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Introduction

This thesis aims to show how the secondary teacher in New Zealand was constituted in discourse through an examination of two major recontextualisations of education, the changes resulting from the Thomas Report (1944),\(^1\) and the Picot Report (1988),\(^2\) and of the collective identity of secondary teachers. Both reports redirected government education policy and regulation and had fundamental implications for teachers’ work and the role they were expected to play in education. Secondary teachers resisted both reforms, and in doing so they revealed elements of their conservative, pragmatic and defensive collective identity, which changed in only one significant respect in the time period considered in this study.

It took twenty years before the central tenets of the Thomas Report were even close to being universally accepted. Even then, the child-centred philosophy and practice propounded by the Thomas Report, supported by the Currie Report in 1962\(^3\) and supervised by the gentle discipline of the Department of Education, was likely to have been more honoured in the breach than in the observance by many New Zealand secondary school teachers.\(^4\) In more recent times, the ‘neo-liberal’, market-driven view of education and teachers, as expressed in the reforms which followed the Picot Report, were stoutly resisted despite the much more rigorous disciplinary techniques employed by the Ministry of Education. This thesis will show that the dominant discourses which constituted the secondary teacher were those of the collective identity of secondary teachers and that these effectively frustrated attempts to impose change on New Zealand secondary teachers and on secondary education.

---


\(^4\) Except where specified, I have used ‘secondary schools’ as a term to include all post-primary educational institutions, including Technical High Schools and District High Schools.
These ideas are examined through an analysis of the discourses which constructed the collective identity of secondary teachers and of the recontextualisations of the discourses which have reshaped New Zealand’s education system since 1945. That year is the earliest point in the study because the regulations giving legal force to the Thomas Report were issued then, and its effect on teacher identity is followed until 1962. The year 2000 was chosen as an arbitrary end-point, simply because if the post-Picot reforms were going to have affected teacher identity then any changes should have been visible by that time.

While the theoretical foundations of the study will be explained in greater depth later in this introduction, I have generally followed Foucault’s concepts of discourse; both the ‘sets’ of discourses outlined above demonstrated the constitutive role of discourse. Further, the two sets of discourses were almost constantly at odds with one another, and therefore issues of power and control were central to the social construction of the secondary teacher. Foucault’s ideas about power-knowledge offer an approach to an analysis of this form of conflict. This study, then, is essentially Foucauldian in both the concepts and the methodology it seeks to apply.

Analysis of the recontextualisations of education has focused on texts such as the Thomas and Picot Reports themselves, as well as on education policy statements, legislation and regulations. While these texts were mainly concerned with the education ‘system’ and rarely offered specific direction as to what secondary teachers should be, the shape of the education system itself carried with it an expectation of how teachers should serve and conform to it.

At another level, the two recontextualisations of the New Zealand education system also sought to discipline teachers to the official view of their role. Firstly, teacher

---


training was an issue throughout the period of this study because of its potential to produce the ‘sort’ of teacher with the ‘sorts’ of skills and assumptions about education which would support the reforms. The more or less constant discussion and review of teacher training institutions and programmes since 1945 reflected its importance as a disciplinary mechanism with the potential to ‘shape’ the teacher. If teachers were to be trained, and if they were later to be observed and assessed, it is reasonable to assume that texts associated with these processes would reveal what teachers should be and what they should do. Secondly, the techniques of ‘surveillance’ as practised by the inspectorate and, later, the Education Review Office, were another overt attempt to discipline teachers to the role determined by the recontextualised discourses. Texts from those sources have also been used on the assumption that if teachers are to be subject to such disciplinary techniques, then the texts should reveal exactly what teachers were being disciplined to be and to do.

Teaching resources provided by the Department of Education and the Ministry of Education to assist teachers in implementing the intended changes in curriculum and in teaching methods and assessment also provided a more gentle form of discipline in normalising the recontextualised discourses. These resources included published material intended for use in the classroom, such as The Post-Primary School Bulletin, advisory services and in-service training, such as that provided in support of the introduction of the National Certificate of Educational Achievement in recent years. These texts were of considerable practical use to teachers, but they were provided for disciplinary purposes and can be used to help identify the educational and ideological intentions of the recontextualisations.

The New Zealand Post Primary Teachers’ Association Journal and PPTA News are the principal texts I have used in the discussion of teacher identity. Both are publications of the Post-Primary Teachers’ Association, and their material was either written by teachers or selected by editorial staff responsible to teachers; both publications were intended for a secondary teacher readership and served a variety
of purposes. They were the means of communication and discussion about industrial matters, and wider social issues such as second-wave feminism and the place of women in secondary education in general. They reported on PPTA policy and annual conferences, and provided a forum for branches and individual members to respond to issues which concerned them. In all of this a consistent image of a collective teacher identity emerged, and remained almost unchanged throughout the two examples of educational recontextualisation under study. I do not claim that many secondary teachers related entirely to the identity I discuss, but feel sure that all would have recognised it. For the PPTA to have survived as a professional association and as a union, it had to maintain the support of its members. To do this its publications as well as its actions needed to resonate with the majority of its members and I argue that the identity introduced in the opening paragraphs, and discussed more fully later in this introduction, did so. In both of these sources, teachers revealed elements of this collective identity to themselves, and the terms in which it was revealed were designed to produce this resonance.

One of the difficulties in trying to distil a collective teacher identity from these sources is the question of whose voices are heard in them. There is little doubt that principals have had a great influence on the PPTA and it predecessors, the New Zealand Secondary Schools’ Association (SSA) and the New Zealand Technical Teachers’ Association. In their early years these organisations did not have full-time staff and therefore depended on committed individuals. Many of these people were principals, and their views and interpretations of events often featured in PPTA publications. Impressions of the 1928 SSA Conference recorded, ‘There were present 22 principals and about 50 delegates representing the Assistants of Secondary Schools. The conference was thus more representative than usual.’ 9 A comment reflecting on the 1978 PPTA Conference made the same point: ‘My impressions: an overabundance of principals and too few assistant teachers, … This

---

7 For example, ‘Origins of the FOL’, the first of a series of articles surrounding the issue of whether or not the PPTA should affiliate with the Federation of Labour. PPTA News, 2, (5), April 1981, p. 3.
9 Reprinted in PPTA Journal, October 1979, p. 32.
imbalance will only be improved when the classroom teacher is more equitably represented at Conference and on Executive.’\textsuperscript{10} The question arises whether principals’ views were the same as those of classroom teachers. All principals have been classroom teachers, but their very ambition to be principals, and the nature of their work, changed their perspective. It was easier for principals to support educational reform because they did not have to actually carry it out in the classroom, although the administrative implications for them have been immense in the post-Picot period at least. Should principals have wished to move into the Department or Ministry at the end of their principalship, it was unwise for them to speak against, or be seen to obstruct, reform initiated from there. Harker, Gibbs, Ryan, Weir and Adams’ study of teacher satisfaction suggests that there is some difference between the interests of secondary principals (and management in general) and secondary classroom teachers.\textsuperscript{11} It is not surprising that this is the case but since principals dominated PPTA for some time, care must be taken in interpreting whose views were expressed in PPTA publications.

The voice of the activist is another which was frequently heard, particularly towards the end of the century when material written by PPTA officials, executive members and activists increasingly filled the pages of \textit{PPTA News}. Executive members and activists have also been classroom teachers, and experienced the same situations which helped shape the common identity elaborated in this thesis, but they were atypical as well. Their very involvement in PPTA at a national level showed a commitment to values and ideals which transcended the immediate pressure of the classroom and the school. No doubt they aimed to arrive at solutions to ameliorate those pressures, but often the political positions they took on broader social issues, such as the Working Women’s Charter,\textsuperscript{12} attracted criticism because they were concerned with matters beyond the immediacy of the classroom.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{10} \textit{PPTA Journal}, September 1978, p. 23.


\textsuperscript{12} \textit{PPTA News}, 2, 13, September 1981, p.3

\textsuperscript{13} Martin Cooney and Pinky Green, ‘Changing Society Not PPTA’s Role’, \textit{PPTA News}, 6, 17, November
Both principals and PPTA activists would have recognised the narratives which helped construct the collective identity of secondary teachers, and their voices should not be disqualified when they spoke from within it; but both often spoke from its fringes if not from outside it, and care must be taken with what they said.

The above is intended to serve as an outline of the thesis and of the principal texts I have used. What follows is a discussion and acknowledgement of ‘position’ in my argument, in terms of the problem under study and my own position as author of this thesis and in a sense, as its subject.

I am a Pakeha male in my mid 50s, with social democratic political instincts, and I have worked as a secondary school teacher for thirty years. In that time many changes have come down the ‘pipe’. I share with my colleagues an awareness that Department/Ministry of Education and community expectations of teachers have changed. Some changes were assimilated into teaching practice and some were ignored, since experience suggested that some would be overtaken by others before the original change could be absorbed. But little of this affected my own sense of what teachers should be doing in their role as teachers. That changed for me after the Picot Reforms. Increasingly, it seemed to me that the view of education implied by these reforms was quite distant from my own. I found the application of the language of the market-place to schools, teachers and students offensive. As the dispute between the government and the teacher unions over bulk funding of teacher salaries escalated, it was clear that my sense of the gap between the recontextualised discourses and my own experience of what it meant to be a teacher was widely shared by secondary teachers. Less spectacularly, as appraisal systems were introduced and teachers’ practice was assessed according to

---

1985, p. 7. Here, both Cooney and Greene appeal to the ‘ordinary teacher’ and his or her immediate problems and issues.

Professional Standards, my colleagues and I felt that the ‘competency’ model for teacher assessment through brief observation of our practice did not accurately reflect our ideas of what teachers should be. As the reforms became embedded in the 1990s and beyond, and as we reluctantly complied with their disciplinary elements, it became clear to me that, firstly, very little had really changed in the classroom when the door closed; and that, secondly, the reforms had not changed the way we thought of ourselves as teachers. So the problem examined in this thesis arose out of my own experience as a secondary school teacher under the Picot reforms. I discuss the extent to which educational reform can be expected to change teachers’ sense of professional identity. The other side of the issue is to assess the extent to which teachers were able to assert their own identity in a regulative environment which attempted to change it. From this point it was a short step to include a study of teacher identity and the earlier changes associated with the Thomas Report as another example of these processes at work.

The position acknowledged here has had a profound impact on this study. Many of my own views of what education should be echo those of the Thomas Report, and I suspect that by the end of the 1960s most secondary teachers came to that view as well. On the other hand, the market metaphor which the post-Picot reforms tried to apply to education seemed foreign and contrived. I see myself in much of what I write about the teacher identity which resisted changes initiated by both Thomas and Picot, and it is of concern to me that the first acknowledgement in this paragraph suggests that if the regulative authorities invest enough in reform, over a long enough time period, then perhaps they can succeed in reshaping teacher identity.

This study draws from a number of academic disciplines. It borrows little apart from chronology, when it is needed, from histories of education in New Zealand.

---

16 For example, Ian Cumming and Alan Cumming, *The History of State Education in New Zealand, 1840 – 1975*, Wellington: Pitman, 1975, and even later studies such as George N. Marshall, ‘The Development
Such studies are primarily concerned with positivist accounts of the evolution of a liberal education system, and teachers appear as little more than passive servants of the system. The Sociology of Education provides a great deal more for this study, and the ideas of Foucault, Bourdieu, and Bernstein about the social functions of education in cultural reproduction inform much of the thought behind it. However, while such studies are frequently framed as discourse analyses, generally their central concern is how schools reproduce the culture of the dominant groups in society. While teachers are instrumental in that task, and their individual professional and personal identities will be in continuing dialogue with perceptions of the social function of education, the focus of this study is different. The relatively recent body of literature on teacher identity has a direct relationship with this work and I have used it to develop ideas on a teachers’ collective identity. The published material on teacher identity is also ‘multi-disciplinary’ in drawing on sociology, education and psychology, and conceives individual identity formation as a dynamic and ever-changing process of construction. As such, it lends itself well to discourse analysis. Finally, this study is historical to the extent that Foucault is historical. Because discourses are always open to change through the co-option of, or colonisation by, other discourses, it is only through their historical specificity that they can have meaning in a real, material sense. So it is the historical context which gives the discourses meaning here.

I will now discuss the theoretical basis of this thesis further. I have made some reference to Foucault’s concept of discourse in introductory remarks and will expand on this. Secondly, while I have made it clear that I will follow Foucault in my analysis of discourse, I have also drawn important ideas from the work of Basil of Secondary Education in New Zealand from 1935 to 1970’, Unpublished PhD. Thesis in Education, Waikato University, 1989.

19 Bernstein, p. 9.
Bernstein. His work on ‘pedagogic discourse’, with its ‘recontextualising fields’ and its component parts, ‘regulative’ and ‘instructional’ discourses, offers particularly important pathways into this topic. Up to this point I have used the term ‘recontextualisation’ in a general sense to mean ‘reform’, but further discussion and explanation is required, since I have found this idea very useful as a way of conceptualising the process of change. It implies a re-ordering of discourses, a co-option of some and a rejection of others, to re-form and re-direct government education policy and the state education system. In terms of methodology, I will introduce Foucault’s archaeological and genealogical methods, and finally in this section I will discuss the theoretical assumptions behind my use of the concept of a collective teacher identity.

Foucault’s work is attractive because it offers insights into social ordering, but how to apply those insights is neither clear nor simple. It was never Foucault’s intention to provide a prescriptive pathway to social research, which leaves the researcher to find ways of applying his powerful ideas. This is what I will attempt here.

His understanding of ‘discourse’ changed its nature and meaning as Foucault’s work and thought evolved. The ‘discourse’ defined in The Archaeology of Knowledge is not the discourse of his later ‘genealogical’ work, of which Discipline and Punish was the first major result. In the former, discourse ‘is made up of a limited number of statements for which a group of conditions of existence can be defined.’ The particular statements which might constitute any discourse are limited, and selected by ‘principles of exclusion’. Foucault differentiates between principles operating from outside discourses, and those operating within. Of the exterior principles, the most powerful is the ‘will to truth’, which he

21 Michel Foucault, *Archaeology*, pp. 84–85.
distinguishes from the ‘will to know’. The will to truth seeks to validate particular knowledges as truth, and

rests on an institutional support; it is both reinforced and renewed by whole strata of practices, such as pedagogy, of course; and the system of books, publishing, libraries; learned societies in the past and laboratories now.

The institutional support refers to the most powerful of the interior principles, ‘the [academic] discipline’, one of the main targets of his attack on forms of knowledge production, although ‘the analysis of discursive events is in no way limited to such a field.’

The discipline is a principle of control over the production of discourse. The discipline fixes limits for discourse by the action of an identity which takes the form of a permanent re-actuation of the rules.

So, in Foucault’s thought not all statements ‘belong’ to discourse, but in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed by a certain number of procedures.

I have outlined the two to which Foucault gives most importance – the ‘will to truth’ and the academic ‘discipline’, since they point to scientific, academic, disciplinary, claims concerning knowledge production.

While such procedures are seen to govern the selection of statements which are sanctioned in discourse, Foucault’s archaeological project is primarily concerned

---

26 ibid., p. 113.
27 Foucault, Archaeology, p. 33.
28 Foucault, ‘The Order of Discourse’, p. 120.
29 ibid., p. 109.
with ‘…the rules of formation that structure discourses.’ \(^{30}\) Howarth’s summary of these ideas states,

> discourses consist of four basic elements. These are the objects about which statements are made, the places of speaking from which statements are enunciated, the concepts involved in the formulation of discourse, and the themes and theories they develop.\(^{31}\)

It is the rules which govern these elements which offer a guide to the analysis of discourse.

Foucault identifies three rules governing the formation of discursive objects, \(^{32}\) although they inter-relate and cannot be considered independently of one another.\(^{33}\) The first, ‘surfaces of emergence’, requires a description of the social relations within a historical context to explain why ‘one particular statement appeared rather than another.’\(^{34}\) In this study, that requires description of the conditions which privileged both the Picot and Thomas interpretations of the functions that state education should perform, and how they should be delivered. It is very clear that the ‘surfaces of emergence’ for either one would not, and could not, have produced the other. In the same way this study must describe the conditions which governed the emergence of the collective identity of secondary teachers.

The second rule governing the formation of discursive objects requires a description of the ‘authorities of delimitation’. This refers ‘to those authorities that are empowered to decide which objects belong to which particular discursive formation.’\(^{35}\) In this study, such description will relate to those who exercise the power to recontextualise educational discourses. This idea will be revisited in the discussion of Bernstein’s conceptual contribution to the study.

\(^{31}\) ibid., p. 52.
\(^{32}\) Foucault, *Archaeology*, pp. 45 – 47.
\(^{33}\) Howarth, p. 53.
\(^{34}\) Foucault, *Archaeology*, p. 30.
\(^{35}\) Howarth, p. 53.
The third rule for the formation of discursive objects requires an analysis of ‘grids of specification’:

these are the systems according to which the different [categories of knowledge] are divided, contrasted, related, regrouped, classified, derived from one another as objects of … discourse … .  

This idea, one of classification, is also of importance to Bernstein, and is an essential part of the recontextualising process.

The second element of discourse for which Foucault develops a set of rules relates to ‘places of speaking’, or ‘enunciative modalities’.  

This requires consideration of who is speaking? Who, among the totality of speaking individuals, is accorded the right to use this sort of language? Who is qualified to do so? Who derives from it his own special quality, his prestige, and from whom in return, does he receive if not the assurance, at least the presumption that what he says is true? What is the status of the individuals who – alone – have the right, sanctioned by law or tradition, juridically defined or spontaneously accepted, to proffer such a discourse?

Not only is it necessary to analyse how the right to speak is given, but also the institutional sites from which the discourse comes. Thirdly, 

The positions of the subject are also defined by the situation that it is possible for him to occupy in relation to the various domains or groups of objects … .

In this study, then, the positions of the voices in its discourses help cast light on power relations; the subject positions of teachers on one hand and politicians and bureaucrats on the other.

---

36 Foucault, Archaeology, p. 46.
37 ibid., pp. 55 – 61.
38 ibid., p. 55.
39 ibid., pp. 57 -58.
The third and fourth elements in Foucault’s concept of discourse have their places in this thesis as well. The rules which govern the production of ‘concepts’ are those that establish logical relations between statements, such as rules of inference; rules which define whether or not classes of statements are to be accepted or excluded from a discourse. and relate to the ‘recontextualisation principle’ discussed in Bernstein’s work. Finally, the rules governing the formation of ‘strategies’ refer to the ideas and theories which might arise in discourses. Foucault locates the emergence of these within discourses rather than attributing them to individual brilliance or historical contingency; once again, there is an obvious place for theory in the recontextualisation of educational discourses considered in this thesis. Early in this introduction I made reference to the constitutive function of discourse. The above discussion on Foucault’s rules of formation for the four elements of discourse emphasise that function. Objects and subjects are created by discourse. Discourses are ‘practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak,’ and have weight in the material world.

These are central elements to Foucault’s concept of discourse within his archaeological method. In applying this method Foucault tries to define not the thoughts, representations, images, themes, preoccupations that are concealed or revealed in discourses; but those discourses themselves, those discourses as practices obeying certain rules. … [Archaeology’s] problem is to define discourses in their specificity; to show in what way the set of rules that they put into operation is irreducible to any other … It is nothing more than a rewriting; … a regulated transformation of what has already been written. It is not a return to

---

40 Howarth, p. 53.
41 ibid., p. 54.
42 Foucault, Archaeology, p. 54.
the innermost secret of the origin; it is the systematic description of a discourse-object.\textsuperscript{43}

So archaeology does not seek to analyse; it describes. He rejects the more traditional approaches to historical study with their concern to locate origins, to establish connections between cause and effect and identify continuity in historical narratives,\textsuperscript{44} and is concerned more with the rules of formation discussed above. I have stated that the use of Foucault’s rules of formation have an important and useful part to play in the methodology I have used, but they also impose an unacceptable limitation on analysis because they deliberately do not engage with meaning and judgements of the discourses under study. The archaeologist is a disinterested observer, analysing the specificity of the rules of formation of discourse. I have already acknowledged that my own subjectivity is firmly established amongst the discourses which have constituted important elements of secondary teachers’ collective identity; trying to maintain the position of an objective, archaeological author would place serious constraints on the study, however useful Foucault’s rules might be to it. For that reason, I have used Foucault’s genealogical methodology when discussing teacher responses to Thomas and Picot.

Genealogy sees discourse differently to archaeology. Whereas in the latter, discourses are autonomous systems of rules that constitute objects, concepts, subjects and strategies, thereby governing the production of scientific statements,\textsuperscript{45}

\begin{itemize}
  \item in genealogy,
  \begin{itemize}
    \item discourses are the means for different forces to advance their interests and projects, while also
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{43} Foucault, \textit{Archaeology}, pp. 155 – 156.
\textsuperscript{44} Michel Foucault, ‘Nietzsche, Genealogy, History.’, in Keith Jenkins, (ed.), \textit{The Postmodern History Reader}, London: Routledge, 1997.
\textsuperscript{45} Howarth, pp. 48 – 49.
providing points of resistance for counter-strategies to develop.\textsuperscript{46}

This view of discourse acknowledges and demands engagement. It requires discussion of power relations, with attendant Foucauldian concepts of discipline, which are important in my analysis of the conflict between teachers’ sense of themselves as teachers, and the view of teachers offered in recontextualised discourses. Further, Foucault begins genealogical analysis in the present.

I set out from a problem expressed in terms current today and I try to work out its genealogy. Genealogy means that I begin my analysis from a situation posed in the present.\textsuperscript{47}

This does not mean his approach is ‘presentist’, in that he sees the past in terms of the present, but that the genealogist recognises a problem in the present and attempts to ‘examine its contingent historical and political emergence.’\textsuperscript{48}

In conclusion, I have used important elements of both his archaeological and genealogical methods of enquiry. His rules of formation offer an approach to the identification and description of discourse, and his genealogical approach allows analysis of the power relations implicit in it. Foucault saw no contradiction between the two methods.

If we were to characterise it in two terms, then “archaeology” would be the appropriate methodology of this analysis of local discursivities, and “genealogy” would be the tactics whereby, on the basis of the descriptions of these local discursivities, the subjected knowledges which were thus released would be brought into play.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{46} ibid., p. 49.
\textsuperscript{47} Mona Lloyd and Lloyd Thacker, (eds), \textit{The Impact of Michel Foucault on the Social Sciences and Humanities}, London: Macmillan, 1997, p. 35.
\textsuperscript{48} Howarth, pp. 72 – 73.
This is the approach I attempt to follow. I have identified the problem in the present and I set out to ‘…examine its contingent historical and political emergence.’ For this reason, too, I discuss the post-Picot reforms before considering the Thomas Report and its implications. This offers a structural reminder of the direction the thesis takes. It does not attempt to establish continuity between the two reforms, although I am concerned to examine their emergence and the impact of both on teacher identity.

I have previously acknowledged the work of Basil Bernstein in providing some important ideas for this study and I will discuss them further here. Bernstein is a British sociologist who has studied the role of education in cultural reproduction. His 1996 publication, *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control, and Identity. Theory, Research, Critique*, was an attempt to summarise and clarify ideas developed and refined over decades. His central question has been

> how does power and control translate into principles of communication, and how do these principles of communication differentially regulate forms of consciousness with respect to their reproduction and possibilities of change? 

He provides his answer in the exposition of his ‘pedagogic device’, the symbolic principle governing consciousness in relation to cultural reproduction, and asserts that

> Those who own the device own the means of perpetuating their power through discursive means and establishing, or attempting to establish, their own ideological representations.

This is achieved through pedagogic discourse, the production and reproduction of which is governed by rules, which operate in much the same manner as Foucault’s ‘rules of formation’. Bernstein’s ‘Distributive Rules’ serve the same sorts of functions as Foucault’s rules governing the formation of discursive objects.

---

50 Bernstein p. 18.
51 *ibid.*, p. 117.
52 Bernstein, p. 117.
However, it is Bernstein’s second set of rules, the ‘Recontextualizing Rules’, which contribute an important conceptual element to this study. ‘These rules regulate the work of specialists in the recontextualizing field who construct the “what” and “how” of pedagogic discourse.’ In fact, ‘pedagogic discourse is a recontextualizing principle … which selectively appropriates, relocates and relates other discourses to constitute its own order.’ Within this ‘principle’ Bernstein locates recontextualising ‘fields’: the ‘Official Recontextualising Field, dominated by the state and its ministries, which are ‘arenas for the construction, distribution, reproduction and change of pedagogic identities’; and the Pedagogic Recontextualising Field, where, for example, teachers select and adapt from discourses for the purposes of teaching and learning. These recontextualising fields offer a useful conceptual framework for this study since ‘regulative’ and instructional discourses are produced as a result of activity within them – particularly from the ‘Official Recontextualising Field’. The regulative discourse ‘is to do with the role of pedagogies in constituting social relations and order (the “hidden curriculum”) …’ and the instructional discourse ‘is to do with pedagogy in the transmission and acquisition of knowledges.’ It is these discourses which are intended to shape the formal education to be delivered in schools and, most importantly for this study, it is in the instructional discourses that the recontextualised role of the teacher is made explicit.

Bernstein’s framework helps identify the sites of potential and actual conflict in this study. He writes,

we must have an understanding of the recontextualizing principles which construct the new discourses and the ideological bias that underlies any such recontextualizing. Every time a

---

53 ibid., p. 117.
54 ibid., p. 47. (Bernstein’s emphasis).
55 ibid., p. 80.
56 ibid., p. 48.
When governments initiate recontextualisations in education, changes in regulative and instructional discourses take place. There may be many reasons for making the changes, but ideological ‘shifts’ are likely to be among them, and the ‘official recontextualizing field’ would expect this to be reflected in the regulative and instructional discourses delivered in schools. Bernstein makes it clear that

the instructional discourse is embedded in the regulative discourse, and that the regulative discourse is the dominant discourse. … Pedagogic discourse is the rule which leads to the embedding of one discourse in another, to create one text, to create one discourse.  

In other words, the instructional discourse should deliver the social messages of the regulative discourse as if they were the same thing. This study argues that secondary teachers resisted both major recontextualisations of education in New Zealand since 1945. Both the regulative and instructional discourses of the post-Picot reforms were opposed while it was the Thomas instructional discourses, in particular, which were resisted. Collectively, secondary teachers felt that their professional identity, their role in education and their understanding of the purpose of education in general did not match the recontextualised regulative and instructional discourses.

Both Foucault and Bernstein offer profound insights. While Bernstein’s project is not my own, his model for analysis provides a clear pathway into an educational context, and it helps ‘ground’ some of the Foucault’s more general concepts of discourse analysis. Bernstein’s work and Foucault’s archaeology bear a striking resemblance, despite the facts that Bernstein is unashamedly ‘structuralist’ while Foucault has denied this label. Both view discourse as constitutive, and they

---

58 Bernstein, p. 24.
59 ibid., p. 46.
both offer similar approaches in terms of their rules governing the production of discourse. The point here is that the conceptual frameworks offered by both men integrate well and contribute much to this study. I have followed Foucault’s approach to discourse analysis and Bernstein’s framework in applying it in an educational setting.

The final part of the discussion on the theoretical foundations of this thesis concerns the concept of a secondary teachers’ ‘collective’ identity. This is a central element in my argument as I try to show that it has been the construction of this identity that has lain at the heart of teacher resistance to the recontextualisations of education experienced in New Zealand since 1945.

While the construction of personal identity has been an area of study for some time, the analysis of teachers’ professional identity is relatively recent. Some of the interest in the field comes from concern with teacher education. Some within the official recontextualising field might assume, for example, that if the construction of teacher identity was clearly understood it might be possible to prepare teacher trainees in such a way that they ‘naturally’ adopt the form of identity most sympathetic to education reforms. However, the studies themselves do not betray such cynical motives. Beijaard et al surveyed much of this literature and identified three approaches to the subject which have generally been followed. These are:

1. studies in which the focus was on teachers’ professional identity formation;
2. studies in which the focus was on the identification of characteristics of teachers’ professional identity as perceived by the teachers themselves or as identified by the researchers from the data they collected;
3. studies in which professional identity was (re)presented by teachers’ stories told and written.  

---

Virtually all of the studies are concerned to account for individual identity formation, rather than with the formation of a collective identity. Most also make the point that identity formation is a very fluid, continuous process, whereas the form of collective identity I present is remarkably fixed, having changed little in the 65 years of the study. Nevertheless the evidence and theories they present do give me theoretical and evidential support for presenting the idea that a collective and stable secondary teacher identity exists.

Donald Taylor, Evelyne Bougie and Julie Caouette provide further support to my contention that the collective identity of secondary teachers is of great importance. They assert the primacy of collective identity in the development of ‘self concept’:

> personal identity can only be articulated against the backdrop of a clearly defined collective identity, which specifies values, goals, norms and strategies for successful negotiation.⁶⁴

They present ‘cultural collective identity’ as the single most important of any individual’s collective identities because of its ‘pervasiveness’, but also acknowledge the importance of ‘occupational collective identity’, and others, within that. Taylor, Bougie and Caouette also offer support for the view that collective identities remain relatively stable.

> We would argue that one’s collective identity will remain relatively fixed and stable … it is precisely because cultural collective identity serves as the psychological backdrop against which the individual crafts a personal identity that the collective identity must remain relatively stable and clearly defined.

> As much as collective identity requires stability, personal identity must be fluid and adaptive … .⁶⁵

---


⁶⁵ *ibid.* p. 207.
These ideas obviously support my argument that the collective identity of secondary teachers is a dominant and relatively stable element in the development of teachers’ individual professional identities.

Whether teachers select positions on the ‘professional knowledge landscape’,66 in forming their individual professional identities, or whether they select from a variety of ‘traditions’ available to them,67 (not a dissimilar idea),

Most studies on teachers’ professional identity formation demonstrated or reconstructed ways in which teachers build their personal practical knowledge from experiences in practice. … This identity, then, is formed and reformed by the stories we tell and which we draw upon in our communications with others. In other words, stories inadvertently shape teachers and teaching; they are not only chosen and managed by their tellers alone, but are also expressions of cultural values, norms, and structures passed on by the tellers … . 68

I argue that a collective identity of secondary teachers is created in exactly this way. The shared stories of common elements of the teaching experience form the principal element in the creation of a common identity. These stories focus on the harsh and sometimes brutal realities of the classroom. They create a sense of solidarity in the face of perceptions of increasing demands from educational authorities and from an unappreciative community. They are stories from the ‘chalkface’, a term which deliberately evokes the harsh conditions of the coal mine. Very often they are sad stories of disillusionment and growing cynicism, and while it may be that individual teachers do not place their own professional identity entirely within these narratives, in my experience virtually all would recognise the stories as belonging to the profession. They represent the distilled bottom line of

68 Beijaard et al, p. 123.
teaching experience and the discourses which create the collective teacher identity are based on them. Further, they have changed only in superficial ways.

This approach to the formation of teacher identity, individual or collective, assumes considerable agency for teachers, but as Coldron and Smith point out,

An individual teacher’s professional identity/location is, on the one hand, determined biographically, through his or her own choices, and, on the other, socially “given”. 69

This is obviously the case. The status the community is willing to accord to teachers and the expectations educational authorities place on them through regulative and instructional discourses all share in contributing to identity formation, both individual and collective. The collective identity can be a defence against the pressure to meet externally applied norms. At least the shared narratives of experience are their own. Moore, Gwyn, Halpin and George make reference to this when they observe that teachers might also … adopt contrived allegiances to certain wider discourses, within which any changes that might be interpreted by an ‘outsider’ as undesirable are rendered more easily defensible. 70

This study it is not of changes which teachers might seek to make more defensible, but their resistance to change. Foucault makes reference to the same idea in his discussion of the effect of doctrine in controlling discourse.

Doctrine … tends to be diffused, and it is by holding in common of one and the same discursive ensemble that individuals (as many as one cares to imagine) define their reciprocal allegiance. In appearance, the only prerequisite is the recognition of the same truths and the acceptance of a certain rule of (more or less

69 Coldron and Smith, p. 174.
flexible) conformity with the validated discourses. … the doctrine always stands as the sign manifestation and instrument of a prior adherence to a class, a social status, a race, a nationality, an interest, a revolt, a resistance or an acceptance. Doctrine binds individuals to certain types of enunciation and consequently forbids them all others; but it uses, in return, certain types of enunciation to bind individuals amongst themselves, and to differentiate them by that fact from all others. Doctrine brings about a double subjection: of the speaking subject to discourses, and of discourses to the (at least virtual) group of speaking subjects.  

‘The Doctrine’, in this case, is the collective teacher identity, and it binds teachers to a collective allegiance, but in so doing the discourses which construct the identity also construct the teacher.

One last point in this introduction to my use of identity concerns the recalcitrant, oppositional and somewhat subversive nature of secondary teachers’ collective identity. Beijaard, Meijer and Verloop note that a teacher’s individual identity is made up of a number of ‘sub-identities’, some more central than others, and that it is important that the sub-identities do not conflict. However, During initial teacher training, student teachers often experience such conflict. … Experienced teachers may experience such conflict in cases of educational change or change in their immediate working environment. … The more central a sub-identity is, the more costly it is to change or lose identity. 

If teachers feel ‘guilt and denial … as they are obliged to put such policies [the results of ‘educational change’] into practice…’ then it is reasonable to expect them to find support in the collective identity, which, resenting pressure for change where it conflicts with its own concept of what education should be and of teachers

72 Beijaard et al, p. 122.
73 Moore, p. 562.
role within it, encourages a sort of subversion, ‘(a sort of underground resistance
that seeks to gradually undermine what it feels it cannot more immediately
change)…’  

In my discussion so far I have linked the idea of teacher identity - what teachers
‘are’ - and teacher role - what teachers ‘do’ - although I accept that that teacher
identity is not synonymous with teacher role: ‘role speaks to function whereas
identity voices [emotional] investments…’ While this distinction is quite
reasonable it also seems reasonable to conclude that they are closely related and
will each contribute significantly to the other. In this study they are thoroughly
entwined and speak one to the other constantly. The collective identity under
discussion here derives substantially from what teachers think they should ‘do’.

This introduction has sought to serve a number of functions. It has introduced the
main direction and scope of the topic, the nature and range of the principal texts,
and my own position as participant/author has been acknowledged. I have
elaborated on my theoretical and conceptual framework, derived from the work of
Michel Foucault and Basil Bernstein, and from literature related to the formation of
teacher identity. The remainder of the thesis applies these ideas. Chapter I discusses
the discourses which produced the conservative, pragmatic and defensive collective
identity of secondary teachers and why it was resistant to education reform. Chapter
II examines the post-Picot recontextualisation of education in New Zealand and
how it tried to reconstitute the teacher and teaching. It shows why this was resisted
by secondary teachers and the importance of the collective identity of secondary
teachers in accounting for resistance. Chapter III considers the Thomas
recontextualisation in the same way. That is, it discusses how these reforms tried to
reconstitute the teacher and teaching, and explains teacher resistance in terms of the
collective identity of secondary teachers.

---

74 ibid., p.562.
75 Michalinos Zembylas, ‘Emotions and Teacher Identity: A Poststructuralist Perspective’, (electronic
The main point in this study is to show that teacher’s own discourses, in particular those which constitute the collective identity of secondary teachers, have played a much more dominant role in the social construction of ‘the secondary teacher’ than have those associated with education reform in New Zealand.
Chapter I
The Collective Identity of Secondary Teachers

This thesis attempts to show that the discourses which constituted the collective identity of secondary teachers constituted the teacher and that this explains why secondary teachers resisted educational reforms from 1945 until the end of the century. I do not argue that all teachers resisted change. There is ample evidence in the sources that individual teachers and the New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers’ Association, (PPTA) tried to encourage change in particular circumstances. However, I do argue that secondary teachers generally viewed the prospect of change with a very jaundiced eye, and while they were resigned to superficial compliance with official requirements little changed behind the classroom door. This chapter discusses the constitution of the collective identity of secondary teachers, which was the basis of teacher resistance to change.

2 For example, New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers’ Association, Teachers in Change. Report Of The Curriculum Review Group On The Education And Training Of Teachers, Auckland: Longman Paul, 1974, and any number of submissions to Commissions of Inquiry and Investigative Committees.
The collective identity of secondary teachers was constructed in narratives of shared experience. The point has already been made that the collective identity served as a ‘template’ against which teachers could ‘articulate a personal identity … .’\(^3\) Not all teachers located their individual professional identities entirely within these narratives, but all would have recognised that they belonged to the profession. The narratives revealed key elements of the collective identity. The first ‘set’ of narratives was retrospective in that it looked to the past for affirmation. This went some way to explain the continuing academic emphasis in secondary schools and the higher status accorded to teachers with academic, as opposed to technical, qualifications. The image of the teacher as an academic subject specialist, able to impart knowledge to students, and the teaching profession in general as motivated by ideas of service, were important elements in the collective identity. The retrospective narratives also carried a profoundly pragmatic element to the identity of secondary teachers, with an accompanying deep suspicion of innovation and of education theory. These elements of the identity supported a conservative approach to teaching methods which assumed that what worked well in the classrooms of the past would continue to work; and if it did not it was not the fault of the methods. Such narratives constituted teacher knowledge of how to do the job and how to survive its challenges. This knowledge also contributed to what I have called ‘martyr’ narratives – the second ‘set’ of narratives under discussion. It emphasised the difficulties under which teachers worked and allowed complaints to be couched in self-righteous terms. They offered guidance to teachers in their dealings with disenchanted and poorly behaved students, demanding principals, officials and parents, and rapidly escalating work-loads. They offered reassurance in an educational environment in which teachers felt misunderstood and unappreciated; and they affirmed the essentially co-operative basis of the relationship between teachers. It was these narratives which

formed the collective identity of secondary teachers and it was the collective identity which constituted the secondary teacher in New Zealand.

Two further features of the collective identity are discussed in this chapter. Firstly, it remained remarkably unchanged and stable. The only significant change I notice in this study was the adjustment to accommodate ‘trade union’ tactics in the PPTA’s pursuit of professional objectives and improved pay and conditions for teachers. This came at the expense of earlier teacher commitment to concepts of teaching as a vocation and a profession, with its more formal and traditional ideas of how professional and material objectives should be pursued.

The coercive power of the collective identity is the other feature discussed in this chapter. I will show that the collective identity demanded high levels of allegiance from teachers and that it was intolerant of any challenges to its values and its knowledge. The possibility that the collective identity changed to accommodate feminist and Maori identities is considered, but I conclude that while the collective identity could accommodate a variety of individual identities, its coercive power ensured that these did not seriously challenge its own values, priorities and knowledge.

By its very nature the collective identity was resistant to change; and since its discourses constituted the teacher, then teachers resented change. Bernstein made the point that teachers looked to the past for affirmation.

The culture of the pedagogic discourse of schools is retrospective, based on a past narrative of the dominance and significance of disciplines, whereas the management structure is prospective pointing to the new entrepreneurialism and instrumentalities. The state has therefore embedded a retrospective pedagogic culture into a prospective management culture.⁴

This quotation neatly sums up a large part of the problem under investigation in this thesis. The view that management, and certainly the ‘Official Recontextualising Field’, was *prospective* goes a long way to explain the conflict between the collective identity of teachers and the view of teachers and teaching advanced in both the post-Picot reforms and in the Thomas reforms. Bernstein’s analysis locates teachers within the ‘pedagogic discourse of schools’ – in particular, within the ‘Pedagogic Recontextualising Field, where … teachers select and adapt discourses for the purposes of teaching and learning.’

It is through their ‘instructional discourses’ that ‘regulative discourses’ are delivered in the classroom, and if teachers look to the past for affirmation for what they are and what they do then the regulative and instructional discourses of the prospective, reforming discourses of the ‘official recontextualising field’ are unlikely to be delivered. The discussion of the regulative and instructional discourses advanced by the two reforms under study in Chapters II and III demonstrates their ‘prospective’ nature, but it is Bernstein’s statement that ‘the pedagogic discourse of schools is *retrospective*’ which is of direct interest to this chapter.

The cartoon (Fig. 1), draws attention to influence of narratives based in the past on the secondary teacher. The gowns and other trappings of traditional New Zealand secondary education established a link between teaching and traditions of academic disciplinary knowledge. Clarence Beeby, appointed Assistant-Director of Education in 1938 and Director the following year, and who was the major figure behind the Thomas reforms, observed that

As a body, secondary teachers had always been more conservative than primary teachers. There were many reasons for this: over a long period, most secondary teachers were untrained and were often suspicious of educational theorising; they were subject specialists and felt more affinity with university lecturers than with their “humbler” primary colleagues, [who were] mostly without degrees …

---

\[5\] See ‘Introduction’, p. 17.

Elements of this continued, although the gown may now make its appearance only on special occasions such as annual prize-givings. On those occasions, the message delivered to the community is that teachers are subject ‘experts’ whose specialised knowledge has been recognised and legitimised by the ‘the university’.

The academic pathway for students through secondary school had always been privileged. Partly this was because parents in New Zealand saw the academic pathway as a route their children should follow to social and economic advancement, but it is also the ‘sort’ of education teachers felt most comfortable in delivering. Teachers of more practical subjects regularly complained about this. In 1955 a supporter of agricultural courses in secondary schools wrote:

Advice given to John Citizen by many teachers, those nurtured in the academic tradition, is along one or more of the following lines:—
- the best general education is to be obtained in the academic (professional, general, or language) course;
- if in doubt about the course to be taken, the best “bet” is the academic course;
- well, the best teachers are in the academic course;
- no person is educated unless he has at least a nodding acquaintance with at least one foreign language;
- as he is a clever boy, he must of course go into the academic course, it would be a sin to put him anywhere else;
- don’t put him in the Agricultural Course for it is too small and there would not be enough competition for him with boys of good ability.

In fact the separate existence of the Technical Teachers’ Association until its amalgamation with the Secondary Schools’ Association (SSA) to form the New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers’ Association (PPTA) in 1951 reflected concerns that

---

8 ‘The Place of Agriculture in Multi-Course’, *PPTA Journal*, 1, 1, April, 1955, pp. 7–8.
the interests of technical education would not be served through amalgamation with a professional body which placed such a high value on academia.

Because of the value they placed on academic education, teachers showed great loyalty to, and respect for, the academic disciplines within which they had been trained. Chapter III will show that a major reason for the difficulties Social Studies had in establishing itself as a subject in its own right after 1945 was the determination of geography and history teachers to guard their disciplinary frontiers from the incursions of ‘new’ subjects.

Narratives of the teacher as selflessly and dedicatedly serving students and community converged with those respecting academic disciplinary knowledge to form a central element in the collective identity of secondary teachers. They drew on the image of the Scottish ‘dominie’ and the respected village schoolmaster. The following obituary, published in June 1956, provides a glimpse of such a selfless servant of student, school and community.

It must be rare indeed that a small country school is fortunate to have the services of a teacher with such profound learning and experience … .

We know him as a quiet, reserved and scholarly man who devoted himself to his work as a teacher with a deep sense of responsibility to his pupils. He gave wholehearted, sterling service to this school and laid the foundations of a tradition of scholarship which can one day make it famous.

Towards the end of 1954, Harold Baker received warning from his doctors that his life was numbered in weeks, and it was then that his true and noble quality was displayed. With no word of complaint, and giving no sign of his inward distress, he continued quietly at his work and prepared, for each of his pupils, a summary and report of individual achievement and ability to hand on to his successor.9

In 1948, a refresher course for woodwork teachers was addressed in terms intended to promote a similar image:

the real teacher does not look for a reward, but the reward is there; the unspoken but sincere thanks of many parents and pupils, and the spiritual and moral progress and enlightened mentality of those who for a short period of their lives are under his control. This reward is the teacher’s monument – hidden but real – and will last longer than words of praise etched on blocks of stone. …

Let us … follow the example set by Him, the greatest Teacher that the world has known.
He, gentlemen, was a Carpenter.  

Other elements in this narrative emphasise the responsibility that teachers bear in moulding future citizens.

We deal with human material, with children at the adolescent period – a period of life probably more important as far as building the character of a nation is concerned than any other period.  

A later PPTA president, in addressing teacher trainees at Christchurch Teachers’ College, assured her audience that teaching is never boring; teaching deals with human problems and touches on human joys that can never be mechanised . . . .  

However, she did concede that the joys of teaching might ‘be too easily veiled by day-to-day worries and irritations… . ’ The value of service was still a part of the collective identity of secondary teachers at the end of the century but by that time it was referred to much less frequently. While much of the identity remained stable throughout the period of this study, this is one example of how it has changed, and such changes will be discussed later in the chapter.

Teachers’ suspicion of theory also adds weight to the view that the collective identity of secondary teachers looked to the past for its models and that it looked for

---

10 N. G. Thompson, ‘Our Profession, Our Attitude, Our Influence’, STA, XII, 1, April 1948, p. 21.
security in its academic disciplines rather than in education theory. This was an important point in the debate concerning teacher education as well as in teaching practice. Beeby noted the lack of interest in education theory in his own teacher trainee days in the 1920s.

We have heard teachers say, ‘Forget all you’ve learned at Training College and go ahead the old way,’ until it has become monotonous. … There seems to be a dominant idea among people generally that Theory is one thing and Practice another. That both terms should be capable of intimate relationship seems never to have occurred to them. The correlation of theory and practice is one of the few that most teachers seem to overlook.\(^{13}\)

In her address to the South Island Social Studies Refresher Course in 1959 Phoebe Meikle, a leading supporter of the ‘spirit’ of the Thomas reforms (see Chapter III) made the same point:

I believe, one of our greatest national weaknesses is our distrust of theory: our distrust of the speculative, critical mind. And in teaching our unphilosophical approach is specially harmful. We’ve scores of technically well-equipped and conscientious teachers … but we’ve far too few who ask: What is our school’s general function? What is it all about?\(^{14}\)

Teachers’ Colleges were in a difficult position on this issue. Although separate post-primary departments were not established at Auckland Teachers’ College until 1944 and at Christchurch Teachers’ college until 1954, since 1915 graduates intending to train for secondary teaching enrolled in a one year ‘Division C’ course.\(^{15}\) There a balance was sought between preparing trainees for the content they were to deliver, how it was to be delivered (teaching methods), and acquiring practical experience while ‘on section’ in schools. A forty week course could hardly

---


\(^{15}\) A. H. W Harte, Deputy Associate Principal, Teachers’ College, Christchurch, ‘An Education Course For Division “C”’, PPTA Journal, IX, 2, March 1962, p. 11.
expect to include a solid grounding in education theory as well, although introductions to education theory were offered.

Even then, attempts to promote the value of education theory were often undermined by trainees’ prejudice in favour of their own disciplines and by the fact that when ‘on section’ in schools they were often encouraged to discard theory in favour of the wisdom of practising teachers, derived from their own practical experience:

advice to teachers is so often in the form of neat imperatives such as ‘Keep your lesson and presentation interesting’, ‘Be consistent’, ‘Know when to overlook’; derived ultimately from unsystematic study and experience, these are the aids that common-sense approves as indispensable to the beginner.\(^\text{16}\)

Teachers who recognised the value of education theory to secondary teaching practice felt frustrated that the prejudice against it was so strong; a feeling expressed in a 1974 *PPTA Journal* article.

> The sooner we – all of us, that is, and not just the ones who go on courses – give up our dependence upon the mixture of folk remedies and idiosyncratic guesswork which passes for ‘the fruits of experience’ and start reading a few books instead, the better for everyone – especially the kids.\(^\text{17}\)

Reflection on teaching practice, informed by education theory, was made difficult from the outset of a teaching career. Commitment to the demands of teachers’ own disciplines, the difficulties faced by teacher education institutions in promoting the value of education theory in a short course of training, and the advice of practising teachers, all directed teachers to pragmatic, traditional solutions to the problems posed by the everyday experience of teaching. These solutions were those enshrined in the ‘retrospective’ narratives that made up the collective teacher identity.

\(^{16}\) I. J. Whyle, Senior Lecturer in Education, Auckland Teachers’ College, ‘Illusion or Vision? To Train or not to Train’, *PPTA Journal*, IX, 5, June 1962, p. 17.

\(^{17}\) Gerald Haigh, “We Are the Most Ignorant Profession”, *PPTA Journal*, August 1974, p. 11.
The loyalty of teachers of academic subjects to their disciplines and suspicion of education theory also had important implications for the teaching methods employed. Senior secondary school curricula were dominated by examinations of one sort or another since long before 1945, and it is still an important part of teachers’ work to prepare students for their examinations. In this context teachers saw themselves transmitting the body of knowledge specified by the curriculum to the students, and often the methods used were similar to those teachers had experienced themselves, both at school and at university. J.H. Murdoch observed in 1943 that many teachers interpreted ‘teaching’ to mean ‘instructing’, and Phoebe Meikle made the same point in 1961: ‘I believed that I could take as a model for my own teaching of English and history the aims, the subject-matter, the approach and methods … I remembered from my school days.’ This sort of approach to teaching methods was a serious impediment to the introduction of Social Studies, she wrote, in a summary of the proceedings of a Social Studies Refresher Course in 1959:

Some Other Weaknesses of Current Social Studies’ Teaching:

1. The tendency of the teacher who is mainly a historian, to ‘bog down with the Babylonians,’ and of the teacher who is primarily a geographer, to prance around places without looking at people.
2. Too restricted a use of teaching aids such as books, film strips, charts, models.
3. Too narrow a range of teaching methods.
4. Regular dictation of notes.
5. The too frequent failure to adapt a course to suit a Form’s abilities and interests.
6. Insufficient liaison with primary schools.

Traditional methods are still preferred by many teachers. The 2004 Education Review Office’s (ERO) report on my own school recommended that the school should examine ‘strategies that encourage greater levels of interactive, student-

---

centred learning .’21 The recommendation followed the ERO team’s observation that numbers of teachers favoured traditional teaching methods.

Many of the narratives constituting the collective identity of secondary teachers offered clear guidelines on how to manage the classroom, and these invariably supported traditional teaching methods. This suggests that innovation in teaching methods was difficult.

And so I persevered for three days. I liked talking to the kids at close range. I felt I could direct their reading and learning a lot better. But I had to resort to threats of near violence to keep the rest of the class silently reading. My final threat was dramatic. I flung the pre-fab door open. I stood, glowering in the entrance. Then I shouted shrilly, strongly, and with great vehemence, “The next time I have to open this door because I hear talking, the person I see talking - or with her or his mouth open no matter whether that is the first and only time she or he has talked today that person will, and I repeat, that person will have detention here after school with me today or tomorrow. IS THAT CLEAR?”

Silence. I went back to the group somewhat less enthusiastic, trying to remember to be nice and relaxed and intimate and what part of the book we were on.22

Here, a classroom teacher told of her attempt to introduce classroom reading groups. Apart from demonstrating students’ lack of co-operation and indicating that the ‘prefab’ was an imperfect physical environment for teaching, themes constantly repeated in teacher narratives which will be discussed further, this story justified a return to more traditional teaching methods on the grounds that they worked. This was the case even when it was unlikely that the class concerned was preparing for examinations. The application of pragmatic solutions to classroom problems, based on teachers’ experience, was highly valued by teachers and was constantly reinforced in the narratives that constructed the collective secondary teachers’

---

22 Martha Morseth, ‘Classroom Reading Groups – Ha!’, PPTA Journal, August 1978, p. 17.
identity. This being the case, whatever the regulative discourses implicit in any recontextualisation of education, the instructional discourses were likely to be delivered in traditional ways.

Teachers also learned through these narratives how to cope with the everyday challenges of the job. Firstly, they offered advice on dealing with reluctant, badly behaved students.

‘Morris, Head of maths’, the voice said. ‘Let me give you a piece of advice. Don’t make the mistake, the fatal mistake, of trying to teach the little wretches anything. You’ll come a terrible cropper if you do this. Self protection is the name of the game. Forget about any great ideals you might have to put a bit of culture in their heads. You’re a lion-tamer, nothing more, nothing less. If one of them gets out of line, give them a crack of the cane.’

This story of the experiences of a beginning teacher is a caricature, but the advice it offered is unmistakable. Martha Morseth’s account of her experiment with reading groups also ‘advised’ that the relaxation of firm discipline in an attempt to apply ‘progressive’ teaching methods would increase discipline problems in the classroom. In the cartoon (Fig. 2), Miss Peach responds to a classroom challenge. The reader is intended to recognise ‘Miss Peach’ as a spinster; the cartoon suggests that a class has drawn this to her attention, with the observation that she is sexually frustrated. Miss Peach’s stance and her tone make it clear that the way to deal with such a challenge is to crush it. She restores firm discipline in a thoroughly traditional manner.

---

Again, this was a teachers’ story and like the other examples, it called to teachers’ experience for its effect. Other elements in this cartoon will be discussed in the section dealing with teachers’ perception that they were overworked.

David Hill, the teacher responsible for the ‘Tonkins’ cartoons (Fig. IV), provided an example of the reluctant student and the equally unappreciative parent in his ‘valedictory’ article explaining why he was leaving teaching after sixteen years.

> It was always near the end of the winter term that you’d get the fourth former who, after pawing lethargically through the pile of irresistible books you’d just driven 40km to get from the School Library Service, would intone, ‘Reading’s slack, anyway’; plus the parents at report evening who would say, ‘He’s always enjoyed the subject up till this year … ’

While he gave a range of reasons to explain his departure, and this anecdote was not meant to suggest that leaving the profession was the only way to deal with its

---

challenges and frustrations, Hill established his credentials as an experienced teacher by including such stories. Teachers recognised the situations and the people, and the wry humour with which they were told helped teachers deal with those situations. The *PPTA Journal* and *PPTA News* published many such ‘stories’ in letters and articles. They served to reduce the isolation many teachers felt in coping with confrontation and negative situations in the classroom, and in many instances provided traditional and pragmatic suggestions about how the problems might be solved. These stories spoke of practical teaching experience and constituted teaching ‘knowledge’. They were expected to resonate with teachers and would not have appeared in these publications otherwise.

Other important narratives forming the secondary teachers’ collective identity were about being over-worked and under-appreciated. These are the ‘martyr’ narratives. Teachers saw themselves in a daily struggle to avoid being overwhelmed by the demands made on them from both within and outside the school. Miss Peach’s tirade in Fig. II lists a number of such demands. These narratives provided reassurance and consolation for teachers, and offered them a sense of shared self-righteousness at times when they felt that their efforts were taken for granted by the community at large.

Teachers constantly asserted that their work did not end at 3.30 p.m. when the students went home, and were particularly vocal on this point in times of dispute with governments over pay and conditions. The narratives supporting these assertions drew on the ideal of service which brought many teachers to the profession in the first place, and went on to identify the unreasonable expectations placed on teachers’ professional and private time by students, school administration, community and Department/Ministry of Education. Their contribution to the collective identity of secondary teachers was to provide it with a powerful emotional component. They pointed to the tragedy of idealism crushed, or forced out of the classroom and the school by pressures beyond teachers’ ability to control. They explained any failure of teachers to live up to high standards of performance
as teachers simply had too much to do and were too highly stressed to do it properly. Further, although teachers were prepared to put mind and body at risk in the service of the youth of the nation, no-one, governments in particular, seemed to appreciate their efforts in any way that mattered – that is through improvements in status, pay and conditions of service. These narratives illustrated teachers’ concern with their professional and social status, and their divided, but changing, views on the use of trade union activity in support of improved pay and conditions. When addressed to teachers, they served a useful purpose in reassuring individuals that ‘they were not alone’, but they were often presented to the public in a manner which projected an almost abject powerlessness which attracted scorn if they failed to attract sympathy. An extreme example of this appeared in a *Dominion* feature article in May 2002. A caption on a photograph showing a woman close to tears read:

> after suffering ill health linked to working 80 hour weeks and at weekends, the experienced head of department says she may leave the profession and won’t be advising others to enter it.  

The story ran that

> As she sat there, the huge demands of the day ahead pressing on her mind, Ms… had what she now calls an “attack”. Her vision went blurry, she lost the sensation in her tongue and, feeling frightened, called out for another teacher to help.

The story was intended to attract sympathy to the teachers’ cause in the midst of a protracted dispute over their collective contract. It noted teacher workload concerns about the increasing paperwork required to support the post –Picot reforms, and quoted a Wellington principal as saying ‘any secondary teacher will confirm that the paper war in recent years has sucked any pleasure out of the job.’ This became a major theme in PPTA publications.

In 1979 the *PPTA Journal* reprinted a letter from the *Auckland Herald* listing an ‘ex-teacher’s’ duties.

---

I used to have at least two hours of preparation or marking a night plus PTA meetings, Saturday-morning sports, private talks with parents, sports coaching, a form class to counsel, drama productions, school magazine, debating teams, taking three to six nights a week of my ‘own time.’ Most teachers have equal or greater demands on their time.\(^\text{27}\)

A Dunedin head of department contributed to this narrative in typical fashion with her article ‘Teachisteria’.

Every day I start with my diary in hand, neatly filled out with the day’s tasks, my \textbf{enthusiasm} intact.  
**Disillusionment** - sets in by interval. I am drained like the morning teapot.  
**Panic** - I’m not going to get time to call Julie’s mother till lunchtime, and by that time she could be in Timaru.  
**Search for the guilty** - me? the timetabler? the bellringer? the principal? the school board? the union? the Minister of Education?  
**Punishment of the innocent** - 6J are still waiting for their marking. My son wonders why I have to go back to school tonight to finish writing the school reports - and quite frankly so do I.  
**Praise and honour for the non-participants** - yes, the community will certainly take the credit for the successes and assume the right to use teachers as scapegoats when talking about educational failures or for heaven’s sake, the unemployed! How simple it is for a parent to demand an individual spelling programme for a 13-year-old boy; how easy for an employer to demand that schools get back to the basics. Good grief, we’ve never left them!\(^\text{28}\)

‘A Day in the Life of a DP’ added to the picture of serious over-work by tracing the day from its first work-related duty at 6.40 a.m. to its last at 9.00 p.m.\(^\text{29}\) In 1962 the \textit{PPTA Journal} quoted the president of an English Head Teachers’ Association that, ‘The perfect pedagogue should be part priest, part pedant, part parent, and part policeman, able to supply inspiration and information, admiration and

\(^{27}\) \textit{PPTA Journal}, March 1979, p.6, quoting ‘Mr Franklin, President of Gloucestershire Head Teachers’ Association’.  
In December 1947 the editor of STA wrote in similar terms about teachers’ services outside the classroom.

Certain it is that outside-the-classroom activities make heavy demands upon the time of the average post-primary teacher, … His activities show great diversity. With his academic and teaching qualifications he must combine some of the football genius of a Fred Allen, the stroke-making wizardry of a Bradman or Kramer; in some cases he must emulate Stokowski and possess the business acumen of an impresario. Then, too, he must be sufficiently vociferous to encourage a football or a hockey team, and be as patient as a Yogi philosopher in the cricket season. On one afternoon in each week he gives a pale imitation of a Guards drill sergeant while he endeavours to reduce his recalcitrant recruits into military formation. If he be specially gifted he gives instruction in boxing, life-saving, acting or sundry brass-band instruments, or perhaps trains a choir or runs a debating club.

In 1979, the PPTA broadened the issue, addressing a list of ‘factors contributing to the decline in teacher morale’ to the Director-General of Education. The list identified seven such factors:

1. unfair community expectations of secondary schools
2. inadequate conditions of service, conditions falling behind those pertaining outside the profession
3. an endemic incurable teacher shortage
4. inflationary pressure on school finances cutting down resources and classroom materials
5. increasing job pressures from difficult pupils, unsupportive parents, incompetent colleagues
6. unrealistic curricula because of examination domination
7. a feeling that the department is no longer interested in secondary education

These narratives supported a shared sense that teachers were put upon. They identified those responsible – badly behaved students, demanding parents, education

---

30 PPTA Journal, IX, 1, February 1962.
authorities. The exhausted faces of the timetablers in the cartoon (Fig. III) below illustrated the problem of increasing demands on the curriculum.

Only in the sixth factor in PPTA’s list above is there any suggestion that teachers had any part in creating the problem. Whether or not the claims of excessive work load were justified is not the question here.\(^{34}\) the shared sense that they \textit{were} justified provided the moral justification and self-righteousness nurtured by the


\(^{34}\) A branch survey of hours worked in 1981 showed that classroom teachers worked between 42.5 and 51 hours per week (\textit{PPTA NEWS}, 2, 7 May 1981, pp. 4 – 5). A PPTA survey of teachers leaving the profession in 1997 reported that 63\% of those who responded to the survey reported working between 50 to 69 hours. (\textit{PPTA NEWS}, 19, 1 February 1998, p.4).
‘martyr’ narratives which, in part, constituted the collective identity of secondary teachers

The degree to which the collective identity of secondary teachers changed over the time period of this study is now discussed. I have followed Taylor, Bougie and Caouette in presenting ‘collective identity’ as a relatively stable template ‘against which the individual crafts a personal identity….’ Even so, the collective identity of secondary teachers did change as teacher narratives moved from expressing the conviction that teaching was a profession and that the PPTA should act as a professional association, to a position where the former was much less an issue and where it was widely accepted that the interests of teachers and education in general were best served by the PPTA’s acting as a trade union.

PPTA publications regularly debated on whether or not teachers met the criteria to be regarded as members of a profession in the way that, for example, doctors and lawyers were. Generally, the conclusion was that teachers did not. What follows was a typical definition of a profession:

A profession is a **vocation**, accorded a **status** of high standing by the society in which it **serves**; this status depends upon certain pre-requisites for entry, a prolonged preparation in skills and knowledge and the behaviour and conduct of its members, all being **controlled** by the profession itself; also implies certain **obligations**, virtues and ideals on the part of its members; and finally it follows that appropriate financial and social rewards and conditions of service will accrue.\(^{35}\)

Such definitions were followed by laments that teachers were not accorded a high standing by society, that entry and behaviour standards, and professional discipline of teachers, were not in the hands of the profession; and that appropriate financial and social rewards and conditions of service certainly did not accrue. However, the ideas of vocation and ideals of service were constantly emphasised, demonstrating
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the close link between these and what many teachers believed it meant to be a member of a profession.

Without doubt teaching is a profession. Those who follow it profess a range of knowledge and/or skill which they are willing to devote to the service of others … the true – the only valid – motive for our striving for enhanced status – the only one, indeed, to be worth the effort – is the improvement of the service we as an organised body of people can give to the young. We must be scrupulously on our guard against mere selfishness; we must ensure that what we seek is primarily not for material advantage but for the betterment of our overall service to the community. 36

As the experience of classroom teaching increasingly carried with it the perception that teachers’ willingness to serve was not receiving the recognition it deserved, teachers’, the PPTA’s and headmasters’ willingness to compromise, 37 and the over-emphasis on ‘humble service’ were criticised:

humbility is stressed to our disadvantage … there remains a public, parental, and editorial expectation that teachers should be everlastingly submissive and sacrificing. 38

The ‘gentlemanly’ approach to addressing the problems faced by secondary education implied by the professional/vocational view of teachers seemed to have failed.

Conditions under which teachers labour have remained sub-standard; classes are still too large; pupils at either extreme of ability are still inefficiently educated; and teachers continue to accept aspects of their duties that they should have been strong enough to discard long ago. By failing to take a firm stand on educational matters teachers have avoided the full responsibilities of their vocation … 39

Here there was no denial of teaching as a vocation, but there was a clear view that trade union tactics would be more likely to achieve the ‘professional’ objectives of the vocation.

Much of the above focuses on teaching conditions, but there was also teacher dissatisfaction with the extent to which the Department, and later the Ministry, of Education consulted with them. Teachers felt that their expertise was under-valued in the formulation of education policy. In his address to the PPTA annual conference in 1969, the president, C. B. Newenham, quoted UNESCO’s ‘Recommendation Concerning the Status of Teachers’ adopted by an ‘inter-governmental conference … in Paris on 5 October 1966’. Recommendation 75 stated that:

‘In order that teachers may discharge their responsibilities, authorities should establish and regularly use recognised means of consultation with teachers’ organisations on such matters as education policy, school organisation, and new developments in the education service.’

Let it be noted that this is regarded as an essential part of the teacher’s responsibility. Yet this Association has to exert a continuous pressure to be allowed to represent the views of teachers on these matters. Some rethinking of education policy is required to provide greater recognition of the part to be played by an Association such as this and a more realistic appreciation of the contribution that teachers have to offer.  

Frustration about exclusion from policy-making continued to grow. It reached crisis point under the post-Picot reforms discussed in the next chapter.

The debate within the PPTA about whether or not it should continue as a professional association rather than as a trade union in its efforts to pressure governments and their agents to remedy the problems outlined above was long and circular. The passing of the Labour Relations Act of 1987, which legislated the
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PPTA into the role of a trade union, did not end it. However, there was increasing willingness to discard the ‘gentlemanly’ tactics consistent with the view of teaching as a profession in favour of pursuing ‘professional’ objectives as well as improvements in pay and conditions through more direct trade union tactics. Many of the objectives and the improvements sought reflected the themes of the ‘martyr’ narratives which contributed to the collective identity of secondary teachers and demonstrated the growing influence of those narratives within it. Not only did they provide the emotional and moral grounds to sustain teachers in their ‘never-ending story’ concerning pay and conditions; they explained the adoption of elements of ‘trade unionism’ within the collective identity of secondary teachers.

The development of trade unionism did not over-ride the idea of the teacher as a professional. Many of those professional priorities continued to be supported through trade unionism. The idea of service remained, although as the ‘martyr’ narratives made clear, maintaining it in the face of the problems they reported was not easy. Often the continuing high value placed on the idea of service was hidden under a cover of cynicism which protected teachers from the vulnerability which could be exposed by unguarded idealism. The ‘martyr’ narratives made it clear that recalcitrant students, hostile parents and unsympathetic governments did not always want to be served. None the less, the ‘intangible rewards’ which came through ‘service’ and which drew many teachers to the job in the first place continued to be important to teachers. David Hill’s cartoon (Fig. IV) made this very point. It reminds us that even Tonkins, the hardened, eccentric veteran of countless classroom engagements presented in the cartoon, was drawn to the job for altruistic and idealistic reasons and that experience taught him that survival in teaching required other qualities.

The apparent loss of ideals, or at least the difficulty in maintaining them given the challenges of classroom teaching, was a regular theme in PPTA publications. Figure V is another such example. Idealism had to be put aside as teachers were forced to

---

adopt the more pragmatic survival strategies inherent in many of the narratives already discussed.

Figure IV.42

Figure V.43

Frustrated idealism can be found in more recent complaints about excessive workload, some of which have already been presented. The following ‘Plea from the Chalkface’ was published in support of PPTA’s ‘Time to Teach’ campaign.

I love my job. It can be exciting, creative, challenging, stimulating, varied and inspiring. When it is all these things, it sings. When I see my students learn and develop I feel alive and useful and intensely rewarded. I never knew my work would be so deeply satisfying. I get a real kick out of it.

So why, after six years in the job, do I feel compelled to read the Situations Vacant, even though I want no other job?44

The answer, of course, was ‘The workload is kicking it out of me.’ However, acknowledgement of the ‘intangible and imponderable rewards’ was there. Although the ‘martyr’ narratives became much more important in the collective identity of secondary teachers towards the end of the century, the idealism and the desire to serve which were more obviously part of the earlier sense that teaching was a vocation and a profession, and a recognition of the rewards such service brought, were not lost.

The identity shift which came as a consequence of the PPTA’s increasing acceptance of a trade union role was the most obvious example of change in the collective identity of secondary teachers. There were other opportunities for change, however. The collective identity I have discussed, particularly as it applied in the earlier years of this study, presented a male Caucasian face. Women featured in numerous narratives after that time, but none of the narratives I have presented featured Maori teachers. There is no doubt that gender and ethnicity became important in New Zealand after the 1960s, and it is worth considering how the collective identity of secondary teachers shifted in response to these. Teachers’ awareness of these ‘new’ identity issues was reflected in the changing nature of the PPTA Journal after 1981. From that point, fewer individual PPTA members’ opinions or responses appeared. Instead, whole issues were devoted to educating

members on topical and sometimes controversial matters. For example, the Term II issue in 1986 was devoted to women and Maori in post-compulsory education. The Term II 1989 issue discussed the experiences of women (teachers) and girls in secondary education, while the final issue of the Journal, Term I 1990, marking the sesquicentenary of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, featured the Treaty itself. However, while the collective identity made room for these identities, it did not change noticeably because of them. The collective identity remained the template which identified the values and practices which teachers should adopt to be successful, or at least to cope in their work. This allowed teachers to develop their own individual professional identities within it. Both identities were able to coexist, and complement each other, but problems arose if the individual identity began to challenge the primacy of the collective identity in determining the values and practices of teaching. At that point the coercive nature of the collective identity was demonstrated, and this partly explained the high levels of stress felt by Maori teachers who owed a ‘dual accountability’ to the collective identity of teachers as well as to a Maori identity.\(^{45}\) So, apart from the profession/trade union change in the collective identity, there is little evidence of any other significant change. Instead, the collective identity provided the ‘backdrop’ and support to any number of individual professional identities, provided that they subscribed to its own fundamental dictates.

The discourse which produced the collective identity had this coercive power because it existed to guide and protect secondary teachers, and its narratives comprised ‘teacher knowledge’. It would not have been a collective identity if most teachers did not relate to it in the performance of their work. Therefore, it acted as a normalising influence on teachers’ attitudes and practise. If teachers challenged it, they put at risk ‘their reciprocal allegiance’\(^{46}\) to the collective identity and, therefore, to their colleagues. This made it difficult for some to remain in the job;


my own experience suggests that this was a problem for some Maori teachers. The coercive power of the collective identity operated in every case where the narratives which constituted it were widely accepted. Gerald Haigh described its effect as he criticised teachers’ resistance to education theory.

It is still too often true that the teacher who attempts in a staff meeting to make a point based on something he read in an education journal is likely to be met with an embarrassed silence, as if he had broken wind in assembly or written balls [sic] in the punishment book.47

In 1956 ‘Ichabod’ called on the coercive power of the collective identity to undermine B. I. Fulton’s arguments in support of the learning needs of all students and of the spirit of the Thomas Report. Fulton, he wrote,

by virtue of his office, has the …disadvantage of never being able to get to grips with the enemy. His duties take him out of the classroom – mine take me into it. He can never be in close and constant association with such pupils as I arraign; … From my position, right up here in the firing line, I have a shrewd feeling that I know what is really going on and for that reason his trumpet blasts fall flat and mockingly on my ears.48

B. I. Fulton was a principal.

In 1973, the PPTA Journal published two challenging articles written by Graham Clarke (or Graeme Clark – his name appeared in both spellings).49 Clark’s teaching experience amounted to ‘three months on section’. Both articles were highly critical of teachers and New Zealand secondary education, and challenged the values and priorities of teachers’ collective identity on a number of fronts. One response to his articles, in particular, demonstrated the coercive power of the collective identity as it sought to discredit Clark on the grounds of his lack of teaching experience and his dependence on theory for his authority. The correspondent began by establishing his

47 Gerald Haigh, PPTA Journal, August 1974, p. 11.
own right to speak by emphasising his experience: ‘After 20 odd years in the front line grappling with reality … ’. He went on to denigrate Clark’s use of theory.

There is nothing to be gained by bothering to point out the incredible fallacies in the statements he tries to make, as virtually all are the result of his obtuse misunderstanding of the situation and his errors are compounded by the fact that he has apparently read a couple of books connected with his topic.  

The high value the collective identity placed on practical experience was not to be challenged lightly.

Even the ‘martyr’ narratives carried their own constraining influence. While these helped teachers cope by allowing them a self-righteous tone when complaining about work-loads, they did not suggest that teachers should refuse to do the work. Apart from endorsing the right to complain, they offered no actual strategy to relieve the problem. The sub-text of these narratives appeared to be that teachers should continue to do the work until governments, or the community at large recognised the problem and did something about it. It may well have been that it was because teacher narratives had no real answers for the teacher discussed in the Dominion’s ‘Running Scared’ article, and because the narratives implied that teachers could cope with the work-loads, however much they complained about it, that she was driven to leave the profession.  

The collective identity served vital functions for teachers, but it imposed high levels of compliance, and the personal and professional risks of challenging its ‘teacher knowledge’ were also high.

In conclusion, the collective identity of secondary teachers was constructed from narratives of secondary teaching experience. Many of the narratives offered support and guidance for teachers in times of difficulty, by casting teaching situations in a

---

51 See p. 39.
cynical and humorous fashion. Their focus was retrospective and they served as a pragmatic guide to traditional teaching methods. Periodically, for political or industrial purposes, the identity took on shades of pained self-righteousness as teachers tried to persuade their employers and the public of their value, but behind all these forms of narrative lay a desire to serve, through imparting knowledge to willing learners, and to guide and mentor students towards a full and satisfying adult life, and to be recognised for doing this.

Secondary teachers were in no doubt of their value as a profession. They professed to speak pedagogically with the weight and authority of the ancient academic institutions behind them, and the wearing of academic regalia at prize-givings in many schools reminded the community of their academic credibility. Teachers often lamented the increasingly frequent occasions when those within the ‘official recontextualising field’ reached their decisions without consulting them. Teachers believed that it was their knowledge which should have guided education. They positioned themselves at the centre of secondary education. The knowledge practised by teachers, honed from experience and shaped by pragmatism generally free of educational and philosophical theory, was built into the narratives which shaped the collective identity of secondary teachers, and encouraged the view that teachers knew what was in the best interest of themselves, the schools and the secondary education system itself. This collective identity exercised a strong normalising effect on teaching knowledge and practice, and exacted a severe personal and professional toll if individuals challenged it.

Conflict arose, however, when recontextualisations of education attempted to de-centre teachers from their largely self-appointed position and construct a different ‘sort’ of teacher with a different ‘sort’ of role. Both the Thomas and the post-Picot reforms challenged the collective identity of secondary teachers described above. As a result, the reforms were resisted. Despite the attempts of the two recontextualisations, it was the narratives which formed the collective identity of secondary teachers which continued most to construct the teacher.
Chapter II

The Picot Recontextualisation and the Secondary Teacher.

The ‘Picot recontextualisation’ of education in New Zealand is the first of the two major educational reforms under study in this thesis. The term ‘Picot recontextualisation’ is one of convenience, intended to identify the process of reform which followed the publication of *Administering for Excellence* (The Picot Report) in 1988, so the discussion goes well beyond consideration of that report alone. This chapter surveys the conditions which gave rise to the discourses in the Picot recontextualisation and identifies their implications for secondary teachers. Teacher opposition to the Picot recontextualisation has been an obvious feature of secondary education for the last fifteen years. I argue that the Picot recontextualisation’s regulative and instructional discourses presented a role for teachers which was fundamentally different to the role implicit in the collective identity of secondary teachers described in Chapter I. Teachers opposed them for that reason. This chapter also examines the ways education authorities tried to discipline teachers to accept their recontextualised role. It is here that the detail of teacher resistance is discussed. While teachers appeared to comply with the requirements of the Picot recontextualisation, they continued to resist it. The major focus of this thesis is to show that the discourses which constituted the collective identity of secondary teachers, and hence, constructed ‘the teacher’, account for this.

The regulative discourses which applied the metaphor of the market-place to education, the business models of education provision, the high priority accorded to ‘choice’, and different concepts of teacher accountability, all challenged teachers’ views of how education and society should be ordered. Instructional discourses introduced standards-based forms of assessment for students, and continued demands for increased responsiveness to the individual learning needs of students.
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Appraisal criteria based on observable competencies of teachers threatened to re-
define the concept of professionalism implicit in the collective identity of secondary teachers. The senior school curriculum was broadened far beyond the traditional academic subjects so important to the collective identity of secondary teachers. The recontextualisation invested heavily in strategies to oblige teachers to conform to the new priorities. However, despite these points and the many changes which came with the Picot recontextualisation and teachers’ apparent compliance with it, at the end of the century it was still the collective identity of secondary teachers which determined the nature of ‘the teacher’, the delivery of instructional discourses, and which continuously strove to undermine the regulative discourses of the Picot recontextualisation.

In general terms the Picot recontextualisation of education was the result of the adoption of neo-liberal economic theories by powerful state agencies, in particular by the Treasury, and by key figures in government who felt these theories promised a solution to New Zealand’s economic and social problems of the 1970s and 80s. The economic problems, brought into focus by the ‘oil shocks’ of the ’70s and by New Zealand’s restricted access to the British market, were all the more stark in New Zealand after the relative wealth and stability of the 1950s and ’60s. Growing unemployment and rising inflation raised serious concerns about the structure and performance of New Zealand’s economy, and its ability to maintain the existing levels of state involvement in social services such as education.

Education systems are an obvious and easy target for scrutiny in periods of crisis, economic or otherwise, and, however real it might be, the development of a sense of crisis seems to precede recontextualisations in education. A solution requires identification of the problem to be solved. If economic performance is poor, it is easy for politicians and others to point to education’s failure to improve it.

---


the logic of those who looked to neo-liberal economic theory as a solution to economic and social ills did not focus on education alone, education did, and still does, receive a lot of attention.

These matters have not concerned New Zealand alone. The same issues surfaced in the United Kingdom, the United States of America and in Australia, and these countries have sought answers in similar ways to New Zealand. Neo-liberal theories of economic and social life gained great influence in political, commercial and economic circles. In the United States of America, the relative success of the Japanese and West German post-Second World War economies in comparison to its own prompted a search for explanations, and an examination of education was a part of that process. In 1981 a National Commission on Excellence in Education was established in response to these concerns, and its 1983 report, ‘A Nation at Risk’, provided the prototype for at least the personnel aspects of ‘Tomorrow’s Schools’, the policy document based on the recommendations of Administering for Excellence, in New Zealand.\(^4\) It identified teacher quality and training as the heart of the perceived problem in the United States, and advocated improved teacher pay and status, as well as better teacher training and more accountability as a solution.\(^5\) These developments lay behind the formation the New Zealand Parliament’s Education and Science Select Committee’s enquiry into the quality of teaching and the resultant ‘Scott Report’ of December 1986. They have remained central concerns of those within education’s official recontextualising field ever since.

Another source of concern which contributed to the perception that the education system was failing the population and needed reform, was that the objectives of the Thomas Report of 1944 had not been met. Not only was criticism directed at education from the political right on the grounds that standards had fallen and that education was failing to prepare students to meet the challenges of the modern world, but it was being criticised from the left as well. In particular, second-wave

\(^4\) *ibid.*, p. 8.
feminism and the increasingly insistent voice of Maori challenged the view that equal educational opportunity for all was available in the New Zealand. Feminists claimed that education perpetuated a patriarchal society, and that everything from teacher career structures to the language of school texts needed revision; Maori claimed that the education system perpetuated Pakeha hegemony. These voices were encouraged by Marxist analyses, in academic circles at least, of education’s role in bourgeois cultural reproduction. If education was not the means of providing equality of opportunity, as assumed by the Thomas reforms and reinforced by the Currie Commission in 1962, and if it was failing to provide the population with the means of finding a place in the ‘modern world’, then advancing solutions to the questions about the objectives of education and how they should be delivered were obvious steps for the critics of the education system.

The New Zealand Treasury advanced the cause of neo-liberal discourses in its Brief to the Incoming Government in 1987. Hugh Lauder summarised the Treasury claims about education as follows:

1. In the past New Zealanders have been too optimistic about the ability of education to contribute to economic growth and equality of opportunity.
2. Increased expenditure on education does not necessarily improve educational standards or equality of opportunity, or lead to an improved economic performance.
3. The nature of education [society?] has changed rapidly in the eighties but education has not. In particular education needs to become more oriented to the needs of the economy. Failure to do so may hold significant costs to the society.
4. Not only has the education system not adjusted to changed circumstances but it has performed badly despite increased expenditure on it.
5. The reason why the system has performed badly and not changed rapidly is because of the self-interest of teachers and the
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educational establishment. As a result of this pursuit of self-interest the education lobby has effectively bloated educational expenditure, so (6) government expenditure has exceeded rather than fallen short of the optimum i.e., should be cut. Finally, the sting in the tail: (7) the Treasury assumes that education can be treated like any other commodity in the marketplace.  

Lauder’s first four points illustrated the doubts about the education system which were circulating in the 1970s and ’80s. The remaining three points accounted for these problems, and introduced the neo-liberal solutions.

Lauder’s fifth point referred to the idea of ‘provider capture’, which assumed that teacher organisations and the Department of Education exercised monopolistic control on what happened within education, to the exclusion of other legitimate interests or ‘stakeholders’ – notably ‘The Community’. The Treasury maintained that such a monopoly was simply not efficient and that reform was not possible if it was directed by the vested institutional interests.

In schooling, as with any other service, there can be no presumption that monopoly state provision is either equitable or efficient in meeting the diverse needs of children. More contestability in provision would tend to make it easier to exert greater pressure on schools to reach the high standards that families want … Given the inherent limitations of schools as an educational source, the state cannot deliver if the partnership between school and family is not good. By capturing virtually all available state intervention for itself, the institutional sector is ensuring that the potential of the family resource is in many cases not fully realised ….
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8 Hugh Lauder, ‘A Review of the Treasury’s Brief on Secondary Education’, PPTA Journal, Term I, 1988, p. 10. The first reference to ‘education’ in point 3 appears to be a mistake. Replacing it by ‘society’ appears to make more sense.

The Treasury’s application of neo-liberal philosophy to education was summarised in Lauder’s last point: ‘education can be treated like any other commodity in the marketplace.’ One of the principles which governs behaviour in the marketplace is choice. The Treasury claimed that the monopolistic practices of the education providers had restricted the choice available to members of the community, both in their ability to influence what their children might learn and in their right to choose which school their children might attend. ‘Zoning’ was the offending practice in this latter case. Provider-capture also prevented the right of employers to determine the pay and conditions of teachers, which had been done through negotiation of national conditions of employment and salaries. The Treasury stated that this situation

militates against regional and subject differentials in pay and conditions that are necessary if sufficient teachers are to be attracted into regions and subject areas with recruitment and retention problems, and hinders the application of incentives for high performance and sanctions for poor performance.  

10

The Treasury argued that removal of the monopolistic practices of providers and the application of market principles to education would solve these ‘problems’ and improve the efficiency of state involvement by

i. maximising consumer choice and information;
ii. maximising provider flexibility and responsiveness to consumer demands;
iii. ensuring the management, accountability, and incentive structures cohere and are performance and target related; and
iv. minimising the extent of in-kind provision by the state, in a contestable environment.  

11

This was the Treasury’s advice to the incoming government in 1987, but the agenda had already been set with the appointment of the Taskforce to Review Educational Administration under the chairmanship of Mr. Brian Picot on 21 July, and the

Treasury’s views were available to the Taskforce through the attachment of Dr. Simon Smelt, a Treasury Economist, to the Taskforce’s secretariat.\textsuperscript{12}

Before studying component parts of the reforms, some discussion of the theoretical support, or the ‘strategies’, of the neo-liberal position serves a useful purpose. Teachers in general were not well acquainted with their detail, but they acquired an uneasy sense of the content as they became more familiar with the post-Picot regulative and instructional discourses and the techniques which were employed to discipline teachers to them.

‘Neo-liberal economic theory’ is derived from the classical economists. It assumes that

Because government has such an invariably deleterious influence upon the economy, it must be reduced to the minimum functions possible. In the days of Hobbes and Adam Smith it was assumed that this meant that minimal government concerned itself with security of the country and of the individual members of the citizenry, that is, with the armed forces, with foreign policy, with internal peace via the police force, and with the law courts.\textsuperscript{13}

However, neo-liberal ambitions extend beyond limiting government involvement in the economy.

They have actively sought to apply their ideas to the fields of politics, welfare, and education. This project of application of economics to politics and other fields is called Public Choice Theory.\textsuperscript{14}

Public Choice Theory is based on the assumption that all human behaviour is dominated by self-interest. This view leads naturally to a fundamental distrust of

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{ibid.}, p. 172.
politicians and the bureaucrats who carry out their will, and of any powerful interest group, because in exercising their ‘disproportionate share of influence and income … individual liberty is undermined and economic growth is disrupted.’ Therefore, their authority should be limited so that individual liberty is increased and the free market can operate efficiently.

Other elements of the neo-liberal position are Agency Theory and New Public Management ideas. Both of these, as well as Public Choice Theory, informed the Treasury’s *Government Management* in 1987. All three were reflected in the post-Picot reforms and had an important bearing on the view of the teacher and teacher role found there. Agency theory develops

the idea that social and political life is a series of contracts (or agreed relationships) where one party is the principal and the other the agent. The agent performs tasks on behalf of the principal for an agreed reward. Agency theory also rests on the premise that individuals are self-interested and opportunistic, and that the relationship between a principal and an agent is one of equals, in which either party may seek to implement the bargain in ways that disadvantage the other. … Agency theory is also linked to an emphasis on outcomes. Outcomes are specified as performance criteria, inserted into contracts and measured in service and performance agreements.  

Along with Agency Theory, New Public Management practices aim to remove controls on public sector employment to allow ‘managers to manage’. They aim to remove constraints on, for example, who can be employed for what purposes and for how much remuneration. While it aims to increase the potential efficiency and power of management, it also builds in disciplinary measures for managers, since they, by definition, are expected to serve their own self-interest rather than the interests of those who employ them. This discipline takes the form of establishing measurable and observable outcomes which must be met by the manager. These are
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16 *ibid.*, pp. 5 - 6.
the ‘strategies’ brought to bear in the Picot recontextualisation, and while this study deals with the application of these theories in education, they have obviously been applied in other areas of state activity in New Zealand too.

The first step in the Picot recontextualisation was aimed at educational administration. This was reflected in the terms of reference given to the Picot Taskforce in July 1987. The Taskforce was to examine:

- the functions of the Head Office of the Department of Education with a view to focussing them more sharply and delegating responsibilities as far as practicable;
- the work of polytechnic and community college councils, teachers college councils, secondary school boards and school committees with a view to increasing their powers and responsibilities;
- the Department’s role in relation to other educational services;
- changes in the territorial organisation of public education with reference to the future roles of education boards, other education authorities, and the regional offices of the Department of Education;
- any other aspects that warrant review.\(^{17}\)

It is not the intention here to analyse either the Picot Report or *Tomorrow’s Schools* in depth. A general outline will suffice because the main focus of this study is on those aspects of the reforms which have had a particular impact on teachers and teachers’ work.

The Picot Taskforce was expected to recommend the devolution of the powers of the Department of Education to local communities which were to be represented in the governing bodies of education institutions. This was intended to eliminate the perceived monopolistic behaviour of the Department. At the national level, the Picot Report recommended the abolition of the Department of Education and the creation of a Ministry of Education, with more carefully defined policy and operational functions. At the level of school governance, regional education boards

\(^{17}\) Picot Report, p. vii.
were to be abolished and boards of trustees were to be responsible for the delivery of education to each school’s community. These reforms were intended to ‘result in more immediate delivery of resources to schools, more parental and community involvement, and greater teacher responsibility.’\(^{18}\) In these and other recommendations the Picot Taskforce did not disappoint the supporters of neoliberal economic and social theory; most of its recommendations were adopted virtually unchanged in the government’s policy response, *Tomorrow’s Schools*.

Underlying the whole Picot Report is the assumption that ‘choice’, one of the most important principles of the ‘market place’, would solve perceived problems in education and ensure the ‘learner receive the best education from every dollar spent.’\(^ {19}\) Choice would be exercised in a number of ways. Communities could exercise choice in electing parent representatives to boards of trustees. Boards could exercise choice in the allocation of the funding they received from the Ministry. Boards were to become the legal employer of teachers and support staff,\(^ {20}\) although *Tomorrow’s Schools* departed from the Picot recommendation that they should pay teachers from a bulk salaries grant, and ‘decide the number of teachers, and at what step in the national salary scale they start.’\(^ {21}\) This gave the community, through the boards of trustees, new and vastly increased power over teachers and how they might be deployed within a school. It was intended to solve the problems created by what the Treasury described as teachers’ self-serving practices, since their immediate community was now to be their employer. It was also expected that in the reformed environment parents would exercise choice by selecting the schools to which they would send their children and that they would naturally choose those that ‘performed’.

The Treasury outlined what it saw as the benefits of this exercise of choice in *Government Management*. It argued against ‘zoning’ and ‘limited subsidy of

---


\(^{19}\) Picot Report, p. vii.

\(^{20}\) *Tomorrow’s Schools*, p. 5.

\(^{21}\) Picot Report, p. 49.
private schools’ as ‘disabling tactics, restricting choice’, and claimed ‘the individual will benefit from greater choice and the pressure this exerts for attainment of the standards achieved by the best schools ….’ \(^{22}\) The Treasury intended schools to compete for custom, and expressed the view that this would improve the standard of all schools. The consequences for schools which failed to compete would be falling roles, reduced staffing and funding, and, unless these trends were halted, eventual closure. The Picot Report generally endorsed this view. It allowed that the zoning of enrolments was justified ‘to ensure that every student has an absolute right to attend the nearest neighbourhood school’, but that it should not be used ‘to maintain enrolments in schools which might otherwise decline.’ \(^{23}\) The same principles were expressed in *Tomorrow’s Schools*. \(^{24}\) These ideas are important to this thesis because the market-related concept of competition – that schools (and therefore teachers) should compete for custom - is quite alien to the views of schools’ and teachers’ behaviour embodied in secondary teachers’ collective identity. There, a high value is placed on co-operation and collegiality.

Closely associated with increased opportunity for community and parent choice went accountability, reflecting the New Public Management concerns. Boards of trustees were to be accountable to their communities, and were to report regularly to them. \(^{25}\) Schools were to be subjected to regular review by a central Review and Audit Agency, which was finally instituted as the Education Review Office, one of the major disciplinary instruments imposed on boards and teachers in the recontextualised system. A new Teacher Registration Board was also intended to oversee the maintenance of teaching standards and teacher discipline. It was to determine ‘the conditions and requirements under which teachers will be able to be registered as teachers’, and be responsible for ‘maintaining a register of teachers.’ \(^{26}\) Significantly, and intended to address the perception that the teaching profession

\(^{23}\) Picot Report, p. 77.  
\(^{24}\) *Tomorrow’s Schools*, pp. 35 – 36.  
\(^{25}\) *ibid.*, p. 4.  
\(^{26}\) *ibid.*, p. 23.
harboured incompetent teachers,\textsuperscript{27} the Teacher Registration Board was also to decide ‘if a teacher’s name is to be removed from the register, and … the conditions under which this could occur.’\textsuperscript{28}

Teacher performance appraisal was a serious concern of the Picot Taskforce. It was suggested that appraisal systems take place in a ‘collaborative environment’, but that the clear purpose was ‘to assess the current status of teacher knowledge, skills and qualifications and to implement a staff development programme to help teachers enhance their skills.’\textsuperscript{29} However, the disciplinary aspect of appraisal systems was made clear when the recommendation went on to detail procedures to be followed when concerns were raised about teacher performance.\textsuperscript{30} Performance appraisal received only passing mention in \textit{Tomorrow’s School}, however. There it was merely stated that ‘the board of trustees … will be responsible for instituting procedures of teacher appraisal …’\textsuperscript{31}

Schools developed their own appraisal systems until the final years of the century when teachers were required to be appraised against a nationally applied set of professional standards. Both the ERO and the Teacher Registration Board are important for the discussion of teacher identity and role, because in order for them to carry out their tasks they had to specify, at least to themselves, the personal qualities they expected to find in teachers, and behaviours and skills which constituted effective teaching. Both organisations did this; but whereas their definitions reflected the ideology and expectations of the Picot recontextualisation, ideas of what constituted an effective teacher within the collective identity of secondary teachers did not.


\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Tomorrow’s Schools}, p. 23.

\textsuperscript{29} Picot Report, p. 68.

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{ibid.}, p. 69.

\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Tomorrow’s Schools}, p. 12.
‘Merit pay’ was a concept introduced in the Picot Report, and related to appraisal. Paying teachers according to their merits was implied as one of the choices available to boards of trustees. However, specific mention was restricted to the suggestion that positions for ‘teachers of outstanding merit’ be created.

Such an incentive would not only place a premium on the teaching skills of teachers of outstanding merit but would also recognise those skills in a public and tangible way.

Such teachers were to be recommended by their principals and boards of trustees and final judgements were to be made by the Review and Audit Agency.  

Tomorrow’s Schools confirmed that such positions would be built into salary scales. Both the Report and Tomorrow’s Schools accepted that the number of these positions would be limited.

This, then, is an outline of the administrative reforms of the Picot recontextualisation. They were intended to address perceived problems in education and, like the curricular and assessment reforms which followed and which are discussed later in the chapter, they anticipated a brighter future. To use Bernstein’s term; they were ‘prospective’. Implementation problems arose because the narratives which shaped the collective identity of teachers, and their responses to change, were ‘retrospective’.

This thesis argues that the Picot recontextualisation’s regulative and instructional discourses were resisted by the collective identity of secondary teachers. To revisit Bernstein’s terminology: regulative discourse delivers pedagogies concerned with social relations and order; while instructional discourse concerns the transmission and acquisition of knowledges. In any recontextualisation the reformed role of the teacher will be detailed in the instructional discourses. The object of any recontextualisation is for instructional discourse to become embedded in the regulative to become a single ‘pedagogic discourse’. At that point the social

---

32 Picot Report, p. 70.
33 See ‘Introduction’, p. 17.
‘messages’ of the recontextualisation would be delivered and acquired in the course of teaching and learning in the classroom, probably quite unconsciously by both teacher and student. However, for that to occur, both teacher and learner would have to accept as their own the view of society inherent in the pedagogic discourse. Experience, and The Munro Report quoted below, do not indicate teachers accepted either the regulative discourse or much of the instructional discourse brought by the Picot recontextualisation. As a result it was only partly successful, at best, in reshaping the secondary teacher and in introducing educational change.

The Picot recontextualisation’s regulative discourses offered great offence to secondary teachers. Firstly, although Brian Picot stressed ‘that the taskforce had found a bad system but good people’; and that, according to the consultants hired by the taskforce, the education system ‘only hangs together because of the professional dedication and integrity of those who run it’, teachers felt that the reforms called their integrity into question. In 1989, the NZPPTA commissioned Rae Munro ‘to review the personnel provisions as outlined in Tomorrow’s Schools.’ He also reached this conclusion.

The taskforce, Treasury, and the State Service Commission, characterise teachers as powerful, unified, self-interested professionals who have literally captured the policy-making of New Zealand education. The reality for ordinary classroom teachers is far removed from this … they are seen to, by and large, work alone and isolated within cell-like spaces we call classrooms. Inside, when the door is closed, teachers experience varying degrees of success in working with thirty or more, often very lively, adolescents. Most, during the course of a week, will experience elements of humiliation, abuse, and downright failure in achieving their goals. Despite this, most persist with remarkable forbearance.

35 Munro, p. 2.
36 ibid., p. 35.
While Munro was under contract to the PPTA to write his *Report*, what he wrote accorded perfectly with teachers’ views of themselves expressed in the narratives which constituted their collective identity. The image of the unappreciated professional, working against the odds to serve often-reluctant adolescents for inadequate pay and in poor conditions has been described in Chapter I, and it did not match well with the Treasury view of teachers. This was exacerbated by the assumptions behind the whole low-trust, managerial philosophy of the reform, with its insistence on accountability.\(^{37}\) These ideas offered a fundamental challenge to teachers’ view that they were the education experts and should be at the centre of the whole education enterprise. To add insult to injury, the reform imposed the metaphor of the market-place on education, complete with its corporate language, and most teachers rejected the proposition that education was a contestable commodity like any other, and that it was not a self-evident public good.\(^{38}\)

By 1995 the average age of secondary teachers was 48.\(^{39}\) It may be that 48 year olds, generally, are slow to accept radical change, but the age of secondary teachers meant that a majority of them was brought up in a social-democratic climate which was reflected in the regulative discourses of the Thomas Report discussed in the next chapter. It is not surprising, therefore, that many teachers in this age group regarded as self-evident the view that education *was* a public good and an important means of shaping citizens for the improvement of society in general. They accepted the Thomas Report’s assumption that education should aim

> to create people who are not only self-disciplined and free in spirit, gifted in work and in enjoyment, worthy and desirable as persons, but also responsible and generous in social life, able to give and take freely from others, willing to serve social ends and to lose themselves in social purposes greater than themselves.\(^{40}\)


\(^{38}\) The Treasury, Vol. II, p.32.


\(^{40}\) New Zealand Consultative Committee on the Post-Primary School Curriculum, *The Post-Primary*
Such assumptions, particularly the last point, accept that the interests of ‘the collective’ should take precedence over the interests of ‘the individual’, and that education should aim to produce citizens able to recognise that. The Picot recontextualization’s insistence on choice and its underlying assumption that the pursuit of individual self-interest is society’s driving mechanism was diametrically opposed to the social values of a majority of secondary school teachers, and probably opposed to the social values of the majority of the same generation. It is quite possible that as a large number of aging secondary school teachers retire from the profession within the next ten years, the neo-liberal concepts of how society should be ordered will be more widely accepted by secondary teachers, and teachers’ collective identity will adjust accordingly; but at the end of the century, and beyond, the regulative discourses of the Picot recontextualisation were still resisted fiercely by secondary teachers whose identity was firmly grounded in a different set of social values.

The instructional discourses which came with Picot were not immediately apparent. They were made more explicit as the curriculum documents associated with the implementation of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework began to appear after 1993. They were made clearer as standards-based assessment methods were introduced over the course of the decade with the first trials of ‘Unit Standards’ and with the introduction of ‘Achievement Standards’ early in the new century. Finally, the disciplinary measures employed by the Ministry of Education, through the agency of the ERO and the attempt to impose Bulk Funding of teacher salaries, attempted to ensure that the instructional discourses were put in place. The combination of the above attempted to remodel the secondary teacher better to deliver the regulative discourses already outlined, and in the process tried to re-define concepts of teacher professionalism. Secondary teachers implemented the new curricula and applied, and even supported, the new assessment methods.

Whether or not teachers had reservations about the Picot recontextualisation’s instructional discourses, they were required to comply and to a large degree they did. ERO reports indicated this clearly enough. However, the collective identity of secondary teachers meant that teachers resisted attempts to change their professional role, and continued to deliver their lessons in a traditional manner. They felt that they were required to take part in ‘someone else’s game’\(^{41}\) and so they obstructed the Picot recontextualisation’s attempt to change ‘the secondary teacher’ and what they did.

When a major review of the school curriculum was released by Russell Marshall, the Labour government’s Minister of Education, on 13 April 1987, the PPTA hailed it as ‘the most extensive examination of the curriculum in schools since the Thomas Committee reported on secondary schools in 1942.’\(^{42}\) Even here, the attempt to change the role of teachers, later given teeth in the Picot recontextualisation, was heralded:

> Teachers are much more than a source of knowledge. They become managers of learning experiences. co-ordinators of the resources students use, and have a central role in helping students to establish control over their own learning. … Teachers are now expected to actively involve their own students and the community in planning and implementing the school curriculum.\(^{43}\)

So, even before ‘Picot’, business language was being applied to teachers’ role.


---


For the first time in the history of New Zealand education, the national curriculum will be given a framework. The framework consists of a set of learning principles, essential learning areas, generic skills, and national curriculum objectives underpinned by assessment methods.\footnote{Lockwood Smith, \textit{Education Policy. Investing In People Our Greatest Asset}, Wellington: Government Printer, 1991, p. 18.}

One of his priorities was to enhance student achievement through the National Curriculum Objectives, which would define more specifically the knowledge, understanding, skills, and qualities within the essential learning areas, and the essential skills that are to be attained. They will describe the levels of achievement which can reasonably be expected of a student at particular stages of learning throughout the years of schooling.

In the senior secondary school, examination will be improved to ensure that student results are reported in terms of achievement, based on published standards.\footnote{\textit{ibid.}, p. 19.}

The new curriculum and assessment statements made it clear that educational standards would be set and that it was the responsibility of teachers to meet the individual learning needs of each student so that he or she could reach the standards. This was an important change. Teachers were no longer expected to account for student failure in terms of social background, lack of ability to understand the material delivered by the teacher or any other reason which teachers may have offered previously. In other ways the new curriculum documents were unexceptional in terms of suggesting teaching methods. For example, each of the Social Studies, Science, English and Mathematics Curriculum statements supported building on each student’s personal experience and knowledge in the course of developing understanding.\footnote{Ministry of Education, \textit{Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum}, Wellington: Learning Media,}

\footnote{\textit{ibid.}, p. 19.}
and few teachers doubted its value. Even the principles of the new Curriculum Framework,\textsuperscript{47} and the values they represented raised few objections from teachers. However, the challenge for teachers to be accountable for student achievement did represent a significant change in the relationship between the teacher and the learner, and this did not conform to the teacher role supported by the collective identity of secondary teachers. Here, the teacher ensured that the learner had been ‘taught’ the knowledge needed to succeed in its assessment, but it was the learner’s responsibility to understand and apply it. Learners, not teachers, were accountable for their own performance.

There was one other way in which the new curricula challenged the traditional priorities of teachers. With the introduction of Technology as one of the seven essential learning areas, old distinctions between subjects such as ‘Woodwork’ and ‘Metalwork’, or even between ‘Workshop Technology’ and ‘Home Economics’, blurred. How technology should be delivered seriously threatened teachers committed to the traditional ‘practical’ subjects and it was resisted by many teachers directly concerned. ERO confirmed that, ‘The source of this resistance [to the implementation of changes] varied, but it came most often from teaching staff.’\textsuperscript{48} The changes appeared to threaten time-honoured ‘subjects’, an offence to the collective identity of secondary teachers; but perhaps opposition might also be explained in terms of a perception that jobs would be lost.

The new standards-based assessment methods posed a direct challenge to teachers’ collective views on assessing student performance. Teachers viewed themselves as

professionals able to apply professional judgement, based on experience, to judge levels of student performance. This is consistent with an identity which placed the teacher at the centre of the education process, and had governed the assessment of student work for a very long time. Lockwood Smith made it clear that it was *skills* which were to be attained and assessed. This struck a blow at the integrity of knowledge as an end in itself, an idea which was highly valued by teachers. In demonstrating levels of competence in particular skills, students might not have to show a full understanding of traditional disciplinary ‘units’ of knowledge, or ‘topics’. This again threatened the integrity of traditional academic disciplinary knowledge, and the expertise of the teacher in it. This was a direct challenge to the identity of many teachers, and compliance was often reluctant. The result was that the instructional discourses which were delivered were not those of the Picot recontextualisation. At best, the latter were highly compromised by those which conformed to the discourses which constituted the collective identity of secondary teachers.

The activities of ERO, the introduction of an appraisal system based on professional standards after 1999, and the attempt to impose the Bulk Funding of teachers’ salaries all clarified the post-Picot role of the teacher. All three aimed to discipline teachers to the reforms, and all highlighted the distance between the concept of the teacher envisaged in them and that implicit in the collective identity of secondary teachers.

As I have noted, any attempt to redefine the nature and role of the teacher must develop it own definitions before it can impose them. This particular issue was faced by the Teacher Registration Board, whose definition formed the professional standards on which teachers’ appraisal systems were based after 1999. ERO faced the issue too, and produced its own definition in *The Capable Teacher* which acknowledged its debt to the Teacher Registration Board in reaching its
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conclusions. The approach of these two agencies reflected the neo-liberal view of education, with its focus on observable, measurable outcomes.

ERO acknowledged that defining a ‘teacher’ and ‘teaching’ was a difficult task, and settled for an attempt to define the ‘capable teacher’, as opposed to the ‘competent’ one, reflecting the view that behaviours indicating capability would be easier to identify than those indicating competence. Even so, ERO noted that

There is no single model of a capable teacher. Good teaching requires judgement and improvisation. Different teaching approaches are appropriate in different contexts depending on the learning needs of the students and the demands of the subject being taught.\(^{50}\)

ERO followed the ‘dimensions’ identified by the Teacher Registration Board, (i.e. professional knowledge, professional practice, professional relationships and professional leadership), as it set out to detail what ‘reasonable expectations of a satisfactory teacher …’ might be.\(^{51}\) In terms of professional knowledge, for example

**A capable teacher demonstrates informed professional knowledge of:**

- current curricula, the subjects being taught, and current learning theory …
- the Treaty of Waitangi and te reo Maori me ona tikanga …
- the characteristics and progress of their students …
- appropriate teaching objectives …
- appropriate technology and resources …
- appropriate learning activities, programmes, and assessment

\(^{50}\) *ibid.*, p. 23.

\(^{51}\) *ibid.*, p. 9.
Each of the behaviours listed was expanded by explanatory notes. For example, in the case of the first bulleted point, the notes indicated how professional knowledge of current curricula might be expected to be demonstrated.

- current curricula, the subjects being taught, and current learning theory
  can explain the relationship between current learning theory and own practice

written programme documentation and teaching practice reflect knowledge and understanding of content of the subjects and requirements of the New Zealand Curriculum and relevant learning theory

planning and practice reflect an understanding of relationships among topics and concepts

teaching practices take into account current research on best practice

And so it goes on, listing all the behaviours ERO officers might expect to find in their review visits to schools. A capable teacher in professional practice ‘creates an environment of respect and understanding’ through establishing ‘an orderly, friendly classroom in which students are treated with consistency and fairness.’

The teacher ‘manages student behaviour positively’ through using ‘subtle and constructive methods of monitoring and managing student behaviour’. A capable teacher ‘uses a range of teaching approaches’. This can be demonstrated, amongst other ways, by varying ‘teaching approach to take account of the type of learning outcomes sought’, and by taking ‘account of the differing learning needs of individuals and groups of students’. The capable teacher ‘provides learning experiences that gain a high level of student attention’, and ‘involves students in goal setting and self assessment’. The Capable Teacher even provides anecdotal accounts of these sorts of behaviours.

---

52 ibid., pp. 10 – 11.
53 ibid., p. 10.
54 ibid., p. 13.
56 ibid., p. 16.
An example of a teacher who engages students in learning.

This teacher is working on an inquiry based unit on the significance of Captain Cook in New Zealand’s heritage. The teacher has acknowledged the children’s prior knowledge by allowing them to brainstorm individually what they already know about Captain Cook. Using this information she has developed a unit plan that takes individual needs into account, as a basis for the study. Students visited the replica ship ‘Endeavour’ at the local port so the unit is timely as students are highly motivated. The visit itself generated much media coverage and current newspaper resources are providing a springboard into discussion. 57

The list of behaviours which constitute ERO’s description of a capable teacher is exhaustive, and, in every likelihood, exhausting for the ERO officer in trying to observe them in a short visit to a classroom and a school, for the teacher trying to perform the behaviours and for students having to witness them. However, there is little doubt that the list detailed a long list of worthy elements of what capable teachers might do. The list formed a critical part of the Picot recontextualisation’s instructional discourse, since it detailed the teacher role implicit in the reform, and offered comprehensive guidance on teaching methods.

The problem here is that this approach to the assessment of teachers and to making teachers accountable challenged the notion of professionalism upheld by the collective identity of secondary teachers. While few teachers would, or could, argue that any one of the individual ‘capabilities’ identified by the Teacher Registration Board and ERO was inappropriate, or did not represent ‘something’ a teacher might do, in such a ‘list’

Teaching is portrayed as an unreflective technical process and ‘quality’ as synonymous with meeting pre-specified standards through a system of supervision, inspection and control. Teaching Quality may use the rhetoric of professionalism, but in reality

57 ibid., p. 17.
this amounts to giving teachers a little more than the right to exercise a limited technical discretion ….

The whole focus is on observable behaviours from which inferences can be drawn about possessed competencies … . The danger of this approach is that it is based on the notion that it is easier to infer technical skills and simple understanding, than investigate the range of abstract conceptual thought which shapes a teacher’s professional practice.

As examples of this ‘abstract conceptual thought’ Adams et al suggested a good teacher needs to have a sound knowledge of the social and political context of teaching … [and] how this bears on the gender, social class, ethnic and economic relations of the school settings. It is these areas which ultimately shape the learning and teaching processes, and the nature of the interactions within the school.

ERO’s ‘observable behaviours’ formed an important part of the Picot recontextualisation’s instructional discourses, and were designed to be ‘policed’ as ERO officers observed teachers at work in classrooms. The understandings listed in the quotation directly above, and which the academic subject expert implicit in the collective identity of secondary teachers might be expected to demonstrate, were located in the regulative discourses delivered in schools. They related to social order and were delivered as the ‘hidden curriculum’ in any number of instructional discourses. There are two points to be made here. Firstly, the definition of teacher role based on ERO’s The Capable Teacher did not match the teacher constructed by the collective identity. The former was ‘technocratic’, while the exercise of professional judgment over a broad range of social and professional issues was of

---

60 Adams et al, p. 259.
central importance to the latter. Secondly, the post-Picot reforms aimed to produce a limited teacher role which would present the reformed regulative discourses through much more carefully observed instructional discourses. However, since teachers rejected Picot’s more limited teacher role in favour of maintaining the broader definition of professionalism implicit in their collective identity, they also undermined Picot’s regulative discourses.

Another problem which faced teachers as a result of ERO’s approach to the assessment of what makes a ‘capable’ teacher was the normalising effect it had. Assuming, with Adams et al, that the ERO model was limited, there was a danger that the elements of professional practice which could not be directly observed would receive less attention from teachers and might disappear. At that point, of course, the discourses comprising the collective identity of secondary teachers as I describe it would have lost the contest to the recontextualised discourses, but it did offer another ground for teacher opposition to reform. Teacher narratives lauded the eccentric. Part of the appeal of ‘Tonkins’ and ‘Morris’, introduced in Chapter I, lay in their eccentricity, which was well outside the norms established in the ERO list of competencies. The collective identity of secondary teachers still had a place for such ‘character’, while the ERO disciplinary strategies tried to control and even eliminate it. Teachers had no choice but to offer at least superficial compliance to this form of discipline, but ERO surveillance could not determine the regulative discourses delivered in the classroom, and neither could it do more than encourage the delivery of instructional courses using the teaching methods advocated by the post-Picot recontextualisation. The collective identity of secondary teachers was still ‘holding out’ at the end of the century.

Pre-service teacher education has the potential to be a powerful tool for those operating in the official recontextualising field. It is reasonable to expect that the Ministry of Education would aim to produce teachers who accepted Picot’s recontextualised regulative and instructional discourses through its influence in funding teacher education programmes. However, the fact that
There is a lack of consensus about what the specialised body of knowledge and skills for initial teacher education should be, who has the right to say what it is, and how it can be recognised and validly assessed.\(^{61}\)

meant that this tool was not very effective. Measures of teacher competence produced by the Teacher Registration Board and ERO, coupled with the Ministry’s professional standards, were certainly considered in the design of secondary teacher education programmes by the growing number of providers (32 by 2004\(^{62}\)), but there was no certain knowledge as to how, whether, or which standards are used to guide the knowledge base and exit standards of programmes of initial teacher education.\(^{63}\)

The lack of certainty about the nature and purpose of teacher education tended to undermine perceptions of the integrity of the whole process, and in that situation the influence of the collective identity of secondary teachers on student teachers was at least as powerful as any other voice. The on-going debate undermined the value of teacher education as a tool which those in the official recontextualising field could have used to produce teachers supportive of its reforms. Instead, the collective identity of secondary teachers remained the major influence in their construction.

The attempt to impose the Bulk Funding of teacher salaries brought the conflict between the reforming discourses and those of the collective identity of secondary teachers into clear focus. The post-Picot reforms aimed to allow school boards of trustees the flexibility to pay teachers according to the school’s own criteria and perceived needs, and to open up the possibility of ‘merit pay’ for teachers. It was assumed that the new methods of assessing teacher performance would expose


\(^{62}\) ibid., p. 5.

\(^{63}\) ibid., p. 3.
‘incompetent’ as well as particularly ‘competent’ teachers, and boards could remove the former and reward the latter. These aims accorded perfectly with the ‘strategies’ adopted by the recontextualisation as expressed in New Management Practices and Agency Theory. In the event, teacher opposition to merit pay on the grounds that it would encourage increasing competition between teachers when cooperation was what teachers valued, the difficulty in establishing the grounds for assessing ‘merit’, and the defeat of the National Government in 1999, meant the idea failed. As for Bulk Funding, *Tomorrow’s Schools* moderated the recommendations of the Picot Taskforce, but the Direct Bulk Funding model, which proposed to pay nationally averaged teacher salaries into schools’ accounts, became a key element in Lockwood Smith’s, and his successor Wyatt Creech’s, education policy. The result was that school boards of trustees which either opted into the bulk funding trial, or boards who expressed interest in the bulk funding of salaries at a later date, risked the possibility of being blacklisted by PPTA members or facing ‘wildcat strikes’, as was the experience at Melville High School in 1992 and Central Southland College in 1999.

The opposition to Bulk Funding was built upon the social democratic convictions of the collective identity of secondary teachers. In the first place teachers suspected that the bulk funding of their salaries was the thin end of a wedge to destroy their national collective agreement. Secondly, there was a concern that it was part of a strategy to reduce government spending on education by abrogating responsibility beyond paying bulk operational and salaries grants and leaving local boards of trustees to make up any shortfall. Teachers felt that this would encourage inequality in education provision, because schools in more affluent areas would be better able to supplement inadequate funding and hire the best teachers and buy the best equipment. The Thomas era’s ambition,

that every person, whatever his level of academic ability, whether he be rich or poor, whether he live in
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town or country, has a right as a citizen to free education of the kind to which he is best fitted, and to the fullest extent of his powers.\footnote{Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives, E1, Wellington: Government Printer, 1939, pp. 2 – 3, (See Chapter III, p. 87).}

was still strongly supported by teachers, who felt that this principle would be compromised by the imposition of Bulk Funding. The threat to a national education system and national pay structures was what angered teachers. This was another illustration of the ‘sort’ of regulative discourse favoured by teachers, and emphasises their commitment to priorities and values formed in the past. Once again, the opposition of teachers acting in accordance with the discourses comprising the collective identity of secondary teachers was a major factor in the defeat of an important disciplinary strategy of the Picot recontextualisation.

The discourses constructing the collective identity of secondary teachers produced teachers whose sense of how society should be ordered and of the place of education and teachers in it looked back to the values and regulative discourses of the Thomas Report era. They felt increasingly alienated by the regulative discourses of the Picot recontextualisation. To make matters worse, Picot’s instructional discourses threatened to change the concept of professionalism and the role of the teacher implicit in the collective identity. The central role of teachers in the delivery of expert academic knowledge was challenged, and the underlying altruism of teachers was increasingly dismissed in favour of discourses of accountability enforced by disciplinary strategies aiming to reconstruct the teacher according to the dictates of the Picot recontextualisation. As a result, teachers resisted it. While superficially complying with the requirements of new curricula, assessment methods and appraisal procedures, teachers resisted Picot’s instructional discourses concerning teaching methods and the role of the teacher and they did not deliver Picot’s regulative discourses to any extent at all. If the success of any particular recontextualisation of education is measured by the complete merging of the instructional within the regulative discourses to produce a single discourse then, by
2000, the post-Picot reforms were a resounding failure. Teachers’ success in resisting the Picot recontextualisation demonstrated the dominance of the discourses constituting the collective identity of secondary teachers, which in turn constituted the secondary teacher.
Chapter III

The ‘Thomas Recontextualisation’ and the Secondary Teacher.

The Thomas recontextualisation of education in New Zealand is the second of the two major educational reforms examined in this study. Discussion of The Post-Primary School Curriculum. Report of the Committee Appointed by the Minister of Education in November 1942 (the Thomas Report)\(^1\) is not intended as a comparison to the reforms which followed the Picot Report, and is not intended as a means of explaining the origins of the latter reform. The chronological order of the two reforms is reversed in this thesis in an attempt to follow Foucault’s approach to historical analysis more closely, and avoid making comparisons and explaining origins.\(^2\) It does, however, provide an opportunity to examine another attempt to reconstruct the teacher and to show that the discourses constituting the collective identity of secondary school teachers proved the stronger on this occasion as well.

This chapter sets out to explain the conditions which permitted the emergence and coalescence of the discourses which gave rise to the Thomas Report and to identify its implications for secondary teachers and their role in education. It follows a similar approach to that adopted for the post-Picot reforms discussed in Chapter II. I show how the collective identity of secondary teachers resisted the Thomas recontextualisation’s instructional discourses, although teachers were much more inclined to accept its regulative discourses. The impact of the Thomas recontextualisation is followed up to about the time of the publication of the report of the Currie Commission in 1962\(^3\) on the assumption that its effects would be obvious by that time. A number of factors accounted for teacher opposition to the Thomas reforms, but chief amongst them was that their instructional discourses and what they required of the teacher did not match the teacher role implicit in the collective identity of secondary teachers.

---


The Thomas Committee was appointed as one of the final steps in a process which aimed to reduce secondary education’s domination by the universities and the Matriculation Examination. The abolition of the standard six Proficiency Examination in 1936 removed one obstacle to open access to secondary education. However, it also added importance to the question of whether or not the secondary school curriculum, including that taught in Technical Schools, could any longer be directed almost entirely towards achieving university entrance. In 1938, for example, only 10% of secondary school leavers intended further study at a university.4 That being the case, there were some obvious issues about whether academic courses were appropriate for the 90% who did not go on to university study. The fact that success in the Matriculation Examination was widely seen as evidence of a successfully completed secondary school career did not necessarily make the school curriculum any more appropriate for most secondary school students.

In 1941 the Senate of the University of New Zealand approved accrediting as a means of ‘passing’ the Matriculation Examination. In doing so it required that Matriculation be undertaken at the end of the fourth year of secondary schooling rather than the third, as had been the case before 1941. This change provided an opportunity for education reformers because it had the potential to free the first three years of the secondary school curriculum from the overwhelming influence of university requirements, and to elevate the status of the School Certificate Examination as the qualification best able to indicate the successful conclusion of a general course of study at secondary school. The exact nature of the general course of study, and what was to be examined in the School Certificate Examination, were the issues which the Thomas Committee was required to address.

The Thomas Committee’s only tasks were (a) to report on the effects this [accrediting] would have on the post-primary curriculum and the school

certificate, and (b) to recommend the choice of subjects for the school certificate, the content of these subjects and the consequent changes to be made in the relevant government regulations.5

Support for a more general curriculum in secondary schools had existed for some time. Numbers attending secondary schools had increased since the Secondary Schools Act of 1903 provided ‘free-places’ for two years of post-primary education for those who passed Proficiency. Prior to that time ‘high school education was largely a middle-class preserve since all schools were fee paying.’6 As Inspector-General of Schools and Secretary for Education, George Hogben advocated a more ‘practical’, less academic approach to secondary schooling and his views lay behind the 1903 Act.7 This was regularly supported in the period leading to the Thomas Report by high profile headmasters such as Frank Milner, from Waitaki Boys’ High School, and J. E. Strachan, from Rangiora District High School, both of whom advocated integrated courses in schools. In analysing a 1936 curriculum survey he had conducted, Milner argued that

The ideal today is a liberal synthesis, and wise compromise between the cultural and the vocational, a harmonious combination in organic union of the humanistic and the practical.8

Such men, Milner in particular, acquired a national reputation, and exercised considerable influence in the Secondary Schools Association, one of the two major organisations representing secondary teachers. Their influence can be seen in the resolutions passed at their 1936 annual meeting.

That in view of the proved necessity for adjusting the secondary school curriculum to meet individual differences while retaining the elements of a liberal education, drastic revision is necessary.

---

8 STA, III, 1, March 1936, p. 12.
That the curriculum has adhered too long to traditional valuations, has disregarded the findings of educational psychology as regards subject isolation and the transfer of subject values, and has lost touch with the realities of modern life and especially with the changing needs of our own society.

That the curriculum through prescriptive deference to external examinations and to false valuations thereby engendered of foreign languages and mathematics fails entirely to interpret social studies as a preparation for citizenship, sectionalizes where it should integrate science, and neglects the rich cultural content of the province of art: it fails culpably on the creative, artistic, and physical sides.

That the curriculum should contain a cultural core consisting of English, Social Studies, General Science, Health, Handwork, Art and Arithmetic, and that all other subjects should be relegated to the sphere of pre-vocational options to be taken in accordance with individual needs and interests.

That the Matriculation Examination so far as it affects secondary schools should be abolished, and that contingent upon the provision of satisfactory humanistic culture each school should be free to draw up its own curriculum and organize its own courses to suit its special needs.

These are strong statements in favour of a ‘common core’ of subjects in a general, as opposed to a strictly academic, curriculum. Murdoch, in his New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) survey of New Zealand’s ‘high schools’, commented that

The S.S.A has clearly and unmistakable accepted a decidedly modernist viewpoint, confounded its critics by out-criticizing them, and enunciating a programme of radical reform.\footnote{Murdoch, pp. 65 – 66.}

While there is little doubt that support for the ‘decidedly modernist viewpoint’ was growing, I argue that Murdoch’s conclusions greatly overstated teachers’ enthusiasm for these reforms and that the above resolutions reflected the persuasive powers of people like Milner and the fact that the S.S.A. was dominated by principals, a point noted in the Introduction. However, it did reflect significant support for a broader, more general approach to curriculum matters.

\footnote{\textit{ibid.}, p. 66.}
If my thesis is correct and most secondary teachers remained suspicious of such changes, there can be no doubt that the public remained to be convinced as well. Wider access to secondary education after 1903 was greeted warmly by many New Zealand families who had been unable to pay secondary school fees. Now they had ‘the opportunity to “get on” within the existing scheme of things.’ They did not want a ‘new’ education for a ‘new’ democracy; on the contrary … The demand has always been for courses with a market value, so that, to take an extreme instance, practical minded country people have insisted on their children learning Latin (which is useful for examination purposes) and resented the introduction into the curriculum of the arts and crafts, or health education or even agriculture.\textsuperscript{11}

There was tension throughout the period of this study between the intentions of those within official recontextualising field, teachers’ objectives in and for education, and the powerful parental demand for the education system to provide credentials to enhance their children’s career prospects. The tyranny of School Certificate quickly replaced the tyranny of Matriculation over curriculum breadth and teaching methods.

Nevertheless, demands for change mounted. The election of the first Labour government in 1935 provided the political will to enact changes. By definition, the Labour Party resented an élitist view of secondary education, and determined that socio-economic factors should not restrict access to it. The fact that Peter Fraser was Labour’s first Minister of Education reflected the importance it attached to the portfolio. Fraser is reported as having listed his educational priorities as

1. The development of the physical constitution and power of our young people.
2. The development of the character.

\textsuperscript{11} A.E. Campbell, \textit{Educating New Zealand}, Wellington: Department of Internal Affairs, 1941, pp. 118 – 119.
3. The development of their mental constitution and power in an atmosphere of free and happy childhood but all in preparation for the adult life as responsible citizens.\textsuperscript{12}

These priorities were far from academic, and reflected quite different interests. To Fraser, ‘The education system is for the child, and the interests of all others must be subordinate to that.’\textsuperscript{13} This philosophy of education was clearly outlined in the Thomas Report itself and presented a stern challenge to teacher views that the teacher should be at the centre of education and, to the extent that this was a focus of the Thomas Report, explained much of the teacher opposition to it.

Support for child-centred education was clearly expressed in the well-known statement of intent delivered in the Minister’s report to the House of Representatives in 1939, written the evening before its delivery by Clarence Beeby, the Fraser-appointed Director of Education.\textsuperscript{14}

The Government’s objective, broadly expressed, is that every person, whatever his level of academic ability, whether he be rich or poor, whether he live in town or country, has a right as a citizen to free education of the kind to which he is best fitted, and to the fullest extent of his powers. So far is this from being a mere pious platitude that the full acceptance of the principle will involve the reorientation of the education system.

Education was no longer to be

A special privilege for the well-to-do or the academically able, but a right to be claimed by all who want it to the fullest extent that the state can provide.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{13} ibid., p. 55. (Quoting from National Education, XVIII, 191, 1 June 1936, p. 213).
\textsuperscript{14} Beeby, Idea, pp. 123 -124.
\textsuperscript{15} Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives, E1, Wellington: Government Printer, 1939, pp. 2 – 3
These were the principles of the Thomas Report and in making its recommendations the Committee was confident that it spoke with the authority of government, whatever other authority these reforms might have attracted in the preceding years. For teachers embedded in the collective identity discussed in this thesis, Fraser’s warning that education must undergo a ‘reorientation’ might have come as a danger signal.

Beneath Fraser’s statement lay the idea that education was a powerful tool in shaping citizens. Clarence Beeby shared this ‘burgeoning belief that education, if only we could understand it properly, was the key to the country’s future.’16 ‘Citizenship transmission’17 had always been seen as an important function of education in New Zealand, employed in support of the Empire and of New Zealand’s part in it.18 The rise of Nazi Germany and the experience of the Second World War made this idea even more important. The concept of the citizen, both of the nation and of the world, that was supported by education reformers and by the Labour government contrasted sharply with the concept of the highly disciplined citizen under totalitarian regimes such as that of Nazi Germany:

liberal-progressive educators saw themselves not just as educational crusaders, but as scientists and humanists. As such, they saw the ‘scientific’, ‘rational’ values of internationalism, human brotherhood and democratic consensus as infinitely preferable to the discredited traditional conservatism which they believed had been responsible for World War One. … World War Two lent yet more impetus to liberal-progressive views on citizenship for its values easily mingled with reconstructionist ideals on both future international co-operation and on the role of citizens in a democracy.19

16 Beeby, Idea, p. 128.
18 ibid., p. 23.
19 ibid., pp. 21 - 23.
The belief was that education of the sort proposed by Labour and outlined in the Thomas Report would produce responsible liberal citizens who would take their part in a democratic society. This was expressed most clearly in the Thomas Report’s discussion and description of Social Studies and its role in the Core Curriculum. While sympathetic to the citizenship message, however, many teachers resisted the new subject of Social Studies because their professional identities encouraged them to believe that their energies should be directed elsewhere.

An event which brought these ideas into focus was the New Education Fellowship Conference in 1937. The New Education Fellowship was founded in England, and aimed to further educational improvement and reform throughout the world so that every individual – whatever his nationality, race, status or religion – shall be educated under conditions which allow the full and harmonious development of his whole personality, and lead to his realizing and fulfilling his responsibilities to the community … .

The Fellowship promoted the same child-centred and practical approaches to education which Fraser and Beeby favoured, at a time when western governments were more prepared to intervene in education. Branches were established in New Zealand in the 1930s, and enthusiastically recorded the progress of practical ‘experiments’. In 1939, the Chief Inspector of Primary Schools in Dunedin reported to the NZCER on some of these.

4. At the Normal School an experiment in traffic control had been made with a model crossing, traffic lights and miniature vehicles. The experiment was very successful but was discontinued when a supernumerary teacher with mechanical genius left the school. The experiment, however, showed that the methods used were very effective.

5. At Macandrew Road the Headmaster had made experiments with the teaching of History with reference to the educational value of the subject and its adaptation to the social needs of the School. This experiment has for its aim the inculcating in the pupils of a sense of continuity of development in our social institutions. The scheme is an

21 ibid., p. 84.
ingenious compound of history, geography and economics; but although it deals with much unusual matter in history and geography it does not cover the usual syllabus in such subjects. The scheme, however, is so elaborate that it is difficult to see how it can be implemented without sacrifice of other subjects. It certainly demands of the staff acquisition of new knowledge and constant intelligent supplementing and adaptation of that already acquired.22

Although the experiments took place in primary schools and would probably have horrified many secondary teachers as they sought to prepare their students for Matriculation, they did illustrate the general direction of the ‘New Education’.

Clarence Beeby, as Director of the NZCER, had made contact with some leading lights in the movement through his association with the Carnegie Foundation, the source of funding for NZCER at its establishment in 1934, and when he learned of the Conference’s activities in Australia he persuaded the panel of fourteen experts to visit New Zealand too. The New Zealand government accepted responsibility for the travel costs. Large venues were booked to accommodate the numbers expected to attend their lectures, and were usually full. Some 6,000 teachers registered to attend sessions of the conference.23 The experts criticised examinations and the influence they had in shaping secondary education, over-centralisation of education administration, the role of inspectors in schools and the system of grading teachers. They advocated the importance of the individual child, supported the need for activity in the delivery of the curriculum, and greater public involvement in its formulation. They argued the need for greater freedom, initiative and flexibility to meet the needs of individual pupils. This added weight to the policy favoured by Beeby, soon to become Director of Education, and by the Labour Government.

Supporters of educational reform took heart from the visiting experts, and felt they were participating in a world-wide movement for educational change – and, of course, so they were. The combination of educational credibility provided by the

22 E1, 4/10/26, ‘New Education Fellowship 1936 – 39’, [Archives New Zealand/Te Tua Mahara o te Kawanatanga, Head Office Wellington].
23 Abbiss, p. 86.
Conference experts and the political will provided by the Labour Government gave a considerable degree of momentum to the sorts of reforms the Thomas Committee considered.

A committee of fourteen was appointed in November 1942 by H. G. R. (Rex) Mason, Fraser’s successor as Minister of Education, under the chairmanship of William Thomas. Thomas had retired as rector of Timaru Boys’ High School in 1935, and had collaborated with Beeby and M.H. Oram in the publication of the NZCER’s *Entrance to the University* in 1939. Beeby, who directed the recruitment of all the committee members, appointed Thomas largely as a result of this association. He could be confident that Thomas shared his views. The same could be said of the Committee members. A. E. Campbell, the Committee’s joint secretary, was Beeby’s close associate, and had succeeded him as Director at the NZCER. Beeby had developed a close relationship with Sir Thomas Hunter through the same organisation. E. Hogben, R. Ridling, E. Stephens and I. Wilson were all school principals, and E. Higgins was a school senior mistress, all of whose support for educational reform was well known to Beeby. The same applied to the other six appointees. Beeby’s interpretation of the Committee’s terms of reference, quoted earlier, accurately reflected the actual terms of reference, but despite the limitations set out in them the Committee produced a very significant curriculum document.

The report of the Committee (the Thomas Report), published in 1944, is significant for both its structural recommendations and its ‘forward looking philosophies and principles that make it one of the most notable of curriculum studies in the world.’ It was certainly ‘prospective’. It set out details of a common core of subjects to be offered in secondary schools, as well as a range of optional subjects which might be offered and which were intended to meet the individual interests of secondary school students. The Committee spoke with the authority of government and with

---

the momentum of educational reform behind it, and it cited British studies such as the Spens and Norwood Reports. Other education ‘experts’ were quoted, such as Dr. W. M. Aiken, the American author of a five volume series under the general title *Adventure in American Education*, and British Educationalist, Sir Fred Clarke, author of *Education and Social Change* (1942). With its political and educational credibility, the Thomas Report was a landmark document.

The intention here is not to attempt a detailed description of the contents of the Report in terms of its curricular recommendations, but to identify elements from it which constitute its recontextualised regulative and instructional discourses. The regulative discourses were those which delivered the ‘hidden curriculum’. They presented a view of how society should be ordered. The instructional discourses were those which delivered knowledges and carried the regulative messages with them. As in Chapter II, I will show that the recontextualised discourses, in particular the instructional discourses, and the role they assigned to teachers did not accord with teachers’ own sense of what they should be and what they should do and were, therefore, substantially opposed.

Chapter I of the Report served as an introduction, and in discussing ‘The Scope of the Report’ made some important comments concerning the role of the State in determining curriculum.

Questions relating to the organisation of the post-primary system and to the recruitment, training, and employment of teachers lay outside the scope of our inquiries; so also in large measure did problems of teaching method, of corporate life, and of internal school organisation. … Our general view is that the State as trustee for the community has the duty to insist on certain minimum requirements and to encourage progressive developments, but that it exceeds its functions if it tries to impose a cut-and-

---

dried philosophy on the schools or to control the curriculum in any detail.\textsuperscript{27}

This statement anticipated the gentle approach taken by the Department of Education in implementing the 1945 Regulations\textsuperscript{28} which gave force to the Committee’s recommendations for change. The Report did make clear suggestions about the reform of teaching methods and of curriculum content which would translate its philosophy into practice, but both the Committee and the Department of Education stepped back from rigorous enforcement of those suggestions. This approach was criticised as partly responsible for the fact that so little of the philosophy of the Thomas Reform was put into practice in the nation’s secondary classrooms.\textsuperscript{29} The Committee, though, framed its recommendations as a challenge to schools and teachers, and clearly hoped they would respond positively.

The question that remains to be answered is whether or not the new opportunities will be seized with boldness and imagination. There is an easy road and a hard one. A school that takes the easy road will continue to accept uncritically the standards and objectives, and the curricula and methods hitherto largely imposed from without, and will be content with minor adjustments – the elimination of the more academic subjects from the courses of the less scholarly pupils, the devotion of more time to subjects hitherto given relatively little, and so on. A school that takes the hard road will examine its whole theory and practice, make up its mind about the real needs of its pupils and the means by which they can best be met, and then act courageously in accordance with its findings. It will be a poor school that does not find much in its life that, on reflection, it wishes to retain; but there is a vast difference between doing things because they are believed to be right and doing the same things out of mere routine. The most that a committee of our kind can do to encourage the schools that are prepared to take the hard road does not amount to very much. It can help to remove a few obstacles from the path, indicate what it believes to be

\textsuperscript{27} ibid., p. 1.
\textsuperscript{29} Whitehead, 'The Thomas Report', pp. 60 – 61.
promising lines of advance, possibly make some useful practical suggestions; but ultimately each school must work out its own salvation. It is in this spirit that we have approached our task and made our suggestions and recommendations.\footnote{Thomas Report, p. 3.}

The General Aims were set out in Chapter II of the Report, and it was here that the Thomas recontextualisation’s regulative discourses were laid out. In the subsequent chapters, the instructional discourses were outlined; they included detailed recommendations about teaching methods, despite saying that such matters would be left to the discretion of schools and teachers. The values implicit in the whole reform movement I outlined earlier were made explicit here, to the extent that, as Bernstein explained, there was to be only one discourse – the pedagogic discourses in schools would deliver the regulative with the instructional.\footnote{See Introduction, p. 18.}

The Thomas Committee set out
to create people who are not only self-disciplined and free in spirit, gifted in work and in enjoyment, worthy and desirable as persons, but also responsible and generous in social life, able to give and take freely from others, willing to serve social ends and to lose themselves in social purposes greater than themselves,

and to indicate

the basic values a democratic school system should cherish and the kind of person it should set out to produce.\footnote{Thomas Report, p. 4.}

There was a heavy emphasis on education for democratic citizenship.

The schools thus have the overriding duty of helping pupils to understand them [democratic values] and live in accordance with them, in other words of assisting to build up a democratic society capable
both of defending its essential values and of widening and deepening their influence. It is this belief that underlies our recommendation that the curriculum of all pupils should include the activities and studies we have set down under the heading of ‘the common core.’

The new subject of Social Studies was to have an important role in this. The Committee quoted from an English report that this might be difficult to achieve unless

the school society itself is permeated with democratic values, which are illustrated by some measure of self-government, providing situations for solving problems on democratic lines, and ensuring that those who have to obey the rules have some hand in framing them.

No doubt this point was self-evident to members of the Committee, but as an instructional discourse carrying its regulative meanings with it, this suggestion would not be taken very far by experienced teachers. Experienced teachers would find little wrong in teaching democratic values to students but would baulk at practising them to this extent, in the classroom at least.

In general terms, however, the regulative discourses revealed in the Thomas reforms matched those implicit in the collective identity of secondary teachers. Teachers shared the view that democracy had been defended in the Second World War and that the rights and responsibilities of democratic citizenship should be inculcated in the young. Teachers also shared the Report’s respect for the integrity of the individual, but they were likely to have put more emphasis on the duties, rather than the rights, of individual citizens. These included the right to have individual educational needs met, and it was this element which dominated the instructional discourses detailed in the Report, and became the focus for teacher opposition.

33 *ibid.*, p. 5.
34 *ibid.*, p. 24
The General Aims of the Report introduced its instructional discourses. They made it clear that the new approach to education was to identify and develop the particular talents of each pupil.

A great modern psychologist has said: ‘Every normal man, woman, and child is a genius at something, as well as an idiot at something. It remains to discover what – at any rate in respect of the genius.’ The process of discovering talent of all kinds and degrees, and providing it with the best possible conditions of development, should more and more become a central task of the school.  

This reflected the student-centred approach supported by the ‘new education’. It required more from the teacher than simply to transmit knowledge selected by the teacher or by a syllabus. It implied that a good deal of teacher time and effort would be spent on assessing the particular interests, skills and strengths of each student, and then, in more recent terms, developing ‘individual learning programmes’ for each. As in the case of the post-Picot reforms, the learner replaced the teacher at the centre of education. The teacher was to be the mentor, if not the servant, of the learner. Again, the narratives which sustained teachers through the changes in secondary education following the Thomas Report opposed this notion. Teachers may have acknowledged that the Thomas ideal was one to be admired, but in the classroom environment of the late 1940s and beyond it was simply impracticable.

Another important element of the reform’s instructional discourses was its determination to offer a ‘general education’ to the growing numbers of students who were able to obtain a secondary education. This lay behind the creation of a Common Core to be studied by all students, and was the reason for pushing university entrance qualifications to the end of the fourth year of secondary schooling. The Committee was careful to explain, however, that this should not be to the detriment of ‘vocational education’.

\(^{35}\) *ibid.*, p.7.
It should be particularly noted that we are not exalting ‘general’ education at the expense of ‘vocational’ education. It is now recognised that the antithesis is largely a false one. Ideally, vocational education should include a humane study of the social implications of the job in view, and of its relations to the arts and sciences, and general education should bring its studies to bear on some particular function the individual is preparing himself to perform in society.\textsuperscript{36}

The argument here was intended to address concern that the education of both academic students, whose interests may have been adequately served by the pre-Thomas situation, and students who aimed at technical and practical occupations would be harmed by exposure to a more general programme of studies. As far as both groups were concerned,

We should like to see every pupil working to capacity for purposes he can accept and in ways consistent with health, emotional stability, and full enjoyment of the high spirits of youth.

But the Committee did concede

The nature and extent of the effort it is right to expect varies enormously from pupil to pupil \ldots \textsuperscript{37}

Again, the Committee’s support for a general, as opposed to a narrowly academic education, ran counter to strong elements within the collective teacher identity. Numbers of teachers interpreted this as a challenge to the integrity of their own cherished disciplines. The Committee made its views on strict adherence to disciplinary boundaries quite clear in quoting form the British ‘Norwood Report’:

subjects have tended to become preserves, belonging to specialist teachers; barriers have been erected between them, and teachers have felt unqualified or not free to trespass upon the dominions of other teachers. The specific values of each subject have been pressed to the neglect of values common to

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{ibid.}, p. 5.  
\textsuperscript{37} \textit{ibid.}, p. 7.
several or all. … In the meantime, we feel, the child is apt to be forgotten.  

This matter received a lot of attention in the outline of the Common Core in Chapter IV of the Report. The aim was to provide students’ courses with an ‘organic unity’, and it was declared that ‘the basic integrating factors are not patterns of subject matter, but purposes in the minds of pupils.’ In Social Studies, for example, history and geography were to be integrated and taught by the same teacher. While this became general practice, and has been the case since soon after the Thomas Reforms were initiated, this recommendation outraged many geography and history teachers and accounted for much of their opposition to the reform. For example, Harry Evison, head of Linwood High School’s History Department in 1963, addressed the following comments to a Lopdell House course for Social Studies teachers.

The fact is that history and geography are separate subjects. That they both deal with Man (as do several other subjects) is no more valid reason for integrating them, than it would be to integrate all the sciences because they all deal with matter. Besides, history and geography are fundamentally different subjects: history is an art, while geography is (at least by definition) a science.

Similar views had been expressed since the first Social Studies ‘refresher courses’ were held in 1945. The Education Gazette reported that some teachers attended the courses ‘to discover what can be achieved by the social studies … that cannot be achieved by good and proper teaching of history and geography.’ These opinions demonstrated the disciplinary loyalty which was central to the collective identity of secondary teachers and which seemed to be challenged in the instructional discourses of the Thomas recontextualisation.

---

38 ibid., p. 18.  
40 ibid., p. 25.  
Of equal concern to teachers with a strong belief in the virtues of their disciplines were the implications of ‘general education’ for their presentation. For example,

English must be taught from the point of view of function – there is an English which is good for conversation, there is an English which is good for serious discussion, there is another English which is good for imaginative writing, and for oratory, and for description, and so on. The schools are mainly concerned with what may be called “English for everyday life” – writing and speaking, reading and listening, in relation to the ordinary business of earning a living and living with others. Few pupils will want to write essays or novels in later life; all will want, continually, to express their feelings, aims, and desires for everyday purposes and to understand the thoughts of their fellows.  

This posed a serious challenge to English teachers who regarded the teaching of literature as the crown of their discipline. Critics of the Thomas direction saw this as a ‘dumbing down’ of the subject, and argued that it denied students access to the glories of English literature. Charles Brasch, editor of *Landfall*, summed up this concern in a *PPTA Journal* article published in 1956.

If they [children] cannot write, how can they understand, and how can they make themselves understood, except in the simplest terms or in a very hazy approximate fashion? The conclusion is unavoidable, that English literature is very slowly being closed to New Zealand children, because they are not being given the only means of understanding it, which is a sound knowledge of the language coming from reading, writing and formal study.  

Language teachers were even more concerned, because the Report marginalised them in the junior school by omitting their subjects from the Common Core, leaving them to sink or swim in the options. In fact, according to the Report

---

43 Thomas Report, p. 16.
the question may well be asked (and often is asked), whether the difficulties of language-study being so great and its practical usefulness so small, we should encourage the study of foreign languages in New Zealand at all.\(^{45}\)

Languages had held an honoured place in the Matriculation Examination, for which candidates had regularly entered in two languages. In November 1945 a Canterbury conference attended by teachers of Latin, called in response to the draft regulations based on the Thomas Committee’s recommendations, resolved that:

> anything tending towards the discouragement of linguistic training in the schools can have in the end only disastrous results on the education standards of the country.\(^{46}\)

It was the instructional discourses laid out in the Thomas Recommendations that were most likely to be opposed by secondary teachers. In Chapter I, I argued that the identity of secondary teachers looked to the past for affirmation, and that it encouraged a strong sense of loyalty to the academic disciplines. The Report’s focus on learners’ individual needs and interests aimed to shift the focus in education away from the teachers as ‘transmitters of knowledge’ and reduced the importance of academic, disciplinary knowledge as a goal of secondary education. Further, the Report blurred the distinction between different academic disciplines and relaxed the rigour of their content. The instructional discourses of the Thomas Report presented a serious challenge to all teachers who looked to their academic disciplines for pedagogical justification and affirmation.

Given the scope of the Thomas Report and its intention to reform the secondary curriculum and to ‘modernise’ the teacher and teaching methods, its comparatively gentle approach to disciplining teachers to deliver its instructional and regulative discourses is of some interest.

Clarence Beeby understood the problem clearly enough.

---

\(^{45}\) Thomas Report, p. 63.

\(^{46}\) S.T.A., IX, 12, November 1945, p. 15.
The department could provide - though never adequately - the buildings, equipment, materials, books and special services that the innovations called for; it could offer seminars, conferences, training courses and the services of its inspectors to help cross-fertilise the successful experiments; it could give the weight of government approval to a general direction of educational change that had officially been agreed upon by representatives of professional bodies, but that, at certain stages, could not have been maintained without consistent departmental backing. Yet only teachers could take the final step.47

Beeby acknowledged that the Department of Education could institute disciplinary measures to remodel the teacher to deliver the regulative and instructional discourses of the Thomas recontextualisation. Despite the strength of the convictions which lay behind the Thomas Report, however, these measures were employed with a very light hand indeed. Beeby and the Thomas Committee spoke with the same voice when, on the philosophical level, they made it clear that the state should not ‘impose a cut-and-dried philosophy on the schools or … control the curriculum in any detail.’ However, in reserving the right of the state ‘to insist on certain minimum requirements and to encourage progressive developments …’,48 the Department could have been expected to be more assertive in making sure that the intent as well as the structural changes introduced by the Thomas Report were carried out. In the event, this was impossible; and not simply because many secondary teachers resisted the changes.

The Department of Education became preoccupied with trying to meet the material requirements of the post-Thomas secondary education system, and attracting enough teachers to staff it, without being overly concerned about even fundamental points of philosophy. These problems arose directly as a result of the democratisation of post-primary education. Following the abolition of the Proficiency Examination the school leaving age was raised to 15 from the beginning of 1944. Secondary school rolls soared:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Primary School Leavers Entering Secondary Schools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of students attending all types of secondary schools increased from 46,036 in 1946 to 90,038 in 1959. By 1970 it had reached 158,302. What is more, students increasingly stayed longer. The ‘average length of the school life of pupils in all types of post-primary school’ increased from two years and six months in 1946 to two years and ten months in 1959, and this was in a time of high employment. High unemployment since that time has encouraged students to stay much longer. The immediate problem for the Department was how to ‘house’ these students; this required building new schools and adding new facilities to existing ones. The scale of the problem was indicated by the increase in capital expenditure on secondary buildings and equipment from £289,993 in 1947 to £3,306,990 in 1960. The ‘prefab’ was one response to the demand for more school classrooms. A *PPTA Journal* article in 1986 noted

Classrooms, regardless of the year in which the school was built, still reflect the nineteenth century concept of a schoolroom ... a large box capable of seating, at standard school desks, 30 – 35 adolescent bodies. A blackboard with a teacher in front of it. A desk, with chair, for the teacher. Windows on one side. A wall with a piece of display board on the other. Linoleum on the floor. No soundproofing.

However, the overwhelming priority was to provide teaching spaces of any sort.

---

51 *ibid.*, p. 612.
52 *ibid.*, p. 419.
53 *ibid.*, p. 221
Total expenditure on education multiplied by nearly five times between 1947 and 1960.\textsuperscript{55}

Staffing the rapidly increasing classrooms was another major problem. Total numbers of teachers on the government payroll rose from 1891 in 1945 to 4120 in 1959\textsuperscript{56} and 8625 in 1970.\textsuperscript{57} While the increase in numbers was impressive, it disguised other serious problems. Firstly, whatever the increase in staffing, it was not enough. In June 1957 the PPTA publicised a shortage of 460 teachers, and predicted that it would reach 700 by 1962. Secondly, in order to get teachers in front of classes the Department resorted to a range of strategies which reduced teacher training requirements.

Last year selected graduates were offered teaching posts on July 1, after completing only a portion of their training course at Training College. This year they were asked to go straight from University into the classroom.

A more positive strategy from the Department was to increase the number of post-primary studentships, which provided a financial incentive for those intending to become secondary teachers. In 1960, 313 more intending teachers took up studentships than had done so in 1956.

But even here there was a deterioration of standard. Holders of the studentship, and other students, with as few as five University units are now admitted to the graduate course at Training College. In 1960 one third of the students in one Teachers’ College graduate course had incomplete degrees.\textsuperscript{58}

Whitehead painted a gloomy picture in his discussion of the shortage of experienced teachers.

Various factors contributed to it including low salaries, poor working conditions, and a rapidly

\textsuperscript{56} ibid., p. 322.
\textsuperscript{57} ibid., p. 510.
expanding demand for highly qualified manpower in the economy generally. As a result, many schools were literally half filled with unqualified and temporary staff. Many of the staff recruited were also young and therefore inexperienced, and their rate of turnover was high owing to the attractions of more lucrative occupations. … In many cases, the daily grind of keeping a page or two ahead of their pupils was their principal concern.

In the face of these sorts of problems it is not surprising that the Department had more on its mind than making certain that teachers would be dedicated to their task or well versed in the ideals of the Thomas Report, or that they would spend time and energy in devising new programmes of work to cater for the individual needs and interests of pupils.  

The increase in secondary rolls had a major impact on the experience of teaching, and on the narratives which construct the identity of secondary teachers. Teachers were faced in their classrooms with a much wider cross-section of New Zealand adolescents whose interests were not necessarily academic. The incidence of disruptive and ‘reluctant’ behaviour increased. To teachers, whose collective identity was based in the delivery of academic content and values, the new secondary environment, with its disruptive pupils, large classes and teacher shortages, could seem very bleak. Teacher narratives about the casting of academic pearls before unappreciative ‘swine’ increased in proportion to the number of disruptive pupils. One declared ‘We are not under-staffed; we are over-pupilled.’

The writer was entirely serious. He went on to discuss PPTA demands for more teachers, noting

Every device for increasing teacher supply is a rod for our own backs. It produces even more pupils of a still lower standard, both of capability and behaviour.

59 Whitehead, ‘Teachers and Curriculum Reform’, p. 17
The dramatic increase in student numbers, with the broadening of students’ interests, challenged the teachers’ view of themselves and their roles. The ‘new methods’ supported by the Thomas Report seemed ‘pie in the sky’ to teachers faced with large classes and increasing numbers of poorly behaved students who had little interest in academic disciplines and traditional teaching methods. Pragmatic knowledge, contained in the teacher narratives, offered affirmation and guidance in this difficult environment, but also helped form teachers who resisted implementation of the Thomas recontextualisation’s instructional discourses.

The combined effect of these challenges on teachers, as well as their concerns about the status of teaching as a profession increased their feeling that they were not appreciated and reinforced the ‘martyr’ narratives described in Chapter I. Teachers’ collective identity provided a defence against the attacks teachers felt were being made against them but the job, as many teachers saw it, was being made impossible. Even when echoes of the Thomas Report were heard, teachers felt it was not possible to apply its idealism in the classrooms it created. Even the Currie Report, despite its endorsement of the Thomas Report and its generally optimistic tone, conceded that change was relatively slow in secondary schools.\textsuperscript{61} The instructional discourses of the Thomas recontextualisation had made little headway.

Another implementation problem for the Thomas instructional discourses was that they simply replaced the domination of Matriculation with that of School Certificate. The role in which teachers felt most comfortable was meeting the demands of public examinations. Most schools soon opted to prepare their students to sit School Certificate after three years, rather than the four the Thomas Report suggested, and this helped teachers justify adherence to ‘tried and true’ teaching methods. It also undermined any status that the core curriculum had.

In many schools the core studies were integrated into the School Certificate syllabuses to ensure that pupils got the maximum preparation before sitting the examination. One prominent secondary school spokesman … has likened the core studies to the

\textsuperscript{61} Currie Report, pp. 25, 336.
warm-up activities engaged in by athletes before the main event.\textsuperscript{62}

Even the curricular freedom the Thomas reforms hoped to achieve for at least the first two, if not three, years of secondary education was quickly subverted. While these developments may have suited many secondary teachers and satisfied the demands of the collective teacher identity to cast teachers as transmitters of knowledge, in allowing School Certificate to dominate the curriculum they were also responding to the demands of the community, which quickly adopted the examination as the measure of secondary school performance. In this way, the School Certificate Examination was the ‘sleeper’ in the instructional discourses of the Thomas recontextualisation: soon becoming active to restrict the freedom the reformers had hoped to introduce.

The Department did make some attempt to implement the Thomas reforms and ‘reshape’ the teacher. More attention was given to teacher training. In 1948 a Consultative Committee on Recruitment, Education and Training of Teachers was established, and it reported in 1951. If this Committee had been intended to define a teacher identity and teacher role which would lead to implementation of the Thomas recontextualisation, then these hopes would have been disappointed. Its findings were expressed in very general terms, and had little impact on teacher training. It identified five varieties of ‘equipment’ teachers should possess. Under ‘Personal Qualities’, it listed:

Integrity, emotional poise, some warmth and colour of personality, a sense of justice and fair play, vigour, intelligence, initiative, humour, and a liking for work with people are among those most to be sought.\textsuperscript{63}

Under ‘Teaching Content’ it stated:

\textsuperscript{62} Whitehead, ‘Teachers and Curriculum Reform’, p. 22.
Post-primary work, which must usually be regarded as covering Forms III—VI, calls for a university degree or its equivalent, preferably a Master’s degree in a teaching subject.\textsuperscript{64}

It later added, when discussing preferred qualifications for teacher trainees, that

It has therefore long been recognized that the entrant to post-primary teaching needs a university degree (including normally a Stage III or, preferably, a Master’s degree pass in his principal subject together with a reasonable number of Stage I and Stage II passes in supporting teaching subjects), or some more or less equivalent qualification, such as a technological diploma or membership of a professional institution. We recommend that wherever possible these basic requirements be rigorously enforced.\textsuperscript{65}

There was little new thinking about teachers and teaching here, and what there was would have supported the image of the teacher as an academic ‘expert’; the image implicit in the collective identity of secondary teachers.

In the little the Consultative Committee’s Report had to say on teaching methods, little commitment to the Thomas ideal can be found. As if in response to criticism that the Thomas reforms had led to declining academic standards, the report affirmed the importance of content.

So conceived, ‘subject-matter’ is as important as ever it was, the only qualification being that it should have an intimate relationship to the experience and life of the pupils. The clear implication is that teachers need both knowledge of children and knowledge of subjects.\textsuperscript{66}

While recognising that there was a great deal of debate on ‘special method’, the report did not endorse any teaching method in particular, commenting that

\textsuperscript{64} \textit{ibid.}, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{65} \textit{ibid.}, p. 127.
\textsuperscript{66} Committee on Recruitment, Education and Training, p. 9.
Though concerned with detail it [the Report] has its roots firmly in principle, and it preaches ready adaptability rather than rigid adherence to a ‘one best way’. 67

If teacher training could be seen as a form of discipline which might be employed to produce a certain type of teacher with a certain set of skills which would support the implementation of the Thomas recommendations, then the consultative Committee’s report was unlikely to make any impact. In fact it reflected the values of the collective identity of secondary teachers, rather than an attempt to change them.

The Currie Report affirmed the Thomas priorities strongly68 and also offered views on teacher training. However, apart from suggesting that this be carried out by the universities69 and that making teaching a graduate profession would improve its status and ease recruitment problems, had little more to say about what secondary teachers should be and what they should do than had the 1951 Consultative Committee Report. It did state, however, that amongst the most important duties of secondary teachers was

the inculcation of a sense of values and of those attitudes in which the moral aspirations of the community are properly reflected, responsible behaviour, feelings of tolerance and respect for others; the appreciation of what is just and fair … 70

but this followed the generally optimistic tone of the report and was not of not great use as a defining statement of the secondary teacher in the 1960s. As far as teaching methods were concerned, the Currie Report repeated a general concern, expressed in the Thomas Report as well, that

the distinction to be made between rote learning and practice, the point at which understanding must be

67 *ibid.*, p. 10.
68 Currie Report, pp. 11-12.
69 *ibid.*, p. 487 ff.
70 *ibid.*, p. 570.
reinforced by drill, is still imperfectly understood by some teachers.\textsuperscript{71}

While offering support for the Thomas recontextualisation’s instructional discourses, the Currie Report did little to recommend their enforcement. There was little there to challenge the collective identity of secondary teachers.

The regulations governing secondary teacher training at this time were expressed in terms which were just as general,\textsuperscript{72} although by 1961 the growth in numbers of trainees by 1961 allowed Christchurch Training College to appoint a full-time lecturer in ‘Education and Principles and Practice of Teaching’,\textsuperscript{73} thus giving more emphasis to the theoretical elements in teacher training. There was no indication, though, that either the regulations or the expansion of teacher training programmes would seriously challenge the influence of the collective identity of secondary teachers in shaping the secondary teacher. Obviously there was potential for teacher training to be tailored to produce teachers willing and able to deliver the instructional and regulative discourses favoured by government at any given time but it is equally clear that teacher training failed to train ‘Thomas Report’ teachers with any rigour at all. On the other hand, if teacher trainees did reach schools filled with enthusiasm for ‘new methods’ and new courses, the narratives of teacher experience suggest that their idealism soon gave way to pragmatism, which is a much more obvious element in the collective identity of secondary teachers.

In-service training was also used to discipline teachers to recontextualised forms of teaching practice. \textit{The Education Gazette} reported on the North and South Island refresher courses for Social Studies held in the early months of 1945,\textsuperscript{74} even before the Regulations giving force to the Thomas recommendations were issued. Social Studies was an important ‘test case’ for the success of the Thomas reforms because of its role in the delivery of ideology through citizenship training, its emphasis on integration of traditionally independent disciplines and on its ‘new methods’. So it

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{ibid.}, pp. 32 – 33.
\textsuperscript{73} \textit{ibid.}, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{The Education Gazette}, XXIV, 3, 1 March 1945, p. 38.
was not surprising that refresher courses took place so early. Dr. Beeby attended both courses and spoke of the importance of democratic citizenship. His presence showed the high hopes held by those working within the official recontextualising field for the success of this form of training. The report of the Feilding course suggested that its hopes had not been in vain:

If the social studies teachers fulfill the promise of their enthusiasm and determination which they carried away from Feilding, their courses will prosper.\(^\text{75}\)

However, it has already been shown that support for Social Studies was far from unanimous. Further Refresher Courses were held for Social Studies teachers in 1959. Phoebe Meikle gave the opening address at the South Island course. Despite her enthusiasm for the Thomas ‘spirit’ in Social Studies, she acknowledged that progress in imparting this spirit had been limited.\(^\text{76}\)

In-service training was a far from common experience for secondary school teachers, however much it might have been needed, and cynical responses to it were common. Trevor Agnew’s account of a four day course on School Based In-service Training expressed these views in 1977.

Not all teachers have a chance to attend national courses. What then could be more reasonable than to bring the course to them? This account of a four day course on School Based In-Service Training is dedicated to all those who don’t know where Lopdell is, or how to pronounce Hogben.\(^\text{77}\)

\(^{75}\) ibid., p.41.
\(^{77}\) Trevor Agnew, ‘Trickling Down’, \textit{PPTA Journal}, July 1977, p.24. (Both Lopdell House and Hogben House were facilities for in-service teacher training.)
Trevor Agnew’s summary of responses to educational innovation (above) demonstrated the problems faced by administrators expecting to use in-service training as a means of disciplining teachers to follow a particular direction and the collective identity of secondary teachers is evident in the questions ‘the teacher’ asked. School-based in-service training proved to be no more effective in embedding the Thomas reforms than did pre-service teacher training programmes.

---

Inspection was another means available to the Department of Education in its efforts to disseminate the spirit and letter of the Thomas reforms. The grading system which determined promotion for teachers was in the hands of the inspectors. Both grading and inspection came in for heavy criticism from the visiting experts of the New Education Fellowship Conference because of their tendency to impose an orthodoxy in an educational setting that, they argued, required initiative and freedom.\(^\text{79}\) However, there is some evidence to suggest that inspectors did their best to encourage the implementation of the Thomas reforms. The Inspectors’ report of a visit to Napier Boys’ High School in 1946 recorded that:

> Much time during the visit was spent in discussing various aspects of Social Studies teaching with individual teachers and at a group meeting.

The Inspector gave specific advice on how the new Social Studies should be presented:

> The work should be so organised as to develop a spirit of active enquiry and research. This presupposes a good supply of reference books in the social studies library, class sets consisting of eight to ten copies of numerous books, constant use of the library in class periods and regular instruction in the use of the library and in the technique of finding material.\(^\text{80}\)

These recommendations were entirely along the lines suggested in the Thomas Report, and if promotion was at stake then it is likely that some notice was taken of them. The inspectorate could have been an effective means of discipline. However, teacher narratives contained as much collective wisdom about dealing with inspection as inspectors had in visiting classrooms. As one teacher observed after the inspection system was abolished in favour of inspectorial ‘advisers’:

---


how can anyone judge teaching competence in twenty minutes with a class which happens to decide to be incomprehensibly stupid?  

Other stories told of teachers’ prepared lessons, with their prepared pupil responses and arranged seating plans to maximise opportunity for inspectors to look at the best bookwork. So whether inspection, or the even less rigorous advisers who did not ‘grade’, were effective ways of ensuring compliance with educational reform was debatable. As with other forms of disciplining teachers, inspection did not seem to have been very rigorous.

Another form of discipline carried in the instructional discourse was the production of resource materials for the use of teachers. If teachers’ claims of over-work and ‘busyness’ were to be taken seriously, it is reasonable to suppose that if resources were produced and made available to teachers they would be used in preference to teachers having to prepare their own. *The Post-Primary School Bulletin* was one such resource. It was ‘established to provide background material which is not available elsewhere, or not in a form suitable for post-primary teachers’, in response to the Thomas Committee’s suggestion ‘that material of which the schools stood in need should be specially prepared…’ The intention of *The Bulletin* was not to replace textbooks, but to provide mainly New Zealand material which did not exist in them. In Social Studies, *The Bulletin* material aimed to ‘show people at work in this country, and to help pupils to pursue their own investigations.’ (Its list of Social Studies publications up to 1956 appears in the Appendix.) These titles showed clear support for the idea of citizenship-training and reflected the Thomas Report’s ‘suggestion’ that core Social Studies should include a

Study of the social life of the pupil’s own local community and of New Zealand as a whole, in relation to the geographical environment and the historical background. What is suggested is an active kind of regional survey, undertaken for a social

---

84 *Education*, 5, 3, October 1956, p. 40.
purpose; to find out how the community lives and is managed, and how it has come to be what it is… .

It is likely that these resources were used in those schools which made attempts to develop new courses in the post-Thomas environment. In the mid-1970s, the resources for the ‘New Social Studies’, and the fact that a number of their authors taught at Christchurch Teachers’ College, supported the ideas behind a syllabus revision in the same way. For teachers who tried to implement the changes asked of them, this was a welcome form of discipline.

Other Department publications served a similar function. From 1948 the journal *Education – a Magazine for Teachers* regularly presented material about the new curricular requirements, including a number of attempts to elaborate on Social Studies programmes. In May 1949 a Wellington school’s experience of a Student Civic Administration week appeared, while in October 1956 an article extolled the virtues of the use of diagrams, or ‘sketchmaps’, in the presentation of third form Social Studies. Prior to the publication of *Education – a Magazine for Teachers*, *The Education Gazette* offered articles of a similar sort. Examples of Social Studies schemes of work were published. *The Gazette* also served as a means of publishing Department notices, and details concerning, and comments about the Thomas Committee’s work and the Regulations which followed were publicised through its pages. Through the *Gazette* the Department was able to apply more gentle discipline to encourage teachers to implement the Thomas reforms.

These endeavours of the Department were quite ineffectual, however. Even the Thomas Report itself quickly became unavailable, and it was not republished until

---

85 Thomas Report, p. 27.
89 ‘Changes in Post-Primary Education’, *Gazette*, XXIV, 11, 1 November 1945, pp. 277 – 279.
1959. A note appearing on the front page of *The Gazette* on 15 February 1954 requesting that unused copies be given to the Department because of the constant demand from overseas\(^90\) hardly suggests that the Department was determined to see that teachers should be quoting chapter and verse from the Report.

The discourses constructing the collective identity of secondary teachers produced teachers who generally supported the regulative discourses of the Thomas recontextualisation, but who resisted its instructional discourses. These challenged the more traditional role of teachers implicit in the collective identity, so were resisted. The democratisation of secondary education only made it more difficult for the reformed instructional discourses to ‘infiltrate’ the collective identity. Two components in the collective identity, teachers’ commitment to their academic disciplines and the defences they created against the ever-larger and unappreciative numbers of students in secondary classrooms, combined to defeat the Thomas instructional discourses. The Thomas recontextualisation failed in its attempt to reconstruct the teacher, just as the post-Picot recontextualisation failed. Both failed because the discourses which constituted the collective identity of secondary teachers proved stronger.

\(^{90}\) *Gazette*, XXXIII, 3, 15 February 1954.
Conclusion

From 1945 to 2000, the collective identity of secondary teachers was far more dominant than the reforming discourses of the Picot and Thomas recontextualisations in shaping the secondary teacher. Because the recontextualisations did not account sufficiently for the strength of the collective identity in forming teachers’ professional values and knowledge, they met with only limited success.

Clarence Beeby, the architect of the Thomas recontextualisation, recognised this difficulty.

Paradoxically, the teaching profession imposes the greatest restraint on major educational change, and yet offers the only means of bringing it about.1

Frank Lopdell, after whom the South Island location of teacher in-service training, Lopdell House, was named, made a similar observation.

Anyone who thinks that teachers readily adopt innovations is much mistaken. … From my own experience of teachers, I believe that they tend to resist innovations for two very good reasons: they are reluctant to discard long established and well proven methods, and they believe that children are too precious to be experimented with. Any new way must offer much greater promise than the old way which it will replace.2

The strength of teachers’ collective identity explained why that was the case.

The secondary teachers’ collective identity was constituted by two sorts of narratives teachers used to describe their work. Firstly, the retrospective narratives looked to the past for affirmation. They accorded a high value to traditional, academic, disciplinary knowledge; traditional, pragmatic solutions to the day-to-day

---

2 F. C. Lopdell, Education: a Magazine for Teachers, 2 June 1956, pp. 11 – 12.
problems faced by teachers in their work, and upheld the efficacy of traditional teaching methods while remaining very dubious about the value of education theory. Secondly, the ‘martyr’ narratives gave strong emotive support to teachers. They supported teachers when they felt increasingly overworked, underpaid and generally unappreciated, and were used to fuel a sense of self-righteousness in times of conflict with governments. Together, these narratives constituted the ‘doctrine’ that bound teachers amongst themselves, and brought about ‘a double subjection: of the speaking subject to discourses and of discourses to the … group of speaking subjects.’³

The two recontextualisations studied in this thesis, of Picot and Thomas, presented discourses which aimed to reconstitute the teacher. Exactly how was made explicit in their regulative and instructional discourses. In particular, the instructional discourses set out the role teachers should play and the teaching methods they should use in the reformed environment. This thesis shows that where these discourses did not match those of the collective identity of secondary teachers, they were resisted; and where they were resisted, they largely failed. This left the discourses of the collective identity of secondary teachers as the most dominant in constituting the secondary teacher.

The Picot recontextualistion’s regulative and instructional discourses were both resisted. Its regulative discourses applied the metaphor of the market place to education. Education was regarded as a commodity and not to be seen as a self-evident public good. The concepts of choice and supply and demand were to be applied, on the assumption that individual self-interest was the motor which drove society. Teachers resisted this view of how society should be ordered. Their general acceptance of social democratic values, their belief that education was unquestionably a public good, and their belief that teachers should be honoured in education’s service led them to resist Picot’s market-driven, managerial discourses.

Picot’s instructional discourses emphasised educational outcomes and teachers’ accountability for meeting them. Teachers were to be learning ‘facilitators’, responding to the individual needs of learners, and they were to be appraised on a wide range of observable behaviours. There was to be a new emphasis on learner acquisition of skills, and the curriculum was broadened far beyond the traditional academic subjects. This was not the teacher shaped by the collective identity, so, while teachers learned to offer superficial compliance when it was required, Picot’s instructional discourses were resisted as well. The broadened curriculum seemed to threaten the primacy of the traditional academic subjects. Teachers preferred the role of the professional expert, using traditional teaching methods to impart knowledge, rather than that of the facilitator/learning technician using ‘new’ teaching methods to build learner competence in skills. The recontextualisation threatened to change the nature of ‘professionalism’, and the role of the teacher, as it had been traditionally understood by teachers. For these reasons teachers constituted by the collective identity of secondary teachers resisted the Picot recontextualisation.

Consideration of the Thomas recontextualisation offers another opportunity to demonstrate the dominance of the collective identity of secondary teachers in the construction of the teacher. In this case Thomas’ regulative discourses generally did match the values of the collective identity and were not resisted. Both shared a belief in the value of democracy, with respect for individual liberty tempered by acceptance of broader social responsibility. Both accepted the capacity of education to shape society and believed that there should be equality of educational opportunity. Education was a self-evident public good. The Thomas recontextualisation’s instructional discourses were resisted, however. The implementation of a common core of subjects ensured that a general education was offered to students, in the first years at secondary school at least. Meeting individual learning needs was given a high priority and strong support for progressive teaching methods was given, if only in the actual Thomas Report.
Teacher resistance resulted from the threat that a general education seemed to offer the traditional academic subjects. Not only did a general education reduce the time students were exposed to specialist subjects at secondary school, the new methods the Thomas Report supported seemed to reduce their rigour as well. Some subjects, like History and Geography, were expected to integrate in the presentation of Social Studies. The languages were left out of the Core altogether. Those shaped by the collective identity of secondary teachers resisted these challenges to their academic priorities.

Implementation of the Thomas recontextualisation’s new teaching methods never stood a chance. While many teachers may never have been very sympathetic to them, the growth of secondary schools and the teacher shortage meant that teachers faced larger classes, and growing numbers of students with little interest in academic content. Teachers reported rising levels of uncooperative behaviour and felt that the only way to maintain order was to use traditional teaching methods. The rising community demand for its children to be successful in the School Certificate examination was a further blow to ‘new methods’ since it provided further justification for teachers to adopt the role of an academic expert, imparting knowledge. This accorded perfectly with the image of the teacher embedded in the collective identity of secondary teachers, so the implementation of the Thomas recontextualisation’s new teaching methods, with the accompanying changed role for the teacher, were not only widely resisted; they failed.

Each of the recontextualisations tried to support their reconstituted teacher in a number of ways. Teachers were inspected and appraised; new resources were published; teacher training, in-service training in particular, tried to re-shape the secondary teacher. In both cases, however, little progress was made. The recontextualised role of the teacher failed to take root in the collective identity of secondary teachers. The identity was highly resistant to change and its discourses remained dominant in constituting the secondary teacher in New Zealand from 1945 to 2000.
Appendix

*The Post-Primary Bulletin* publications, in support of Social Studies, to 1956\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. C. D. Somerset, ‘The Dairy Farm’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Pascoe, ‘The High Country Run’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. J. Gamier, ‘The Mixed Farm’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. D. McDonald and J. Watson, ‘The Miner’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. S. Hearnshaw, ‘The Factory Worker’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The Office Worker’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Henderson, ‘Statistics in the School’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Henderson, ‘Statistics’</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. G. Wilson, ‘Statistical Diagrams in Social Studies’</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Fraser, ‘Holding a Meeting’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. A. Olssen, ‘Principles of Local Government’</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. A. Olssen, ‘Local Government in New Zealand’</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Cresswell, ‘Tales of the Canterbury High Country’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. S. Duff, ‘Moas and Moa-Hunters’</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. L. Hewland, ‘Dairying in Australia’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. W. Robinson, ‘Sugar Growing in Australia’</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. W. Robinson, ‘Sheep Farming in Australia’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. W. Robinson, ‘Cattle in Tropical Australia’</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. L. Pownall and J. E. Chapman, ‘The Location of Factory Industry in New Zealand’</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. J. Danks, ‘New Zealand at Work’</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) *Education*, 5, 3, October 1956, pp. 41 – 45.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. D. Jensen, ‘Manufacturing in New Zealand’</td>
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<table>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJHR.</td>
<td>Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZCER.</td>
<td>New Zealand Council for Educational Research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZPPTA (PPTA)</td>
<td>New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers’ Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA.</td>
<td>New Zealand Secondary Schools’ Association.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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