) this would make the story a little more personnel and interesting.

I am not familiar with some of your new initiatives so you may wish to enlarge the profile of these topics.

I do not want to give you extra work, but I do want to do justice to your life’s story by adding any important events that have occurred during your teaching career and information that you are prepared to share with future generations.

Once I receive this information and document it, you will be sent a copy of the draft for approval. I am really excited that Professor Joanne Scott (historian) has encouraged me to include these oral histories. She believes the information is too valuable to be lost.

If you require any further information I can be contacted on 07 5443 7825 or 0417038813 to return your call.

E-mail: norma.gray@bigpond.com

Yours Faithfully,

Norma Gray
Appendix 14

1. Letter for approval to use names

2. Letter to the wife of the deceased participant

3. Replies for approval to use name

1. Unit 902 The Duporth Riverside
   Maroochydore

6 Wharf Street
Queensland 4558

26th March 2012

Dear

It is almost two years since I interviewed you for my research project and I am now at the final stage of completing my thesis. I have found the whole process most enjoyable, pleasurable and fascinating to read the perceptions and memories you hold of your time as a District Inspector. I have two supervisors Dr Bill Allen, and Professor Joanne Scott (an Historian).

As the thesis has progressed both Bill and Joanne have enjoyed your stories and believe that to use your coded ID instead of your name would be an injustice. To honour your work by including this personal touch would complete the thesis and make it a valuable historical document.

Any changes must be submitted to the ethics committee for approval therefore I need your written permission to implement this change. You have the right to refuse.

Please contact me on 07544378250 or email norma.gray@bigpond.com if you have any concerns.

Yours sincerely,

___________________________________________________________________________

PLEASE FILL IN AND RETURN IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED

I GIVE my permission to use my name instead of my coded ID

I DO NOT give my permission to use my name

Signature
Dear Kerrie,

Thank you for returning my phone call last night. I was saddened to hear of your loss and will be giving special acknowledgement to Ron’s contribution in my thesis. When I started my thesis the fear was that interviewing participants 27 years after the event could be a gamble. My fear became a reality with Ron’s passing however it was not expected as he was one of the younger DI’s.

I am certain that he would have been proud of his contribution to ‘The perceptions that the DIs held from the 1960s until 1983 about their role and contribution to the Victorian Primary Education System.

As discussed, I am sending you a copy of his transcript from the interview to inform you of its content. I do need written permission from you to allow me to change the ethics committee ruling. His coding was RRI but I would prefer to use Ron Ikin if you agree.

I wish you well in the future and hope you get the chance to finish your PhD.

Yours sincerely,

PLEASE RETURN THIS SLIP IN THE STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE PROVIDED

As Ronald Ilkins’ next of kin, I give permission /I do NOT give permission to use his name instead of his coding in your thesis.

Signature
3.

PLEASE FILL IN AND RETURN IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED

I GIVE my permission to use my name instead of my coded ID ✓

I DO NOT give my permission to use my name □

Signature  

I wish any reference to this work to be acknowledged by use of my name, not coded ID

Signature

Thanks Norman, would love to read your work in the future.

Regard, Peter
As Ronald’s next of kin, I give permission \textit{NOT} give permission to use his name instead of his coding in your thesis.

Signature

[Kerrie Ink]


PLEASE FILL IN AND RETURN IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED

I GIVE my permission to use my name instead of my coded ID

I DO NOT give my permission to use my name [   ]

Signature

Dear Norma,

Thank you for the offer but I am comfortable with the original arrangement.

Best of luck,

[C]
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1. Letter to Chair of the Ethics Committee showing that participants allowed their names to be used in the thesis

2. Letter from Ethics Committee granting that permission

1.

Unit 902 ‘The Duporth Riverside’,
6 Wharf Street,
Maroochydore,
Queensland, 4558.
April 5th 2012

To the Chair of HREC, University of the Sunshine Coast.

Re: A History of the Inspectorial System in State Primary Schools of Victoria from 1965 to 1985

Ethics Approval Number: HREC: S/09/232

Dear Sir,

In consultation with my supervisor, Dr Bill Allen, and in consideration of the nature of the study, which largely honours the reminiscences of the participants, it was decided to seek permission from the participants to change from using codes in the thesis text to using their real names. This was also suggested to us by Professor Joanne Scott, from her experience as an oral historian.

I have sent a letter to each of the participants asking them if they are happy with this. Ten of the twelve participants responded immediately, saying that they were happy with this. One of the participants has unfortunately died since the research began, but I sent a personal letter to his widow. After a telephone conversation with her, she asked that I would send his transcript to her. Having received the transcript, she then replied, giving permission for the change.

Therefore eleven of the twelve participants have agreed. However one participant did decline, and so I have continued as before, by making every effort to ensure that this person remains completely de-identified.
I have attached the letters and replies for your records, and await your approval to now name
the participants appropriately in the text.

If I have your approval, I would appreciate the return of these documents.

Yours sincerely,

Norma Gray
22 May 2012

Ms Norma Gray
Dr Bill Allen
Faculty of Science, Health, Education and Engineering

Dear Norma and Bill,


This letter is to confirm that on 22 May 2012, the Chairperson of the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of the Sunshine Coast granted expedited ethics approval for an amendment to the project, An Oral History of District Inspectors of Primary Schools in Victoria 1950 – 1983 (S/09/232).

The amendment of the project refers to choice being given to participants to identify themselves in all published documents.

The conditions for ethics approval for this project as outlined in our letter of 25 November 2009 continue to apply.

If you have any queries in relation to this matter or if you require further information please contact me by email at humanethics@usc.edu.au or by telephone on +61 7 5459 4574.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Barbara Palmer
Manager, Office of Research