Ideology and Policy in the History of New Zealand Technical Education - 1900-1930

A thesis submitted to

the Department of Education,

Massey University

In partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Liz Gordon

1984

Abstract

This thesis is a study of historical aspects of New Zealand state education policies. Within the neo-Marxist tradition of the sociology of education, there has recently been much debate over the need to re-interpret the historical development of state education policies. This trend stems from a perceived breakdown in the liberal foundations of education in the past decade. This work is concerned with developing a historically and sociologically adequate framework for analysing aspects of state policy in education, and using this framework to explore and re-interpret selected policies in particular periods.

Acknowledgements

The isolation that surrounds those who attempt work of this nature is famous; however, a thesis cannot be completed without the help, support and friendship of many people. Firstly, I'd like to thank my supervisors: Dick Harker, who would always rather be chasing mermaids; and Roy Shuker, who kept telling me what history really was. Also the Education Department of Massey offered a supportive intellectual environment where creative work was encouraged, challenged and accepted. In particular, Ivan Snook, Roy Nash, Eric Archer, John Codd and David Battersby have been of invaluable help to me.

Secondly, thanks to Allanah Ryan and other 'third floor dwellers' for their support and encouragement. Allanah, as fellow-student, friend and intellectual companion has helped make my year less lonely. Thanks to Alison Stewart for her wonderful proof-reading, friendship and support.

Thirdly, my friend Wendy Craig has always been there when I have needed someone to talk with. Her famous phrase: 'Well I don't know anything about education, but perhaps you should.....' has helped me in more ways than I can adequately express.

Last, but not least, I would like to acknowledge some friends from far away - my sister Chris and Paul Willis - who, through their letters, have consistently forced me to see what I am doing in a broader context.

Contents

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction: Theory and Practice in Educational Policy Research

The purpose of this thesis is to develop an adequate analytical framework for examining the historical development of New Zealand state education policies. The demand for such a framework has come primarily from critical theorists within the sociology of education (Johnson 1982, Nash 1981). As well, however, there have been increasing calls within the history of education for a more systematic approach to the analysis of policy (Silver 1983). These developments must be understood within the social context in which they developed, and chapter two explores the breakdown of 'consensus politics' of education and the subsequent emergence of critical theories. The first part of this chapter looks at the justification for an explicitly theoretical history of education. The most recent history of state education in New Zealand (Cumming and Cumming 1978) will be examined for its underlying assumptions, as an example of why explicit theory is necessary. The second section argues that the significance of the state as a provider of education has been ignored or greatly underemphasised within the sociology of education (Dale 1982). Theories of the state are considered alongside a brief history of the state in New Zealand, and the beginnings of state education are outlined. Lastly in this chapter, the central arguments of the thesis are outlined and explained.

The Argument for Theory:

The back cover of Cumming and Cumming's 1978 book: History of State Education in New Zealand 1840-1975 proclaims that "This book is the first comprehensive history of New Zealand education to be written in over forty years". It is interesting that a critical examination of the assumptions underpinning this book provides an excellent argument for the necessity of explicit theory within histories of educational policy. The central problem with this book is the thoroughly conservative, though totally implicit, political stance taken by the authors. Frequent references to "classic" literary texts and writers are interwoven into the text as if such statements were unproblematically true and immutable. An example is:

> While it is easy to be critical of too much bookish theory one must acknowledge the substantial practical work done by every one employed in the service of education. They have followed the advice contained in the exhortation of St Theresa of Avila to the novice, 'My daughter, we do not want ecstasies here; we want some who can wash up'. It was unfortunate that television interviewers equated information with temporary trivialities. The result was that the Minister of Education from 1972 to 1975 was seldom seen by New Zealand citizens except when involved with students, Polynesians and teachers over what were sectional or domestic matters touched with emotion" (p361).

There are a variety of problematic themes underlying this extract. Firstly, the implied value and timelessness (almost

sanctity) of practical knowledge ignores the problems of interpretation (in relation to legislation, administration, curricula and teaching practices) that pervade education systems at all levels. Secondly, very real issues, reflecting material problems in social and educational structures are written off as 'trivialities', 'domestic matters' and, worst of all, 'emotion'. If there is any historical justification for these comments, the reader is certainly not informed of it.

The example above is not isolated; indeed, such value conclusions pervade the book from beginning (especially the preface) to end. Perhaps one of the most insidious results of the authors' approach is an implicit racism. In particular, the book tends to 'side' with the education system against Maori children:

> No matter how earnestly teachers and vocational guidance officers encouraged Maoris to exert themselves in preparing for satisfying and well-paid careers, the young Maoris themselves, their parents and tribal committees, were content that Maori youths should yield to the temptation of easily earned money in non-skilled jobs (p319).

Given all the research that has been done on the subject of minority groups and the mental/manual division of labour, such a view is inexcusable.

Shuker's (1980) review of this book argues that in spite of the claim that education is considered within its social, political and economic contexts, these factors "are tossed in as

background.... to which they are often connected only in a casual fashion" (1980 p37). Perhaps a prime example of this was the authors' perception of the social context of education in 1956:

> In 1956 - a year notable for the first performance of My Fair Lady - the Roxborough turbines were put into operation, New Zealand accounted for a visiting South African rugby football team and won its first cricket test when it defeated the West Indies, another school for dental nurses - the third - was opened in Christchurch, and HJ Kelliher offered a prize for the best oil painting by a New Zealand artist of a typical New Zealand landscape (1978 p302).

There is no recognition here of the necessary relationship between education and social structure; instead the reader is given a list of (very selective) reminiscences of an 'arty' and 'sporty' person.

It is important not to see this publication as representative of the work being done within the history of education in New Zealand. However, the claim can be made that, with an awareness of how one's biases, or world view, affects research, mainstream historians of education would no longer be satisfied with acritical research such as this. A close examination of the researchers's biases and political predispositions can set the stage for a truly critical history.

However, Shuker's comments on the content of this book must also be acknowledged:

> A wealth of information is tightly packed into fourteen chapters, well-documented with some 700 footnotes and references, and fully indexed. This enables the reader to pursue particular topics throughout the book, and also to be guided in further study by the often extensive footnotes. The book therefore provides a valuable reference, and a useful adjunct to Butcher's standard, but now dated, history of New Zealand education.

I agree with much of what Shuker says here - information on aspects of education are often hard to find and Cumming and Cumming are, in places, very thorough. But it should also be recognised that a failure to critically examine aspects of educational policy can bring misleading results. For example, the authors note that:

> Under the Education Amendment Act (No 2) 1974 the control and management of teachers colleges passed to teachers college councils: the intention of the legislation was further decentralisation in the education and training of student teachers (p362).

As historians, it should have been important to note that, under the Act, the Minister retained his powers to dissolve the Teachers College Councils at any time. This knowledge became very important last year when a Minister of Education did exactly that to the Auckland Council. It is such selectivity, in this case possibly based on a belief that no Minister would do such a thing, that is determined by the underlying values of the writer, and which causes incorrect or inadequate analyses.

Cumming and Cumming's <u>History (etc)</u> provides an excellent example of what can be called traditional research. This

approach espouses conventional wisdom within a normative framework, and renders implicit the political nature of the "formulation, conduct and utilization of a given piece of research" (Galper 1980 p216). The effect of this is that the value-base of the research is not clearly established for the reader, and research techniques and findings are displayed as unproblematic, universalistic and immutable. This can particularly be seen in policy research within education. During the period that state schooling has been developed in New Zealand, many decisions have been made by policy-makers as to aims, expenditure, administration and curricula. Much of the research that has been undertaken has worked from the same assumptions as the policy-makers themselves, thus rendering research findings as inescapably conservative. Such analyses take on the reality of the policy-makers, rather than critically examining the structural preconditions and assumptions that govern educational policy-making. Within such a functionalist framework the only possible task of the researcher is to question particular decisions; to examine only the content of schooling policies rather than their form (this is discussed in depth in chapter four). Thus it was possible for Ewing (1970 p50) to state the following:

> Undoubtedly the main reason why educational issues are rarely used to serve political ends is that in the country's egalitarian society there are few seriously divisive issues.

The role of the researcher must be to question both form and

content within the area under study. The purpose of theory is to provide a framework which makes this possible. Galper notes that: "research questions....are formulated from the perspective of the larger world views we already hold" (1980 p216); world views that contain the values and political orientations which guide practice. It is an essential prerequisite of analysis that one's own 'world view', or the assumptions underlying one's theoretical approach, be recognised and taken into account. As Poulantzas (1976 p5) notes: "facts can only be rigorously comprehended if they are explicitly analysed with the aid of a theoretical apparatus constantly employed throughout the text". The task of this thesis, then, is to lay open the values, politics and views of reality that underpin the material under discussion, and to do this by taking an open and explicit theoretical stance. Only in this way can the boundaries of 'reality' be broadened and understanding increase.

The New Zealand State:

New Zealand was first colonised by Europeans, mainly British, at the beginning of the 19th century. The indigenous Maori race at that time had a strong (Sutch 1969 pp34-35), healthy, harmonious lifestyle, yet no attempt was made by the settlers to adapt to a social structure which was perceived by them as 'savage'. Indeed, it soon became quite clear that the aim of the British settlers was to impose the existing social order of Britain on the colony. Their vision was to develop a

sort of 'landed gentry', using the wealth of land and resources of New Zealand to reproduce what the early settlers perceived was the 'best' of Britain's society (Sutch 1969 p45). The new class of landowners exercised "social, economic and political dominance over other groups" (Harker 1981 p4), bringing disease, misery and some starvation, and creating a social class structure which has continued in various forms up to the present day. Despite the desire of some richer emigrants to become 'English Squires', there was never any danger of New Zealand becoming a feudal state. The development of a capitalist economy in Britain, which was ensuring her position as the 'greatest' nation on earth - the workshop of the world - was in its heyday as the first settlers moved to New Zealand. Much of the colony's land was sold on the streets of London to wealthy businessmen for purely speculative purposes (Prichard 1970 p45), and the mass emigration was largely implemented by business organisations - the New Zealand Company being the largest of these.

Many colonists were prevented by contract from owning the means of production, and small numbers of people monopolised the natural resources of the country. The New Zealand Company worked on principles derived by Wakefield, and noted by Oliver (1960 p56):

> Wakefield insisted upon the need to maintain a proper balance between land, labour and capital. A labour shortage led to high wages, which reduced the return upon capitalist investment. Labour became scarce when land was sold too cheaply or given away, so that labouring men could immediately become landowners....

> To strike the correct balance, the price of land must be kept fairly high; then landless labourers would be glad to take jobs. Jobs would be plentiful, for a good investment would attract capital and capital would create employment.

One of the obvious outcomes of Wakefield's system was the creation of a classed social structure, not just inherited from Britain but formed by indigenous conditions.

It was into this classed and exploitative system that the first colonial Government stepped in 1840, under the Governership of Hobson. It seems that Hobson's tasks were essentially to mediate between Maori tribes and European settlers (in particular the New Zealand Company). However, other reasons also led to the development of New Zealand as a colony:

> We have not been insensible to the importance of New Zealand to the interests of Great Britain in Australia, nor unaware of the great natural resources by which that country is distinguished, or that its geographical position must in seasons, either of peace or war, enable it, in the hands of Civilised men to exercise a paramount influence in that quarter of the globe (1).

The new British administration were in favour of self-Government for New Zealand, but only "to the extent in which the principle can be reconciled will allegiance to the [British] Crown" (2).

The growth of the state began as a direct result of the perceived need to mediate the competing interests of capital, workers, Maori tribes and interested absentee groups (eg British investors who had acquired large tracts of land prior to 1840).

Fairly soon, however, landowners in various provinces were agitating for self-government, and in 1852 a democratic House of Representatives, with a nominated Legislative Council, were set up to govern New Zealand under the Governor-General. Eligibility for voting was determined by land ownership (men only), and thus propertied groups had control over the early development of the state.

Thus it is possible to identify the emergence of the New Zealand state with the capitalist development that was occurring concurrently. The early members of the House of Representatives were very concerned to maximise the opportunities for the accumulation of capital in the colony, particularly in relation to the buying and selling of land (Sutch 1969 p87). This was no easy task; the Maori wars, provincial jealousies and the increasing agitation of workers during the frequent depressions all militated against the simple accumulation of capital. The only possible response of the Government, given its interest in maintaining and extending the mode of production, was the development of a strong state apparatus to mediate and control the competing interests of the various groups in society; in short, to provide 'settlements' (CCCS 1981) for the problems which were threatening the social structure.

In its early stages, then, the state apparatus in New Zealand was set up as a means to 'win' the conditions necessary for expansion of the developing capitalist mode of production; to mediate (and if necessary dominate) competing claims and to

develop an indigenous (though based on British capitalism) economic system. Most of the New Zealand research on the state has taken a pluralist stance, seeing the state as an essentially neutral body which sifts competing claims and implements 'the popular'. By claiming here that the state is capitalist, it must be noted that the pluralist model becomes inadequate. There is little doubt that the state does sift competing claims, but the added, structural, imperative of capitalism insists that (a) the state is not neutral and (b) the perceived needs and interests of capital (although these are not always clear and may themselves be contradictory) determine the policies which are adopted. Little work has been done on the capitalist state in New Zealand (Martin 1981 is the exception). But, at a broadly theoretical level, much of the British work in this field is perfectly applicable to the New Zealand context. Thus a brief consideration of the role of the capitalist state will be followed by an analysis of the state in New Zealand as provider of education.

The Capitalist State

It has already been noted that the term "the state" consists of the publicly elected or nominated Government of a nation. However, this is only one, albeit the most visible, part of the state. Policy must not only be formulated but also implemented, and this latter role is played by what Dale (1981) calls the 'state apparatuses'. He defines these as all publicly-funded

bodies. In relation to education in New Zealand, then, the Education Department, regional and local school boards, universities, teacher training facilities, technical institutes, state schools and various other publicly funded educational groups can be defined as the 'education state apparatus'. However, it must be noted at once that these all-encompassing terms do not imply consensus; within the state as a whole, between state apparatuses and within a particular state apparatus there are various (and changing) levels of conflict and contradiction.

Dale (1981 p34) states that "the basic problems facing the capitalist state are the preservation, context and legitimacy of the capital accumulation process". These problems are central and constant, but the tasks of the state in meeting them are variable and fluctuating, due to changes in the social, economic and political forces at any given time. Thus the task of policy makers is to respond, through the state, to the pressures of changing conditions. However, this is not just a mechanical process; there are various constraints which prevent the effective development and implementation of state policy. These will now be considered.

The first constraint is that the processes of preservation, context and legitimacy of capital accumulation are mutually contradictory. As Dale (1981 p3) notes: "while the problems generated for [the state] in these three areas <u>have to</u> be carried out simultaneously, <u>they cannot be</u>" (emphasis in original). This

is because the capitalist state must preserve and enhance a mode of production which is inherently unequal (3), whilst at the same time appearing to be working for all groups in society. For example, a large industry which makes profits may be given public funds to expand, and this may be legitimated on the grounds that such expansion will create more jobs. This is what Galbraith (in a 1982 television interview with Ian Fraser) calls the 'trickle down effect'; in practice there is a tendency for such state support merely to increase the profits of the large corporation. Again, funds diverted towards such things as education and social services, which aim to enhance the context of capital accumulation, may actually serve to diminish opportunities for future production and delegitimate the very system these services were designed to enhance. Thus the state must continually strive to maintain a balance between these three, contradictory, needs.

Secondly, policy is usually formulated and effected by the dominant political group in Parliament - the Government. Not only do governments work towards the long-term goals of capitalism (we must assume that they do, as capitalism continues in New Zealand), but they also:

> ....attempt to represent the short-term interests of the temporarily dominant coalition of forces within a social formation; these coalitions are represented in political parties, and party policy reflects, on the one hand, the shifts of interest and influence between the groups making up the coalition and, on the other, its conceptions of what is required to secure majority electoral support (Dale 1981 p9).

The 'structural' theories of the state, which are discussed in chapters two and three, tend to ignore this very important aspect of the state. Governments can, in the short-term, work against the interests of capital, although in a society where so much is determined by the strength of capital development such a trend is unlikely to continue.

Thirdly, there is a gap between the formulation and the implementation of policy, as the state is not one huge monolith but a large number of smaller bodies who may delay, subvert or even ignore policy decisions. Policy is never clear, unproblematic and universally supported. Opposition to particular measures can be expressed in a variety of overt and subtle ways by state apparatuses. As Bognador (1979 p161) notes, the state works much better during periods of expansion than during retrenchment, as the implementation of new services is generally far less problematic than the imposition of economic or administrative constraints. It will be noted many times in this thesis that expansion in state services brings about the appearance of consensus between various facets of the education system; a 'consensus' which breaks down rapidly during periods of reduced state expenditure.

These are just some of the problems that continually face the capitalist state. In relation to education, some of these problems become enhanced, due to the relative autonomy (see chapter four) that necessarily exists in schooling practices, and the concomitant set of ambiguities which characterize educational

systems. The next section briefly introduces the nature of state involvement in education, and some of the issues and problems that will be discussed in this thesis.

The State as Educator

The role of the New Zealand state in education began in 1877 with the passing of the Education Act of that year. Prior to this, with certain exceptions, education was controlled at the Provincial level, with both Provincial Government and churches taking responsibility for education. By the late 1860's concern was expressed in the House of Representatives that the provincial system was causing an extremely unequal distribution of schooling (4). The system brought in by the 1877 Act was designed to correct the inequalities and to offer primary education to all New Zealand children. This Act made the Government, through a Minister of Education, responsible for the training of teachers, the inspection of the schools and maintenance of educational standards (Webb 1937 p29). Whilst the Act created twelve regional boards, which were to plan and implement their own policy, final decision on all educational matters was to rest with the Minister. Indeed, what was first proclaimed by Bowen as "the most decentralising bill that had been passed in any English country" (5), actually gave the Minister power to change any aspect of the system at any time:

> No matter what it may be that the board of the district

> thinks right to do, the Minister in Wellington may override it by a stroke of his pen (6).

The 1877 Education Act also set up the Department of Education, which was charged with administering the Act and its associated regulations. The Minister responsible for the Act claimed that this body would, for the moment, need only "a secretary and a clerk" (Webb 1937 p34) to run it. However, the Department grew very quickly, which may have been partly a result of the difficulties in controlling such a wide, diverse and expanding system from a central office. The central tasks of the Department of Education have not, in fact, changed greatly from 1877 to the present. In 1982, the Department defines its role as follows:

> [The Department] advises Minister on policy and development, controls the expenditure of money voted, ensures that schools are built and equipped when and where required and that teachers are recruited and trained, checks that standards are maintained in all schools (both state and private) and assesses the efficiency of teachers (7).

Indeed, although there has been a great expansion and diversification of state education since the 1877 Act, structurally the system has changed very little during that period. However, in relation to the functions of education, there have been a variety of reinterpretations of the system.

The Research Question: Historical Interpretations of Education

During the worsening economic recession of the last decade, it has become increasingly difficult to analyse the role of education in society. For sociologists of education, certain contradictions that pervade schooling systems have become increasingly evident, and the 'consensus theories' which dominated the previous two decades did not provide an adequate analytical framework for understanding these contradictions (this is described in chapter two). Issues such as the high unemployment levels of school leavers, the refusal of the Minister to decrease teacher/pupil ratios when a surplus of teachers occurred, an increasing tendency (Lauder 1983) for universities to attract only the children of the wealthy, and the failure of schooling to narrow the gap between rich and poor are just some of the current problems that sociologists of education must attempt to explain. It is not surprising, then, that there have been strong moves towards the use of conflict theories of society, in particular Marxism, to explain schooling practices in New Zealand society.

However, the adoption of Marxist theories to explain current problems in education is not enough; it is also important to be able to examine the development of the education system within the terms of such theories, as it is clear that many of the 'consensus' accounts of the history of education are disjunctive with current experience. There are perhaps three types of history which are common in New Zealand education. The first is

what McKenzie (1982) calls the 'celebratory' history. This is written to commemorate a particular institution or location, and is usually produced for a specific jubilee celebration or other notable event. There are many such histories in New Zealand education. The major difficulty with these is that they deliberately set out to paint a benign picture of the institution, and therefore ignore or misrepresent aspects of conflict. The second kind of history can broadly be called liberal-developmental; these tend to see growth in the education system uncritically as a good thing, and thus often ignore the underlying reasons for expansion. As the history of state education in New Zealand has been of almost continued growth, such histories tend to present education as an unqualified success, despite evidence to the contrary. The third type of history, very prevalent in the 1960's, can be called 'complacent'. During this period, there seemed to be a belief that all problems were soluble within the existing system, and that New Zealand schooling had developed into a very effective system. Thus there was once more a tendency to see the history of education as a continuum of steps leading to a (very satisfactory) pinnacle. Therefore, the increasing importance of conflict theories within the sociology of education has led to a need to re-interpret the history of education in New Zealand; a need to demonstrate that the issues of the 1980's have not been caused merely by a breakdown in an otherwise 'perfect' system, but by a set of contradictions that have always existed even though dominant theoretical approaches were unable to recognise them.

The purpose of this thesis, then, is to construct and apply a theoretical approach which is historically and sociologically adequate to a reinterpretation of aspects of New Zealand education. The focus of the historical accounts will be on aspects of policy, as most educative practices in New Zealand have been developed and determined within guidelines laid down by the state. This investigation will be centrally concerned with sociological rather than historical questions, although questions of historical adequacy will frequently be raised. This is because the demand for a theoretically adequate history of education has stemmed largely from the sociology of education whereas historians, though increasingly aware of theoretical issues, tend to focus on issues of selection and use of source materials rather than questioning underlying assumptions. Therefore, there is a strong emphasis in this thesis on the sociological and theoretical aspects of historical accounts of education. This can be seen most clearly in chapters two, three and four, where attempts are made both to contextualise this work within current research and to develop a framework to guide the development of what Silver (1983) calls a 'social history of policy'.

Chapter two outlines the changes that have taken place in post-war sociology of education, from the structural functionalist accounts of the 1950's to the various kinds of Marxism - economism, structuralism and cultural studies theory in the 1980's. This chapter outlines the reasons behind the increasing interest by sociologists in issues of state schooling

policies, although it is noted that this is a very new development and much work still needs to be done.

The purpose of chapter three is to outline and discuss various Marxist usages of the term 'ideology'. Much of the ambiguity surrounding this term is caused by different definitions of what ideology is. This chapter also gives an opportunity to look at the development of aspects of Marxist theory since Marx, and to compare and contrast the structuralist and culturalist usages of 'ideology'. Perhaps the major task of a Marxist history of education is to identify and discuss the effects of ideologies in particular historical periods and institutional locations. Thus this theoretical chapter aims to make it quite clear what one is, or may be talking about when discussing ideology.

In chapter four some contemporary work in the areas of history and policy studies is outlined and discussed. Certain theoretical terms - notably that of 'relative autonomy' - are discussed and contextualised within current research. The chapter ends with two case studies, which consider aspects of what I have called the history/theory debates; one of these is British and the second is from within the New Zealand context.

Chapters five and six attempt to apply the theoretical and methodological rules discussed in earlier chapters to the study of two aspects of New Zealand education history. Chapter five deals with Technical Education from 1900-1914, looking in

particular at the policies implemented during that time, their effects, and the development of a secondary technical school in Palmerston North. This whole period was dominated by the Liberal government, and the liberal ideologies in relation to education are outlined and discussed. Chapter Six examines the 1920-23 period, when, due to economic constraints and the conservative ideals of patriotism, a noticeable polarisation amongst policy-makers became evident, and was communicated in various ways to the education system itself.

In the final chapter, I will consider whether an explicitly Marxist theoretical approach can provide an adequate reinterpretation of aspects of the history of New Zealand state education.

Notes

1. Instructions from the British Secretary of State for War and Colonies, Lord Normanby, to Hobson, 14 August 1839. Reproduced in McIntyre and Gardner 1971 pp10-11.

2. Minute dated 15 March 1839 by Sir James Stephen, Permanent Undersecretary of State for Colonies. Reproduced in McIntyre and Gardner 1971 p8.

3. See Marx, 'Capital' volume I. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to enlarge on basic Marxian theories of society and the

mode of production. It is assumed that the reader will have a basic familiarity with Marx's arguments.

4. Parliamentary Debates (PD) 1869 p522

5. PD 1877 p32

6. PD 1877 p188

7. New Zealand Year Book 1982.

CHAPTER TWO

Sociology of Education and Educational Policy

Within mainstream educational sociology, which developed as a separate discipline in the period between the first and second world wars, there has been a tendency by academics to underplay or completely ignore the political nature of education. There have been widespread movements to 'keep politics out of education', and even a thesis written arguing that politics must be 'put back in' to education (Ingle 1967). The main reason for this situation has been the focus on a structural functionalist analysis of education (Reynolds and Sullivan 1980 pp 169-171). This approach sees educational provision developing as a response to the needs of society, and is mainly concerned with "the relationship between the sub-system or 'micro' system of education and the wider social system whose needs it was supposed to be meeting" (Reynolds and Sullivan 1980 p169). Thus educators have tended to concentrate on the "most efficient method" (Apple 1982 p12) of transmitting knowledge, rather than on the nature and aims of the policies which underlie and primarily determine the education system.

The schooling policies of post World War II New Zealand were, for more than twenty years, dominated by the notion of 'equality of opportunity'. Fraser (1939) set the scene for the policies with his well-known statement that:

> 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 a free education of the kind for which he is best fitted and to the fullest extent of his powers.

The aim of equity within schooling was not limited to New Zealand, but was a movement which spanned the whole western world. Moreover, such policies were widely supported and acclaimed within the sociology of education as a discipline. This led to an almost total allegiance to structural-functionalist analyses of education during the two decades following the war. This allegiance must be understood within the social and economic conditions in which it developed, as must the schooling policies themselves.

There is little doubt that the end of the war heralded a sense of optimism in the western world that has been unequalled at any other period in this country. This was due both to an expanding economic base and an obvious contrast with "the fact of war and the grim years preceding it" (CCCS 1981 p58). Improving economic conditions made it possible for pre- and intra-war schooling policies to be implemented in New Zealand, as well as in Britain; in both cases under a Labour Government and with high levels of support from working people and educators. In New Zealand, strong policies of full employment plus control of the economy formed the basis of economic growth, whilst state support attained its highest peak in the areas of health, education,

housing and social welfare (Sutch 1969 pp258-9).

During the twenty years after the war, then, sociologists of education were centrally concerned with developing ways of making schooling policies work, rather than questioning the basis of these policies. Research focussed closely on issues of administration, such as class sizes, buildings and organisational hierarchies, and teaching method such as text-books, teaching material, teaching plans, classroom interaction and measures of outcomes. During this period, there was very little room for consideration of issues such as the relationship between state, society and schooling or even the political underpinnings of schooling policies. The continued economic growth in New Zealand meant that 'opportunities' did continue to increase and thus ensured that the basis of schooling policies remained relatively unquestioned. However, by 1962 it had become clear that the Maori people, as a group, were faring significantly less well in school than the Pakeha (Commission of Education Report 1962). In the first issue of the New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies (1966), much space was taken up with this 'problem', showing evidence of Maori 'underachievement' and offering explanations:

> If [Maori] parents, for one reason or another, have been unable to provide experiences which assist in developing independence, flexibility of thought, systematic methods of working, and the desire to engage in taxing mental exercise, the chances of their children being able to meet the standards of their secondary school are minimised, and those of capitulating to comparatively non-intellectual pursuits enhanced. (Lovegrove 1966 p36).

There was little discussion of the viability of the policies underlying schooling practices of the time. Indeed, there was still much optimism, particularly with the founding of the Maori Education Foundation, that inequalities could be overcome:

> But there are also encouraging signs that the interest of Maori parents in the success of their children and the provision of extra assistance to Maoris at all levels of schooling may, by enabling the Maori people to move more fully into the mainstream of New Zealand's social and economic life, counteract the potential threat which current demographic patterns pose to the country's future race relations (Barrington 1966 p10).

Thus, during this period, educators looked to parents, teachers and pupils themselves as the 'causes' of the continued inequalities in schooling. The schools themselves were, as Apple (1982) notes, seen as 'black boxes' where, all else being equal, the outcomes would match the policies. By the 1960's, then, it was clear that equal access to educational resources did not automatically ensure that opportunity would be maximised by all groups in society; indeed, universal education was shown merely to reaffirm existing inequalities (Karabel and Halsey 1977 p44). At this time there was an abundance of (often conflicting) theories of inequality and the failure of universal education, several distinct paradigms, and no cures.

The first major challenge to functionalism within the sociology of education took place in Britain in 1970, at the conference of the British Sociological Association, and the publication of two subsequent volumes - Young's 'Knowledge and Control' (1971) and Brown's 'Knowledge, Education and Cultural

Change' (1973). The theoretical base of what came to be known as the 'new' sociology of education was broadly phenomenological, focussing on the way knowledge was constructed in schools. The new sociologists argued that education was reproducing the existing social order through the mechanisms of the production, organisation and transmission of knowledge in schools (Young 1971 p19). They investigated such areas as the way in which knowledge is socially legitimated, and the cultural bias of the pedagogy. The reordering of research priorities which the new sociology demanded allowed for the development of a new range of concepts for the study of educational practice.

In its original form, the new sociology of education did not survive very long. One crucial problem was related to the phenomenological underpinnings of the approach. The notion that social reality is constructed leads to an inescapable relativism, where it is not possible to state that 'this way' or 'that way' is most real or most appropriate. Schooling in western societies is inevitably linked to particular social and political ends, and the phenomenological approach was limited in its ability to address issues of schooling in these wider contexts. The growth of neo-Marxism in educational sociology can be seen as a direct outcome of the increasing need to address these wider issues.

This need for an analysis of schooling within the context of the wider society led to an increasing interest in structural Marxism during the early 1970's. In 1971, Althusser published his essay 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses'. This

work was centrally concerned with the reproduction of the existing social formation; that is, the ways in which a society reproduces its conditions. For Althusser, reproduction must occur in two separate but related spheres; those of 'productive forces' and the 'means of production'. The latter relates to the material base of the social formation (1972 p243) and also to its mode (ie raw materials plus the method of their distribution and appropriation). However, it is with the reproduction of the productive forces that schooling is centrally concerned (indeed, Althusser places education as the primary instrument of ideological reproduction). Althusser noted that for a labour force to be reproduced it is not enough merely to provide the material conditions through the payment of wages. The skills of working people must also be passed on to the next generation of workers, as must a "submission to the rules of the established order" (p245). Thus the role of schooling is to pass on both the skills and the ideology required for the reproduction of the social formation. Althusser calls the schooling system an "Ideological State Apparatus" (ISA). Along with the other ISA's (churches, legal system, family etc), schooling is seen as a 'superstructure', which is determined by the economic base of the society.

Althusser states that, within schooling, labour power is differentially produced according to the social class of the student. He fails, however, to form a convincing argument about how this 'sorting' is achieved. His explanation is based simply on the length of time people spend in school:

> (School) takes children from every class at infant-school age, and then for years, the years in which the child is most 'vulnerable', squeezed between the family State apparatus and the educational State apparatus, it drums into them, whether it uses new or old methods, a certain amount of 'know-how' wrapped in the ruling ideology.... Somewhere around the age of sixteen, a huge mass of children are ejected 'into production': these are the workers or small peasants. Another portion of scholastically adapted youth carries on: and, for better or worse, it goes somewhat further, until it falls by the wayside and fills the posts of small and middle technicians, white collar workers, small and middle executives, petty bourgeois of all kinds. A last portion reaches the summit, either to fall into intellectual semi-employment, or to provide.... the agents of exploitation, the agents of repression.... and the professional ideologists (1972 p260).

To Althusser, then, the ISA's are formed by the state in order to provide the legitimation necessary for the reproduction of the existing relations of production.

Within the Althusserian framework, there would be little point in investigating either what goes on in schools or the educational policies by which the state forms schooling. The processes of schooling are seen as irrelevant, because it is the structure, school as ISA, which is determining; the outcomes are decided in isolation from the students who attend school. There is little room in his theory for agency, at the level of the individual or group. Schooling policies are simply and unproblematically developed by the state to maintain the ideological and reproductive roles of schooling.

In 1976, Bowles and Gintis published Schooling in Capitalist

America, the classic structural text within the sociology of education. This was the first sustained attempt to explain schooling in terms of its economic context. Bowles and Gintis saw schooling as playing two major roles within capitalist society; the legitimation of existing social relations and the reproduction of the mode of production. They saw schools as microcosms, or mirrors, of the wider society, working to meet the needs of capital. Schooling processes were described as corresponding to the processes of the social formation - thus passivity in the classroom will lead to docility on the shop floor, whilst competition for grades in school will prepare students for the competition of the market-place. It would not be appropriate to undertake a full-scale critique of Bowles and Gintis' work here; this has been done by many others (O'Keeffe 1978, Willis 1981, Apple 1980-81). It is important to recognise the contribution of their study to the sociology of education for, whatever its shortcomings (and these come from the structuralist approach rather than from methodological failings), Schooling in Capitalist America has provided a precedent on which much further work has been built.

It is important to mention here a third theorist who can broadly be called a structural Marxist (though less so in his later work) - Pierre Bourdieu (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977). Neither Althusser nor Bowles and Gintis were able to provide a satisfactory account of how reproduction of social classes takes place within a schooling system that attempts to maintain an egalitarian and meritocratic appearance. Both these approaches

stress that schooling processes produce differential attainment dependent on the class (and race and gender) position of the student, but neither are able to adequately explain how this is achieved. Bourdieu addressed the relationship between culture and social reproduction in the schooling system. He developed the notion of cultural capital, seeing the cultural as at least partially autonomous from the economic. This is a departure from Althusserian structuralism, which tends to see the economic base as solely determinant of social structure. Cultural capital is the cultural style of the ruling class, and pervades all the state apparatuses. Because this cultural style is so pervasive, it is legitimated throughout the society as being the 'objective' culture. In education, primary schools are noticeable for a concern for multiculturalism and tolerance for diverse styles of behaviour. As one moves up the education ladder, however, knowledge of the codes and practices of the dominant culture become increasingly presupposed. The education system mystifies its relationship with ruling class culture through the setting up of 'objective' tests and processes which are seen to be value-free and thus equally accessible to all.

Within contemporary educational sociology there has been a rejection of the overmechanistic accounts of the structuralists. In particular, the notion of ideology as structure rather than consciousness (Larrain 1979), the emphasis on structure rather than agency (Willis 1983) and the strong emphasis on determinism within the structuralist position (Apple 1979) have been rejected or reworked. The most encouraging approach to emerge in recent

years is that of the cultural Marxists.

Before discussing the cultural Marxist analysis of schooling, it is important to make clear the relationship between the cultural and structural positions. Hall (1980), a culturalist, states of Althusser:

> Those who have gone on to further developments nevertheless continue to work and think in his shadow... Many who have definitively criticised him are still standing on his shoulders (p33).

Indeed, the cultural Marxists recognise that there are many aspects of society that structure the consciousness and lived experience of people:

> To be born within a certain gender, a certain class, a certain region, to be formed, developed and become a social subject within a certain cultural/ideological web and language community, to 'inhabit' a set of future possibilities (Willis 1983 p112).

However, those working from this approach deny that such structuring is totally deterministic. They point to the major flaws in the structuralist argument:

> It is absurd... to think that something called capital could coherently think out its list of tight social conditions - these and no other; still less could it imprint them on a malleable class (Willis 1981 p50).

Thus, the structural approach is too simplistic; it recognises only that capitalist society reproduces itself, and ignores the

struggle, the 'making', and the unintended ideological effects (Johnson 1976) that take place in the process of such reproduction. The central theme of the cultural Marxist approach is that people create meanings within structures; culture is formed by "the active, collective use and exploration of received symbolic, ideological and cultural resources to explore, make sense of and positively respond to 'inherited' structural and material conditions" (Willis 1983 p112). Thus, culture is the form by which agents become 'connected' to structures. Culture is formed within the institutions of society that impinge on the life and experience of agents. The schooling system, because of its omniscient presence in the early life of people, is a major site of 'cultural production'.

The seminal work on cultural production within schools is Willis' Learning to Labour (1977). This work is divided into two distinct, but inter-related parts: an ethnographic account of a group of white, working class, counter-culture 'lads' in both the school and work settings, and a theoretical section which uses the material collected to move towards a 'theory of cultural forms'. Both the methodology and analysis have been extensively employed by educational sociologists, and these will both be described here.

The ethnographic method de-emphasizes the mechanistic features of reproduction, and instead concentrates on the subjects who live and experience that reproduction (and, as Willis notes, even produce such reproduction). Ethnographic

study is a tool for understanding the ways in which observed social processes occur, and is thus particularly appropriate for addressing the problem of class-based school failure. Willis' ethnography is a sensitive account of a counter-school culture and the relationship of this culture to two institutional contexts - the school and the shop floor. Reading the book, it becomes impossible to conceptualise working class 'failures' in the school system as passive victims of an all-powerful capitalist ideology. It is made painfully clear that the lads perceive themselves as having power and control over their own existence. The power stems from a ruthless celebration of their own masculinity; money, violence, sexism and racism are at the very heart of the counter-school culture. Through the exercise of their perceived autonomy within the system - a perceived state which, in the short term, leads to a great deal of actual autonomy - the lads develop a sense of superiority over the conformist working class. They see themselves as having a free choice over their present and future activities. Paradoxically, and this is the observation that lies at the very heart of Learning to Labour, it is the exercise of that resistance to conformity which eventually condemns the lads to a shop-floor existence. Life on the shop floor is a celebration of their freedom from the conformist pressures of society (as manifest in the school system), but it concurrently ensures the reproduction of the existing relations of production, and thus the very system which the lads have rejected. Willis' ethnography, then, affirms the education system as a site of the transmission of class inequality, whilst allowing the rejection of mechanistic notions

of such transmission.

To Willis, each class in the capitalist social formation develops its own cultural forms, in relation to its position in the social system. These cultural forms contribute, in different ways, to the maintenance and reproduction of existing social relations. However, and this is where he differs from the more mechanistic theorists, these cultural forms do not co-exist happily in peaceful consensus. Rather, within each generation, the cultural level is a site for contestation, resistance and compromise between dominant and dominated classes. The objects of conflict are the contradictions which are inherent within the capitalist mode of production - e.g. structural inequalities, economic crises, contested work relations etc. Thus the cultural level is constantly dialectically constituting and dynamically reproducing itself.

Cultural forms are produced by the differential assimilation, rejection and subversion of dominant meanings or ideologies at particular sites in the social system. Rejection of modes of dress, language and behaviour by the lads is in contrast to their implicit acceptance of themselves as less desirable and deserving than conformist members of society; ideology is both exposed and internalised. The lads reinforce the ideological division between mental and manual labour, rejecting the mental in favour of physical work. Yet this affirmation is not due to a passive acceptance of their place in society; to the lads, manual work is an expression of masculine

power and superiority, requiring far more physical challenge and awareness of the concrete existence which surrounds their lives, than 'pen-pushing'. They perceive manual work as a source of autonomy, not repression.

Willis states (1981 p49) that:

> ....in order to constitute a reproduced social relationship as a dynamic and contested one, we must explicitly recognise the somewhat independent logics of what I am calling cultural production, the different meanings they play across the social relationship, and the ideological and limiting processes which produce cultural reproduction from production and link thereby, with social reproduction.

What he is claiming here is that cultural production is an integral, though dynamic and constituted, part of social reproduction. Moreover, it is the central process within social reproduction where change and contestation are not only possible, but actively appropriated. Reproduction theorists have, "in an awesome reverse of the Medusan myth", looked "back to cultural production and turned it, not themselves, to stone" (1981 p50). Cultural processes are ideological, but not merely the 'received' ideology of dominant institutions; dominant ideologies are partially incorporated and partially subverted in the working class culture. However, he sees no certain or predetermined connection between this form of reproduction and social reproduction. Although it is clear that reproduction (in the above sense) occurs, and also that social reproduction continues, he argues that culture is produced and reproduced 'in between'

the two processes.

Cultural studies aims to elucidate the processes through which "men make their own history, but... do not make it just as they please" (Marx 1962). The transformative aspects of cultural production, that is of the meanings that agents create within structures, is of importance to Willis:

> Cultural production, then, insists on the active, transformative nature of cultures, and on the collective ability of social agents, not only to think like theorists, but act like activists (1983 p114).

As Learning to Labour showed, most counter-culture activities tend to be, finally, reproductive rather than transformative. Indeed, it seems contradictory to talk about culture as transformative when we see that it is reproductive. However, Willis wishes to move away from an oversimplistic either/or model. He points out that there is no clear separation between agency and structure; these cannot be understood in isolation from one another. Culture stands between the two - structures are "produced through struggle, and in the collective self-formation of subjects and the working-class", and "the working class is formed in and through... the structures and characteristic forms of a capitalist society". Therefore, cultural production can never be merely a process of assigning simple meanings to events, but rather of trying to understand interwoven, contradictory and often 'uncontrollable' aspects of social life. The essential point that Willis makes here is that

cultural choices made in one direction may bring about, in profound yet unperceived ways, unintended effects in another. Thus, transformation and reproduction may exist, in always contradictory ways, side by side within a culture.

There is no doubt that Willis' approach has had a profound effect on Marxist analyses within the sociology of education. This is not shown merely in the increase of ethnographic method in the analysis of educational systems, but also by a new vigour and attention to detail within the field as a whole (Apple 1980-81). Not only are schooling processes no longer a black box, but also the kids themselves, the subjects of schooling, have been promoted to an important place within educational research. Moreover, an increasing interest and concern with the analysis of schooling policies, for so long limited to mechanistic input-output models, has become evident (CCCS 1981). The contribution of cultural Marxism to policy analysis will be discussed in more depth in chapter four.

Research in the New Zealand Context

Bates (1978) was the first to suggest a series of research questions for New Zealand based on the new sociology of education. That this suggestion came so late, in comparison to Britain, may have been a reflection of the state of sociological research into educational questions at that time: "New Zealand can hardly claim to have emerged into the era of traditional, let alone come to grips with the new, sociology of education" (Bates

1978 p17). However, since 1978 there has been a vast increase in research and enquiry in New Zealand, from a variety of theoretical approaches and dealing with many issues.

The concern within the new sociology for investigation into the organisation and transmission of knowledge-forms has been investigated by Harker (1981) and Middleton (1980, 1983). Harker's paper dealt with the Maori people in the schooling system, and was the first published work to suggest that the knowledge-forms of schooling may be implicated in Maori failure. Using the work of Bourdieu, he was able to show that knowledge in New Zealand schools is culturally biased in favour of white pupils. This paper offered a historical dimension to the debate about Maori school failure that had previously been lacking. Middleton's work used the theoretical framework developed by Bernstein and others to show how knowledge is 'classified' and 'framed' in particular ways which work against women in the education system. The strength of Middleton's work is that she teaches the courses under investigation; thus her research can inform her teaching practice. Perhaps its weakness is the phenomenological base which masks the structural impediments to change.

Since 1980, there has been a great increase in interest towards Marxist approaches to sociology of education. This can be seen most dramatically in Battersby's (1983) study of courses taught in New Zealand teachers colleges and universities. In 1980, Marxist approaches were barely mentioned in sociology of

education courses, but by 1983 these approaches were the most frequently covered topics (p7). Moss and Ramsay (1983) have reviewed work within the New Zealand sociology of education, but their analysis of the structuralist position seems inaccurate; this section will briefly reassess the 1980's work being done in this field.

Although Bowles and Gintis's work had an impact in New Zealand, very little work has been undertaken from this structuralist perspective. Nash's (1981) paper 'Schools Can't Make Jobs' did stress the reproductive functions of schools, but did so as a response to liberal-transformative arguments rather than from any commitment to an Althusserian perspective. Freeman-Moir's (1981) paper on the same topic again stressed the reproductive functions of schooling, in order to dispel the liberal myth that schooling can, in itself, equalise opportunities. He too, however, was aware of the problems of a straight reproductive argument:

> There has been an attempt in some recent Marxian analyses of education to make the relationship (termed correspondence) between school and work too straightforwardly functional and hence static. To propose a correspondence hypothesis, however, is not to say anything about the actual mechanisms of socialization and selection (1981 p16).

Indeed, it is difficult to find any New Zealand analyses of schooling which adhere to a purely reproductive approach.

There is no doubt that the cultural Marxist approach has

gained widespread acceptance in New Zealand, although this development is too recent to have either generated much research or given indications of future directions. As Moss and Ramsay (1983 p31) point out, it was Nash's (1982) work which first set out the cultural studies problematic; but it was the influence of Willis's (1977) British study that raised the interest of educators in the cultural approach (eg Shuker 1981a). The rapidly-worsening economic recession has made schooling appear far less egalitarian than previously assumed, and Government cutbacks in various aspects of education have raised questions about the state's commitment. It is within this context that the interest in cultural Marxism must be understood. Recent work which has been undertaken using this approach has looked at images of schooling (Codd 1983), schooling and unemployment (Shuker 1981b, 1983), ideology and schooling policies (Gordon 1983), a development of Willis's work (Gordon 1984) and developments of Bourdieu's work (Harker 1984). As well, Moss and Ramsay have addressed the 'reproduction/transformation debates' (1983), and Middleton has used the cultural approach within the context of feminist theories of schooling. Very little fieldwork has been carried out using the methodology developed by Willis, although it is likely that studies will be undertaken in the near future.

The 1980's has seen an increasing vigour within the sociology of education in New Zealand. This is probably due both to the worsening economic situation and to the methodological and analytical tools which have been imported from Britain and

America. Of these, the cultural Marxist approach is receiving the most interest. This brief review of the various approaches to sociology of education has aimed to provide an overall view of the 'state of the art', and has been indicative rather than exhaustive. In relation to New Zealand, no mention has yet been made of debates in fields outside of the sociology of education - particularly in the area of history, where some interesting trends are emerging. These will be dealt with later. As well, little criticism of the various approaches have been advanced; this will be undertaken when the theories are dealt with in more detail.

CHAPTER THREE

Views of Ideology

Approaches within the Marxist sociology of education focus mainly on the role of schooling in reproducing existing social relations (e.g Sharp 1980, Apple 1982), by examining the mechanisms by which schooling operates (e.g Carnoy and Levin 1976, Bowles and Gintis 1976, Silver 1980) and the relations between schooling and the wider social context (e.g Willis 1977, Corrigan 1979). Marxist sociologists of education share a common set of underlying assumptions, the most pervasive being that schooling systems are sites of ideological forms, which act to systematically distort social relations:

> "the field of ideological positions reproduces the field of social positions in a transfigured form... which consistently sustain(s) in reality a set of representations which are not so much false to, as false inflections of, the real relations on which they in fact depend" (Bourdieu; quoted in Hall 1977).

The basic assumption on which Marxist theories of education rest, then, is that the nature of relations within a given mode of production are mystified by thought forms which are ideological. What is problematic, and a source of continuing debate, are the ways in which ideology works within a social system.

At the time that Marx formulated his theory of the state in capitalist society, there was no free or universal state education. He reacted to a proposal to develop a (German) state-run education system by declaring that rather than "appointing the state as the educator of the people!.... the state has need, on the contrary, of a stern education by the people" (quoted in Demaine 1981 p68) - a view surprisingly similar to that held by many people today. Marxist theories of education, then, have arisen from historical events which are specifically post-Marxian in origin, and this accounts, in part, for differences of opinion between sociologists of education about the ideological mechanisms of schooling. The two major contemporary formulations of ideology within education are the structuralist and the culturalist views, the former more or less corresponding to Althusser's (1972) formulation, and the latter being most closely identified with Gramsci's (1971) concept of hegemony. Before outlining these two approaches, however, it is important first to understand how Marx conceived of ideology developing within particular social contexts, and its role in upholding the dominant mode of production. This will set the stage for later considerations.

a) Marx on Ideology

Before Marx, philosophers were almost unanimous in the view that human understanding was a product of rational thought in concert with nature. Ideas were seen as developing from individual insights into the nature of the world. Conversely, distorted ideas were a result of individual aberration; in particular, the contamination of rationality by emotion. It was a logical extension from these beliefs that ideas, distorted or not, were determinant of social relations. Marx inverted this relationship. In his view, the particular mode of production of a historically specific moment, is determinant of the ideas that people produce and their social relations. To understand what Marx meant when he stated that all ideas were the product of the material base, it is important to make a distinction between different types of practice. Reproductive practice is the process by which people create their material existence. Such a process is social, and thus the labour of persons becomes framed within the social relations of production. Revolutionary practice occurs when the dominant material mode of production has become framed within relations of domination and subordination. However, the conditions for the development of revolutionary practice are not merely arbitrary; they also arise from the material base. New ideas, then, only arise as the conditions of the material base change.

To explain this more clearly, we should return to the beginning of a mode of production - in this example, capitalism. As it is

being set up, the capitalist mode of production has a very limited material base, and is in competition with the prior, feudal, mode of production. Those who work within the capitalist mode control their own social relations. Under capitalism, however, eventually those who own the means of production (i.e. land, raw materials, machinery) become divided from those who own only their own labour, and society splits into two parts or classes. It is important to note that such a split is not caused by any particular agent, but is a phenomenon arising from the nature of the dominant mode of production.

As capitalism develops, the social relations of the expanding material base become independent of any particular practice. In other words, what first appeared to be a choice, freely made by persons, to take a certain role in the new mode of production, now becomes a determination: "men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make in under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past" (Marx, in Larrain p42). This is the first contradiction in any mode of production; that the practice of persons first produces the mode, but the social relations which result are autonomous from the practice that first created it. This contradiction, and the others that follow it, form the basis for ideological thought-forms to develop.

People become aware of the developing contradictions, but are unable to understand them because the material conditions for

their solution do not exist: "it will always be found that the task itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution already exist or are at least in the process of formation" (Larrain 1979). Therefore, the contradictions are distorted in the consciousness of persons into false problems with false solutions - what Marx called 'false consciousness': "Ideology is, therefore, a solution in the mind to contradictions which cannot be solved in practice; it is the necessary projection in consciousness of man's practical inabilities" (Larrain 1979). That is, ideology is a false solution to contradictions that arise from the material base, and which cannot be solved except by changing the base. The effect of ideology is not structural change but accommodation; the contradictions are negated. However, although ideology stems from the ideas of people, it is not merely an "invention of consciousness". Ideology arises from a "limited material mode of activity", a mode which both produces the contradictions and fails to provide the material base for their solution.

What role, then, does Marx's ideology play in society? First, ideology always serves the interests of the ruling class. This is because the conditions of material practice within a given mode of production are always the conditions of the ruling class - under capitalism, the capitalists. Secondly, ideology legitimates the social formation and its practices. This ensures the continuance of the existing social relations of production. Thirdly, ideology plays a major part in reproducing the existing social formation, including social classes and modes of

production. Fourthly, ideology is historically specific. That is, as new contradictions arise in the mode of production, new ideologies are formed, which may extend, override or contradict older ideologies. Thus ideology arises from changes in the material base, and the historical development of that base determines the particular ideologies.

Not all ideas, however, are ideological, even though any conception of being is limited by the material mode of activity in which it is theorised. Expansion in the material base, for example, during the industrial revolution or the present escalation of technological knowledge, brings about the conditions for the development of new ideas. Some of these are ideological, i.e. they uphold ruling class interests and serve to reproduce the capitalist mode of production; however some ideas are rather ideational, i.e. whereas they are limited by the material base they do not, at least mechanistically, uphold it. However, ideas which are not ideological in conception may become ideological in practice - the welfare state in New Zealand is a good example of this.

For Marx, the only way to overcome ideology is through revolution: "Revolutionary practice changes the conditions within which reproductive practice must necessarily produce misleading appearances" (Larrain p60). Alongside of this though, the need for theoretical analysis of ideological structures is of paramount importance. Revolutionary thought must be developed through a critical and conscious examination of the dominant

ideology and the contradictions which underpin ideological thought. Only then, with ideology clearly exposed, can revolutionary practice take place.

Marx's theory of ideology stands on a firm philosophical and social base. Because ideology is conceptualised in a fairly narrow way, this theory offers much scope for the development of ideas which, though stemming from the base, are not necessarily ideological. In the present context, that of state education, Marx offers little except his basic framework of ideology. However, this framework gives us a useful conceptual base with which to understand the later developments and debates around the notion of ideology, the two main strands of which are discussed below. Some recent theories of ideology give more insight into the specific ideological roles and functions of schooling in capitalist societies. The first of these to be considered here are those writers who can broadly be subsumed under a structuralist label.

b) The Structuralists

Althusser (1972) investigates ideology from the point of view of reproduction: "the ultimate condition of production is... the reproduction of the conditions of production". To him, the major agent of reproduction in any society is the state, which functions "as a force of repressive execution and intervention 'in the interests of the ruling classes' in the class struggle

conducted by the bourgeoisie and its allies against the proletariat". The most crucial aspect of reproduction, then, is that of the working class. Two areas which are essential for the reproduction of labour power are identified as the material means of reproduction and the relations of production. The former, according to Althusser, are reproduced through the giving of wages to workers. This system works on the basis that not only will the worker continue to offer her or his labour to the capitalist, but will also provide the material conditions (food, shelter, etc) for the raising of the next generation of workers. The second area - the reproduction of existing relations of production - cannot be brought about merely through the wage system, nor by the state through repressive practices. Thus Althusser posits a set of Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA's), whose function is to institutionalise the dominant ideology "i.e. a reproduction of submission to the ruling ideology for the workers, and a reproduction of the ability to manipulate the ruling ideology correctly for the agents of exploitation and repression" (1972 p245). The ISA's are contrasted with the 'repressive' state apparatuses, such as the police, courts and army. A society cannot easily be reproduced without at least marginal support from its members (particularly in a capitalist society where the 'market' depends on a high level of apparent autonomy), and such support cannot be gained purely by repressive means. Therefore the central function of the ISA's is to reproduce the dominant ideology and thus existing relations of production. Thus, for Althusser, ideology is socially mediated practice which "produces the subject" (Wexler 1982 p59).

It is clear from this account that Althusser has moved away from the Marxian notion that ideological thought is a structurally-caused 'personal' response to the contradictions inherent in a capitalist mode of production. He sees ideology as a body of thought generated at the institutional level in order to ensure social reproduction. To Marx, ideology is a phenomenon arising from processes between persons/classes and structures. Althusser sees ideology as a tool of the state, which ensures reproduction of the existing social order. If ideology fails, the state can bring in its repressive structures. There is clearly a sense in which both Marx and Althusser are correct. Marx tended to underestimate the ideological power of the state (or maybe state power was simply far weaker at the time Marx wrote), whereas Althusser's view seems overdetermined, failing to explain the possibility of non-ideological thought in persons.

Several ISA's are mentioned in Althusser's account, but the educational is transcendent because of the obvious interaction between state and person and its clear importance as a site for reproduction. This Althusserian emphasis has been taken up by many sociologists of education, the most prominent being Bowles and Gintis (1976) and Carnoy and Levin (1976). It is interesting to note, however, that these theorists have not, at least explicitly, developed the work of Althusser, although the parallels with his thought, within the educational context, are clear. To Bowles and Gintis, the education system legitimates existing forms of social relations through an appearance of openness, objectivity and meritocracy (p103). 'Legitimation' is

defined as "the fostering of a generalised consciousness among individuals which prevents the formation of the social bonds and critical understanding whereby existing social conditions might be transformed". Such legitimation takes place in certain historically specific ways - for example, the development and usages of I.Q. testing illustrate how one factor can be used to legitimate and reproduce social inequalities. The school, as well as being a site for the societal legitimation, plays a most active part in reproducing the skills needed in the workplace. As Althusser notes, these skills and attitudes are differential, depending largely on the social class or ethnic group membership of the student. Therefore, Bowles and Gintis argue, the school actually acts as a microcosm of the wider society; through the hidden curriculum it teaches the dominant ideology to the students, who then move on to reproduce existing social relations in terms of their own social class backgrounds.

Carter (in Carnoy and Levin 1976) outlines the basis of what have become known as 'correspondence' theories of education and state:

> When we speak of 'correspondence' between the schooling process and the work process, we are referring to the mechanisms and structures through which schools mediate contradictions in the work process and thereby contribute to the reproduction of existing structures and social relations on the job. Indeed, in our view the institutions of schooling as they exist today arose in response to the need to mediate the contradictions in workplace structures (p55).

This is the essense of the structuralist notion of education. The problems with this formulation fall into two categories:

i) Such an account has an overmechanistic view of ideology. To be more specific, the correspondence theorists make it sound as if educational planners sit round a table and discuss how the school can be used to mask workplace contradictions and churn out the 'right' proportion of working and ruling class kids. Educators do not do this, at least not in any clear and unproblematic way. The relationship between school and society is overdetermined, and no explanation is allowed for the contradictory observation that teachers do, in fact, have a fair amount of day-to-day autonomy. The notion that schools, as well as the other ISA's, can determine the future of social groups fails to account for some apparent anomalies in such a 'tight' system. As Browne (1981 p446) notes:

> It is extremely difficult to suggest that schools are simply instruments of capitalist domination, and teachers the simple agents of that domination, without ignoring the real differences between contemporary schools, and the real-life struggles which go on there. Moreover, if the school is simply such an instrument, then it is extremely inefficient: as a result of schooling, workers are not 'well-behaved', passive and docile, there are huge discrepancies between the jobs available in the labour market and the types of skills and abilities those entering the labour market from the school possess, and there would appear to be a considerable difference between social relations in the classrooms and the social relations in the factory.

ii) The most common culturalist criticism of this 'overstructured' notion of ideological transmission is that it views people as passive recipients of pre-determined knowledge-forms, and social classes as empty vessels waiting to

be filled: "The principal aspect of an analysis of social classes is...not that of the agents that compose them" (Poulantzas, in Shapiro 1980 p322). There is little room for human agency, resistance or conflict at the level of the institution, yet it is clear that such conflict does occur. Apple (1980-81) claims that it is important to view the ideology of the hidden curriculum as a process rather than a structure; a site of continual interplay between institutional and personal tensions.

The major strength of structural analyses of ideology is that they provide an account of ideology at the institutional level. This is clearly an advance on the Marxian person/base model. However, whilst putting forward a picture of these institutions as a site for working class struggle (Poulantzas 1973), the structuralist view can only, finally, account for social reproduction in an over-determined way. The third model of ideology to be considered here is that of the culturalists, who begin their analysis from 'the other end' to the structuralists, and bring an understanding of the role of culture in maintaining the dominant ideology.

c) The Culturalists

It was Gramsci's work, and in particular his concept of hegemony (1971), which first linked ideology to the contemporary notion of lived culture (Apple 1982 p16). In this section the meaning of hegemony will be outlined, followed by a review of the relationship between culture and ideology in contemporary thought. However, this is a dense, problematic area within cultural studies, and has yet been taken up by few within the sociology of education. Therefore this review will be necessarily limited. The major reason for its inclusion is that the culturalist approach takes us somewhat further than the determinism of structuralism; however, it also raises new theoretical problems which are not easily solved.

Gramsci noted that the term 'ideology' had been modified from "the necessary superstructure of a particular structure" (i.e. the thought-forms that necessarily arise from a particular material base, as outlined above in the Marxian position), to mean any "political solution that... is not sufficient to change the structure, although it thinks that it can do so" (1971 p376). The term hegemony, then, was developed firstly to duplicate the former and secondly to explain the processes whereby dominant practices become universalized. Hegemony refers to "a central system of practices, meanings and values, which we can properly call dominant and effective ..(and) are not merely abstract but are organised and lived" (Williams 1976 p205). Hegemony is mediated through the structures of civil society, and underpins

"the spontaneous consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant group" (Gramsci 1971 p12). Hegemony is contrasted with coercion, which is mediated through the state and constituted by the judicial framework.

At this stage, it is difficult to see much difference between Gramsci's concept and structuralist notions of ideology. However, the key to Gramsci's notion is that hegemony is cultural (Femia 1981 p24). It is not merely a reductionist determinism - hegemony must constantly be fought for against countervailing cultural tendencies which may constitute counter-hegemonies, and which are socio-politically produced (Sharp 1980 p102). In other words, the simple base/superstructure model in which the base is determinant of the superstructure, and the superstructure acts merely to reinforce the base, should be discarded: "Far from assuming a simple recapitulation between the various structures of society, this [culturalist] approach sees the 'work' which the superstructures (like schools) perform as necessary precisely because, on its own, the economic system cannot ensure all the conditions necessary for its own expanded reproduction" (Hall, in Apple 1982 p17). Therefore, the economic structure is not able to 'control' the superstructures in any simple way. The central role of the superstructures is seen as maintaining the dominant hegemony against counter-hegemonies which are cultural resistances and contestations which take place in various sites such as family, school and workplace.

According to Wexler (1982), the new culturalist approach has shifted the emphasis of analysis of ideological forms from 'domination' to 'resistance'. It is "a step toward the refusal of defeat", but still "admits resistance as a limited form of class conflict - and then only as an afterthought and only within institutionally isolated settings" (pp61-62). Culturalist approaches offer both an optimism based on the possibility of change and a pessimism because all cultural 'moments', 'tendencies' and 'penetrations' appear inexorably to become subsumed to the machinery of reproduction. However, it is important not to be seduced into the vulgar reductionism that this approach seems to signal. Relations between classes, political forces and bureaucracies - and the ideologies which intertwine them - are always changing as a result of contestation and resistance, which occurs at the level of culture. The state, though agent of the dominant group, must be "conceived of as a continuous process of formation and superseding of unstable equilibria... between the interests of the fundamental groups and those of the subordinate groups" (Gramsci 1971 p182). Reproduction is a battle; the field of combat is staked out by the forces of relative autonomy and cultural production on the one hand, and capital on the other.

In contrast to the structuralist view, ideology is not simply seen to be imposed onto passive non-dominant groups. Indeed, Willis claims that ideologies may be formed within working class groups and mediated upwards:

> The crucial divisions, distortions and transferences which have been examined, arise not so much from ideas and values mediated downward from the dominant social group, but from internal cultural relationships. Certain aspects of the working class cultural affirmation of manual labour considered here are profoundly important both ideologically and materially, and are, if anything, exported upwards to a largely uncomprehending official ideological apparatus (1977 p60).

The hegemony of the dominant class is mediated through the institutions of civil society, and thus there is a tendency for the reproduction of cultural effects. However, these institutions are also sites for the production of alternative cultural forms, which may or may not be counter-hegemonic. Those forms which work within (i.e. are limited by) the dominant hegemony serve to reproduce existing cultural categories. In their turn, these categories legitimate and reproduce existing social structures and relations. Counter-hegemonic activities, on the other hand, produce tendencies towards changes in existing social relations and are thus a site for contestation within civil society, and, where the dominant ideology breaks down, within the coercive apparatuses of the state.

This chapter has been concerned to clarify issues about the nature and role of the Marxian notion of ideology, and to put these issues into the context of current investigation within the sociology of education. Clearly, one's conception of ideology has a profound influence on views about the role of education within a given social formation. The classical Marxian notion provides a great deal of autonomy within an expanding material

base for the formation of non-ideological (and thus non-reproductive) ideas, whereas the structuralist see schools as mirrors of existing social relations, thus offering little opportunity for the development of alternative ways of conceptualising the world. The culturalist view recognises the structural constraints which limit the development of non-ideological forms, but notes at the same time that cultural production is an inherent process of social reproduction, and does provide a site for dynamic cultural tendencies towards contestation and change. This view stressed the processes which underlie the production and reproduction of social groups and institutions within the social formation, and saw ideological forms as mediating these processes. Thus, the domination of the ruling groups is always contested, resisted and transformed within the structures of civil society. The latter view seemed the most theoretically coherent and practically applicable of the various Marxian interpretations.

The theoretical structure of this chapter has given little opportunity for the discussion of issues in educational policy. The next chapter aims to do just that, through a discussion of the relative autonomy of the educational system, current Marxist investigation in this area and an investigation of the relationship between theoretical research and historical analysis within education.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Analysis of Educational Policy

In the first three chapters of this thesis it has been clearly stated that very little work has been undertaken by sociologists on the policy-formation aspects of education. Studies have tended to centre on aspects of schooling processes, rather than on particular policies and their effects in practice. Recently, there has been a great upsurge of interest in analyses of schooling policies. This can, for the most part, be attributed to the increasing need to understand schooling within its social, political and economic contexts. Most of the work which has been undertaken has been heavily critiqued for its theoretical assumptions and methodological approaches. This has led to some debate over how policy formulations should be analysed, as well as the elucidation of the components of such analysis. It was demonstrated in chapters two and three that the cultural Marxist model still tends to rest heavily on certain structuralist assumptions, and adheres, if somewhat implicitly, to the notion of the 'relative autonomy' of institutional sites within the social formation. This chapter begins with a brief discussion of the notion of 'relative autonomy', and from there aims to identify the methodological and theoretical components necessary for an analysis of schooling policies.

Relative Autonomy

The term 'relative autonomy' was first used by Althusser (Althusser and Balibar 1970) as an explanatory concept within the structuralist tradition. As I discussed in the last chapter, Althusser reinterpreted the classical Marxist notion of ideology, positing it as a superstructural level which rests on the material/economic base of the social formation. In this theory, the role of the superstructure is to ensure the reproduction of existing social relations and thus the material base:

> "It is easy to see that this representation of the structure of every society as an edifice containing a base (infrastructure) on which are erected the two floors of the superstructure, is a metaphor, to be quite precise, a spatial metaphor: the metaphor of a topography. Like every metaphor, this metaphor suggests something, makes something visible. What? Precisely this: that the upper floors could not 'stay up' (in the air) alone, if they did not rest precisely on their base" (Althusser 1972 p247).

However, such an approach entails some methodological and theoretical problems (Nash 1983, CCCS 1977). Firstly, it is clear that the actions of agents or institutions at the various sites in the social system are not wholly determined by and determining of the material base (Apple 1982b). Secondly, the tautology of base/superstructure seems unable to explain changes that occur at both the level of base and of superstructure. Thirdly, this model requires a view that all 'sites' in the social system, including culture and education, are merely pre-determined epiphenomena of an all-pervading structure; a

view which is demonstrably false (Hall 1980).

Althusser originally used 'relative autonomy' as a necessary aspect of a structural model, in order to remove the somewhat absurd connotation that all institutions and practices are directly determined by the economic base. The term 'relative' signified that the institution was 'relational' to the base, although in current usage it tends to be interpreted as meaning 'a certain degree of autonomy' (Wells 1981 p79). Although the current theorists within the Marxist sociology of education rarely explicate either a base/superstructure model nor the relative autonomy of the various 'sites' (education, culture etc) which are explored, it is clear that they rest heavily, if implicitly, on this model. As Nash (1983 p27) states, then: "finding sites as space for radical educational practice is a preoccupation of most Marxist sociology of education". Contemporary analyses of education, and in particular those which study cultural processes, work within the gaps or sites which are identified, seeking modes of struggle, resistance and/or transformation. The notion of sites or gaps depends heavily on the notion of relative autonomy; thus such investigation contains an implicit assumption, which is basically Althusserian, about the structure of societies.

Analyses of policy-making within the Marxist tradition must begin from the prior position that the 'contested' nature of policy-formation itself, "the state's ideological functions and... the relation between state policy and the requirements of

capitals" (CCCS 1981 p17) together provide the dynamic in which sites of reproduction or resistance may be identified and transformed. Therefore one task of policy studies must be to analyse the conditions in which the relative autonomy of institutional sites is created and maintained. Changes in the social formation, such as those which occur as a result of fluctuating conditions for capital accumulation, lead to changes in the policies and/or practices which determine the nature of schooling. Thus Marxist analyses are always historically specific; but to understand the conditions which underpin this specificity one must first analyse the conditions under which policy is formulated and implemented. What are the legitimating functions of the relative autonomy of particular institutions and practices? How are the dominant social relations maintained within the contested arena of 'civil society' (in more theoretical terms: how does the relative autonomy of these structures, in the last instance, bring about the reproduction of existing social relations)? Some work has been done on these issues in recent years, in relation to education. The next section reviews some of the current literature of Marxist analyses of educational policy, and raises some issues for discussion.

Educational Policy

Hargreaves (1982 p133) notes that:

> ...one useful way of putting relative autonomy to work empirically would be through careful analysis of its effects upon school practice in particular historical periods. This would make it possible to elicit the ways in which policy is formulated and implemented on the basis of limit-confirming assumptions policy-makers hold about the relationship between schooling and the social structures and in the context of various constraints that derive from that social structure. The ways in which particular policies and accumulations of policies provide a context for school practice, affecting in no small part the shape of the latter, could then be traced through.

Hargreaves is here promoting an approach to policy research which differs from the traditional, conservative accounts of educational policy-making. The traditional method has been to work from the stated aims and projections of policy-makers, and to test through empirical research whether these aims have been accomplished. Recommendations which spring from such research are necessarily normative, because of the narrow analytical framework in which they are embedded. The task of the researcher is simply to state a situation (X), compare it to the aims of a particular policy (Z), and to work out a strategy (Y) whereby the situation can be brought into line with policy objectives. Thus, necessarily, X + Y = Z. The nature of such research is illustrated in the following account:

> But this type of account is deeply problematic, theoretically and politically. It excludes the living,

> active force of the vast majority of historical populations and tends, qualitatively, to take the side of the dominant and articulate minorities. This can happen even where there is no deliberate attempt to uphold the status quo. It follows from accepting, as given, features of politics, education or social conditions in general, which ought to be appraised critically and which have an intricate history of their own (CCCS 1981 p14).

The approach that Hargreaves advocates is an analysis of the relationship between schooling and the social structure, using the concept of 'relative autonomy' to emphasize the structural constraints which impinge on educational policy and practice. The approach asks "How does the education system function? or What work does it perform for other institutions and interests?" (CCCS 1981 p17). It rests "on a more external appraisal of the structures of domination... interested mainly in the functions which education performs for capital" (ibid).

Most research has used the basic argument outlined by Apple (1979 p3) to justify working at this level:

> We need to place the knowledge that we teach, the social relations that dominate classrooms, the schools as a mechanism of cultural and economic preservation and distribution, and finally, ourselves as people who work in those institutions, back into the context in which they all reside. All of these things are subject to an interpretation of their respective places in a complex, stratified and unequal society.

The structural, 'correspondence' interpretations of the mid-1970's have given way to forms of analysis which acknowledge and explore the complex relationship between schooling and

society (Willis 1977). Particular questions dominate the research in this area. Pierre Bourdieu's work on cultural capital, or 'habitus', is of ongoing value in the study of educational policy (1977 pp72-95). Habitus is:

> a system of durably acquired systems of perception, thought and action, engendered by objective conditions (quoted in Harker 1982).

The 'objective ' nature of the habitus masks the fact that such a schema is a particular, rather that the only, interpretation of reality; that of the dominant groups in society. Bourdieu's work has been used in the New Zealand context in an examination of educational policies relating to Maori children (Harker 1981). The work of Michael Young and others (Whitty and Young 1976) in the area of the sociology of knowledge has opened up the processes of schooling for critical examination. This work demonstrates that the selection of curricula and the transmission of knowledge, as well as the very organisation of schooling, involve particular biases and are based on problematic sets of assumptions. The schooling system is seen as a site of cultural transmission, which works to legitimate dominant social relations (Anyon 1981) through a variety of functional practices. In an excellent summary of the current research in this field, Whitty (1981) describes and critiques the dominant ideologies that surround the curriculum, in the context of the issues of sexism, racism and teaching materials and practices.

In New Zealand, Sue Middleton's work on the development of a

curriculum for Women's Studies courses at the University level illustrates how the sociology of knowledge can be used to implement new practices. Thus, the contribution of this field to knowledge about the processes of schooling as forms of social control and cultural reproduction has important implications for policy. The relationship between schooling and society has been explored, then, from many perspectives by Marxist sociologists of education in the past decade. There has been a slow but clear development away from pessimistic structuralism to the realisation that social and cultural reproduction through schooling is effected through a complex interplay of practices which, once recognised, are open to transformation.

Whilst Hargreaves' approach provides a starting-point for analysis of schooling policies, by itself the relationship between schooling and social structures is not adequate to an account of policy-making, as the work of Bowles and Gintis (1976) demonstrates. Dale (1982 pp127-8) notes that most schooling in capitalist societies is undertaken by the state, and thus an account of the workings of the state is central to an analysis of schooling policies. He notes further that such an account is lacking, even in current Marxist analyses of education: "It seems that for sociologists... the state is regarded as an effectively neutral means of delivery of intended outcomes decided elsewhere" (ibid). Although some Marxists - for example, Nicos Poulantzas - have argued that the state is indeed neutral (Abercrombie et al 1981 p512), it seems clear that, in at least two senses, it is not. Firstly, the state operates from a

clearly functionalist analysis; using institutions such as schooling to maintain existing (capitalist) relations of domination and subordination. The ad hoc nature of most educational policies demonstrates this clearly (Webb 1937). Thus state policies are clearly not neutral; they act to maintain existing social relations, and thus in the interests of the dominant groups in society. Secondly, institutions such as schooling have a legitimising function in society - i.e. they reflect changes in the wider society in particular ways, which justify the social conditions in which the institution operates. Thus schooling systems are relatively autonomous from the social structure in which they are embedded, but their existence within that social structure limits the possibility of social change through policy formation.

Analyses of state policy-making have been dominated by the structuralist tradition within both sociology and education. Althusser's (1971) essay on ideological state apparatuses set the stage for the correspondence theories of Bowles and Gintis (1976) et al. This approach stresses the role of state schooling in legitimating and reproducing the existing social formation. The purposes of state schooling policies are thus linked to the 'need' for reproduction and legitimation within capitalist societies. The shortcomings of such a model were discussed earlier. Dale (1982) has begun to examine educational policy-making as a site of struggle: "schools, then are... key sites of what are usually referred to as struggles over hegemony" (p152). However, this thesis is not well-developed and he tends

to slip back into a form of determinism: "We should note though that the terrains of the struggles, what is to be resisted, and the channels of resistance, are demarcated by the state through its control of the education system and the schools" (ibid). Thus, there is a clear need for a thorough analysis of the role of the state in maintaining existing capitalist relations through schooling. Therefore, the relationship between the state and both the social structure and particular educational sites are a second broad area for Marxist research; one which, as Dale notes, has not been a focus of educational sociologists.

CCCS (1981) note that an important analytic approach is found in the tradition of 'the history of working class struggles'. This approach stems from two, related, beliefs; that social contexts are historically constructed, and that changes in social structures occur as a result of struggle between dominant and dominated groups:

> "The emphasis is on the working class or the populace as an active force which has shaped social institutions and values" (p16)

This approach, then, accounts for changes in terms of class struggle. There are various, historically specific, sites in the social system which mediate the contradictions of the social formation. In terms of the relative autonomy thesis, each site, as relatively autonomous from the material base, offers both an arena for struggle between classes and the possibility of successful counter-hegemonic activity. Policy-making, then, is a

process of mediating the competing claims in society in such a way that the policy legitimates, against counter-hegemonies, the existing social relations. Thus a particular policy may 'win' for the working class certain concessions - such as universal free primary education - but these 'victories' also serve to further legitimate existing structural arrangements and thus the dominant groups.

The work of social historians such as Richard Johnson (1976), which traces the development of schooling in relation to the changing social conditions, is of value in explicating the relationship between schooling and society, and adds a further dimension to considerations of policy. In a recent publication, Silver (1983) discusses in depth the foundations of, and problems with, what he calls "a social history of policy" (p11); in particular, he notes the difficulties of interpretation and re-interpretation of events within the "many dimensions of ideology". For Marxists, this problem of interpretation is particularly crucial, as the dialectic between social theory and historical event adds dimensions of complexity which can lead into "too swift a move from simple descriptive theory or abstraction to the full account of complex, concrete historical events and determinations" (CCCS 1981 p20). Very little of this type of policy research has been undertaken, to date, in New Zealand. Roy Nash's (forthcoming - 1984) study of native education policies is perhaps the first major publication to analyse the history of educational policy from a Marxist perspective.

To summarize, there are at least three areas which are central to an analysis of state education policies: the relationship between schooling and society, the role of the state as policy-maker, and the socio-historical conditions in which policy is formed.The latter area has been the subject of much debate between sociologists and historians. Various competing claims have been made about the methodologies and interpretive frameworks that have been used in recent socio-historical studies of schooling systems.The next section provides a discussion of some aspects of this debate.

Approaches to Policy Research: Two Case Studies

Each of the approaches to policy analysis described above require a historical component. Policies are inevitably historically specific, as are the practices which they institutionalise. However, the analysis of historical events raises seemingly insurmountable difficulties. History cannot be a mere description of events, although it is often presented as such, but requires interpretation; thus the history itself inevitably rests on the assumptions of the historian. However, if the position were simply this then it would be pointless to study histories at all. The relationship between history and theory is inevitably reflexive - historical information informs and transforms the nature of theory and vice versa. Thus history is produced at the interface of research and interpretation. Moreover, there is no such thing as the 'perfect' history; the

product of the investigation must be judged in terms of its adequacy to the aims and approach of the historian. Of course these aims and approaches may also be critiqued, but only with reference to either theoretical problems (which must be justified with reference to other, more adequate, theories), or methodological error (inadequacies or inaccuracies in the source material). This may seem very obvious; however, as this section will show, certain criticisms of history seem to be made on very flimsy grounds.

It is within the context of these thoughts that I outline the two debates which constitutes this part of the chapter. My aim is simply to investigate the conditions under which historical analyses of schooling policies may be considered 'adequate'. The first debate relates to the publication Unpopular Education (CCCS 1981), to Silver's (1981, 1983) review of this book and the CCCS's response to Silver's comments. The second debate, in the New Zealand context, looks at the relationship between history and ideology.

(i) Real History: CCCS v Silver:

The stated purpose of Unpopular Education is to provide an analysis of 'schooling and social democracy in England since 1944'. The central organising factor of the book is social democracy - its making, limits and breaking. The first chapter outlines the methodology used in the book, and it is with this that I am centrally concerned here. The authors begin by

outlining some problems with 'older' reconstructions of schooling policies; in particular the inescapable conservatism which stems from a failure to critically examine the assumptions on which policies are based. Thus a functionalist account "follows from accepting, as given, features of politics, 'education', or social conditions in general, which ought to be appraised critically and which have an intricate history of their own" (p14). As an example of such conservative forms, they cite the use of the term 'education' to identify "the work of schools, colleges, and other formal 'educational' institutions":

> "It is.... very important to distinguish more carefully between 'education' and 'schooling'; the first term refers to all forms of learning, the second to that specific historical form which involves specialised institutions and professional practitioners. Mass, public, compulsory, state schooling is a still more specific educational form, limited historically to the last 150 years or so" (CCCS 1981 p14).

Having recognised the conservatism inherent in most historical accounts of schooling policies, the authors outline a set of theoretical propositions which can be used to broaden the analysis of history. Firstly, a critical analysis of policy discourse can be used to expose the ideologies and underlying logic of texts. The shortcomings of this approach are that the structural, external, context of that discourse is not taken into account. Secondly, we may 'take the side of the people', recognising the struggle and counter-ideologies which characterise particular periods or issues. However, these struggles are often not documented adequately, although it is

important for the historian not to assume consensus because no evidence to the contrary is available. Thirdly, Marxist theories offer guidelines for identifying and analysing the structural factors that impinge upon policy-making. Together with a close and detailed historical account, these three theoretical approaches can provide a critical history, and a more complex view, of particular issues and policies. The first chapter of Unpopular Education outlines these approaches in some depth, and critiques some of the previous analyses for their over-structural stance.

The rest of the book outlines, contextualises and analyses the struggle which has characterised the development of schooling policies from pre-1944 to the present. The approach, as Silver (1983) notes, is mainly 'top down', looking in particular at that changing role of the Labour Party over the period. The book is closely detailed and certainly complex, thus avoiding the homologies and structural determinism of Schooling in Capitalist America. Rather than undertaking a comprehensive analysis of the book, which would be impossible in the space available, I wish to concentrate on Silver's (1981,1983) review, which appeared first in the British Journal of Sociology of Education (1981), and was extended in 1983 and placed in his book Education and History (pp239-256). It is from this latter source that all references are drawn.

Silver (1983 p239) notes that Unpopular Education worked at a "history/theory interface rarely approached in the history of

education", emphasising the need to "write and think more 'historically'". The two major tasks that the book emphasises are "a concern with close and detailed description and analysis", and "a preoccupation with continuity and especially with change, with crisis and with transformations" (1981 p20). Silver, rightly I think, begins by briefly summarizing the relation between theory and historical material:

> Education since 1944, like any social process or institution in any period, raises difficult questions of description, and therefore of selection and emphasis. Whether historians remain committed to description and selection, or move explicitly into interpretation, their work is influenced or informed or governed by some kind of theory - from the least explicit, 'common sense' kind, to the most explicit and overtly ideological. Historical selection is not random, and is conducted within the terms of the historian's understandings of social, economic, political, cultural or otherwise defined processes. The very conceptions 'social', 'economic', 'political', 'cultural' and other categories involve commonly understood and accepted definitions and models - some of which we have previously seen emerging clearly only in the late nineteenth or early twentieth centuries. Historical description and analysis are often conducted as or amount to case studies in the relevant theory - whether or not it is explicit. As generations of historians have learned and relearned, to try to identify the history-theory relationship is to be involved in cross-frontier debates and disputes with sociologists, philosophers, and political and economic theorists.

However, the strong stance that historical understanding is theory-dependent, is not maintained by Silver, who wishes to keep some distance between "experience" and "theory" in order to bring about a "sensitive dialogue between the historical evaluation of experience, and the intrusive nature of theory" (p241). These latter formulations, as the authors of Unpopular Education note,

"imply belief in a realm of experience or history which is accessible to the mind without some mental, moral and political frame of reference, without 'theory' in that sense" (1982 p190). The authors go on to argue that Silver's position is self-contradictory, because on the one hand he notes the inevitability of theory yet, at the same time, wishes to maintain a distance between the theory and the historical material. However, these relative positions, which seemingly end in an impasse, are perhaps not so different. Both 'sides' would agree with the following propositions:

1. The theoretical position of the researcher provides a structure wherein historical material is selected and analysed.

2. The historical material informs and transforms theoretical understandings.

The first point, according to both arguments, is a necessary condition. Without a theoretical framework of any kind, there could be no structuring of materials and no choice of what to study, because choice itself is determined by the theories of the researcher. It is on the second point that a difference occurs. Silver wishes to claim some autonomy, some space, for the history to, as it were, speak for itself. The authors of Unpopular Education argue, with some justification, that, given the first premise, any notion of autonomous history seems impossible. Yet they still insist on the transformative effects of history, but

the processes of such transformation are perceived as more subtle that the idealist formulations of Silver. It must be pointed out here that this argument has nothing to do with the 'nature of history' - it is simply an argument about the 'nature of theory'. Silver's epistemological position states that the necessarily limiting aspects of our theory can be recognised and overcome if we commune with the 'realities' contained in history. This is a very romantic view; indeed, a Platonic one (CCCS 1982 p191), and requires Silver to forget his previously stated positions that history is necessarily constructed within the framework of a theoretical viewpoint.

Perhaps the best way to illustrate Silver's central objection to Unpopular Education would be to use an example from the book. Right from the beginning, the authors make their political position quite clear: "The last thing that we would wish is that our critique would in any way serve the conservatism of the 1980's" (1981 p7). Such a position stems directly from a Marxist theoretical analysis of a capitalist society, where conservative forces are directly aligned to the interests of capital and against the interests of the great mass of the people. Silver perceives this allegiance as an obstacle to the construction of history:

> However helpful the book's disentangling of, for example, different conceptions of social class, the massive, shaping presence of the capitalist state remained overwhelming in the argument - making the promised 'close and detailed description and analysis' superfluous (p257).

Given Silver's position earlier that selection of material along theoretical lines is a necessary part of historical research, this view is somewhat confusing. Is it theory-in-general or Marxist-theory-in-particular he is objecting to? He is asking us to see the theoretical basis of Unpopular Education as a massive, rigid and unbending structure which totally assimilates (and transforms) historical material, yet leaves itself totally unchanged. Within such a scheme there would be no place for the surprise, the elements of discontinuity or of paradox which appear, supposedly, in every 'real' history.

I do not recognise Unpopular Education in Silver's description. I do see the political commitment to a socialist education quite clearly, but alongside of this there is much in the historical material which is informative and paradoxical. The explicit theoretical position does 'take sides', but never neglects to put forward and detail the arguments of the 'opposition', with all their contradictions, as well as the socio-political conditions within which such arguments were formulated. The political commitment of the authors did not 'change' from the beginning of the book to the end, but this can in no way indicate the lack of a serious engagement with the historical material (I have actually read only one book where the theoretical allegiance of the author changed from start to finish, and it was not a historical account - Corrigan 1979). The authors of Unpopular Education do not accept that history and Marxist theory are separate enterprises which, linked together,

provide a necessary misrepresentation of one, the other, or both. Marxist theory "has its roots in the modern world. It is the theoretical sign of the deepening troubles of the societies of the post-war west" (1982 p194). It is through history that we can come to understand how present conditions and current 'troubles' have occurred, and such an understanding can help us develop future strategies. There is no necessary separation between the two enterprises.

In their response to Silver, the authors note that "the problem, as we experience it, is not "the relation of theory and history", but the quality of the history itself and the categories which organise it. Is the account adequately explanatory? Are the categories adequately historical?" I have no intention of trying to answer these questions, but I agree with the authors that these, rather than questions of theoretical bias, are the important ones to ask of a historical study. The most valuable contribution of Unpopular Education, for me, is its weaving together of the various 'levels' within education since 1944. For example, the relationship between Labour Policy and educational research in the 1960's, with the work of Halsey and others (see also Dale 1981), and the rise to prominence of neo-conservative educational thought through the Black Papers in the deepening economic recession of the 1970's. As well, the explanation and discussion of neo-conservative educational ideas is extremely insightful and owes much to the detailed historical understanding of the authors.

This case study has been primarily concerned with examining the relationship between theory and history, and with some of the criteria which may contribute to a good historical analysis of schooling policies. It has been proposed that most of the arguments about historical interpretation are actually arguments about theory. There is no answer to these disagreements, as in sociology where, in the end, competing theorists must agree to disagree. However, this discussion underlines the necessity to be clear about what it is that is being critiqued - if it is the history, it must be discussed with reference to historical methodology (eg adequacy of source materials, the emphasis of particular arguments etc), whereas if it is theory, then it must be discussed in theoretical terms (eg the nature of class structures, the role of the state, the nature of ideology etc). No doubt this is an oversimplistic scheme, but at least it may make historians and theorists alike aware of the distinctions between the two enterprises. The second case study to be presented here centres around the concept of ideology within history of education in New Zealand.

b) Fact, Idea and Ideology: McKenzie v Olssen

McKenzie's (1982) paper seeks to distinguish various uses of ideology in histories of New Zealand education, to examine these uses and their implications for historical research and to draw up some assumptions that could (or 'should') guide New Zealand historians of education. His aims are timely, but I wish to show

that from a theoretical point of view he fails to answer what may be considered the most pressing questions.

The first issue that must be discussed in the context of this thesis is McKenzie's use of the term ideology. In chapter three I proposed that the most justified Marxist usage of the term was: those ideas which uphold the dominant groups in a social order and serve to reproduce existing social relations. It is clear that McKenzie is not using the term ideology in that sense; or, indeed, in any Marxist sense. As an aside, his paper may have taken on a new, and interesting, complexion if he had. Olssen (1982) suggests that McKenzie tends to construe 'ideology' "as being concerned with the production and signification of meanings" (p2). It is important to distinguish between this usage of 'ideology' and the concept of 'theory', as McKenzie fails to make this distinction clear and tends to use the term 'ideology' when he is referring to issues of theory. For example, "a priori ideological schema" (p7) would seem to be interchangeable with 'theoretical underpinnings', unless one is suggesting that some theories are non-ideological, and this would not seem possible in the sense Olssen suggests that McKenzie uses the term. McKenzie uses the term 'theory' in his paper in interesting ways, but fails, at least explicitly, to make a link between this and 'ideology'. Theory tends to be contrasted to 'practice': "no problem, so it seemed, was in theory insoluble" (p4). We are left in doubt as to whether 'ideology' is something that is merely theoretical, or also practical, or some combination of the two.

A second problem in McKenzie's paper relates to a tendency to dismiss as 'ideological' all those histories which do not measure up to some (undefined) 'ideal' historical account. Thus school jubilee histories tend to ignore conflict and incompetencies in order to satisfy a particular audience, whilst the 'bigger is better' historians tend to view the continued growth of the schooling system as a necessary good. Although McKenzie states several times in the paper that all histories are underpinned by an ideology, he leaves us with the firm impression that, historically, some ideologies are better than others (or at least excusable). For example, in relation to Marxist histories McKenzie makes the claim that: "The possession of a strong ideology seems to tempt the writer to use history as a footnote to his [or her] theory" (p6). If everyone possesses an ideology, then what makes some ideologies 'strong' and others, presumably 'weaker' or 'weak'? Strong or weak in relation to what? Olssen (p3) claims, and I would agree with him, that some ideologies are seen as less committed, or weaker, because they seek "not to push or put forward ideas which are disjunctive with conceptions legitimated by dominant (positivist) modes of thinking and by (bourgeios) conceptions of common sense". McKenzie claims that Marxist histories have tended to be inadequate, and in relation to Schooling in Capitalist America, which he cites, most Marxists would tend to agree with him. However, that the structuralist theories had little space for the convolutions of history, as Bowles and Gintis' study demonstrated, has tended to lead to more adequate theoretical, and historical, accounts by Marxists in more recent years. Thus there is an ongoing dialectic between

history and theory (Johnson 1982), and in that sense many Marxists can no longer be accused of taking an over-deterministic stance. But the tendency to continue to come up with findings unpalatable to liberal and neo-conservative interests has been largely responsible for the current attacks on Marxists-as-historians. McKenzie notes that:

> ....the rise of monopoly capitalism; the increasing rate of youth unemployment; criticism by employers of "the tendency to de-emphasise the traditional teaching role of the school in favour of a social change role in the community"; these are the realities to which a Marxist beckons" (p6).

Different questions inevitably bring about different findings. If Marxists are to be criticised, it must be recognised that these criticisms may be more related to the theory and its related questions than to the history.

Finally, I wish to address the question of history as an interpretive activity. After all, this is the theme that McKenzie's paper purports to address. At no point does McKenzie make a distinction between methodology and interpretation in historical research. As a result, there is a tendency to confuse the two, and this is largely an unnecessary complication. Aside from this, McKenzie never really gets to grips with what it is about some histories which makes for invalid interpretations. I would agree with Olssen that this is because McKenzie searches for the answers in the wrong places, missing the point that 'ideology' lies not in the material under study but in its

interpretation (though, of course, histories themselves are inherently ideological). The prescriptions, or 'questions' that end the paper reflect these weaknesses. They are, in fact, theoretical questions which are 'dressed up' to look like methodological tenets. I am not suggesting that this is deliberate, merely that McKenzie failed throughout the paper to make some important distinctions - between 'ideology' and 'theory', and methodology and interpretation, and that the problems of the analysis were reflected in the prescriptions for action.

As a social theorist, my central concern is necessarily with issues of theory within society. McKenzie's central concern is with historical study. I hope I have shown that both enterprises are essential components of a truly critical analysis of schooling. New Zealand education histories, as McKenzie notes, have overwhelmingly lacked a clear and explicit interpretive framework, whilst New Zealand sociology of education has remained in an ahistorical present, and thus is unable to address issues with the full historical understanding they deserve. It is said often in the literature that the two enterprises are complementary and need to be brought together. I would endorse this yet again, and would caution against 'talking past' each other, because there is a clear need for the two groups to talk <u>with</u> each other.

Conclusion

This chapter has been concerned with the major theoretical and methodological issues involved in an analysis of educational policy. The notion of relative autonomy, which underpins Marxist accounts of state policy, was discussed in an attempt to develop an adequate theoretical base for the relationship between production and reproduction. In the light of current research in the field, three analytical positions were identified as being necessary aspects of any Marxist account of educational policy - the relationship between schooling and society, the role of the state, and socio-historical research. Two case studies were given to demonstrate some of the theoretical problems that arise from a socio-historical study of policy within education.

Many of the issues discussed here have not been resolved, and the historical accounts of the next two chapters do not attempt 'perfection'; rather, they aim to provide a theoretically coherent analysis of educational policy during various periods, an account which is also historically and methodologically sound. In the past three chapters my concern has been to contextualise the current study: firstly, within the sociology of education as a discipline; secondly within theories of ideology; and thirdly within current debates in the field, both in New Zealand and in other countries. The stage is now set for a critical analysis of aspects of schooling policies in New Zealand.

CHAPTER FIVE

Technical Instruction and Manual Labour

Policy research must be primarily concerned with two areas. Firstly, with the aims of the particular policy, those which are explicitly adopted as well as those which are implicit to it, though not necessarily less important. Secondly, policy research must be concerned with the effects of a particular goal or piece of legislation (see Hargreaves, in chapter four). 'In between' these areas lie a host of largely unexplored actions and effects - ideologies, cultural production, administrative constraints and social and economic pressures (CCCS 1981). It is through a detailed analysis of all these areas that a picture emerges of particular social sites in particular historical contexts. The study which comprises this chapter relates to the 1900 and 1902 Manual and Technical Instruction Acts, and some of the effects of these two pieces of legislation in the period between 1900 and 1914. This will not be a full account, due to the lack of any previous social history research in education for this period which works from any but the most consensual of frameworks (McKenzie 1982). The primary source material for this study has been the Hansard debates and appendices and the Governing Board of what was the 'Palmerston North Technical School'. Although this material is interesting, informative and sometimes surprising, it is difficult at this stage to draw any but the most tentative conclusions.

Introduction and Historical Context

By the end of the 19th century, the aim of universal primary education which was embodied in the 1877 Education Act had come close to realisation, at least for the European population. Indeed McKenzie (1982b) claimed that school attendance had increased to such a degree, both in absolute numbers and in average weekly attendance, that the 1901 School Attendance Act followed rather than pre-empted dominant community practices. During the latter part of the 19th century, a long economic stagnation had eroded growth in New Zealand industry, but this situation did not continue into the 1900's; indeed, over twenty years of strong economic growth were to follow, which included considerable industrial development. However, very few children received a secondary education - only 2723 (Butchers 1930 p591) people in 1899 were receiving education in a secondary institution set up and supported by the state, almost exclusively the children of the wealthy. These were the 'endowed' schools, which, though state-supported, charged fees. A few scholarships, offered to promising students, were the only chance of a free education (McLaren 1970 pp96-97).

The aim behind universal primary education was to provide basic literacy and numeracy skills to every member of the population. Differences of opinion within primary education tended to focus on ways of achieving aims rather than the aims

themselves. Within secondary education, however, the aims were less clear and often quite diverse and contradictory. The major areas taught at secondary schools were based on the British 'classical education'. The syllabus of the secondary school was slanted heavily towards the demands of university entrance examinations (Webb 1937 p79). However, not more than 5% of secondary pupils in 1900 actually attended university (1). Webb (1937 p78) claims:

> New Zealand was then, and is now, completely under the domination of middle-class ideals.... the secondary school curriculum continued to be based on the implicit assumption that secondary school pupils were destined to join the ranks of a learned profession or to live in cultivated leisure

Almost the only opportunity given to the children of working class parents to attend secondary classes was in the District High Schools, which comprised a two year secondary department of existing primary schools. However, in 1898 there were only fourteen such departments with about 250 children attending throughout New Zealand. Also, such schooling was not, by legislation, free, although Butchers (1930 p95) reports that, for the most part, children in these classes did not pay fees. The curriculum in these schools was, as in the endowed schools, heavily weighted towards "Latin, French and a little elementary algebra or Euclid" (Butchers 1930 p203). Given the lack of opportunity for these pupils to advance to further secondary education after their two-year course was finished, it would be difficult to disagree with Hogben's claim that such a curriculum

was largely useless to the pupils (2). This lack of provision for secondary schooling was more a reflection of the economic recession than of lack of community interest. Sutch notes that:

> From several places came the demand for secondary education for all - the teachers favoured it, liberal-minded politicians favoured it, many working class families, tired of depression and poverty wanted a middle class education and security for their children; some demanded technical schools so that their children might learn the skills necessary to give them a trade, while those trade unionists who were politically minded passed resolutions demanding free education from the primary schools to the university (1969 p77).

The first attempt to provide state support for technical classes came in 1895, when an 'Act for the Promotion of Elementary Technical Instruction' was passed. It encouraged Education Boards to provide manual and technical classes in public schools, and also gave the opportunity for such classes to be established away from the school by Education Boards or, in certain cases, other authorities. Opposers to this Bill protested that technical instruction could be detrimental to the, already overcrowded, primary school curriculum. An amendment was incorporated stating that the total sum to be expended per annum under the Act was not to exceed £2000 (3). In practice, the Act did little to encourage technical education in public schools. Some technical schools actually received less under this Act than they had previously from Government grants (Nicol 1940 p47). As a result of this Act, which allowed classes to be set up by any organisation in towns more than five miles from education board classes, many small, community run groups were set up around the

country. Nicol (1940 p47) noted of these groups that "in the nature of things [they] could only be of an ephemeral character". But this was probably equally true of all classes set up under this Act, as no provision was made for the erection of buildings, the inspection of classes or the training of technical instructors.

By 1897, a new Bill had been drafted which allowed, subject to fairly tight controls, an annual sum of £25,000 to be distributed for technical education. This Bill had a stormy passage through Parliament and was eventually thrown out four days before Christmas. Opposition to the Bill focussed on three issues - the need for technical education to be secular, the exclusion of agricultural education from the definition of technical instruction, and the large amount of decision-making power given to the Minister of Education. The powers of the Minister under this Bill, relates to the issue of 'relative autonomy' discussed in chapter four, and forms an important part of the arguments in this chapter. It was not re-introduced in 1898, and indeed did not reappear until 1900 (Nicol 1940 pp49-51).

The problems which occurred in attempting to implement a broadly-based policy relating to technical education highlighted major differences of opinion about what such education should aim towards. There were many conflicting views about what the nature of such education should be, but at the same time appeared to be a fairly wide consensus that state technical education was a good

idea (La Trobe 1928 p84). A broad general education was not seen by many working people to be relevant to their lives (Webb 1937 p30), so existing provision for secondary schooling in the District High Schools, with their academic curriculum and meagre resources, was not an attractive alternative for many. The issues, then, that the 1900 Bill addressed were just those which concerned the working people. Relevance to occupations, voluntarism, evening (as opposed to day) classes, and the possibility of occupational advancement were all provisions made to assist the working person. There was a great deal of union support for state development of technical education, not only by the more conservative trades groups, but also by those of socialist beliefs (Sutch 1969).

The 1900 Bill

The 1900 Bill was based mainly on the report of Arthur Riley (4), Director for Technical Instruction to the Education Board of the Wellington District. Riley had visited technical institutions throughout England and Scotland, and his substantial report gave a full account of different aspects of technical instruction practiced in these institutions. Riley wished to see technical education implemented right through from kindergarten to university, and thought that the centralised Education Department would provide the co-ordination necessary for this to happen. He called for co-operation between employers and employed to aid "the great cause of education" (5). Further, he

called upon unions to "take the interests of their trade to heart" and classify "the workmen first, second or third class in accordance with their ability, and thus avoid the present pernicious practice of paying the bad workman a wage equal to the more experienced man" (6). He wanted, indeed, to make a course of technical instruction compulsory for apprentices (p43). Riley clearly saw the issue of technical instruction as being critical for New Zealand's future. In his introduction, he claims (p1) that "if New Zealand desires to maintain her position among British colonies this question of technical education will need serious attention".

Hogben was appointed Inspector-General of schools in 1899. He had a consistent, liberal view of education, and approached his new job with much enthusiasm (Roth 1952 p87). He came into office just at the time when the economic constraints of the last decade were being lifted and the state had more funds to expend (Webb 1937 p74); there was also a high degree of commitment to education being exhibited around the country. Seddon's Liberal Government agreed with Riley that education was of crucial importance to New Zealand and its future development, and Hogben's emphasis on manual training, evidenced in his first annual report to the Minister (7), received much support. The terms 'manual' and 'technical' had been defined in the 1895 Act in terms of the British definition (8); Hogben proceeded to redefine these terms according to his liberal philosophy. The broader definitions of the 1900 Bill allowed a greater variety of subjects and teaching methods to be included as manual or

technical instruction. For example, the 1895 Bill defined manual instruction as:

> instruction in the practical handling of tools, and in the actual construction of models and other articles in wood, metal, clay or other materials.

The 1900 Bill defined the same term as:

> such exercises as shall train the hand in conjunction with the eye and the brain; it includes kindergarten employments, exercises in continuation thereof, modelling in any material, and generally practice in the use of tools.

Similarly, 'technical instruction' was extended in 1900 to include the teaching of modern languages and "such other subjects connected with industrial, commercial, agricultural or domestic pursuits". Although Hogben obviously introduced many of Riley's ideas into the Bill, it is clear that he extended them to include his own views, as Riley worked on the narrower, British definitions of manual and technical instruction.

Hogben was not advocating merely the implementation of new subjects which would train children for various vocations. Rather, he saw embodied in manual and technical instruction a new method of teaching for all subjects, which would train the mind and body in 'co-ordination with nature'. He claimed that such instruction would develop powers in the individual that might otherwise lie dormant (Nicol 1940 p55). However, it was also up to him to justify his system of education on economic grounds.

He thus made the following claim:

> If the manual dexterity and the regular and easy co-ordination of hand and eye and brain that lead to the development of skill in the workman or engineer, the artist or the surgeon, be not developed in youth, then there is a gap between school-life and the after-life (9).

Thus school was to provide a preparation for work, which would make job-training easier and more natural, and would provide the basis for a high level of skill development within industry.

To a great extent, the 1900 Bill appealed in different ways to many sectors of society. The farmers were provided with agricultural instruction, the politicians were given economic and developmental justifications, the employers were promised work-ready school leavers, unions were offered state support for the further development of their trade, women were assured that domestic instruction would be provided, and workmen were given the opportunity for more training and thus higher wages.

The Debate

Seddon opened the debate of the second reading of the Manual and Technical Instruction Bill with the following statement:

> I think I shall have said enough if I say that I do not know that there is any measure of greater importance to the colony than the Bill it is now proposed to read a second time. If the youths are to be placed on an equal footing with the youths of the Mother-country and

> of other nations; if our industries are to be a success; if our education is going to be complete - I say you must follow up with what is now proposed (10).

It is important to note that this statement was designed to appeal to a wide variety of interests - those concerned with industrial development, individual aspirations and educational provision. However, the broad claims and apparent consensus that underpinned the provision of technical education were marked by some deep contradictions. Firstly, Seddon's claims ignored the social class nature of New Zealand society. Technical education aimed to increased competition within social and occupational groups, particularly the working class (see Riley's comments above on the grading of tradespeople), rather than to provide social mobility. The relative positions of each group were to remain unchanged, but the worker was to be more skilled, the housewife more domestically efficient and the young person more 'prepared' to join the workforce. Sutch (1969 p131) notes that the liberal view of the state during that period was, despite the clear dominance of the middle classes in Government, that it gave the opportunity for the 'people', through democracy, to govern (11). Sinclair (1980 p176) believes that the liberals "were not repudiating the existence of classes so much as denying that the state was the executive committee of the ruling class". It would be difficult indeed to accept that the liberals were unaware of the social class nature of the society. Much of the labour legislation during this period was aimed specifically at reducing the exploitation of workers by capital. As well, the technical instruction legislation was introduced only a decade after the

1890 Maritime Strike, which constituted a virtual class war (Sutch 1969).

Secondly, the notion that a thorough training in a trade or craft constitutes a 'complete education' is a very narrow and conservative view. Moreover, it is underpinned by a concern to reproduce, preferably with higher levels of efficiency, the existing mode and conditions of production. Thus this view is also 'ideological' in the narrow Marxist sense used in chapter three. Rather than broadening the horizons and suggesting alternatives to the student (arguably a function of education), technical courses would be far more likely to focus skills and interest on narrow occupational goals. There was some acknowledgement in the debate that there were competing interests between the state and working people on this issue. Monk noted that manual and technical instruction "can perform excellent work for the state", but that the power of the unions would limit the effectiveness of the bill for both the individual and "the very state itself":

> While the Government of the country and the Parliament... permit such regulations that are now inflicted by our labour associations, it is more likely to do injury than good by the mere smattering of technical education proposed to be imparted in this Bill (12).

He went on to caution that individual development was not necessarily a good thing:

> There is no surer method of inflicting a hardship - I mean a mental hardship - and dissatisfaction in the mind of a human being than by inculcating in it the sense of aspirations that cannot be fulfilled (13).

The ideology which underlay Monk's view was upheld by an almost Platonic view of education in society. The role of education in the Platonic state would be to teach each person according to their, pre-determined, place. Monk's view of the state, then, at least in relation to its' educative functions, was that it should be used to uphold the existing (presumably 'right') social order. This theme was continued by Willis (member for Wanganui), who noted that the Bill "will be the means of making better workmen than in the past". Seen in this light, the workman is little more than an instrument of capital. MacKenzie (member for Waihemo) makes an even stronger claim:

> I may say that instead of the pupils becoming fitted for the backbone industries of the colony, they are practically being diverted from those pursuits (14).

In terms of the input into this debate, it is possible to conclude that, despite a concern for "the fullest possible consummation of the individual life" (Sinclair 1980 p175), members were primarily concerned with the development of industry. The contradiction between the social reality of class groups and the needs of industry was, at least within the debate, resolved in favour of capital.

Another issue of ongoing importance which was raised again

was the fear of increasing centralisation of educational control. The 1877 Education Act had been proclaimed as "the most decentralising Bill that has been passed in any English country" (in Webb 1937 p29). Meredith (member for Ashley) noted that "the word "Minister" occurs in this Bill no less that fifteen times. (We are)... abrogating our powers and handing them over to the Minister to carry out" (15). This Bill did seem to be a step towards centralisation, in that the Minister had full power to recognise any technical classes. He could refuse to recognise such classes "if he considers that sufficient means of instruction in that subject are already provided", and could withdraw his recognition "if he is dissatisfied with the manner in which the class is being conducted" (16). Indeed, if the Minister used his powers as outlined under this Bill, and the Act, there would be very little autonomy left to local interests.

In chapter one, it was stated that, in a capitalist state, the central role of policy makers is to ensure the conditions for the continuance of capitalism, in relation to both the accumulation and legitimation of capital. The issues discussed here demonstrate some of the tensions involved in meeting such aims in a liberal state. The need of capitalism for workers is set against the freedom of people to choose what they learn, whereas the choice of educational subjects at the local level is subject to immediate Ministerial veto. The clearest contradiction that emerges here is an implicit acknowledgement that the goals of 'people' and 'society' may conflict, whereas the whole notion of local control is predicated on the pluralist

notion that 'the people' in a society actually produce that society in ways which are not predetermined by any one group. Broadly, then, the objections to Ministerial control were based on a pluralist notion of the state, and thus it would have been difficult during the liberal period for the Minister to legitimate widespread intervention in local technical schooling. It is significant, however, that the Minister in the early 1920's had no such difficulties, and these Ministerial powers had important effects during this 1920's period.

The final major issue outlined in the debate concerned the location of technical education within the schooling system. Pirani (member for Palmerston North) questioned that technical classes should be developed in secondary schools; he argued that "many of these schools were, to a large extent, being used for the wealthier classes of the community" (17). Thus, to ensure some equality of access to technical education, provision should be made solely in the primary schools. This suggestion was not taken seriously, and neither was that of MacKenzie that some District High Schools should be turned into technical schools.

In the Legislative Council, the Bill provoked further discussion. Walker, the Minister of Education, initiated the debate with a consideration of how education must move and change with the times - technical education was seen as more relevant than the classics to modern society (18). It is doubtful whether the predominantly conservative Council would be sympathetic to arguments about individual freedoms and development - whereas the

Liberals were dominated by small farmers, the Council represented large-scale capital, in particular land, interests. However, the Council were fully in favour of the Bill, and Dr Grace outlined the reasons for his support:

> Sir, it was about 1858 that England first became alive to the fact that the neglected education of her people was damaging commercial interests... owing to the want of thrifty habits in the English house-wife, and indifference to details on the part of the English workman, notwithstanding his pertinacity and physical power, he is handicapped in the race, and in danger of losing his supremacy (19).

Thus technical education was expected to work towards correcting these faults which had slipped into the personality of the English working-person. Dr Grace went on to outline those things that technical education should achieve:

> Technical education does not mean that every worker shall have the whole of the technical knowledge appertaining to the branch of work in which he is engaged at his finger-ends, or stored away in his brain. It rather means that he should have an appreciation of the absolute necessity for subordination of personal views to the mind of the inventor; that the mechanic should learn the value of co-operation in work, and of strict obedience to the highly intelligent foreman. What is the matter with our colonial people is that they are unwilling to submit themselves to discipline of any kind; and I hold that this necessity for discipline can never be imparted to them till they see that no results worthy of achievement can be gained without it (20).

The worker, through technical instruction, was to be inculcated with a particular set of ideologies aimed at serving industry. If such education were to be widespread, the

industries would be staffed by a disciplined, trained workforce. If the industries were so staffed, the country as a whole would prosper - both in itself and in relation to other nations such as Germany. In the end, it was these arguments which offered the strongest justification for the development of state technical education. 'Individual development', though not completely forgotten, became linked to the development of industry and that of the nation as a whole. This is a long way from Hogben's "training of the hand in conjunction with the eye and the brain"; further, development of education in conjuction with industry requires far more co-ordination and centralised control than mere individual development.

The Development of Technical Education 1900-1914

The Act as finally constituted differed little from the Bill. Denominational schools, initially included in the Bill, were struck from the schedule, but no attempt was made to either restrict technical education to primary schools, nor to reduce the Minister's powers to revoke approval of technical classes. The Department of Education was specifically excluded under the Act from itself setting up technical classes, an interesting political move which absolved the Minister (and the Department) from any responsibilities for the development of the system; however, it also had the effect of giving a great deal of initiative to the local level. The Act was far more successful than its 1895 predecessor, but the major growth of technical

education took place in primary schools (Webb 1937 p78). All classes had to transmit to the Minister an annual programme of work, plus "satisfactory proof of the competency of the Instructor". Within these constraints, it was up to individual school boards, education committees, university bodies and "any similar public association(s) formed in connection with any branch of trade, industry or commerce" to develop and administer manual and technical instruction. No limits on expenditure were determined in the Act. Nicol (1940 p102) notes that, during this period, "forward movements originating in the schools themselves were of far greater importance than those emanating from the central Department of Education". However, the Department was certainly not neutral towards technical instruction during this period, and several factors relating to control of the education system had a profound effect on the development of technical schools. These factors were: the conservatism of the endowed secondary schools, Hogben's and Seddons's support of technical education, the demands of society for free secondary education and a growing trend, encouraged by the Government, towards integrated courses of technical education (Nicol 1940).

Technical instruction at the post-primary level did not expand greatly after the 1900 Act, and by the end of 1903 there were only 568 'special, associated or college' classes being taught, compared with 1659 handcraft classes, which were mainly taught in primary schools (21). A shortage of trained instructors, added to a lack of local facilities, made it difficult for classes to be established. In some country areas

technical instruction tended to concentrate on commercial subjects, which bore as little relationship to country life as the academic curriculum of secondary schools (Nicol 1940 p70). Other classes tended to concentrate on trade practice, making no attempt to link their work to the 'underlying principles' so dear to Hogben (Roth 1952). The implementation of the 1900 Act was thus, at first, marked by a piecemeal approach which bore little relation to Hogben's ideals. The 1902 Manual and Technical Instruction Amendment allowed City and Borough Councils to establish technical classes, in an attempt to increase provision of technical instruction whilst ensuring that the local control philosophy was maintained. A second amendment allowed the Government to grant land and buildings for technical instruction. This latter amendment was to be of importance in future years.

The next section of this chapter will discuss the major policy issues arising from the implementation of technical education up until 1914. The concern here is with issues of state policy, but it is essential to look at the effects of such policies. To this end, I will introduce and discuss the development of the Palmerston North Technical School in relation to technical education policies during this period.

Palmerston North Technical School

The Palmerston North District High School was formally opened, in temporary premises, on Monday 17th February 1902. A

committee was formed comprising representatives of three local primary schools and the Wanganui Education Board. The District High School was set up to develop further the academic ability of those who had passed standard VI, and followed trends in other parts of the country - 25 District High Schools were set up between 1900 and 1902 (22). The committee of the District High School was also determined to develop 'continuation' and 'technical' classes and planned for a Technical School to be developed, hoping that, in future years, this school would have its own premises and staff. Even at this early period, the DHS was to cater for the 'scholars', whilst the technical school was expected to receive enrolments from those of 'lesser academic ability'.

One of the first tasks of the new District High School/Technical School committee was to take a deputation to the Premier, Mr Seddon, requesting that a building be erected for the use of both schools. They were able to demonstrate a high level of organisation and community support for their request, having already commenced instruction (in makeshift classrooms), and having raised £200 locally towards the cost of technical school buildings. The Premier was sympathetic to their case, but it was several years before the buildings were erected. It can be seen, from the level of government expenditure on technical education (23), that the liberal government, though vastly increasing the annual expenditure on technical education, had not yet reached the stage of providing large sums of money for technical schools. Indeed, the enabling legislation did not pass into law until the

end of 1902, and it was another few years before the technical school building programme was finally underway.

In April 1902, a public meeting marked the inauguration of the "continuation classes attached to the Technical School" (24). Dr. Smyth, the school inspector, outlined what he saw as the major benefits of a technical education. He referred at some length to the German education system. This speech, reported in the local newspaper, captures clearly the dominant rhetoric in relation to technical schooling:

> It was the duty of the state, then, to see that young people became intelligent citizens, and in order that they shall become that the state sees to their primary education....(In Germany) it was compulsory for a boy to attend continuation classes for several evenings in the week. Parents and employers were held responsible for the boys' attendance at these classes... He had been impressed by the fact that whilst in Germany, he had never seen any young people about the streets, but when he visited the technical classes the problem was solved... An ideal education was being held before the minds of the young people. All boys were being trained to be good men, good workmen and good citizens, a very high ideal. Primary schools only went a certain length. They did not make workmen. But by the system adopted in Germany mind and fingers were trained together, since it was compulsory that boys should learn at the continuation classes the science of the business they were engaged at during the day. Special stress was laid on the importance of a thorough knowledge of the literature of one's country, and the benefits that would arise from a thorough conception of the thoughts of great men and women (25).

There was already an awareness by the Board that technical schooling could not achieve the grand aims outlined in this quote without state financing - in particular for buildings and equipment. At this time (1902) the government were not, as yet,

outlaying large sums of money on technical education, but in future years there would be large amounts expended on building and fitting-out technical schools. Perhaps the major reason for the increase in expenditure was the liberal govenment's "Free Place" scheme, which created an unprecedented demand for secondary education of all kinds.

Secondary Schools and the Free Place Scheme

By 1900, there was a high level of feeling against the endowed secondary schools in New Zealand. These, fee-paying, schools, were considered by many to exemplify the privileges of the wealthy; yet, they were supported by the money of all taxpayers (Harrison 1961 p64). It was widely stated that New Zealand was fast developing a two-track system of education - one for the rich and the public schools, leading at the most to two years in a District High School, for everyone else. The practice of these schools of taking in younger children into 'preparatory' classes further enraged the critics, who saw this as a blatant rejection of the public school system. Sentiment had been growing for some time that all children who had passed Standard VI should be able to go on to a complete secondary education. This was actively fuelled by Hogben, who emphasised in more than one annual report to parliament the number of students passing standard VI and the numbers going on to secondary school, managing to infer that the 50% who did not continue schooling had been 'failed' by the system. As McLaren (1971) notes, it was

clear from the depth of public feeling on this issue that the Government would have to open up the secondary schools to those qualified to attend them.

In 1902, Seddon offered the following scheme to secondary schools:

> ...grants at the rate of £6 per head for pupils admitted without payment of fees for tuition, provided that one free place was already given for each £50 of the net income from endowments (26).

Fifteen schools accepted these conditions, and in 1903, the first 400 free place students were admitted to secondary schools (Butchers 1930 p190). However, the other secondary schools were more recalcitrant, and, responding to popular feeling, Seddon stated "that it was the Government's intention to introduce legislation to compel boards of governors to carry out the wishes of Parliament in regard to secondary education" (in McLaren 1971 p17). The 1903 Secondary Schools Act was such legislation, and reflected the feelings of the country by forcing secondary schools to offer free places, and also ensuring that endowment income would not be used for preparatory education.

Clause four of the 1903 Act stated that: "Every endowed secondary school shall, after the passing of this Act, unless it provides free places in accordance with the next succeeding section (ie Government-sponsored), offer scholarships of a total annual value equal to one-fifth of the net annual income derived

from endowments, or such greater amount as the governing body from time to time determines". This clause effectively forced the secondary schools to accept the free place scheme. In case they still did not, a further clause gave authority to the Minister to establish rival High Schools.

The preparatory classes of the secondary schools were struck a huge blow by having their income from endowments taken away. A further condition was that these classes had to be taught separately from the senior school. The Government's intention to get rid of these classes completely is clear. In a letter to the Canterbury College Board of Governors, which was replying to a claim that the school had no place for free-place students, Hogben noted: "If the younger children now admitted were excluded there would be more room, and I believe the rest of the school would gain in efficiency" (27). In practice, preparatory classes dwindled in size and number, although some continued to operate.

To meet the criterion of offering free places under the Act, the schools had to admit "all qualified pupils of good character who wish to attend the secondary school", provided that the pupil was less than fourteen years of age; 'qualified' referred to a pass at Standard VI level. However, if the school became overcrowded the Governors were allowed to refuse admission to prospective pupils (28). All secondary schools except one, Wanganui Girls' College, eventually adopted the scheme; that school complied only through compulsion under the 1914 Act

(McLaren 1971 p21).

The original purpose of the free place scheme was thus to open up the secondary schools to all students showing academic ability. It is to the credit of the Liberal Government (and to Hogben's persistence) that, almost immediately, the scheme was extended to include technical schools (Nicol 1940 p75). It became apparent that many people without the necessary qualifications wished to avail themselves of the scheme and thus many technical schools, including Palmerston North's, introduced classes in standard VI work. Many changes in the technical school curriculum proved necessary, as the regulations stated that free place students had to receive a general education in addition to a technical education; thus English and Arithmetic were compulsory for all free place students. In Palmerston North, approximately half of all students had free places. Prior to 1914, about 40 people enrolled for the Standard VI class each year; from 1914 onwards, these numbers dwindled to about 20, probably because of both the war and the raising of the school leaving age to 14, which increased the numbers of standard VI passes.

The liberal ideology which underpinned this Act, it must be remembered, developed in a period of increasing economic growth, coupled with a large expansion in Government spending on health, housing, education and other 'social services'. The liberals saw the role of the state, including its educative functions, as a mechanism to reduce inequalities, but in practice the 1903 Act

never constituted a direct challenge to the existence of social class divisions in New Zealand society. It is perhaps impossible to determine the effect of this Act on social mobility within New Zealand society. Social mobility tends to increase in times of economic growth, when the capital base of a given mode of production expands. Thus social mobility becomes more prevalent, but the mobility of particular persons may well be attributed (at least partially) to educational causes. There is little doubt that the Act was successful, as far as encouraging the development of technical schools. Less success was gained, however, in the attempt to bring technical instruction into the secondary schools.

Secondary Schools and Technical Instruction

It was not just over free places that the secondary schools proved themselves to be out of touch with dominant public and political feeling. The curriculum of these schools was completely tied to the demands of Matriculation and Civil Service examinations. Hogben had hoped that the Manual and Technical Instruction Act would encourage the development of a broader basis for secondary education, but, although liberal grants were offered for technical classes, little advantage was taken of them. The major problem in attempting to change the curriculum was that existing secondary education commanded a "high value on the labour market" (Roth 1952 p113), and was itself "a mark of distinction" (Harrison 1961 p67). Technical education was thus

seen by parents and Governors as a form of 'pollution' of the 'pure' academic syllabus. Even as late as 1908, less than £900 was paid in technical capitation to these schools, and most of this was used for science classes (Webb 1937 p79). Another reason why technical education was not introduced by many secondary schools may have been the conditions under which the capitation was offered, which gave the Department of Education powers to closely supervise such classes.

In most centres, then, technical classes were established away from existing secondary facilities. Two major problems resulted from this. Firstly, there was little co-ordination of individual educational needs, as capitation was based on subjects rather than courses:

> Students enrolled to get instruction for a term or two in some subject which the exigencies of their particular trade made desirable, and their narrow outlook envisaged nothing beyond this meagre degree of attainment (Nicol 1940 p71).

Secondly, there was no minimum degree of educational attainment necessary for enrolment in most technical classes. Some students had left school prior to Standard VI, and this led to a great variance in levels of academic ability within classes. In many places, these problems ware compounded by a lack of space (Harrison 1961 p72).

Technical Education, the Free Place Scheme and Day Technical Schools

Extension of the free place scheme to technical education was intended to subsidise the cost of evening classes for those qualified to undertake free secondary education. It is probable that Hogben's faith in technical instruction brought about this move; but probably neither he nor anyone else foresaw the changes it would bring to secondary education in New Zealand. By 1903, it was already becoming clear that technical instruction was to become the 'poor sister' of educational provision, catering mainly to those unable to afford the luxury of full seondary schooling:

> Although facilities were afforded for the children of poor parents to obtain secondary education by means of scholarships, there were a great number of parents who were unable to let their children take advantage of free secondary education, for the reason that they were unable to keep them at school after a certain age, as they require their assistance financially and otherwise, and could not afford to maintain them at school, even though no fees were payable. He would suggest the establishment of compulsory night-schools where the children could receive education in the evening, and at the same time attend to their work during the day (29).

To qualify for a free place, pupils had to undertake a course of instruction as outlined in the 1903 Free Place Regulations:

a) English and Mathematics to a level higher than Standard VI;

b) Regular instruction in one subject under the 1900 Manual and

Technical Instruction Act; and

c) Three or more of the following subjects - French, German, Latin, Geometry, Algebra, Trigonometry, Elementary Mechanics, Book-keeping, Shorthand, Physiology, Geography, History or other subject approved by the Minister (30).

Furthermore, capitation under the 1900 Act would be payable in addition to free place grants. It is clear that technical classes, many of which suffered under financial pressures, had much to gain from accepting free place students. Such arrangements, once complete, would give technical instruction a curriculum parallel to that of secondary schools. Whether the extension of the free place scheme to technical education was an attempt to lessen the status of the secondary schools or to promote technical education is not clear; both motives would make sense within the context of the dominant ideology.

The combination of the 1900 and 1902 Technical Instruction Acts and the 1903 Secondary Schools Act opened the door to the establishment of day technical education. Under clause six of the 1903 Act the Minister of Education was given the power to "establish a high school in any place where there are not less than sixty pupils who have gained a certificate of proficiency". Unlike the endowed secondary schools, these high schools were to be for the express purpose of giving secondary education to free place pupils, and would be maintained by grants rather than by endowments. There was no mention in the legislation of such a

provision being extended to include technical education. However, this did not deter those in charge of technical classes. In 1905, the Wellington Technical College opened its doors to day students, with the support of Hogben and, unofficially, the Government (Harrison 1961 p70).

The 1903 Secondary Schools Act made it possible for secondary schools to be governed by an autonomous board, rather than under the auspices of local education authorities. In 1906, such a body was set up to run the Palmerston North Technical School, and responsibility for it was taken over by the newly constituted High School Board of Governors. A special meeting of the Board was held on 1st March 1906, to "consider matters in connection with the Technical School classes and the general working of the Technical School" (31). Mr. Vernon, the Rector of the High School, outlined a plan to "save" the Technical School. Although the School, as yet, had no premises, the following subjects were to be taught: "Art (drawing and painting), English, Arithmetic and Mensuration, Shorthand, Typewriting, Chemistry, Magnetism and Electricity, Applied Mechanics, Carpentry, Cooking (continuation class), Civil Service, Dressmaking and Book-keeping" (32). A scale of fees was agreed upon, and so was the principle of free scholarships for bright students.

By the beginning of 1907 the roll of the Technical School was 260. New courses were organised in Elocution, Carriage Drafting and Photography, and several rooms had been rented. New

classes were proposed at almost every meeting, ranging from Staircase-building to Dairying, German to Singing. The aims of the Technical classes were embodied in the Prospectus: "It is the earnest desire of the High School Board of Governors that the instruction given at the Technical School may be of practical value to all sections of the community". By the end of 1907 class attendances topped the 700 mark.

By 1908, a scheme was well under way for the building of the Technical School. Although this had first been planned in 1902, the Minister had stated that "before the Department would erect a building for the Technical School, he would have to be satisfied about the number of people who would attend". By 1907 it was clear that the Technical School under its new organising body was going to be successful, and the High School Board of Governors pressed for a school building. The manner in which this building was procured demonstrates the increasing trend towards reliance on Government funding (and thus control) of the school. The land was purchased at a price of £1450, which was financed by community donations, local authority grants and a £750 subsidy from Government. Most of the work involved in the purchase and the choice of land, was left in the hands of the Board. They commissioned an Architect to draw up plans for the building, which had then to be sent to the Department for approval. A grant of £5000 was approved for the building, and from this point on it became necessary for the Board to refer its every decision on the building project to the Department. This is merely the first example of a large variety of issues which together led to

the increasing centralisation of educational decision-making.

In 1908 Mr F.D.Opie was appointed Director of the Technical School, and the range and content of the classes was increased considerably. In 1909 the new school was opened. During the years 1908 to 1914 the most significant development was in the increasing roll of the school and the concomitant diversification of the curriculum. Nicol (1940 p109) notes that "despite its comparatively late foundation, the Palmerston North Technical School had become the largest of its kind outside the four chief centres (by 1914)". In these early years, the actual number of students attending classes took on a particular significance. First, the capitation grant (which was increased under the 1908 Education Amendment Act) was purely dependent on the numbers attending classes, and second, the flourishing roll gave the Board a certain amount of political leverage, which was demonstrated by the fact that a succession of politicians sat on and chaired the Board. This leverage was particularly necessary as the Department of Education tended to allocate its monies in a "haphazard" way (Nicol 1940 p119).

Technical classes continued to expand, and by 1910 day classes were being held in all four main centres (Nicol 1940). The 1910 Education Amendment Act consolidated and expanded upon this development. As well as officially sanctioning day technical schools, this Act offered increased capitation for pupils who took grouped courses, such as commercial, civil service or industrial instruction. Power was also given to

Education Boards to compel "attendance at continuation classes or technical classes of young persons within the school district who are not otherwise receiving a suitable education" (clause 18:1). However, this clause was not implemented in many areas, because classes were already well-attended (Nicol 1940 p80). Under this amendment the method of calculating capitation was also changed. Previously, capitation was calculated on the basis of 'attendance per pupil per hour'; a cumbersome method. Under the Act, attendance was based on annual figures.

In 1911, a regulation was instituted which restricted free places to those taking all of the subjects in a grouped course. This was aimed at improving the educational benefits of technical instruction, but may also have been a reaction to the escalating costs of Government support for technical schooling (33).

The Technical School was initially planned as an evening school, for use by apprentices after they finished work, and generally for the education of workers. However, very early on the Technical School offered daytime classes in such subjects as Art, Cookery and Woodcarving (34). By 1914 the day school was as large as the evening school, and this was underlined in the legislation of the day by the granting of special funds to 'day Technical Schools'. The 1914 Act also made education compulsory up to age 14, and gave Boards the legal ability to enforce technical education for "young persons" - those between the ages of 14 and 17 (35). This movement towards full-time education was probably the result of the narrow courses still being offered in

most District High Schools, and was officially recognised under the 1914 Education Act which retitled these schools 'Technical High Schools'.

In effect, however, the increasing strength of technical schools had, by this time, brought about almost a three-tier system of education - primary, technical and academic secondary. The increasing separation of technical from academic secondary schooling seems to have been largely unintended (Hogben especially wanted to bring about integrated secondary courses), yet there is little doubt that, up until technical secondary schools were abolished in the 1970's, there was a marked division between the two types of schooling. Moreover, this division tended to reinforce differences in status and wealth between working and middle classes.

There is no evidence that the Palmerston North Technical School offered a more limited curriculum than the High Schools. In the year 1914 there were 1206 students studying the following 31 subjects:

English	Chemistry	Mechanical Drawing
Arithmetic	French	Woolclassing
Book-keeping	Latin	Motor Car Engineering
Dressmaking	Building Construction	Ticketwriting
Woodwork	Mathematics	Cookery
Farm Carpentry	Shorthand	Typewriting
Plumbing	Elocution	Standards V and VI

Botany	Agriculture	Millinery
Physical Science	Geography	Needlework
Sheepshearing	Art	Steam Engineering
Practical Engineering		

Due to the demands of the free place scheme, the school organised a set of integrated courses, combining specialised studies with a more general educational base. In 1914, there were eight such courses: Commercial, Engineering, Domestic, Agricultural, Trades (Carpentry and Plumbing), Art, Painters and Decorators work and Junior Civil Service Examination.

During the period studied here, the most remarkable feature was the growth of state involvement in technical schooling. By 1914, the Minister of Education largely controlled the buildings and equipment, the curriculum, the teaching staff, and made available practically all the funding for the Palmerston North Technical School. Indeed, the liberal view of education which clearly dominated this period had an enormous effect on technical education, one which was to be felt for many years. However, the contradictions inherent in this liberal view - in particular the role of the state as a mechanism of redistribution, was to have profound effects in later years. There are two areas in particular where this became clear. Firstly, the division between technical and academic secondary curricula, which tended to reinforce traditional social class distinctions between mental and manual labour. Secondly, the high level of state control. According to the liberal ideology, state involvement should be to

the benefit of 'the people', as in a democracy the people control the state. During the period under study here, there was largely a consensus between state and people in relation to the provision of technical schooling, which was fuelled by the expansionist policies of the liberal state during a period of economic growth. However, in the early 1920's New Zealand entered a long period of economic decline, and it became clear that the interests of the people and the state could, and did, diverge. During that period, which will be considered in the next chapter, cutbacks in state expenditure in many areas, including technical education, were justified by an ideology of social control which undermined many of the gains made in the pre-war period.

Notes

1. Appendices to Journals of the House of Representatives (A to J) 1901, E-12 p7.

2. A to J 1902 E-1 p.xvi.

3. Nicol 1940 p50; 1895 Manual and Technical Elementary Instruction Act, Clause 6.

4. A to J 1898 E-5B.

5. Ibid p45.

6. Ibid p45.

7. A to J 1899 E-1.

8. A to J 1898 E-5B p1.

9. A to J 1902 E-5 p1.

10. Parliamentary debates (PD) 1900 v114 p468.

11. See Law and Sissons 1893 for a discussion of liberal ideology.

12. PD 1900 v114 p470

13. Ibid p470

14. Ibid p472

15. Ibid p471

16. 1900 v114 Manual and Technical Instruction Act, clauses 5 and 6.

17. PD 1900 v114 p471

18. PD 1900 v114 p697

19. Ibid p702

20. Ibid p702

21. A to J 1904 E-5 p1.

22. A to J 1904 E-1.

23. See Appendix I.

24. Evening Standard, Palmerston North. 10 April 1902.

25. Ibid.

26. A to J 1903 E-1 p.xxxiii.

27. Quoted in McLaren 1971 p13.

28. New Zealand Gazette 1903 pp2685-86.

29. PD 1903 v125 p551.

30. New Zealand Gazette 1903 p2686.

31. Minutes Book, Palmerston North High School Board of Governors 1906 p127.

32. Evening Standard, 2 March 1906.

33. See Appendix I.

34. 1907 Prospectus of the Palmerston North Technical School.

35. 1914 Education Act, Section 124.

CHAPTER SIX

Ideologies and Cutbacks - 1920-1922

By 1921, New Zealand had entered an economic recession which was to have long-term effects on Government spending, not the least in the area of state education:

> I remember quite well speaking across the floor of the house and stating that education was the first Department that the pruning-knife was being put in so far as a decrease in expenditure was concerned. I remember the Minister quite well shaking his head at me, and telling me he knew better. Well, now, anyone who has followed the position very closely will realise that what I said at that time has proved to be absolutely true, and it is coming about to a greater extent every day (1).

In 1921, total expenditure on technical education reached an all-time high at £244,627. In 1922 this figure dropped back to £207,628 and in 1923 to £177,501. There is no doubt that by the early 1920's the state was beginning to feel the effects of the recession, nor that during this same period there was a marked reduction in Government spending on technical instruction, as well as many other aspects of educational expenditure. What is unclear is the reasons why this area was chosen as a target for such cutbacks - in previous years it was continually stated that education, in all forms, was essential to the development of the people and the nation as a whole (ref. chapter five). The account that follows investigates the ideological underpinnings

of the approach of policy makers to education during this period, and clarifies the nature of the increasing doubts held about the role of education in New Zealand society. The primary sources used in this chapter are the parliamentary debates of the 1920 and 1921 education amendment bills, the records of the Palmerston North Technical School, and various newspapers and official reports.

It is important to mention the context of the events that will be described here. Firstly, the Great War was fresh on the minds of New Zealanders, and there was still much ill-feeling against their erstwhile enemies, which tended to generalise to anyone who was not of British 'stock'. The war had also increased calls for expanded and diversified educational programmes, although these were not immediately answered: "A Department naturally disinclined for action had now its perfect excuse; to all inconvenient requests for increased expenditure or for changes of method it could reply with grave and reproachful reminders that a war was in progress" (Webb 1937 p94). Education programmes were seen as a high priority for returning servicemen, and this in turn led to expansion in all areas of education, both during and immediately after the war. Secondly, the conservative Reform Party, under Premier Massey, had been in power since 1912 and were to remain there until 1928; however, only in the 1919 elections did the party win the majority of seats in Parliament (Sinclair 1980 p241). At the same time as the Reform Party had been gaining strength on the right, so there had been developing an active and radical Labour

Party on the left, which won almost a quarter of the votes in the 1919 elections. This socialist movement advocated education as strongly as did the liberals and conservatives, but for very different reasons. One of the causes of the cutbacks in education during this period, as will be shown here, was a growing awareness amongst policy-makers that education could be used as an instrument for socialization or revolution, for patriotism or internationalism, or for 'loyalty' or 'sedition'. Thirdly, overseas prices for New Zealand exports began to fall rapidly in 1920, bringing a decade of insecurity followed by the great depression. This insecurity showed itself in many ways, one of the significant (for education) being what Sinclair (1980 p247) calls "compulsory loyalism".

In terms of the theoretical model described in chapters three and four, the issues discussed here relate to the concepts of ideology and relative autonomy. In relation to ideology, it became important for the Government to uphold the conditions for social reproduction, despite strong countervailing pressures. In the area of education, this involved maintaining some control whilst instituting cutbacks - a rather contradictory aim and one which threatened the legitimation of dominant educative practices. In relation to the relative autonomy of the state schooling system, during this period the Government used its discretion (through the Minister) to tighten the controls on many aspects of schooling, including administration, curriculum and teaching staff. This chapter outlines and discusses some of the arguments which underpinned these and their effects. The debates

outlined here are not primarily about technical education, but they affected it as part of a complete scheme to bring education, of a particular kind, to New Zealanders.

The one true form of knowledge:

> There is creeping into the teaching profession a spirit of Bolshevism that needs to be suppressed (2).

There is no clearer way of exposing the social control ideology which underpinned state education policies in the early 1920's than by analysing the 'loyalty' debates. This material has been thoroughly discussed by Openshaw (3), but his discussion tends to be somewhat inconclusive, due to the lack of an explicit and coherent theoretical framework. Here I will be referring mainly to one debate - that of the 1921-22 Education Amendment Bill. This Bill contained two features which highlight the broad concern for patriotism at the time. Under clause 7, the term 'efficient', related to private schools, was defined as follows:

> ....means that the premises, staff, equipment and curriculum of the school are suitable; that the instruction afforded therein is as efficient as in a public school of the same class; that suitable provision is made for the inculcation in the minds of the pupils of sentiments of patriotism and loyalty (4).

There are shade of Humpty Dumpty in the definition: 'when I say efficiency I really mean patriotic indoctrination'. It is interesting also to use this definition of efficiency to

understand the following statement:

> If increased efficiency in the nation is desired, the real remedy is to raise the compulsory age (of school leavers), and to make provision for more practical work for those children who are somewhat below the average in attainments (5).

Or even:

> Our educational system in New Zealand has arrived at a very high state of efficiency, and it does not lend itself to revolutionary reforms (6).

Clause 11 provided for the compulsory taking of an oath of allegiance for all teachers. It was legislated that no teacher was to be employed by any school unless:

> ....he has, since the passing of the Act, made and subscribed in the prescribed form an oath that he will not, directly or indirectly, use words or be concerned in any act which would be disloyal to His Majesty if such words were spoken or written, or such act were committed, by a subject of His Majesty (7).

The question to be asked here of this emphasis on patriotic teaching is whether it was ideological in the sense that it upheld ruling class interests in New Zealand society. Openshaw (1980a p334) notes that, during the war, patriotism was seen as a common cause - in the interests of which people were to "set aside political and class differences in the interests of unity". It is clear that policy-makers were intent on continuing this spirit of unity. However, the conditions which had initially

brought it about - a common concern for the defence of the Empire - had, by 1921, long since departed. Indeed, these 'political and class differences' which had preceded the war had not only failed to disappear, but had reappeared more strongly than ever (Sinclair 1980 p243). Why then did it seem so important to continue to inculcate, through education, "militarism, imperialism, protectionism [and] exclusive nationalism" (8) into the minds of young New Zealanders? Parr, the Minister of Education, noted that a central aim of schooling was to effect the reproduction of dominant ideologies. He framed his argument in the following terms:

> If you have disloyal teachers you are going to have disloyal children. The teacher has much to do in moulding the minds and the characters of the children of New Zealand. The teacher is a citizen-maker. The teacher can either, as I say, make a nation that will be disloyal and anarchistic; or, on the other hand, the teacher, by his or her influence and example can create a loyal and law-abiding citizen in this country (9).

The ideologies which underlie this view are not unknown to New Zealanders today. There is no 'necessary' class conflict in New Zealand society; rather, certain 'disloyal' elements stir up popular feeling, thereby creating 'anarchy'. If these elements become patriotic (either by choice or by legislation), then (presumably) the country as a whole would prosper. This view is underpinned by a pluralist conception of society - remove the conflict and everyone will settle into their place, to the benefit of all. However, within a framework which sees class interests as <u>necessarily</u> conflicting, it is meaningless to talk

of 'loyalty' per se. Loyalty to which of the competing groups? This was also made quite clear in the debate; it is those groups whose interests are upheld by the state:

> We want to see that our children are not taught by teachers who are likely to teach them to hold views destructive to the state, destructive to the country in which they live, and destructive to loyalty (10).

The state in this context must be interpreted to mean the Government, the ruling class and (in particular the landowners, farmers and industrialists who constituted the Reform party), mechanisms for upholding the existing conditions of production. 'Law-abiding citizens' worked for low wages and poor conditions, did not hold strikes or read socialist materials (11), were diligent and hardworking parents and supported their employers. Such an ideology underpinned the general wage cuts which occurred in 1921 - for example, those of the seamen:

> The balance-sheets of the Union Company disclose the most prosperous of business transactions financially. The shipowners want this (Arbitration) court to take out of the pockets of working men and women some £2,500,000 yearly, and place that sum in the pockets of a few wealthy men and women holding shares in various shipping companies, while the unfortunate, struggling worker is kept at starvation point (12).

The seaman, along with most other worker groups (including the Public Service), did receive pay cuts that, in some cases (including the teachers) were not restored until the mid-1930's.

A picture emerges, then, of a type of patriotic fervour

which had very little to do with the War, nor, I would argue, with the threat of further world conflict (Openshaw 1980a b) which was apparent at the time. The major 'threat' to existing, capitalist, New Zealand society came not from these factors, but from labour-related conflicts and the possibility of a Russia-like socialist revolution. Thus, such 'patriotism' was no more nor less than a form of social control; an ideology which acted to prevent unrest during a period of economic recession and worker deprivation. Education was seen as a means to provide a labour force which was totally loyal and subservient to state and ruling classes:

> Sir, the world is only beginning to find what an extraordinary influence education has upon the building-up of the character and more particularly the opinions of children, and the state is therefore coming to recognise that it is necessary in the first place to teach the children loyalty to the state and respect for the flag which symbolises the state...I have noticed that it has been suggested that children who refuse to take part in saluting the flag shall be excluded from the school. That would never do; I venture to say that we would have then an epidemic of disloyalty.....For another thing, we must take care that there are no martyrs in this country. We could not do more to increase the disloyalty than by making martyrs of any who show such signs.....if this instigation of children becomes at all general, and it becomes necessary to take certain steps, the parents of the children should be disenfranchised (13).

Openshaw (1980a and 1980b) notes that the control aspects of the call to patriotism were not overlooked by certain groups in society at the time. In particular, the more radical members of the Labour Party showed themselves to be fully aware of the ideological message embedded in Parr's determination to enforce loyalty to the state:

> The honourable member for Patea has made it clear what disloyalty amounts to from the Government viewpoint. Whoever refuses blindly to follow the Reform Government is disloyal; whoever does anything that interferes industrially with the profit-making operations of the exploiting class the Government stands for is disloyal (14).

As Fraser (member for Wellington Central) pointed out, the usefulness of the clause for ensuring loyalty was, in any case, doubtful:

> ....I do not think it will disturb any teacher. It does not strike me as being any particular hardship to ask teachers to take the oath of allegiance: it only strikes me as being a quite unnecessary and rather stupid piece of legislation. There has been absolutely no necessity shown for it, and, as far as I have ever known or read, I cannot see that anything revolutionary in any state has ever been prevented by the compulsory taking of an oath of allegiance (15).

Openshaw agrees with this point (1980); indeed, he claims that the very extremity of Parr's call to patriotism eventually caused its decline in the education system. Teachers who had only recently experienced the horrors of war were very willing to teach Civics and National History; Parrs' unnecessary "loyalty by legislation" may have effectively destroyed any such desire. It is difficult to understand at this distance why Parr was so determined to pass this legislation; possibly Openshaw is correct in interpreting this as a sign of real fear of a socialist revolution in New Zealand. But this may not have been the only reason; indeed, Holland (member for Grey) claimed that there was a far more concrete, instrumental motive behind the

Bill: "The idea is to camouflage the coming cuts in teachers' salaries" (16). Given that this legislation was passed a few short months before teachers wages were cut, this is not an unreasonable assumption.

The final point I wish to discuss in the context of this debate is its educational implications. At the basis of any knowledge-claim must lie some view about reality; of the way things are seen to be. Thus to privilege certain aspects of knowledge above others is to assign a value to a particular view of social reality - in this instance, the consensual view of the 'good', patriotic society. Minority cultures, with their own version of social reality hold to forms of knowledge which differ from and may contradict the dominant knowledge-forms. This is, broadly, Bourdieu's case (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977), when he states that 'success' in schooling is dependent on the accumulation of cultural capital. Using Bourdieu's model, an education based on the precepts of nationalistic patriotism would privilege the children of those parents who actively appropriated such a view of society; ie those who gained from supporting the existing social formation. These would be the farmers, the landowners and most professional groups. Those children brought up to understand New Zealand society as consisting of class conflict (for example, the children of those who took part in or supported the 1913 Miner's strike) or the 'superiority' of the European race (Harker 1981) would find a dislocation between the cultural systems of home and school (see chapter two - cultural studies theory). The Labour Party had a clear opinion of what

the patriotic ideology would do to a supposedly democratic education:

> Everywhere in the teaching of history, geography or literature the emotional bias of 'patriotism' is to prevail, while the elements of civics and even of biology are to be exploited so as to impress class discipline, national pride, the duty of prolific parentage, race hostility, and to divide popular solidarity at every stage by presenting life as a competitive struggle instead of a human co-operation....
>
> The human mind is not to be trained to the free handling of facts and their disinterested interpretation, but to be cribbed, cabined and confined by the acceptance of a selected, distorted and impassioned view of the world in which we live and our conduct in it (17).

The people of the country, claimed Fraser, would not submit themselves to such an undemocratic, and unfree, education:

> ....intelligent young men and women stated that they considered they had an absolute right - a right as British Subjects, and as enquirers and seekers after knowledge - to study any form of literature they pleased (18).

The oath of allegiance clause was passed into law and came into effect in 1922; it exists up until the present day, although the notion of what constitutes 'patriotism' has changed markedly since the early 1920's (however, during the 1950's and again in the 1980's there have been attempts to re-assert the ideology of 'national loyalty' in the narrow sense described here; such a move appears characteristic of the conservative state). The effects of the oath on classroom teaching is beyond

the scope of this study, but it provided a set of conditions whereby teaching practices and, indeed, curricula, could be controlled by the state; the ability of the Minister to intervene "for defining the standards of education" and "making such other regulations as may be necessary" having been laid down in the 1877 Education Act.

The struggle for control:

By the time of the 1920-21 debates, it had long been recognised that the Government had, through the Minister of Education, control of every aspect of state education. Indeed, despite the protestations heard since 1877 (and before) that it was dangerous for democracy to have education controlled by the state, it can fairly be said that 1920's politicians did not shrink from such control. Indeed, the major problem for educational policy makers was that, in more ways than one, they were caught between the inexorable pressures from the public to increase educational provision - particularly at the secondary, technical and university levels - and the growing fears so eloquently expressed in the patriotism debates that educational levels did not correlate as perfectly with the nations' level of well-being as had been supposed. Although the increasing state financing had removed some control from the local level, the relationship between state and school had remained, up until 1920, mostly cordial. Any educational retrenchments on the part of the state could be, and were, attributed to the 'necessary

sacrifices' of a country at war. By 1920, education was seen as a high priority endeavour for the nation (19), and this translated into policies of high educational expenditure. Nicol calls the 1914-1920 period the 'new era' in technical education (1940 p119); however, the next 15 years were to demonstrate more retrenchment than growth in educational provision. For example, the provision of the 1920 Education Amendment Act that the compulsory school leaving age be raised to 15 years could not be enforced within the increasingly cramped and financially retrenched conditions; thus, in practice, the school leaving age remained at 14 years until the 1940's (Dakin 1982 p7).

An aspect of the 1920 Education Amendment Bill which did not escape the notice of some Members of the House was the tendency to remove more power from the school Boards. By the 1920's most High Schools and Technical High Schools were totally dependent on the Government for salaries, buildings, inspection, equipment, running costs and incidental expenses. Indeed, Webb (1937 p96) suggests that after the 1914 Education Act "the Department makes little attempt to disguise its view that the Boards are superfluous and that their abolition is the logical and desirable culmination of the changes made by the Act". One member was moved to remark that if the Government intended to abolish the school boards, why did they not just come out and do it (20)? The question which must be asked in the context of this chapter is whether the centralised education system was an administrative necessity or a powerful social control mechanism. Members of the house were similarily confused:

> I hold the first reform to be made in the education system is to decide who is going to control it. We are not very clear at the present time as to who is endowed with power in connection with education (21).

Perhaps the fairest answer to the above question is that centralization was initially conceptualized as the best way of providing education for all New Zealanders in the most equitable way possible, but that the economic dependence of schools on the state increasingly put power in the hands of Government. As this chapter has shown, the Government in their turn showed themselves willing to use this power whenever they thought it expedient.

Conflict between the Department of Education and the Palmerston North High Schools (PNHS) Board was not evident before 1922. By this time the Technical School was extremely overcrowded, and was trying to accommodate an ever-increasing attendance. The classes of the Workers Educational Association were cut in 1921, because of the "withdrawal of the borough subsidy for same" and the "present overcrowded state of the Technical School necessitating further room for other classes" (22). However, Openshaw (1980b p338) notes that the WEA had come "in for considerable criticism for allegedly indoctrinating workers with left-wing theories", which may well constitute a better explanation for the withdrawal of support for these classes. The beginnings of what were to be severe expenditure cutbacks by the Education Department was forewarned in the following memo (23): "Re observance of regulations and

unauthorised expenditure - notified that a written application for approval must in every case be forwarded, and action should be deferred until a reply is received".

At the meeting of 21 February 1922, the PNHS Board received a circular from the Superintendent of Technical Schools stating the necessity for strict economy in the purchase of materials. At the same meeting, an Order in Council "re teachers salary adjustments" was tabled. Reduction in salaries for all teachers were announced (24), and a confidential memo from the Education Department about the salary cuts was also received. Together, these circulars must have been a blow to the Board, but no comment was recorded.

This was merely the beginning of increasing centralised control and retrenchment in educational expenditure. The Board meeting of 21st March 1922 received the oath of allegiance, which, since the passing of the 1921-22 Educational Amendment Act, all teachers now had to take. At the same meeting, the following circular from the Director of Education was tabled:

> Re recognition of classes - no classes to be recognised which are of low educational value or of such small numbers not to warrant continuance - Dressmaking, Millinery, Cookery, First Aid, Typing and Shorthand, Woodwork, Drawing, Elocution, Physical Training etc for Adults will not be regarded as of sufficient educational value. In such classes the number of students must not be less that 12 for Technical and 18 for continuation subjects to warrant recognition.

This did not, in itself have much effect on the Technical School.

What is interesting about the circular is its definition of 'educational value'. It has previously been stated that one of the primary reasons that the Technical Schools flourished in New Zealand was their comparatively broad curricula; the High Schools tended towards narrow academic curricula and thus were seen to be of limited vocational value. It seems that the economic conditions and priorities had now led to a new, more stringent and traditional, definition of what constituted a valuable education. Indeed, this redefinition is an excellent example of the point, made in chapter four, that the term 'education' is itself ideological; its meaning shifts in relation to the needs of the state and the interests of capital (Gordon 1983, CCCS 1981).

Severally, these three measures - the oath of allegiance, the teachers salary cuts and the stringent new rules for the curriculum represented a strong move away from the liberal ideals on which technical and state secondary schooling in New Zealand was founded. Despite these moves, however, there was no noticeable decline in numbers attending technical classes, and no obvious difference in educational standards and curricula. At the national level, there was an increase of 800 enrolments in day technical schools between 1922 and 1923. In relation to the Palmerston North Technical School, the weekly enrolments (per hour) went up slightly between 1922 and 1923, but by 1925 had more than doubled due, it seems, to community demand rather than the implementation of any new government policies.

Throughout 1922, more and more information on cutbacks in educational expenditure by the Department was forwarded to the Board. In June, the Public Expenditure Adjustment Act was passed, authorising more cuts; in July, teachers salaries were 'adjusted' once again. Naturally enough, the continuing cuts in educational expenditure were causing much concern - particularly amongst teachers. The Board of Governers received notification of all the 'economies', but, up until October 1922, they had not officially uttered one word either condemning or supporting the Government's moves. At the October meeting (25), the following resolution was received from the Manawatu Branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute:

> Seeing that a high general level of education is necessary to secure the social peace and material prosperity of the Nation, this combined meeting of Teachers of the Manawatu District pledges itself to resist any proposal to reduce educational expenditure and thereby impair educational efficiency.

The Board supported this motion, although the general nature of the statement did not, in practice, commit them to action.

The Technical School overspent its equipment budget by £80.13.0 in 1922, and the Board applied for, and were refused, this extra amount from the Education Department. Their method of dealing with this conflict demonstrates a certain autonomy which still existed in 1922, despite much 'tightening up' of administrative procedures in the Department. At the meeting of 20th March 1983, the Board heard that the Department had refused

their request for the reimbursement of the overexpenditure. A motion was tabled "that a strong protest be made against the Department's refusal to pay the £80.13.0 for fittings and equipment for the Technical School for 1922, and it be pointed out that no business can estimate its expenditure for twelve months in advance". An amendment was added "that in future years a sum be allowed Boards up to say £100 for expenditure on general fittings and alterations", to be substituted for all words after "1922" in the original motion. A further amendment was put and carried: "That the whole matter be held over until Mr Nash MP interviews the Department re same". At the meeting of May 22nd it was reported that the Minister had promised payment of the amount.

That this personal approach worked on this occasion did not solve the problem of what some Boards saw as the intrusive nature of the control which the Department of Education was practising. In April 1923 the Auckland Grammar School asked the PNHS Board for support of a motion objecting to the Department's centralisation of the purchasing of scientific materials, and asking that the Boards be allowed to deal directly with the supplying firms "as required". A motion of support for the Auckland idea was proposed, but Nash (member for Palmerston North) proposed and carried an amendment calling for support of the Department's scheme.

In effect, this whole episode demonstrated the power of the state to successfully act against the wishes of teachers and

administrators, thus showing a strong ability to legitimate policy moves which were of doubtful value to those affected. Educational authorities, used to sharing a consensus with Government in relation to policy, found themselves unable or unwilling to oppose policies of retrenchment and reduced educational expenditure. In the case of the PNHS Board, this period was marked by the domination of Reform politics and support for Government policies. Nash, chairman of the Board from 1924-27 and an active member previously, was a member of Massey's Reform Government, and had majority support on the Board. Thus there was no open conflict between the Board and policy makers throughout this period, and disagreements were handled 'within the party' by Nash's personal representations, as in the example above.

The consequences of using such methods to handle disagreements and contradictions in Government policies are difficult to gauge. Nash's involvement in a secondary school board was not an isolated case; many MP's in the Reform Government were similarily involved in education at the regional and local levels; indeed, Cumming and Cumming (1978 p234) suggest that strong moves in 1927 to abolish the Boards altogether were unsuccessful simply because the incumbent Minister of Education had "climbed into power on the shoulders" of the Wellington Board. Thus there was undoubtedly a strong lobby within the Reform Government in relation to education. However, this study has provided evidence that when cutbacks, restrictions and increasing centralised power were decided upon,

that very same group of lobbyists actually prevented local resistance and facilitated the transfer of power from local to central control. It is likely that the continued existence of secondary school Boards, despite much pressure for their dissolution, was the only major achievement of the education lobby during this period. In later years, notably the 1930-34 period, this was to have strong detrimental effects on the provision of education, as regional education groups, totally unprepared for conflict, were unable to struggle effectively against massive cuts implemented in educational services. It should be noted that despite this experience, there is little evidence that educational groups are now more effective in challenging state educational cutbacks than in the period under study here.

The 'education' of women:

A major theme within cultural Marxism is the male hegemony of capitalist societies. The cultural Marxist approach emphasizes the culturally-mediated struggle which underpins ideologies in particular institutional locations (Wolpe 1977). Different ideologies may be developed in different institutional settings, whereas the effects of these ideologies, through cultural agency, may extend far beyond the institutions in which they were produced. Analyses of the cultural level are able to show how outwardly egalitarian messages within schools are countered by other, conflicting, messages. In particular, Willis

(1977) has shown how a counter-school culture can produce profoundly patriarchal forms, which undermine dominant liberal ideologies about the role of women. However, patriarchy is not only produced from below - many studies have shown that schooling systems continue, if implicitly, to work on patriarchal models (Barrett 1980). It seems that girls in schools are bombarded from 'above' and 'below' with their necessary subordination to men. The threat, however, also comes from over their shoulder. The strong tradition of the historical contestation of women's equality continues to affect current thinking. However, very little work has been undertaken on the patriarchal ideologies which exist within the state in relation to education, nor on the historical struggle over the role of women in New Zealand education. Most contemporary analyses of the role of women in education are notably ahistorical, and of a liberal nature (Barrett 1980 p137). The feminist movement is assumed to have begun in 1970 or thereabouts, and continuing inequalities tend to be attributed to a 'time lag' between the implementation of policy and its application, rather than to the existence of patriarchal structures. However, some evidence was uncovered in this research which pointed to a struggle about the role of women in education during the 1920's. This is a sideline from the major issues of this chapter, but does illustrate further the ideologies that characterized the increasing retrenchment in the New Zealand economy and its effects on state education.

During the war, teaching was not seen as a priority occupation, and thus women's role in teaching became increasingly

important. After both the first and second world wars, pressure was put on women to return to their 'places' in the home, and to give up their jobs for men. For example, in 1918 the PNHS Board passed a resolution at its Annual General Meeting giving wage rises to all the female teachers, but to none of the men. The very next year, wage rises were implemented which reintroduced and even increased the pre-war disparity between men and women. Although there was little attention paid to women and girls in the education system during the debates under study, those comments which were made reinforced the conservatism of post-war patriarchy. On the education of girls, Mitchell (member for Wellington South) noted:

> I suggest to the Minister that now he has taken a step in the direction of increasing the age to fifteen it would be a wise policy to realize that the girls of today are the future mothers of the race. The nature of the education they receive is therefore of the very first importance. It is time we realized our duty in regard to teaching these girls, before they leave school, as much as we possibly can of the subject of their parental duties. We are not doing so at the present time. I do hope that the Minister will concentrate the training during that extra year, as far as possible, on the science of domestic economy, so that those girls will have a knowledge of their duties in life when it comes their turn to get married. Marriage and family is the natural fulfilment of womanhood, and we should prepare our girls to fulfil these duties (26).

This patriarchal view of the role of women came about almost thirty years after New Zealand women gained suffrage, and indeed continued to strengthen during the 1920's and 1930's. Apart from the overt sexism of this piece, it can be related once again to the reproduction of the capitalist social formation. Women feed

and clothe the workers, bring up the next generation and act as a reserve labour force. As well, there is a sense in which having a wife and family acts as a pressure on the worker to stay in his job. It is also clear that the honourable members were not too keen to have their education system dominated by female teachers:

> It is regrettable that there are not more males qualifying for teachers than there are at present. Evidently our education system is not sufficiently attractive, and it would seem there are other spheres in life more remunerative than that of teaching, because there is a marked falling-away in connection with the number of males who are offering their service to the teaching profession. In 1913 there were 1603 male teachers and 2659 female teachers; in 1919 there were 1606 male teachers and 3394 female teachers. In a period of six years the number of male teachers has increased by only three, which is not an encouraging state of affairs (27).

The interesting point to note about such ideologies is whose interests they uphold (CCCS 1982). Such views were not held merely out of the ignorance of the times; another speaker during the same period was able to assert:

> The present was the day of economic independence of women. They were no longer subject to the domination of man.... The recent war had shown the high place women were destined to take in the world (28).

Within the context of the period under discussion here, there is no doubt that the conservative, patriarchal view won out over the liberal view. The war may have shown that women were capable of attaining "high places", but post-war educational policies had the effect of ensuring that women did not fulfil that potential.

More than a decade after women had supposedly reached their 'independence', legislation was passed making it legal to (a) refuse to employ and (b) 'terminate the engagement' of any women simply on the grounds that she was married (29). The major question to answer here is why the conservative ideologies of the role of women re-attained such prominence in the 1920's period. It seems likely that the answer must be couched in terms of the social, political and economic factors which prevailed. As this chapter has frequently noted, the 1920's was a period of increasingly retrenched economic conditions, conservative politics and an increasingly regulative state. This does not mean that sectors of society did not continue to hold liberal views (in relation to the role of women, education etc), but that the prevailing conditions were in favour of conservative ideologies. For example, it is much more likely that further education for women would be promoted during a period when capital has a need for all the trained workers it can find, rather than when the job market is shrinking and unemployment is rising.

Conclusion

There are a variety of inter-related factors which have been outlined in this chapter. It would be a mistake, one which structuralist and economistic analyses often make, to cite any particular aspect as a cause of the events described here. Thus it is important to outline the causes but concentrate on the

effects of particular factors (Urry 1981 and ref chapter three). The dominant context of this study was described as economically unstable and politically conservative; very little attention was paid here to social factors, not because they were not important; rather, the social history of the 1920's is complicated and just treatment of it would have taken up undue space. It is within these contexts that certain ideological themes about education were discussed, and the notion of the 'relative autonomy' of schooling systems was investigated within this framework. Several notable themes emerged.

The first issue discussed was the attempt of the Reform Government to redefine the limits of knowledge in schools, and indeed within society as a whole. This was to be achieved by ideology; in particular that of patriotism, rather than by legislation. However, certain regulations were brought in to underline this ideology, and these constituted a new definition of 'educational value'; one which was distinctively different from the liberal view of the early 1900's. By and large, according to Openshaw (1980), this attempt failed. It seems that education, as carried out in various social arenas, continued to be dominated by liberal ideas; it seems fair to say that it continues to be up until the present day, and this must offer some justification for those who see education as a site for social change.

Secondly, the issue of state control of education, and its effects at the local level, was discussed. It is clear that

during this period the state took a more active role in educational activities. This showed itself in several ways: the constraints on educational expenditure; the increasing control of the curriculum and the teachers' salary cuts are some examples cited above. It was noted, with some surprise, that the cutbacks and constraints appeared to have very little effect of the running of the Palmerston North Technical School; the school continued to expand and diversify throughout this period. The concept of 'relative autonomy' is very useful for describing this effect. The constraints which the policymakers imposed on schools had less effect, and probably different effects (particularly in relation to patriotism) than were intended. There was no direct correspondence between the two levels, thus the economistic arguments make no sense in this context. The discrepancy between policies and their effects cannot be understood without reference to the local level. The teachers agreed to work for lower wages. Curricula were structured in such a way that nominally incorporated, without apparently affecting, the educational provision of the schools. The PNHS Board negotiated settlements with the Government which, in the short term, worked to the benefit of the local level. Thus, despite large and growing differences between Liberal and Reform ideologies of education, the schools were able to carry on much as before.

In relation to the role of women, it was suggested that conservative policies were more effective and long-lasting. This study has not provided enough information to give more than a

tentative explanation of why this happened. Some more in-depth research into this area is strongly indicated. Feminist researchers (Barrett 1980) have suggested that the subordinate position of women is essential to the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production, and thus the state is centrally and directly concerned with maintaining their lowly position. If the labour of women in the home was to be paid, capitalist profits would fall dramatically. In relation to schooling for women, state policies must be reflected in the organisation, curricula and classroom practices for them to be effective. In practice, this is what happened; girls tended to take homecraft courses and subjects related to narrow future goals. The dominant conservative ideologies of women were undoubtedly successful, but this still fails to explain why this was so. One factor that must be taken into account was the dominance (in the case of Palmerston North, the universality) of male representation at the levels of government and school administration. This was, no doubt, a result of dominant views, but may also have acted to maintain existing male/female relations of domination and subordination.

A wide range of factors have been considered in this chapter, many of them inter-relating. It must be re-emphasized that this study does not constitute an exhaustive view of education in the early 1920's, Only those aspects were considered which looked at the relation between central policy making and possible effects at the local level. Thus, this study is necessarily biased in favour of the political rather than the

social history of education. As such, however, this account has provided an illuminating analysis of the period under study.

Notes

1. Parliamentary debates (PD) 1921 vol.191 p149
2. Ibid p933
3. 1980a and 1980b.
4. 1921-22 Education Amendment Act.
5. PD 1920 v189 p559
6. PD 1921 v191 p957
7. 1921-22 Educational Amendment Act.
8. PD 1921 v191 p955
9. Ibid p935
10. Ibid p964
11. Censored under the 'subversive literature' clause of the 1920 War Regulation Continuance Act.
12. Tom Young, in Roth and Hammond 1981 p6.
13. PD 1921 v191 p939
14. Holland, in PD 1921 v191 p972

15. PD 1921 v191 p953

16. Ibid p971.

17. Ibid p955.

18. Ibid p954.

19. Evening Standard, Palmerston North 14 September 1920.

20. Smith, PD 1920 v189 p573.

21. McNicol, in PD 1920 v189 p571.

22. Minutes of Palmerston North High School Board of Governors, 13 June 1921.

23. Ibid, 18 July 1921.

24. New Zealand Gazette, 2 March 1922.

25. Minutes of PNHSBG, 17 October 1922.

26. PD 1920 v189 p589.

27. PD 1921 v191 p946.

28. Evening Standard 13 September 1920.

29. 1931 Education Amendment Act, section 34; 1934-35 Education Law Amendment Act, section 9.

CHAPTER SEVEN

A Conclusion:
The Historical Analysis of Educational Policy

In chapter one it was noted that the central purpose of this research was to develop and apply a theoretical framework for the analysis of educational policy. The outcomes and implications of this study will be considered here. This final chapter will look at two, related, issues. The first is a general consideration of the historical/theoretical model used in this research, looking in particular at the collection of data, the forms of analysis and the presentation of the histories. The second part takes a broader view, offering a reinterpretation and integration of the historical studies which will aim towards a more general, but historically informed, understanding of the events described, the implications of such analysis for policy studies and a brief restatement of the need to think historically.

Historical Adequacy:

It is probably impossible to develop a history that all will agree is 'adequate'. The inherent biases of the researcher, as well as questions of selection and presentation are always reproduced in the history. Therefore, how does one choose a yardstick to judge the adequacy of particular histories? This problem was largely resolved here by the choice of an article by

Johnson (1982), who adheres to much the same culturalist approach as has been developed in this thesis. Johnson analysed the method of historical analysis used by Marx, and presented it in a schematic form (p157) which I shall follow here. Briefly, Johnson's case is that Marx undertook his research at a concrete level, then moved to a level of analysis and abstraction where theory and history were considered together as a dialectical relation, before presenting his findings, once more in the concrete. Using this model, this section will investigate the methods by which this thesis has met these criteria, and some of the strengths and constraints of this research. In the next section, the second 'half' of Johnson's model will be outlined and applied.

a) The collection of data: Ideally, this step would encompass all aspects of the particular issue or period under study. For example, in relation to the 1900 Manual and Technical Instruction Act, all groups who had interests in the issue would need to be investigated, a thorough social history of the period would be needed and economic and political factors would be important. However, this is where the selection of material becomes necessary, as it is impossible (certainly within a thesis such as this) to include all aspects of an issue or period. The result, for the 1900-1914 study, was a strong emphasis on economic and political factors and the development of one particular school. The second history also had a strong political and economic bias, although far more material was available on social factors - in particular the roles of women and workers. This material was

'easier' to research than the first study, as the increasing political conflicts provided a forum for a large variety of views and ideologies; there was an increasing tendency for groups to 'take sides' than during the liberal period.

The local research of the Palmerston North Technical School was collected mainly through the minutes of Board meetings and associated material. Unfortunately, the schools' own early records were destroyed by fire in 1970, but some were preserved in a 'celebratory' history written by Dr Spurdle in 1956 for the fiftieth anniversary of the school. This work emphasized the growth of the school, the respectability of its background and, for light relief, aspects of the 'bizarre' and unusual. It is very much in the tone which McKenzie (1982) describes of such histories. Material from the local research was chosen for the histories to emphasize the relations that existed between the levels of policy and its' implementation.

The major 'gap' that existed in the collection of data was any material at all on the practical level - the day to day teaching of subjects, the class, race and gender composition of the students, teaching facilities; in short, all those things by which teachers and students judge the nature of education in New Zealand society. This is a shortcoming indeed. Was technical education 'working for capital' when it came down to the level of the classroom? There is some evidence that the Palmerston North Technical School, when it became 'Queen Elizabeth Technical College' in the 1950's, was very much the working-class school of

Palmerston North. Even in 1955 and beyond, the University Council refused to offer accrediting of university entrance to pupils from the school, due to an apparent lack of academic bias in the curriculum. The past Headmaster of the school tells of gangs of boys who used to roam during class time and vandalise the school. It was not until the technical courses were moved to the tertiary level with the founding of the Palmerston North Technical Institute in 1974 that the school began to gain the status of other secondary schools - even though, up until this time, the school had always offered a full academic curriculum in addition to technical subjects. In the 1980's, it is (ironically) the broad base of the school which now ensures its popularity, as it runs a large number of community evening classes and accepts many adult day students every year. The school is now probably the most popular co-educational secondary institution in the city. The issues that surround these 'movements' are very interesting and somewhat complex, and thus analysis at the level of the classroom should not be ignored. However, it was not possible to examine this level in depth due to the destruction of the school records; indeed, it was preferable to ignore it altogether rather than to make unfounded assumptions.

One further issue that should be addressed under this heading is the use of extracts from the parliamentary debates to identify dominant ideologies. It has been suggested that this source is hardly conclusive, as so many conflicting opinions are expressed during these debates. This is true, of course, but

does not take away from the importance of noting what was said in relation to the outcomes that occurred as a result. It was very noticeable, too, that the tenor of the 1900 debates over technical education were very different indeed from the 1920's education debates, thus reflecting the strong political differences between the two periods.

In conclusion, it is important to emphasize that the data was by no means complete, and that the constraints that governed its selection were due not only to theoretical predispositions; practical issues such as time, the accident of a fire, and the lack of social history research in education for the period also contributed to the final choice of material.

b) The analysis - history and theory: My theoretical approach and clear allegiance to the sociology of education to a certain extent 'formed' the histories in this thesis. It was noted frequently that this study was contextualised within current trends of the sociology of education - firstly towards the use of more critical theories (see chapter two) and secondly in the increasing need to analyse the role of state policies in education (see chapter four). Thus there was never a simple interest in a particular period; instead this work was motivated by an awareness of a need to reinterpret the history of educational policy in relation to events and theories that have become clear only in the 1980's. In particular, it was important to emphasize the complexities of education's history - complexities that are ignored in liberal-developmental (Butchers

1930) or structural-economistic (Bowles and Gintis 1976) accounts. For this reason, it was decided to look at two periods in some depth. That one period turned out to be a liberal, growth-oriented time whilst the other was characterised by polarised politics, cutbacks and conflicts was accidental, although it has proved beneficial to the analysis. The central theoretical aims of the historical studies were to examine the notions of 'ideology' (chapter three) and 'relative autonomy' (chapter four) in relation to aspects of educational policy.

In order to look again at the nature of the ideologies identified in chapters five and six, it is important to reiterate the definition of ideology adopted in this thesis. Ideologies are those sets of ideas which work to uphold the existing mode and social relations of production (in New Zealand, capitalism), and which work in the interests of the dominant groups (ie capitalists - farmers, landowners, industrialists etc). The analyses showed quite clearly that both political and economic factors contributed to the dominant ideologies of the time. During the 1900-1914 period, liberal policies of expanding state involvement in education were coupled with a period of economic growth that enabled these policies to be carried out. In the 1920-22 period, a conservative (Reform) government, in a time of economic retrenchment forced cutbacks in educational expenditure. However, over and above the simple economic conditions, it was important not to overlook the very different ideologies that policy makers held about education. To the liberals, the broadest possible education offered to the largest numbers of

people offered the best hope for both individual and social development. There was very little conflict between the central and local levels, as the Department of Education and the Minister were content to let local Boards develop secondary technical education as they pleased. This can clearly be seen in the increase in state expenditure on technical education during the 1900-14 period (appendix I), where expenditure increased at twenty times the rate of education as a whole. However, it is important not to overstress the liberal view of education as the sole cause of this expansion; it must be remembered that the 1895 Act had, in a time of economic stagnation (and under a liberal Government), limited expenditure on technical education to a mere £2000 per year, with no provision for secondary instruction, buildings or equipment. Thus expansionist liberal ideologies were 'caused' as much by economic circumstances as by an inherent philosophy.

Similarly, the conservative ideologies of the Reform Government cannot be understood outside of the economic conditions in which they were formed. Indeed, one Labour MP went so far as to identify the oath of allegiance as simply a tool for ensuring the 'loyalty' of teachers in the ensuing wage cuts. The most interesting aspect of the 1920's ideologies was a belief that not only could the economy not afford the continued growth of education, but neither could capitalist New Zealand. Education could be 'destructive to loyalty'. It is quite clear that this ideology stems from a completely different philosophy of education to that of the liberals. The liberal view saw

education as a way to expand, enhance and diversify the nation, whereas the conservative view saw it as a necessary tool for the control of the people. These two views have resurfaced time and time again in educational policy during the twentieth century. Freire summarizes the problem best: "education can either be for domestication or for liberation" (1973). One of the basic points made in chapter one was that the state, in a capitalist society, must always 'take the side' of capital. Given this premise, it is important to consider whether the liberal ideologies of schooling could, no matter who was the Government of the day, have continued during the economic recession of the 1920's. That is, do retrenched conditions for capitalist development necessarily produce conservative ideologies? The phenomenologist would tend to see ideas as being more or less independent from social conditions, whereas it can be argued here (but not proved) that the material conditions of a social formation in a given historical period produces the dominance of particular ideas - ideologies - that work 'in the interests' of that social formation. This is, of course, a point made by Marx many times (see chapter three), and the present study tends to bear out his claim. If this argument is to be refuted, more coherent alternative explanations for the dramatic change in ideologies of schooling must be presented (1).

Before considering the relative autonomy of education systems during these two periods, this notion should once again be defined. It was suggested in chapter four that two meanings have been attached to the notion; either 'a certain degree' of

autonomy from state and policy makers or 'autonomy in relation to' the economic base. The first meaning is largely empirical; it requires an inventory of school practices which are then measured against existing policies. For example, given that the present Minister of Education has reiterated time and again that no sex education will be taught in primary schools, how much of this kind of instruction actually goes on? The second usage of the term is more complex and, in the present context, far more interesting. The school, or other aspect of the education system, must be considered in terms of its relation to the economic base. If there were a perfect relation between the two, in times of expanding material conditions the schooling system would also expand to the same degree, and in times of retrenchment schools would similarily cut back. As well, however, the ideological component of relative autonomy must be considered. If, as I suggested above, ideologies are caused by material conditions, then in a 'perfect' system, ideologies of schooling would change in line with the conditions of the material base. These points can now be examined within the context of this study.

The Palmerston North Technical School was largely 'formed' as a result of Liberal policies, in particular the 1900 and 1902 Manual and Technical Acts and the 1903 Secondary Schools Act. It was noted above that the school was largely allowed to develop as it wished, but this 'freedom' must not be confused with 'relative autonomy'. In relation to the expanding economic base, the expansion of schooling practices was in line with economic

trends; thus it is meaningless to talk of autonomy here. In fact, the expansion in the school, and in technical instruction altogether, was largely a reflection of the economic growth at the time, although technical education as a whole certainly grew much faster than the increase in real wealth during the period between 1900 and 1914. In relation to ideological aspects, the strong liberalism of state education encouraged as much diversity in educational issues as schools were able to provide. However, as was noted, there was some disagreement as to what form this liberalism should take. Hogben, who was largely responsible for administering the Act, adhered to a very idealist liberal philosophy. Seddon's liberalism was modified by a desire to develop manufacturing industry in New Zealand, and expected that the teaching of manual and technical subjects in schools would enhance the prospects of such development. However, no demands were made on the curricula of these classes, beyond the broad definitions of technical instruction embodied in the 1900 Act.

Indeed, it was not until the second period studied here, 1920-22, that relative autonomy, in the sense used here, could adequately be identified. Indeed, the relative autonomy demonstrated by the Palmerston North Technical School and by other parts of the education system raises some very interesting issues about the nature of state education in New Zealand society which will be dealt with later. For the moment, though, this account will concentrate on the relative autonomy of schooling systems that was demonstrated in chapter six. First, in terms of economic issues, the recession <u>did</u> cause a reduction in state

expenditure on schooling, particularly in teachers salaries and administrative costs. Attempts were also made to reduce the funding of certain courses by invoking a new and narrower definition of 'educational value' in manual and technical subjects. As was noted in chapter six, these measures had no appreciable effect at all on the Palmerston North Technical School. The school rolls continued to increase, and increase markedly, through the 1920's and into the 1930's. Administratively, too, the measures seemed to make little difference. The effects of the teachers salary cuts are not known, although there must, in the long term, have been some hardship, as many salaries were not fully restored until 1945 (2).

In relation to ideological issues, the picture is even clearer. Openshaw (1980b) notes that the effects of the blatant attempts by the state to control teaching practices - in particular through the oath of allegiance - resulted in "alienation between the Government and the teaching service" (p343) which, finally, "hasten[ed] the decline of patriotic zeal in the education system" (p344). Attacks on the school Boards, both the political which threatened their existence and the administrative which attempted to centralise controls, appeared to have little effect. Indeed, the effects of these measures appeared only to strengthen local control of those school under the Palmerston North High Schools Board. It was noted at the end of chapter six, and must be reiterated here, that one area where relative autonomy was not sustained was in relation to the role

of women in education. The status of women in the education system appeared to decline along with the economic downturn; the 1920's and 1930's had crippling effects on the role of women in education, both as teachers and as pupils. It was not until the 1960's that women began to regain their positions; a process which is by no means complete and appears to be reversing again as a result of the current recession.

This analysis of the two periods in relation to the concepts of 'ideology' and 'relative autonomy' has emphasized two important points about the relationship between history and theory. The first point is, that no matter how well historical accounts may appear to stand 'on their own', an explicit theoretical analysis does allow histories to be taken further; beyond the boundaries of 'common sense' into new realms whose borders are defined by the theoretical understandings of the researcher and the history itself. Secondly, theoretical concepts and the beliefs they represent are challenged, re-formed and honed in their application to historical material. Concepts which were outlined in earlier chapters of this thesis had to be re-specified and tightened up in their application to this material. For example, it was necessary to make a previously unrecognised distinction between 'freedom' and 'relative autonomy'; the former relating to the ability of schools to act largely as they wished during a liberal period of economic growth, and the latter referring to a relation between the requirements of the capitalist state and the actions of state apparatuses. Some of the issues raised here will be

re-contextualised into the broader educative context at the end of this chapter, after a brief consideration of the presentation of history and theory in this thesis.

c) The presentation: This section is intended to reflect briefly on the presentation of this thesis. In the first chapter I outlined a rationale for an investigation into historical aspects of educational policy from the point of view of sociology. In chapters two, three and four my aim was twofold; firstly to provide a context for this research from the examination of the development of the sociology of education, and in particular cultural Marxism, and secondly to outline and discuss the theoretical issues that were of direct concern to the historical analysis of educational policy. As I have noted previously, the central aim of the historical chapters five and six was to examine the relationship between two 'levels' of the state education system in terms of selected policies.

There is a sense in which this thesis lacks integration. Whilst engaged in the research, and particularly when undertaking the analysis, I have attempted to meet the demands of adequacy from both history and theory. Despite protestations that there is no necessary tension between the two enterprises, it appears that, in practice, there is. This is demonstrated best in Silver's critique of Unpopular Education (CCCS 1981), which was discussed in chapter four. Willis (1980 p87) outlines very clearly what seems to be the main barrier to an integration of historical and theoretical (ie critical sociological) approaches

(3):

> The fear seems to be that a theory can only, ultimately, demonstrate its own assumptions. What lies outside these assumptions cannot be represented or even acknowledged. So to maintain the richness and authenticity of [history] it is necessary, certainly in the early stages of research, to receive data in a raw, experimental and relatively untheorized manner - 'Allowing substantive concepts and hypotheses to emerge first on their own'. It is recognised, of course, that there will have to come a time of closure. It is hoped, however, that the selectivity and theorization of the final work will reflect the patterning of the real world rather than the patterns of received theory. These 'anti'-theoretical concerns generate a profound methodological stress on contacting the subject as directly as possible. It is as if the ideal researcher's experience can achieve a one-to-one relationship with that of the researched'.

This issue of the use of theory, raised many times in the course of this study must, reluctantly, be left unresolved. My own position, that the use of an explicit theory enhances historical investigation, has been demonstrated at every opportunity; however, some will find my arguments far from conclusive. Until such time as this issue is resolved, the historical dimension of policy analysis will be missing from much sociological research, to the detriment of such analyses.

Towards Historically Informed Research

In the above section, I have attempted to 'reflect' back on the theory and method of this thesis, and in particular on the relation between the theory and the history. However, a history

is never complete, no matter how methodologically and analytically sound it is, until it has been appropriated into our day-to-day understandings; so that the historical dimension of our social being is fully incorporated into our everyday lives. Thus, beyond the collection of data, analysis and presentation there lies a fourth area, which Johnson (1982 p157) calls 'validation'. This involves a dialectical relation between present and past; an analysis which transforms the assumptions of today through an understanding of yesterday: "[History] is concerned not with the past, but with the relation between past and present" (4). In this section, then, the histories will be placed back into their broader context, and considered as part of 'the' history of educational policy. Thus the histories, already analysed and 'made', will be subject to a reworking within a broader context. The implications of this approach for current policy studies within the sociology of education will then be discussed. Finally, a point will be reached where a case for "thinking historically" within the analysis of educational policy has been made, and brief consideration will be given, within the New Zealand context, to how this can best be done.

a) Validation: In chapters one and two, it was noted that a major reason for undertaking this research was the apparent <u>disjuncture</u> between dominant sociological theories and historical accounts of education and current educational policies. In particular, severe expenditure cutbacks have occurred in certain educational sites precisely at the time when, according to many educators, expansion is needed. This has raised many problems of

analysis, as the post-war expansion of education had engendered many, now unfulfilled, expectations of education as the major instrument of equalisation and opportunity in society. Education is thus conceived of as a counter-balance to emerging problems such as poverty, the increasing gap between rich and poor, and unemployment. The state education system has, however, largely failed to respond to the problems created by the changes in the economic structures of New Zealand, despite frequent calls from those within the schooling system - and outside - for such a response.

Increasingly, it has become clear that education tends merely to reflect, rather than to transform, social, economic and political conditions. Chapter two noted that this realisation has brought about a 'new' sociology of education which adheres to more critical forms of educational analysis. However, these critical theories cannot, by themselves, explain how education in New Zealand society has come to play its present role. Has education simply changed from a uniquely equalising structure to a mere servant of dominant conditions, or have the contradictions which are now apparent been in existence all along? Only historical analysis can answer these questions. Yet, as was noted in chapter one, most historical accounts of education were written from the liberal developmental perspective that had also characterised the sociology of education. Thus, in order to critically examine the relation between past and present in education, it is necessary to return to the preconditions of current educational practices.

This is the general rationale that has governed the research in this thesis. More specifically, then, it should now be possible to raise some questions and develop some hypotheses about the relations between the aspects of history outlined here and current educational trends in New Zealand society. This is necessarily a speculative enterprise and should be regarded as such, rather than a substantive finding of the research.

The central point that arises is the seemingly inherent liberalism that accompanies state education. It was noted that the state schooling system in New Zealand was largely set up under successive liberal governments. Most of the expansion in the system (eg in relation to schools, universities and pre-schools) occurred during notably liberal periods in New Zealand's history. Curricula at all levels have tended to reflect these beginnings. The dominant conception of education, one which is adhered to at all levels (and reproduced through teachers colleges and universities), sees schooling as preparation for life (not lives-in-particular but life-in-general). Socialisation is centrally to be taught in the 'family' (5), thus clearing the way for schools to develop the 'intellect' of children. Class, race and gender boundaries, though clearly important in 'life', disappear in the pursuit of knowledge, of which all humans are more-or-less able. Education is not instrumental, but an end in itself. Even in the technical schooling policies of the 1900 period, such beliefs about education are implicitly present. There is obviously some merit in the liberal views of education; however, a major set of

contradictions arises when a structure built on these ideals is placed in the middle of a capitalist social formation.

The major contradiction is that the ideologies of a social formation pervade every aspect of that system, and thus capitalist ideologies are not absent from liberal schooling systems. In chapter six, it was demonstrated that the free pursuit of knowledge in schools, a classic liberal aim, was threatened by a demand from the state for 'patriotic' schooling. It was also shown that neither the state nor economic conditions were, in the end, able to 'win' education for capital; schooling remained relatively autonomous. This relation, between liberal and capitalist ideologies within schooling systems, needs further exploration. It is clear, however, that (a) neither view actually 'controls' schooling completely, and (b) the conflict between the two is enhanced during periods of low capital accumulation. Thus, contradictions that have been present in various forms throughout the history of state schooling become increasingly apparent in periods of recession (6).

State schooling systems are unlikely to be instruments of revolution, as they rely on the maintenance of (more or less) existing conditions for their continuance. The breakdown of capitalism as a mode of production would inevitably, in the short term at least, bring about the breakdown of state schooling as we know it. In this sense, education in New Zealand is a capitalist education, and must reflect the structurings of a capitalist society. However, the liberal ideal which continues to pervade

schooling (for example, teachers colleges appear to work almost exclusively on liberal-humanist models) maintain the relative autonomy between the state and education whilst creating, particularly in times of economic crisis, many contradictions. The economistic model of Bowles and Gintis failed almost completely to recognise this political level of schooling, and thus tended to see the economic structures as determining of schooling. The historical accounts in this thesis have pointed to the importance of the inherent liberal politics of schooling as a 'buffer' to the otherwise determinate nature of the economic.

It is important not to overstate this account as an explanation of schooling policies in various periods. As noted earlier, this view is speculative and arises from the most tentative of observed relations between schooling and society during particular historical periods. Perhaps the clearest way to examine this proposition further would be through an analysis of particular issues which have accompanied state schooling since its inception. Obvious areas could be Maori education, the education of women, curriculum issues (in particular 'academic' versus 'technical' subjects and their relation to the mental/manual division of labour) and the provision of special education.

The validation of observed historical relations can only, finally, help to bring out new theories rather than solve old problems. Such abstractions are then themselves laid open to

critical comment and reworking. I have attempted here to abstract from the research and the theory an informed account of the nature of educational policies and practices in New Zealand schooling.

b) Thinking historically: In New Zealand at the present time, there is virtually no educational research that attempts to integrate historical and sociological aspects of schooling policies. Sociological research tends to centre, in a very ahistorical manner, on either current issues or the need to redefine aspects of theory. Historical accounts are presented, in isolation, as discrete entities; 'stories' which are calculated to inform, surprise or even shock their audience, with an implicit message that, after this little episode, we all lived happily ever after. I have claimed throughout this thesis that current educational policies cannot be understood in their entirety without an explicit sociological theory and an understanding of historical trends. More than this, I have claimed that these two fields of study need to be inexorably inter-related in order to reach a coherent analysis of current educational policies. The question remains, however: how could this be achieved?

I believe the first steps have already been taken towards an integrated theory/history analysis. Although sociological research remains notably ahistorical, there is a trend towards historical understanding of the development of the sociology of education since its post war beginnings. The theoretical

developments in this field are related to changes in the social context of schooling, in much the same way as I outlined the sociology of education in chapter two. This is very much an imported trend, encouraged by the Open University's excellent work (see Dale 1981). As well, historians such as Shuker (1980) and McKenzie (1982) have begun to tackle the difficulties of presenting 'revisionist' histories.

One of the major hurdles to a more integrated analysis of policy issues is the evident isolation of historical and theoretical accounts from one another. In journals and at conferences, history is presented as totally separate from sociological research. There is little discussion from one to the other, and, in general, none is encouraged. Perhaps the major barrier to a change in this situation is that each enterprise has developed its own, specialised, methods of research and presentation. It is indeed easy for sociologists and historians to 'talk past' each other - much of the time they appear not even to speak the same language (a problem I have encountered many times whilst doing this research). I suggested above that a focus on particular issues may be the best way to examine educational policies both historically and theoretically. A seminar or a debate in a journal on some well-defined problem may, through a contribution of both sets of views, lead to a more adequate analysis of that problem. Historical research inevitably addresses current issues, and may also help 'solve' them; this should be made explicit. As well, sociology of education is often distracted from its grounding in both past and

present by an overwhelming concern with theoretical issues. Theory should always be 'brought down' to its roots in the real world. Thus, whilst there is a need for historians to 'think sociologically', there is perhaps an even clearer need for sociologists of education to 'think historically'.

Notes

1. Openshaw (1980a) blames the emphasis on patriotism and control on the war, the Russian revolution and the 'red scare' of the period. One must ask, however, to what extent these are causal factors and whether they are not themselves mere ideologies, or epiphenomena, of a capitalist state in recession.

2. The Palmerston North High School Board made representations to the Labour Government in 1945 that, in some instances, the proposed pay rises would not even restore teachers' salaries back to their 1920 level. It is generally supposed that all the cuts had been restored when Labour took office, but apparently this was not the case.

3. Willis was not actually talking about history at all here, but the use of theory in relation to qualitative research. However, his comments are particularly relevant here.

4. Back cover, Making Histories (Johnson 1982). The term used

in this book to describe what I have termed 'history' is 'historiography'. I have decided to stick with the more general term.

5. Another very liberal and rather mythical institution.

6. One interesting (and close to home) example of this is the ability of university students to study socialist theories, supported financially by the capitalist state.

APPENDIX ONE

Annual Government Expenditure on Technical Education

1900 - 1914

Year	Total expenditure (pounds)		
	Consolidated a/c	Education	Technical Education
1900	5140128	436304	2,296
1901	5479703	509805	6,167
1902	5895914	502972	10,507
1903	6214018	526820	15,458
1904	6434281	546962	24,208
1905	6635902	635937	27,317
1906	7122340	697957	34,649
1907	7774925	785988	63,255
1908	8213965	821424	71,593
1909	8785513	848234	80,073
1910	8990922	862945	77,983
1911	9343105	942777	76,914
1912	10340386	1012048	85,673
1913	11082034	1084041	98,275
1914	11825864	1131756	109,365

Notes

(a) Total expenditure on education varied between 8% and 10% of total consolidated account expenditure for the period. This variance fluctuated and is hardly significant.

(b) Expenditure on technical education totalled .5% of educational expenditure in 1900; by 1914 it had grown to almost 10% (9.7) of educational expenditure.

(Sources: Appendices to Journals, B-6 and E-5, 1900-1914).

REFERENCES

Althusser, Louis (1972) Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses in Cosin, B.R. (ed) Education: Structure and Society (Penguin Books).

Althusser, L & Balibar, E. (1970) Reading Capital (New Left Books, London).

Anyon, Jean (1981) Schools as Agencies of Social Legitimation International Journal of Political Education 4,pp195-218.

Apple, Michael (1979) Ideology and Education (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London).

Apple, Michael (1980-81) The Other Side of the Hidden Curriculum (etc) Interchange 11,3 p5.

Apple, Michael (1982) Education and Power (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London).

Apple, Michael ed (1982b) Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London).

Barrett, Michelle (1980) Women's Oppression Today (Verso Publications, London).

Barrington, John (1966) A Historical Review of Policies and Provisions New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies 1,1 p1-14

Bates Richard (1978) The New Sociology of Education: Directions for Theory and Research New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies 13,1 pp3-22

Battersby, David (1984) The Sociology of Education in New Zealand British Journal of Sociology of Education (publication pending).

Bogdanor V (1979) Power and Participation Oxford Review of

Education 5,2, pp157-168.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1977) Outline of a Theory of Practice (Cambridge University Press).

Bourdieu, Pierre and Passeron, Jean-Claude (1977) Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture (Sage Publications, London).

Bowles, Sam and Gintis, Herbert (1976) Schooling in Capitalist America (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London).

Brown, Richard ed (1973) Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change (Tavistock Publications, London).

Browne, Ken (1981) Schooling, Capitalism and the Mental/Manual Division of Labour Sociological Review 29,3 p445.

Butchers A G (1930) Education in New Zealand (Coulls Somerville Wilkie, Dunedin).

Carnoy, Martin and Levin, Henry (1976) The Limits of Educational Reform (Longman, New York).

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (1981) Unpopular Education (Hutchinson and Co, London).

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (1982) Silver Foils: A Reply British Journal of Sociology of Education 3,2, pp189-196.

Codd, John (1983) Images of Schooling: A Cultural Critique Paper presented at NZARE conference, Wellington, New Zealand.

Corrigan, Paul (1979) Schooling the Smash Street Kids (Macmillan, London).

Cumming Ian & Cumming, Alan (1978) History of State Education in New Zealand 1840-1975 (Pitman Pacific Books, Wellington).

Dakin, J C (1982) Retrenchment and Restraint in Educational Expenditure 1880-1980.

Dale, Roger ed (1981) The State and the Politics of Education - A Study Guide (Open University Press, Milton Keynes).

Dale, R. (1982) Education and the Capitalist State: Contributions and Contradictions in Apple, Michael ed (1982b - op cit).

Demaine, J. (1981) Contemporary Theories in the Sociology of Education (MacMillan, London).

Dennis, W.H.S. (1975) The Politics of Educational Change and the New Zealand 1877 Education Act Paper presented to 5th ANZ History of Education Society Conference, Wellington, August.

Ewing, J.L. (1970) The Control of Education in New Zealand Journal of Administration May, pp41-52.

Femia, J. (1981) Gramscis Political Thought (Clarendon Press, Oxford).

Freeman-Moir DJ (1981) Employable and Quiet: The Political Economy of Human Misdevelopment New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies 16,1 pp21-27.

Freire, Paulo (1973) Education: The Practice of Freedom (Readers and Writers Publishing Co-operative, London).

Galper, Jeffrey (1980) Social Work Practice - A Radical Perspective (Prentice-Hall, New Jersey).

Giroux, Henry (1980) Beyond the Correspondence Theory (etc) Curriculum Enquiry 10, 3.

Gordon, Liz (1983) Cultural Studies and Ideologies of Schooling Paper presented at NZARE Conference, Wellington, New Zealand.

Gordon, Liz (1984) Paul Willis: Education, Cultural Production and Social Reproduction British Journal of Sociology of Education (publication pending).

Gramsci, A. (1971) Selections From Prison Notebooks (Lawrence

and Wishart, London).

Hall, Stuart (1977) The Hinterland of Sciences: Ideology and the Sociology of Knowledge in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies On Ideology (Hutchinson and Co, London).

Hall, S; Hobson, D; Lowe, A and Willis P. eds (1980) Culture, Media, Language (Hutchinson and Co, London).

Hargreaves, A. (1982) Resistance and Relative Autonomy Theories (etc) British Journal of Sociology of Education 3, 2. p108.

Harker, Richard (1984) On Reproduction, Habitus and Education British Journal of Sociology of Education (publication pending).

Harker, Richard (1981) Culture and Knowledge in the New Zealand School Curriculum Delta 21.

Harrison, Noel (1961) The School that Riley Built (Wellington Technical College, Wellington).

Jessop, Bob (1977) Recent Theories of the Capitalist State Cambridge Hournal of Economics 1 pp353-373.

Johnson, Richard (1976) Notes on the Schooling of the English Working Class 1980-1850 in Dale, R ed Schooling and Capitalism (Milton Keynes: Open University Press.)

Johnson, Richard et al [eds] (1982) Making Histories (Hutchinson & Co, London).

Karabel J & Halsey AH eds (1977) Power and Ideology in Education (Oxford University Press).

Larrain, Jorge (1979) The Concept of Ideology (Hutchinson and Co, London).

Lauder, Hugh (1983) Some Systematic Inequalities in New Zealand Education Draft, University of Canterbury.

La Trobe, W.S. (1928) Manual Training and Technical Education in Davey, I. ed Fifty Years of National Education in New Zealand (Whitcombe and Tombs Ltd, Wellington).

Law, Michael and Sissons, Linda (1983) Ideology and 'Needs' in Continuing Education Paper presented at NZARE conference, Wellington.

Lovegrove MN (1966) The Scholastic Achievement of European and Maori Children New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies 1,1 pp15-39

McIntyre, David and Gardner, WJ eds (1971) Speeches and Documents on New Zealand History (Oxford University Press).

McKenzie, David (1982) Ideology and History of Education in New Zealand Paper presented to NZARE Conference, Christchurch.

McKenzie, David (1982b) Reluctantly to School, in Education and Social Structure (NZCER, Dunedin).

McLaren, I.A. (1970) Background to the Secondary Schools Act, 1903 New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies Vol 5, No 2 p94.

McLaren, I.A. (1971) Secondary Education for the Deserving N.Z. Journal of Educational Studies Volume 6, No 1.

Martin, John (1981) State Papers Dept. of Sociology, Massey University.

Marx, Karl (1962) The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon in Selected Works (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow).

Middleton, Sue (1980) The Covert Curriculum as a Source of Inequality for Women in Schools and Higher Education Delta 27 pp29-37.

Middleton, Sue and Moss, Logan (1982) The Politics of Educational Research - A Case Study Paper presented at N.Z.A.R.E. Conference, Christchurch.

Middleton, Sue (1983) Perspectives and Directions in the Sociology of Women's Education Paper presented at Philosophy of Education Society Conference, Massey University, New Zealand.

Moss, Logan and Ramsay, Peter (1983) Finally and Omelette?: From Reproduction to Radical Pedagogy in the Sociology of Education Paper presented at NZARE conference, Wellington, New Zealand.

Nash, Roy (1981) Schools Can't Make Jobs: Structural Unemployment and the Schools New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies 16, 1, 1-20.

Nash, Roy (1982) Education in Spoonley P et al eds New Zealand: Sociological Perspectives (Dunmore Press, Palmerston North).

Nash, Roy (1984) The Origins of Contemporary Policy in Maori Education (Forthcoming - Palmerston North, Dunmore Press.)

Nash, Roy (1983) Working for Capital Draft, Massey University.

New Zealand Commission on Education (1962) Report (Government Printer, Wellington).

Nicol, John (1940) The Technical Schools of New Zealand (Whitcombe and Tombs Ltd, Wellington).

O'Keeffe DJ (1978) Profit and Control: The Bowles and Gintis Thesis Curriculum Studies 10, 3 p251.

Oliver, WH (1960) The Story of New Zealand (Faber & Faber, London).

Olssen, Mark (1982) Ideology and History of Education in New Zealand: A Reply Paper presented at NZARE Conference, Christchurch.

Openshaw, Roger (1980a) Lilliput Under Siege: New Zealand Society and Its Schools during the 'Red Scare' 1919-1922 History of Education Quarterly, Winter pp 403-424.

Openshaw, Roger (1980b) The Highest Expression of Devotion History of Education 9,4, 333-344.

Pelling, Henry (1968) Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian Britain London: MacMillan Books.

Poulantzas, Nicos (1973) Political Power and Social Classes (Sheed and Ward, London).

Prichard, Muriel (1970) An Economic History of New Zealand to 1939 (Collins Bros, Auckland).

Ramsay, Peter (1983) Fresh Perspective on the School Transformation-Reproduction Debate Curriculum Enquiry 13,2, pp295-320.

Renwick, Bill (1980) Education and Working Life Paper presented to New Zealand Employers Conference, Auckland.

Reynolds D and Sullivan M (1980) Towards a New Socialist Sociology of Education in Barton L et al [eds] Schooling, Ideology and the Curriculum (Falmer Press, London).

Roth, Herbert (1952) George Hogben (Whitcombe and Tombs Ltd, Wellington).

Roth H & Hammond J (1981) Toil and Trouble (Methuen, New Zealand).

Shapiro, H (1980) Education and the State in Capitalist Society: Aspects of the Sociology of Nicos Poulantzas Harvard Education Review 50,3 p321.

Sharp R and Green A (1975) Education and Social Control (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London).

Sharp, Rachel (1980) Knowledge, Ideology and the Politics of Schooling (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London).

Shuker R (1980) Review of 'History of State Education in New Zealand' Delta 26 p37.

Shuker R (1981a) Paul Willis' Learning to Labour: The School, Ethnography and Cultural Production Paper presented at SAANZ Conference, New Zealand.

Shuker R (1981b) Perspectives on Schools and (Un)employment Paper presented at SAANZ Conference, New Zealand.

Shuker, R (1983) The Transition from School to Work: Cultural Contradictions Paper presented to NZARE Conference, Wellington, New Zealand.

Silver, Harold (1980) Education and the Social Condition (Methuen, London).

Silver, Harold (1981) Policy as History and as Theory British Journal of Sociology of Education 2,3 p203.

Silver, Harold (1983) Education as History (Methuen, London).

Sinclair, Keith (1980) A History of New Zealand (Pelican Books).

Sumner, C. (1979) Reading Ideologies (Academic Press, London).

Sutch W (1969) Poverty and Progress in New Zealand (AH & AW Reed, Wellington).

Urry, John (1981) The Anatomy of Capitalist Societies (McMillan, London).

Webb, Leicester (1937) The Control of Education in New Zealand (Whitcombe and Tombs Ltd, Wellington).

Wells, D. (1981) Marxism and the Modern State (London, Harvester Press).

Wexler, Philip (1982) Body and Soul: Sources of Social Change and Strategies of Education British Journal of Sociology of Education 2,3.

Williams, R. (1976) Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory in Dale, R (ed - 1981) Schooling and Capitalism

(Routledge and Kegan Paul, London).

Willis, Paul (1977) Learning to Labour (Saxon House, Farnborough).

Willis, Paul (1980) Notes on Method in Hall, Hobson, Lowe and Willis [eds] Culture, Media, Language op cit

Willis, Paul (1981) Cultural Production is different..... Interchange 12, 2/3.

Willis, Paul (1983) Cultural Production and Theories of Reproduction in Barton, Les and Walker, Stephen eds Race, Class and Education (Croom Helm, Kent).

Whitty, Geoff (1981) Ideology, Politics and Curriculum in The Politics of Cultural Production (Open University Press, Milton Keynes).

Wolpe, Ann-Marie (1977) Some Processes in Sexist Education (Women's Research and Resources Centre, London).

Young, Michael FD ed (1971) Knowledge and Control (Collier MacMillan, London).

Young, Michael and Whitty, Geoff (1976) Explorations in the Politics of School Knowledge (Nafferton Books, Driffield).

Primary Sources

1. The State

Parliamentary debates 1900-1921 (passim).

Appendices to the journals of the House of Representatives:

B-6 1900-1914

E-1 1899-1904 (passim)

E-5 1900-1914

E-5B 1898

New Zealand Gazette 1903

Bills:

Manual and Technical, 1897,1900

Acts:

Education,	1877,1914
Manual and Technical,	1895,1900,1902
Secondary Schools,	1903
Education Ammendment,	1921-22,1931
War Regulations Continuance,	1920
Education Law Amendment,	1934-35
Public Expenditure Adjustment,	1922

2. Other

Evening Standard newspaper, Palmerston North 1902-1920 (passim). Minutes and correspondence of Palmerston North High School Board of Governors meetings, including some Department of Education circulars.