

DID THOMAS MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

LOGAN MOSS

UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO
HAMILTON
NEW ZEALAND

Paper presented at the AARE/NZARE Joint Conference

Geelong
22 - 26 November 1992

In a paper given at the 1990 NZARE conference¹, I argued that there was, as yet, no history of New Zealand education and that it was difficult to see why much of what had passed as the history of New Zealand education should not, more properly, be regarded as the history of a variety of endeavours apart from education. For what we had were not studies which explored the practice of education or sought to recover the experience of learning and teaching but rather, numerous accounts of educational policy making and administration. Somewhat provocatively I suggested that if one did not know otherwise, then one might suppose that education was, first and foremost, a species of administrative or bureaucratic activity, rather than one which was primarily concerned with the processes of teaching and learning.

Central to my argument was the contention that, for a variety of reasons, New Zealand historians have been overly reliant upon the records produced by educational administrators and policy makers. As a consequence of this they have largely "ignored the two principal protagonists in the educational encounter, the teacher and the taught and the principal arena of their engagement, the classroom."²

This, I suggested, had led to a somewhat truncated role for the historian of education in New Zealand, that of gauging the efficacy of the initiatives of politicians, administrators and bureaucrats. Without being overly cynical, one might claim that they have been engaged largely in producing a series of footnotes to the reports and regulations issued by Ministers of Education and their Department.

If teachers have appeared at all in the work of historians, then it has generally been in relation to their implementation of policies determined by Government and its agencies. As I argued in

1990, this is not only a restricted view of the historians' role, it is also a distorted view of that role. Rather than merely concerning themselves with the effects of the implementation of policy, the primary concern of historians should be that of recovering and elucidating, with all its subtlety, the experience of the participants in specific events and situations in the past. They must aim at giving as complete a picture as possible, and one which will also be meaningful to the historian's own contemporaries, of the world as it appeared to, and was experienced by, the "actors" in the various institutions studied. Simply to show that there was (or was not) a fit between specific policies and what appear to be their outcomes, does not thereby allow one to conclude that those policies were a significant aspect of the experience of those "actors."

In this paper I propose to explore these issues further and to do so specifically in relation to the treatment of the Thomas Report of 1945 by historians of education and others.

The Thomas Committee, or more correctly the Consultative Committee on the Post-Primary School Curriculum, was appointed by the Minister of Education in 1942. Its terms of reference were:

To consider and report upon the implications for the post-primary school curriculum of the proposed introduction of accrediting for entrance to the University and in particular to make recommendations regarding -

- (1) The choice of subjects for the School Certificate Examination:
- (2) The content of these subjects:
- (3) any consequent modifications of the Public Service Entrance Examination and the Free Place Regulations.³

It met during 1943 and its report was published in February 1944. Its recommendations, with a few minor amendments, became the basis of the Education (Post-Primary Instruction) Regulations, 1945. From the beginning of 1946 those regulations provided the legal framework for the New Zealand secondary school curriculum. Among those who have written on the topic, there has been general agreement over the significance of the Thomas Committee and the role of its Report in charting new directions for New Zealand secondary education in the post-World War Two period.

Meikle, writing in 1961, referred to The Report as "an admirable document" and admitted to a feeling of "deep respect" for those who drew up a report which was "liberal, idealistic (and, for the most part, realistic)." She wrote in glowing terms of its "regard for moral, social and aesthetic purposes in education as well as for intellectual ones", and of its encouragement of

... breadth and diversity of aim and curriculum and democracy of tone and control in post-primary schools in place of the narrowness, rigidity and conformity by which they had so long been marked.⁴

Seven years later and twenty-five years after the Committee's deliberations, Wallace described it as "one of the most important in the history of secondary education in New Zealand".⁵ Writing in the mid-1970s, thirty years after its publication, McLaren echoed Meikle's praise of the Reports concern with the intellectual, moral, social and aesthetic purposes in education and called the report both "progressive and realistic."⁶ That assessment was reiterated by Marshall in 1989.⁷

There has been greater diversity of opinion over the question of whether the report and its recommendations were ever successfully implemented. Writers such as Meikle and Wallace, were as optimistic in their assessment of the changes it wrought as they were in their assessment of the Report itself. Whitehead, on the other hand, while thoroughly endorsing the sentiments of the report, was inclined to the view that:

the attempt to introduce the spirit of the Thomas Report into the secondary schools by infusing them with a sense of freedom to innovate and shape their own solutions to the curriculum problems that were caused by the advent of universal secondary schooling largely failed ⁸

Prebble ⁹ and Shuker ¹⁰ have taken similar stances, though for somewhat different reasons. I shall return to this question of the implementation of the Report's recommendations later in the paper.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the work of those who have written about the Thomas Report, is the considerable consistency of opinion over the nature of the problems which confronted post-primary educators during the 1930s and early 1940s and hence the problems which the Committee had to set out to address. The general issues are well summarised in the following passage from Prebble

The gradual relaxation of the selective principle regulating entry into post-primary educating culminating in the abolition of the Proficiency examination in 1937, were the necessary preliminaries to an era of general secondary education. In the short space of forty years the post primary rolls had grown from a mere 3,112 in 1900 to 35,565 in 1939. ...

By 1939 fully sixty-four percent of the children leaving primary

school went on to secondary school ... In spite of this great increase in the number of children going on to post-primary education, and the multiplicity of different types of secondary school, there had been little change in the aims or curricula of these schools. As originally founded, the secondary school was intended to cater for the small minority of academically gifted students who wished to go on to university and professional life. The gradual extension of post-primary education to the great mass of primary school leavers had rendered the Matriculation curriculum and examination totally unsuitable for a large proportion of post-primary pupils. ...

... two-thirds of the age group were being subjected to a form of education designed to bring academic success to about five percent. Just as the Proficiency examination had dominated the work of the primary school, the Matriculation Examination held a tight grip on the secondary school.¹¹

Whitehead,¹² largely concurred with this view and decade later the same general picture was sketched by McKenzie,

In 1936 the government of the day abolished the proficiency Certificate Examination thus ensuring thenceforth that virtually the whole child population would attend secondary school. From this date the schools could no longer be accurately described as being preparatory institutions for an academically select group.

A major review of secondary school curricula was clearly required and this need was heightened by a decision by the University of New Zealand in 1941 to accept accrediting for university entrance in lieu of the traditional Matriculation Examination. What was now sought was a curricular emphasis that on the one hand would satisfy the demand for equality of treatment which competition for national school qualifications implies, and on the other, guidelines that would encourage the schools to promote learning experiences which would be rewarding for all children irrespective of their particular academic abilities.¹³

Many writers have also pointed to the "failure" of the School Certificate Examination, introduced in 1934 to cater for the less academically inclined pupils, as indicative of the general problems facing education in the period leading up to the establishment of the Committee. The general consensus would seem to be that despite an attempt to provide a more "relevant" post-primary qualification for the majority of secondary pupils, the mere existence of matriculation, coupled with the demands and expectations of parents and employers, had left the schools hopelessly shackled to an academic curriculum.

Change in the secondary schools - With more children of varying

abilities coming into the secondary schools after the abolition of the proficiency examination, the need to liberalise the secondary curriculum which was still dominated by the university's matriculation examination became more urgent. A new examination for a school-leaving certificate instituted by the Department of Education in 1934 failed to gain adequate acceptance from parents and employers.¹⁴

The general impression of New Zealand secondary education in the 1930s and the early 1940s which emerges, is of a system faced with steadily increasing enrolments but unable to meet the increasingly diverse needs of its pupils. That failure is largely attributed to a curriculum designed expressly for the academically inclined pupils who, increasingly, were coming to constitute a smaller proportion of secondary school enrolment. While the curriculum might admirably have served their needs, it was seen as totally inadequate for those who were "fitted" for other pursuits. What was necessary, so it was claimed, was a reformed curriculum, which would address the needs of the many.

Now there is nothing particularly wrong with that as a summary of the position of the Thomas Committee. Indeed their Report made it quite clear that it was precisely such issues that had commanded their attention.¹⁵ Which is hardly surprising, since Beeby, as Director of Education, had directed their attention to precisely those issues in a memorandum which he had placed before them at their first meeting.

The Committee may be better able to direct its deliberations if it knew some of the problems with which the Department finds itself faced. It appears practically certain that as from 1944 the University Entrance Examination as we now know it will

disappear. It is a commonplace that this examination, besides being used for its legitimate specific purpose of measuring fitness for University studies has also been used by parents and employers as the general criterion of a completed secondary school course. The effect has been that the University, which is concerned with only a small percentage of post-primary pupils, has, whether it wished it or not, dominated most of the work of the secondary schools. The one attempt to provide a specific test of a satisfactory post-primary course as such, the School Certificate Examination, failed because the Certificate was never accepted by employers and parents as of the same status as the "Matriculation".¹⁶

Addressing the issue of the "failure" of School Certificate and how it might be overcome, Beeby went on to observe

It was assumed, in other words, that the main purpose of a

secondary school was to prepare students for the University: to this was added, almost as an afterthought, the education of children with no academic aspirations. It was inevitable that the School Certificate should remain a pale shadow of the University Entrance.

With the introduction of accrediting the University Entrance Examination ... will thus become a specialized examination taken only for the special purpose of entering upon University studies. This will leave the field open to the School Certificate Examination to establish itself as the measure for all general purposes of a completed post-primary education. It is anticipated that it will ... test the results of four years work for the average child. One of the main functions of the Committee is to suggest syllabuses for this new School Certificate examination.¹⁷

However, difficulties do arise if, what are essentially the Committee's view of the problems it addressed, are taken to be representative of a more general consensus, especially among secondary educators, about the problems which confronted secondary education. Yet that is precisely what has been done by many who have written on the Thomas Committee and its influence.

Certainly, if we wish to understand the report of any committee, we must first find out what questions its members thought they were addressing as well as how they proposed to answer them. But having done that, we cannot simply assume that every interested party will agree that the committee has correctly identified the problems which demanded resolution.

It is not that those who have written on Thomas have failed to provide any evidence to support the contention that the opinions espoused by the Committee about the need for reform in secondary education were more widely held. Rather, the problem is that with which I began this paper, the evidence provided has, in general, been drawn from a restricted range of sources. Thus, in support of claims about the

problems faced by educators, we find abundant reference to E1 & E2 Reports, to Departmental publications of one sort or another, to statements by Ministers, Directors of Education and Senior Inspectors of Secondary Schools and to the Thomas Report itself. What we do not find, is a similar amount of evidence drawn from other sources.

For example, in support of the claims contained in the passage quoted above, Prebble¹⁸ cited a variety of official and semi-official sources. These included: E1 reports by both Fraser and Mason, successive Ministers of Education, E2 Reports, an interview with Mason and the 1944 Departmental/Ministerial publication *Education Today* and

Tomorrow. However, the only reference which might be taken as evidence of opinion beyond the Department was contained in the following passage, which occur several paragraphs after the material already cited.

As the numbers of secondary students rose steadily, more and more criticism from educational circles was directed against the University Entrance Examination as being the main obstacle to a broadening of the curriculum. In their report on Entrance to the University (1939), W. Thomas, C.E. Beeby and M.H. Oram traced the changing attitudes of the public, the teaching profession and the university towards Matriculation.¹⁹

However, in the light of the argument I am developing here, the status of this as evidence of a wider view is problematic, given the position in relation to the Thomas Committee of two of the authors!

Similarly, Massey,²⁰ Marshall,²¹ McLaren;²² Shuker,²³ and Whitehead²⁴ have all relied almost exclusively on official sources (or on others who have drawn extensively upon such sources) in their discussion of the Thomas Committee and its influence. Yet each makes broad claims about the wider climate of educational opinion.

The only widely cited evidence which might directly reflect teachers' views and especially, whether, they shared a concern over the secondary curriculum and its allegedly restrictive influence, is the resolution by the Secondary Schools' Association in 1936, calling for curriculum reform. This has been cited by a number of authors as indicative of teacher attitudes on curriculum. Interestingly, it was also cited to the same effect in the Thomas Report,

During the past twenty-odd years the schools have become more and more critical of a system [Matriculation] that has tended to stereotype their curricula and methods and forced them to ignore some of the obvious needs of many of their pupils. The most striking pronouncement on this theme was made in 1936 by the Secondary Schools' Association after a survey of teaching opinion. In support of its claim that the Entrance Examination, ... should be abolished, the Association unanimously resolved: "That the curriculum, through prescriptive deference to external examination and to false valuations thereby engendered of foreign languages and mathematics, fails entirely to interpret

social studies as a preparation for citizenship, sectionalizes, when it should integrate, science, and neglects the rich cultural province of art. It fails culpably on the creative, artistic and physical sides.²⁵

It would appear that most writers have simply accepted without

question the Committee's claim that the Secondary Schools' Association resolution was broadly representative of teacher opinion at the time. Certainly none have subjected the claim to any serious scrutiny. Indeed, at the risk of being thought uncharitable, I would suggest that, for a number of writers, their knowledge of the resolution has been derived entirely from their reading of the Thomas Report.

Of course, in reply to my suggestion that evidence of teacher opinion has been omitted, it might be claimed that as the Thomas Committee was a "consultative committee", the views it expressed were a product of the process of consultation in which it engaged and hence were more broadly representative than is being suggested here. However, as I have argued elsewhere, there are good grounds for doubting that the Committee was consultative in anything other than name.²⁶

The issues raised here should have been obvious from even the most cursory reading of the words with which Beeby began his memorandum to the Committee. "The Committee may be better able to direct its deliberations if it knew some of the problems with which the Department finds itself faced." ²⁷[emphasis added]

What the Committee had been asked to address and to provide solutions for, were the problems confronting the Department and, presumably, the Government. Whether these were also problems which confronted educators, or which educators felt confronted them, is an altogether different matter. Moreover, the problems of the Department were determined to a large extent by its need to implement the Government's general educational policy which had been summarised in the widely quoted statement from Fraser's 1939 Ministerial Report. (See Appendix 1) That statement was cited on numerous instances in the Thomas Report, and, as Shaker has observed,

The Report also reflected the Labour Government's philosophy, setting out 'to ensure, as far as possible, that all post-primary pupils, irrespective of their varying abilities and varying occupational ambitions, receive a generous and well balanced education'. It was critical of the fact that previously both personal needs and social needs had often been pushed into the background by economic pressures, arguing that the schools had an 'overriding duty' to help pupils to understand the human values summed up in the word 'democracy', and to live in accordance with these values.²⁸ [emphasis added]

Fraser's statement has also been presented by many subsequent commentators as defining the educational problems of the day. However,

the question of the extent of the support for those policies amongst teachers and whether (and why) they agreed that post-primary education was in need of reform has not been widely addressed. Moreover, whether

the teachers of the day would have agreed with Shuker's assessment of the facts of the matter, still awaits examination.

What emerges from the various discussions of the Thomas Committee is a "Department's-eye" view rather than a "teacher's-eye" view of the reforms which were initiated. Certainly the voices of teachers, unfiltered by the Department, have remained muted and the possibility that the "story" told might be different if it had been those voices doing the telling, seems not to have been contemplated, let alone addressed.

All this might not matter if writers had confined their attention solely to the Committee's deliberations and/or the Department of Education's role in these, but most have not. Invariably they go on to examine the problems which arose in the course of implementing the Report's recommendations. While the various commentators have not denied that there were differences of opinion over the desirability of the reforms proposed, the basis for any view other than that expressed by the Committee or those stemming from the Government or the Department has remained largely unstated and certainly unexplored. Even in assessing teacher opinion of the Thomas Report we find reliance upon "official" sources rather than upon the teachers themselves. Thus Whitehead wrote

At this point in time it is very difficult to assess the degree of resistance that was present amongst teachers. Department of Education officers have varied in their views over the years, but in its submissions to the Currie Commission of 1960-62, the Department of Education commented on the strong resistance to changes in teaching methods amongst teachers.²⁹

Several paragraphs later he cited Beeby, from the 1957 E1 Report, in support of a claim about why teachers might have experienced difficulty in implementing the recommendations of the report. Though, to be fair, he does follow this immediately with a reference to an article by a school principal in *The PPTA Journal*. In a like manner Shuker, also discussing the reception of the Report by teachers, quoted directly from the 1958 reprint of the Thomas Report, "the main proposals proved acceptable to the great body of teachers and others interested in education"³⁰, but made no effort to evaluate the claim.

Marshall also relied on "official" sources for evidence of teacher response to Thomas, [but he did make some reference to other sources such as principals reports] citing Mason's comments in the 1944 E1 report.

Within twelve months he [Mason] was referring to "the enthusiastic reception accorded the Report in most quarters" and claiming that it had been welcomed by an overwhelming majority of teachers³¹

However, Marshall then went on to observe

One may well wonder how the Minister arrived at this conclusion. It is most unlikely that thousands, or even hundreds, of teachers wrote to him expressing their support for the proposed changes. If he was relying on reports from the Inspectors, he must surely have been aware of the fact that what these officials saw and heard in the course of their visits to schools was not necessarily indicative of typical classroom situations or genuine teacher opinion? 32

But, despite this refreshing display of cynicism on Marshall's part, it does not appear that he saw any need to subject the Minister's claims, or others emerging from within his Department, to any special scrutiny.

As a consequence, explanations for any opposition to the Report and its recommendations have almost invariably judged matters from the point of view of the Committee. In the process the opponents and their arguments have frequently been reduced almost to the level of caricature.

For instance, in discussing criticism of the Committee and of current trends in education, particularly that initiated by The New Zealand Herald and by the professor of philosophy at Auckland University College, William Anderson, Prebble observed

Beeby's response to this type of criticism varied. If the criticisms had some basis in fact, or if they represented a widely felt opinion he would endeavour to supply a full explanation of the Government's policy. ...

In the case of irrational or isolated critics, his policy was to ignore them and thus hope to avoid adding fuel to any controversy. It was this second approach that he adopted in reply to the critics of accrediting and the Thomas Committee - and it appears to have been successful.³³

But as to what would count as facts or as irrationality, Prebble remained silent. presumably, they were whatever Beeby deemed them to be! In a similar vein, and once again discussing the same broad criticisms, Marshall simply dismissed them. "...the intemperate language, exaggerated claims, and totally unsubstantiated opinions of their chief spokesperson, Professor William Anderson, did nothing to advance their cause."³⁴

Opposition to the Report amongst teachers or, perhaps more correctly, the perceived reluctance on the part of some schools to implement its recommendations has been similarly treated. The most common

explanation offered has been inherent conservatism on the part of teachers. Searle,³⁵ Meikle,³⁶ Kivell,³⁷ Prebble,³⁸ Whitehead,³⁹ Shaker,⁴⁰ and Marshall⁴¹ have all, to some degree or another, offered this as an explanation for the difficulties which were experienced in

implementing aspects of the post-Thomas curriculum. The problem with such an explanation is that it too readily confuses the conservative with the reactionary and, by bundling them into a single category, dismisses both on the same grounds. However, to do so overlooks the fact that the conservative generally sees some value in what he or she seeks to conserve. What that value might have been in the case of the critics and opponents of the Thomas Report has simply not been addressed. As a result, there has been little or no serious attempt to understand opposition to the recommendations. Instead, opposition has been treated as a form of deviant behaviour, requiring rationalisation in a manner which in no way challenges the principles which are regarded as underpinning the Report.

Lest I am misunderstood at this point, let me say that it is not my intention to defend conservatism or the views of the conservative critics of the Thomas Committee. I have used that group merely by way of example. My intention is rather to suggest that reliance upon "official" sources, has effectively excluded the experience of large numbers, arguably the vast majority, of those involved in education and were thus required to make sense of the educational problems of the time, including those presented by the Thomas Report. Yet it was they, engaged in their daily practice as educators who, every bit as much as the members of the Thomas Committee, the Minister or the officials of the Department of Education made the New Zealand secondary education.

If, as I suggested at the outset, the task of the historian is to recover and elucidate, with all its subtlety, the experience of the participants in the events of the past, we still have some way to go in respect of the New Zealand secondary school. For we have not yet even begun to address the question of the role played by those outside of the Department in shaping secondary education in the post-World War II era.

At this point it would be nice to be able to say that I had overcome all of the problems to which I have been referring and was about to present a "teacher-eye" view of the "Thomas era." Unfortunately that is not the case. Nor do I expect that anyone will ever be in such a position, for reasons having to do with the ephemeral nature of many of the records produced by teachers and by schools.⁴² All that I can offer at the moment is a very tentative step towards a reassessment of one of the propositions upon which the deliberations of the Thomas Committee were based, the alleged inadequacy of the existing post-primary school curriculum.

As was shown above, it has been widely claimed that the secondary curriculum of the 1930s, while suited to the needs of an academic elite, required substantial modification if it was to cater adequately for the needs of a new group of pupils who, since the abolition of the Proficiency examination, were entering post-primary education in increasing numbers. This was the view expressed, *inter alia* by the Thomas Report, by Beeby and by successive Ministers of Education. Subsequent writers have also generally accepted that it was the

fundamental reason for the establishment of the Thomas Committee, though they also point to the introduction of accrediting as the immediate impetus. However, while there have been numerous claims of this nature, the basis upon which they were made has been rather less frequently examined. What neither the Thomas Committee did nor, so far as I am aware, any subsequent commentator has done, was provide an outline of the "deficient" curriculum, as evidence for their claims. Without that it is difficult to judge the veracity of those claims.

Of course, merely examining the curriculum will not directly assist in determining the more significant questions, namely, how widespread was the belief that it was deficient, and inadequate for meeting the needs of the less-academic pupils. Nevertheless, it would at least provide some basis for comparing the pre-Thomas curriculum which allegedly did not meet the needs of non-academic pupils with the post-Thomas curriculum which allegedly did meet those needs. That, in itself, might provide a starting point for interpreting responses to Thomas, particularly among teachers. What, then, was that pre-Thomas curriculum?

Officially, the curriculum was laid down in the Free Place Regulations, 1917. These divided school subjects into five groups. Several of the subjects were stipulated as compulsory and the minimum times to be spent on each of the subjects or groups of subjects were specified. The basic requirements were laid out in Clause 6 of the Regulations

The secondary school or district high school shall give to each holder of a free place ... suitable instruction in subjects (1) English and (2) history and civics, (Group I of the following schedule) in one of the subjects (3) or (4) of Group II, [Arithmetic or Mathematics] in one subject at least chosen from Group IV, [Sciences] and in not less than two other subjects chosen from Groups III, [Foreign Languages] IV, and V, [Vocational subjects] in such a way that the total number of units of work in a year is in general not less than 20.⁴³

This clause further specified that girls enrolled under the Free Place Regulations would take home science and that boys enrolled in schools

in rural areas would take "subject (11) practical agriculture and dairy science". A unit of work was defined as "one hour a week regularly throughout the school year". A copy of the schedule, outlining each of the subjects and the minimum requirements for each is contained in Appendix 2.

However, using the Regulations as the basis for what is proposing here raises a major problems. Certainly, so far as the Department of Education was concerned, the Regulations defined what went on in the schools. But to what extent did they really do that? How much flexibility was there for schools and to what extent did schools use any flexibility? What is needed is evidence from the schools themselves, about the curriculum as it was actually put into practice. But such evidence is not particularly easy to find.

As I have noted above and argued more extensively in my 1990 paper, the records of schools, apart from those they are required by law to keep, are rather ephemeral things. Unfortunately, the sort of records required for the current purpose is precisely the sort which many schools were unlikely to have kept. While one might find the odd school which had done so, to what extent could one rely on the records of a single school to answer the questions being asked here? Those questions would seem to demand access to the records of a number of schools and that would appear to pose an insuperable obstacle to going beyond the Regulations as an indicator of what occurred in schools.

However, quite by chance, in the archives of NZCER, I stumbled on a collection of material, which went some considerable way towards resolving my dilemma. It was a series of tables, covering all 38 full secondary schools in existence, which recorded the amount of time per week (to within ten minutes) which each school devoted, to what were referred to as "subjects beyond the usual".⁴⁴

This data had been produced by H.C.McQueen and Mary Mules in the course of research for the book, *Entrance to the University*, by Thomas, Beeby and Oram, but appears not to have been used in that publication. The subjects covered by the tables correspond roughly to what would generally be referred to as the non-academic subjects or, in terms of the 1917 Regulations, to the subjects 11 - 23 in Groups IV and V. They were: Physical Training, Music, Drawing, Art, Woodwork, Metalwork, Book-keeping, Shorthand, Typing, Economics, Agriculture, Dairy, Gardening, Wool-classing, Botany or Biology [one category], Needle work, Hygiene, Cooking, Crafts, Home nursing, Homecraft and Elocution. It should be noted that they were not all taught in every school.

The data for each school was for either 1934, 1935 or 1936 and was organised according to level (Form 3, Form 4 and Form 5). A list of the schools, the year in which the data was collected, and the third

and fourth form enrolment for each school is given in Appendix Three.

The data had been organised by type of school, (i.e. "single sex boys", "single sex girls" and "mixed") and in terms of three streams: "Academic", "Modern" and "Other". Generally speaking, the "Academic" stream took two languages; the "Modern" stream, one language and a commercially oriented subject such as book-keeping. The "Other" stream generally took no languages (and frequently no mathematics) and a heavy emphasis was placed upon the more immediately vocational subjects. The character of this latter group is perhaps best conveyed by the names commonly given to this stream in the various schools. "Engineering", "Manual", "Industrial" and "Agricultural" were common for boys, while for girls, one finds such titles as "Home Life" and "Domestic". Every school possessed an "academic" stream at both third and fourth form level. However, in a number of schools one of the other two streams was absent. In some cases a stream would be present in the third form, but absent in the fourth form or vice versa.

As the total number of hours which each school was open during a week was also given it was possible to calculate the proportion of time which pupils in each of the levels and in each of the streams spent on the "non-usual" subjects. It was therefore also possible to calculate the maximum amount of time which was available to each of the streams, in each of the schools, for the academic subjects. This was done simply by subtracting the number of hours spent on the "non-usual" subjects from the number of hours the school was open during a week. The results of this are given in Appendix 4. The overall means for each of the streams and for various categories of school and pupil are given in Appendix 5. As the data for Form 5 was tabulated differently, it was not possible to carry the same calculations using that data, as a result only 3rd and 4th forms have been considered in this paper.

It should be noted that these results do not necessarily give the time actually devoted to the academic subjects, as time may also have been given over to other activities. Indeed, the Regulations required that only 20 hours of instruction be given each week. Therefore the amount of time actually spent on academic study may have been considerably less than the figure given.

What is immediately apparent is the variation which existed, both across the three streams within a single school and across the schools but within the same stream. (For ease of comparison, a 4% difference equates fairly closely to a difference of one hour per week.) Thus, for the third form academic streams, there was a variation of over six hours per week between Palmerston North Girls at one end and Palmerston North Boys, Otago Boys and Marlborough College at the other. While for the third form "other" stream, the variation was even greater, with a difference of nine hours between Rangiora High School and Auckland Grammar. There were also obvious differences in terms of

gender and type of school, though whether these are statistically significant has not been determined and more work has yet to be done on this aspect of the analysis.

However, for the purposes of this paper, what is important is that these figures allow a school by school comparison of the curriculum pre-Thomas (and, indeed, prior to the abolition of the Proficiency Examination) and that laid down by the Thomas Report.

As noted above, the principal recommendations of the Thomas Report formed the basis of the Education (Post Primary Instruction) Regulations 1945. These regulations defined the basic requirements of the curriculum as follows:

Units of Instruction

4.(1) For the purposes of these regulations the term "unit" means one hour of instruction a week throughout the school year.

(2) The minimum numbers of units required in respect of the subjects specified ... are as follows.

	Units		
	First year	Second year	Total for School Cert.
English and Social Studies	5.5	5.0	14.5
General Science and Elementary Mathematics	3.5	2.5	8.0
Music and craft or fine art	2.5	2.5	7.0
Physical education	2.0	2.0	6.0

(3.) In every year not less than twenty units of instruction shall be given to every pupil attending any school or class to which these regulations apply.⁴⁵

Using these figures, one can determine for each of the schools what the effect of these regulations would have been in terms of both the minimum time required for the academic subjects per week and the maximum time available for them per week. This is presented in the Appendices Six and Seven. In each case it is expressed as a percentage of the total time a school was open during a week.

A comparison of the data presented in Appendix Four (which gives an indication of the pre-Thomas curriculum) with that contained in Appendices Six and Seven (which shows the requirements which the post-Thomas regulations imposed upon the schools) provides some rather some rather surprising results.

To make these clearer, it might be helpful at this point to restate what has generally been presented as the objective of that latter curriculum. Meikle, writing in 1961 of the Thomas Report, does that admirably.

Their deliberations took place in 1943. At that date, preparation for the University Entrance examination had been the chief concern of most post-primary schools for many years, and their teaching was usually concentrated on the fairly narrow range of academic subjects prescribed for that examination. Consequently, as the percentage of girls and boys going on to post-primary school had increased, so the task of tailoring them to fit the narrow, rigid curriculum had grown in difficulty and, to quote the Thomas Report, 'the obvious needs' of many pupils were being ignored.⁴⁶

Here we have an almost archetypal statement of the alleged problem. While the existing curriculum may have been meeting the needs of an academic elite, it was manifestly failing to address those of other

pupils. A new curriculum was therefore required which would meet the needs of the latter group. However, a comparison of the pre-Thomas data with the post-Thomas data, suggests that the new regulations would have had a somewhat different effect.

In the case of the "other" streams, in not one of the schools, in either the third form or the fourth form, would the new regulations have required any change in the balance between the "usual" and "non-usual" subjects. In other words, despite the claim that curriculum revision was required to provide more adequately for the needs of the less academic pupils, it was quite possible for that group to continue as though there had been no changes.

For the "modern" streams, the changes necessary to accommodate to the new regulations were again nowhere near as great as one would might have expected, given the ostensible purpose of the curriculum changes advocated by the Committee. The curriculum of seventy-five percent of all the pupils enrolled in the "modern" streams in the period 1934 to 1936 would have fitted quite comfortably within the provisions of the 1945 regulations. The figure for the fourth forms was somewhat lower, but still, the courses of forty-two percent of these pupils would have satisfied the new regulations in terms of the proportion of time spent on academic subjects.

However, to comply with the new regulations, the third form "academic" curriculum in all but four of the schools (Palmerston North Girls, Wellington Girls, Epsom Girls and Auckland Girls) and the fourth form "academic" curriculum in all but two (Hastings and Rangiora High Schools) would have had to become less academic. Only eleven percent of academic third form pupils and less than two percent of their fourth form counterparts had a curriculum which would have complied clearly with the regulations which were to be introduced a decade later.

Thus, while the pupils in the "modern" and "other" streams were precisely the ones for whom the old curriculum allegedly did not cater, it would seem from this data that it was actually those pupils who would have experienced the least change as a consequence of the Thomas Committee recommendations. On the other hand, those for whom there was least call for a change may well have experienced the most.

There is still much which remains to be done in interpreting and assessing the material discussed here. Clearly, what has been presented in the second part of the paper in no way solves the problems which were raised in the first part. However, it does raise the possibility of other interpretations of Thomas. For instance, rather than turning to "teacher conservatism" to explain the apparent lack of enthusiasm of many teachers, it is at least plausible that for some teachers, the recommendations of the Thomas Committee, at least as they understood them, were nothing to get excited about as they appeared to mark no great change to what they may already have been doing. In respect of this point, it is perhaps worth noting that only 99 of the 595 copies of the Thomas Report distributed by the Department [as distinct from being sold through bookshops] were sent to the 38 secondary schools mentioned in this paper.⁴⁷ That is, less than 3 copies per school, approximately one for every seven teachers!

Before concluding, it should be acknowledged that as early as 1956 Stroobant drew an important distinction between "the formal, structural recommendations of the Thomas Report, and its forward-looking philosophy",⁴⁸ or, as Whitehead expressed it, between "the spirit of the reforms [and] the letter of the regulations."⁴⁹ Both suggested that while the formal aspects were implemented, in one way or another, the Report's "spirit" or "philosophy" largely withered in the schools. They argued that it was the failure of the Report in the latter sense which should be addressed but all too frequently had not been.

The data discussed in the second part of this paper certainly seem to bear most directly on the structural aspects of the Thomas Report, however these are not simply either/or issues. The Regulations provided part of the context within which the "spirit" of the Report was interpreted and vice versa. Both were interpreted in the light of current teacher understanding and practice. It is to those process of

interpretation that the historian must look in seeking to understand the educational practice of the period. In doing so, he or she must not overlook or favour any of the participants. This means that one does not simply ask whether teachers understood a particular Report, but rather, what sense they made of it and its recommendations and how and why (if at all) it influenced their actions. The only obvious way answer such questions is by addressing the issues raised in the first section of this paper and turning, as far as it is still possible, to sources beyond those which have traditionally been used by New Zealand historians of education.

NOTES

1. Moss, L. "Whatever Happened to Teachers? - Marginality and invisibility in the history of education." Paper presented at the NZARE Annual Conference, 1990.
2. Moss, 1991, p.1
3. The Post-Primary School Curriculum- The Report of the Committee Appointed by the Minister of Education in November 1942 (hereafter "Thomas Report") p.v
4. Meikle, P. School and Nation - Post Primary Education Since the War Wellington: NZCER, 1961 p.7
5. Wallace, J. "Secondary Education" in Mitchell, F. New Zealand Education Today A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1968 p94
6. McLaren, I. Education in A Small Democracy RKP, London, 1974, p.128
7. Marshall, G. The Development of Secondary Education in New Zealand From 1935 to 1970 DPhil Thesis, Waikato (1989) p.142
8. Whitehead, C: "The Thomas Report - A Study in Educational Reform." NZJES, Vol.9 (1) 1974, pp.52-64
9. Prebble, T. Strategies of Change - A Study of Some Aspects of New Zealand Education During the 1st half of the Directorship of C.E.Beeby, 1940-49. M.A. Auckland, 1970
10. Shuker, R. The One Best System, Dunmore: Palmerston North, 1987
11. Prebble, 1970, pp.96-7
12. Whitehead, 1974, passim
13. McKenzie, J.D.S. "Politics and School Curricula in New Zealand," 1982, p.15
14. Dakin, J.C. Education in New Zealand, Fullerton: Auckland, 1973 p.32
15. Thomas Report, pp.2-3
16. Beeby's initial memorandum to the Thomas Committee, 12 November 1942, Department of Education file: E4/1/5
17. *ibid.*
18. Prebble, T. 1970, *passim.*
19. *ibid.* pp.99-100
20. Massey, L.E. An Analysis of Curriculum Change: Official Statement and Actual Practice: An Attempt at an historical and sociological reconstruction of curriculum change in the New Zealand Secondary School with particular reference to the teaching of science and

- English since the Thomas Report. PhD Thesis, Massey, 1980
21. Marshall, G. The Development of Secondary Education in New Zealand From 1935 to 1970 DPhil Thesis, Waikato, 1989
 22. McLaren, I. 1974, op. cit.
 23. Shuker, R. 1987, op. cit.
 24. Whitehead, C, 1974, op. cit.
 25. Thomas Report, 1944, p.2]
 26. Moss, L. "Who Wrote the Thomas Report?" Paper delivered at the 1991 NZARE conference
 27. Beeby, 1942, op.cit.
 28. Shuker, R 1987, op.cit. p.160
 29. Whitehead, C. 1974, op.cit.
 30. Shuker, R 1987, op.cit. p.161
 31. Marshall, G. 1989, op.cit. p.148

 32. ibid. p.148
 33. Prebble, T. 1970, op.cit. pp.118-9
 34. Marshall, 1989, op. cit. p.148
 35. Searle, E.J. The Teaching of Science in Post-Primary Schools, N.Z.C.E.R.:Wellington, 1958
 36. Meikle, 1961. op.cit
 37. Kivell R.J., Social Studies in Secondary Schools Since the Thomas Report, MA Thesis, Auckland University, 1970.
 38. Prebble, 1970, op.cit.
 39. Whitehead, 1974, op. cit.
 40. Shuker, 1987, op.cit.
 41. Marshall, 1989, op. cit.
 42. Moss, 1990, op. cit. pp.19-20
 43. Free Place Regulations 1917, Appendix H, New Zealand Gazette, 1917, Vol.2, pp.2769-2773
 44. Analysis of Secondary School Timetables made for 'Entrance to the University' by H.C.McQueen and Mary Mules, NZCER Archives 3418-AAVZ [Box 18]
 45. The Education (Post-Primary Instruction) Regulations 1945, (1945/143)
 46. Meikle, 1961, op. cit. p.6
 47. Departmental distribution list for the Thomas Report, Department of Education file E4/1/5.
 48. Stroobant, R.E. "The Thomas Report - Endorsed or Confounded?" PPTA Journal, III (10), November 1957, p16.
 49. Whitehead, 1974, op.cit.

APPENDIX ONE

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. So far is this from being a mere pious platitude that the full acceptance of the principle will involve the reorientation of the education system. The structure of the New Zealand school system as originally laid down ... was based on the principle of selection. An elementary education in the three Rs was given to all the population, but, beyond that, schooling had to be either bought by the well-to-do, or won, through scholarships, by the specially brilliant. Under such a system post-primary education was a thing apart from primary education and tended to be verbal and academic in nature. A definite penalty was placed on the children of the poor, especially on those who lived outside the main centres of population.

From the beginning of this century the rigour of this selective system has been progressively relaxed. New Zealand has moved far more rapidly in this respect than the countries of the old world, and had, even before 1935, given a large measure of free education even at the higher levels. Yet the principle of selection for post-primary and higher education remained, and the present Government was the first to recognize explicitly that continued education is no longer a special privilege for the well-to-do or the academically able, but a right to be claimed by all who want it to the fullest extent that the State can provide. [AJHR, 1939, E1- Report of the Minister of Education, pp.2-3]

APPENDIX TWO

Free Place Regulations, 1917

Schedule

Group I:-(1.) English, as for the Intermediate Examination, and including the general study of a fairly wide range of selected standard works in both prose and verse, reading and recitation, composition (both oral and written), grammar (so far as it bears directly on composition). The cultivation of correct habits of speech and the facility of expression, both oral and written, must receive special attention...4, 5, or 6 units.

(2.) History and civics, including the history of the British Empire in outline and the rights and duties of citizens so treated as to develop a sense of responsibility with regard to social service, and embracing generally more advance instruction based on the course in civics recommended in the Syllabus of Instruction for public schools preparatory to a course in the elementary principles of economics to be taken at a

later stage 1.5 to 3 units.

Group II:-

(3.) Arithmetic (including the arithmetic of business transactions) 3 units; or

(4.) Mathematics - viz., arithmetic, algebra, and geometry 4, 5 or 6 units.

Group III:-

(5.) Latin 3, 4, or 5 units.

(6.) Greek 3, 4, or 5 units.

(7.) French 3, 4, or 5 units.

(8.) German 3, 4, or 5 units.

Group IV:-

(9.) Physical science - i.e., one or more of the following: elementary physical measurements, mechanics, heat and light, magnetism and electricity, chemistry .. 2, 3, or 4 units.

(10.) Natural science - i.e., one or more of the following: physiology and hygiene, botany, zoology, geology 2, 3, or 4 units.

(11.) Practical agriculture and dairy science (one or both) 2, 3, or 4 units.

(12.) Home science, including elementary general science relating to the home and domestic hygiene (not less than 1 unit), together with one or more of the following in conjunction with economical household management; plain cookery, laundry-work, needle craft and garment making, home nursing....2, 3, or 4 units.

NOTE: To gain credit for any of the subjects (9) to (12) each pupil must give to individual practical work in that subject at least half the time devoted to instruction, and such individual practical work must not occupy less than thirty minutes in any one lesson.

Group V:-

(13.) Geography, physical and political 2 or 3 units.

(14.) Geography, commercial (not to be reckoned if (13) is taken). 1 or 2 units.

(15.) Plain cookery and laundry-work, if not included under (12)...1 or 2 units.

(16.) Needlecraft and garment making, if not included under (12)..1 or 2 units.

(17.) Commercial correspondence and shorthand 1 or 2 units.

(18.) Book-keeping 1 or 2 units.

(19.) Woodwork or metalwork 1 or 2 units.

(20.) Drawing, one or more branches 1 or 2 units.

(21.) Any other subject prescribed in the Regulations for Manual Instruction for S5 and upwards. 1 or 2 units.

(22.) Singing. ... 1 or 2 units.

(23.) Any other subject approved by the Minister. ... 1 or 2 units.

APPENDIX THREE

NAME OF SCHOOL	YEAR	NUMBER IN THIRD FORM	NUMBER IN FOURTH FORM	NUMBER IN 3rd & 4th FORM
BOYS' SCHOOLS:				
RONGOTAI	1936	106	89	195
WELLINGTON COLLEGE	1936	228	205	433
WAITAKI BOYS	1936	115	89	204
SOUTHLAND BOYS	1936	93	96	189
CHRISTCHURCH BOYS	1936	198	190	388
AUCKLAND GRAMMAR	1935	305	291	596
PALMERSTON NORTH BOYS	1935	134	91	225
OTAGO BOYS	1935	193	227	420
TIMARU BOYS	1935	119	130	249
MOUNT ALBERT GRAMMAR	1934	182	154	336
GIRLS' SCHOOLS:				
CHRISTCHURCH GIRLS	1936	143	152	295
WELLINGTON GIRLS	1936	176	124	300
TIMARU GIRLS	1936	114	105	219
SOUTHLAND GIRLS	1936	77	84	161
PALMERSTON NORTH GIRLS	1936	107	99	206
WANGANUI	1935	124	107	231
OTAGO GIRLS	1935	202	178	380
AVONSIDE	1935	161	107	268
WAITAKI GIRLS	1935	93	84	177
AUCKLAND GIRLS GRAMMAR	1935	180	178	358
WELLINGTON EAST	1934	142	137	279
EPSOM	1934	210	195	405
MIXED SCHOOLS:				
CHRISTCHURCH WEST	1936	209	145	354
DANNEVIRKE HIGH	1936	117	91	208
THAMES HIGH	1936	68	60	128
SOUTH OTAGO HIGH	1936	71	53	124
ROTORUA HIGH	1936	76	40	116
HAMILTON HIGH	1936	145	111	256
GISBORNE HIGH	1935	162	146	308
MARLBOROUGH HIGH	1935	143	105	248
WAIMATE HIGH	1935	48	52	100
TAKAPUNA GRAMMAR	1935	172	157	329

ASHBURTON HIGH	1935	87	58	145
HUTT VALLEY HIGH	1934	141	134	275
RANGIORA HIGH	1934	79	77	156
HASTINGS HIGH	1934	164	148	312
WHANGAREI HIGH	1934	134	103	237
GORE HIGH	1934	82	73	155
		5300	4665	9965

APPENDIX FOUR

PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT ON 'USUAL' SUBJECTS - FORM THREE

	ALL	ACADEMIC	MODERN	OTHER
ASHBURTON HIGH SCHOOL	72% 87	88% 20	75% 43	52% 24
AUCKLAND GIRLS GRAMMAR	71% 180	79% 69	66% 111	0% 0
AUCKLAND GRAMMAR	88% 305	94% 159	0% 0	82% 146
AVONSIDE	69% 161	82% 35	68% 73	62% 53
CHRISTCHURCH BOYS	86% 198	86% 102	86% 96	0% 0
CHRISTCHURCH GIRLS	77% 143	84% 56	75% 61	68% 26
CHRISTCHURCH WEST	75% 209	86% 106	72% 34	60% 69
DANNEVIRKE HIGH SCHOOL	73% 117	83% 29	83% 44	55% 44
EPSOM	76% 210	78% 107	73% 103	0% 0
GISBORNE HIGH SCHOOL	71% 162	90% 41	88% 37	53% 84
GORE HIGH SCHOOL	83% 82	94% 25	82% 52	60% 5
HAMILTON HIGH SCHOOL	77% 145	87% 76	73% 39	56% 30
HASTINGS HIGH SCHOOL	72% 164	86% 39	76% 52	61% 73
HUTT VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL	82% 141	90% 46	90% 48	65% 47
MARLBOROUGH HIGH SCHOOL	68% 143	97% 5	97% 42	54% 96
MOUNT ALBERT GRAMMAR	80% 182	88% 94	78% 64	48% 24
OTAGO BOYS	93% 193	96% 124	88% 69	0% 0
OTAGO GIRLS	74% 202	82% 85	68% 111	59% 6
PALMERSTON NORTH BOYS	88% 134	96% 44	87% 78	64% 12
PALMERSTON NORTH GIRLS	61% 107	72% 16	70% 49	47% 42
RANGIORA HIGH SCHOOL	53% 79	87% 9	78% 6	46% 64
RONGOTAI	53% 106	89% 64	75% 42	0% 0
ROTORUA HIGH SCHOOL	75% 76	88% 19	75% 48	52% 9
SOUTH OTAGO HIGH SCHOOL	74% 71	90% 38	0% 0	56% 33
SOUTHLAND BOYS	74% 93	82% 32	72% 56	52% 5
SOUTHLAND GIRLS	78% 77	85% 19	76% 58	0% 0
TAKAPUNA GRAMMAR	80% 172	85% 65	77% 98	68% 9
THAMES HIGH SCHOOL	74% 68	84% 17	80% 21	60% 30
TIMARU BOYS	75% 119	92% 14	84% 9	72% 96
TIMARU GIRLS	68% 114	83% 19	65% 95	0% 0
WAIMATE HIGH SCHOOL	74% 48	88% 4	81% 21	65% 23
WAITAKI BOYS	68% 115	89% 23	70% 61	50% 31
WAITAKI GIRLS	70% 93	85% 16	85% 23	59% 54

WANGANUI	73%	124		85%	56		63%	68		0%	0	
WELLINGTON COLLEGE	81%	228		88%	116		73%	112		0%	0	
WELLINGTON EAST	80%	142		88%	68		72%	74		0%	0	
WELLINGTON GIRLS	66%	176		78%	28		68%	113		49%	35	
WHANGAREI HIGH SCHOOL	72%	134		92%	39		80%	38		52%	67	
BOYS		2658			1109			1202			347	
GIRLS		2642			815			1112			715	
TOTALS		5300			1924			2314			1062	

APPENDIX FOUR (continued)

PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT ON 'USUAL' SUBJECTS - FOURTH FORMS

	ALL	ACADEMIC	MODERN	OTHER								
ASHBURTON HIGH SCHOOL	89%	58		89%	17		90%	39		73%	2	
AUCKLAND GIRLS GRAMMAR	81%	178		89%	65		85%	30		73%	83	
AUCKLAND GRAMMAR	90%	291		94%	157		90%	38		82%	96	
AVONSIDE	70%	107		89%	16		83%	17		63%	74	
CHRISTCHURCH BOYS	89%	190		91%	98		87%	92		0%	0	
CHRISTCHURCH GIRLS	83%	152		96%	57		85%	58		60%	37	
CHRISTCHURCH WEST	75%	145		95%	30		89%	32		63%	83	
DANNEVIRKE HIGH SCHOOL	71%	91		87%	23		86%	29		50%	39	
EPSOM	83%	195		90%	101		77%	68		69%	26	
GISBORNE HIGH SCHOOL	75%	146		90%	25		88%	65		54%	56	
GORE HIGH SCHOOL	84%	73		94%	24		86%	19		79%	30	
HAMILTON HIGH SCHOOL	77%	111		87%	40		87%	19		63%	52	
HASTINGS HIGH SCHOOL	65%	148		74%	18		70%	53		58%	77	
HUTT VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL	85%	134		93%	29		92%	68		66%	37	
MARLBOROUGH HIGH SCHOOL	71%	105		91%	39		0%	0		59%	66	
MOUNT ALBERT GRAMMAR	82%	154		90%	92		78%	48		43%	14	
OTAGO BOYS	94%	227		96%	143		89%	84		0%	0	
OTAGO GIRLS	75%	178		84%	66		73%	49		68%	63	
PALMERSTON NORTH BOYS	85%	91		95%	41		89%	20		68%	30	
PALMERSTON NORTH GIRLS	71%	99		94%	17		83%	32		55%	50	
RANGIORA HIGH SCHOOL	59%	77		79%	9		78%	16		49%	52	
RONGOTAI	82%	89		86%	44		0%	0		78%	45	
ROTORUA HIGH SCHOOL	75%	40		96%	12		78%	17		48%	11	
SOUTH OTAGO HIGH SCHOOL	77%	53		89%	33		0%	0		56%	20	
SOUTHLAND BOYS	78%	96		87%	36		80%	22		69%	38	
SOUTHLAND GIRLS	82%	84		87%	20		86%	34		73%	30	
TAKAPUNA GRAMMAR	81%	157		87%	63		81%	27		76%	67	
THAMES HIGH SCHOOL	86%	60		94%	23		88%	26		66%	11	
TIMARU BOYS	73%	130		89%	31		75%	73		49%	26	
TIMARU GIRLS	69%	105		86%	18		83%	19		60%	68	
WAIMATE HIGH SCHOOL	72%	52		86%	5		82%	18		64%	29	
WAITAKI BOYS	69%	89		92%	16		74%	11		62%	62	

WAITAKI GIRLS	66%	84		87%	21		84%	18		49%	45	
WANGANUI	71%	107		82%	29		81%	20		63%	58	
WELLINGTON COLLEGE	78%	205		89%	106		74%	66		48%	33	
WELLINGTON EAST	81%	137		88%	59		0%	0		76%	78	
WELLINGTON GIRLS	70%	124		88%	35		79%	3		63%	86	
WHANGAREI HIGH SCHOOL	76%	103		93%	30		76%	40		59%	33	
BOYS		2396			1017			758			621	
GIRLS		2269			671			512			1086	
TOTALS		4665			1688			1270			1707	

APPENDIX FIVE

PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT ON 'USUAL' SUBJECTS

MEANS FOR ALL STREAMS:

	FORM 3	FORM 4	FORM 3 & 4
ALL SCHOOLS:	76%	79%	77%
SINGLE SEX SCHOOLS:	78%	80%	79%
MIXED SCHOOLS:	74%	76%	75%
GIRLS SCHOOLS:	72%	76%	74%
BOYS SCHOOLS:	83%	84%	83%
GIRLS IN MIXED SCHOOLS:	70%	72%	71%
BOYS IN MIXED SCHOOLS:	77%	80%	78%
GIRLS:	71%	75%	73%
BOYS:	81%	82%	82%

MEANS FOR ACADEMIC STREAMS:

	FORM 3	FORM 4	FORM 3 & 4
ALL SCHOOLS:	87%	90%	89%
SINGLE SEX SCHOOLS:	87%	91%	89%
MIXED SCHOOLS:	88%	89%	88%
GIRLS SCHOOLS:	82%	89%	85%
BOYS SCHOOLS:	91%	92%	91%
GIRLS IN MIXED SCHOOLS:	86%	88%	87%
BOYS IN MIXED SCHOOLS:	87%	90%	90%
GIRLS:	83%	88%	85%
BOYS:	90%	92%	91%

MEANS FOR MODERN STREAMS:

	FORM 3	FORM 4	FORM 3 & 4
--	--------	--------	------------

ALL SCHOOLS:	76%	83%	79%
SINGLE SEX SCHOOLS:	75%	82%	77%
MIXED SCHOOLS:	80%	84%	82%
GIRLS SCHOOLS:	70%	81%	73%
BOYS SCHOOLS:	80%	82%	81%
GIRLS IN MIXED SCHOOLS:	80%	83%	81%
BOYS IN MIXED SCHOOLS:	81%	85%	82%
GIRLS:	72%	82%	75%
BOYS:	80%	83%	81%

MEANS FOR 'OTHER' STREAMS:

	FORM 3	FORM 4	FORM 3 & 4
ALL SCHOOLS:	56%	64%	61%
SINGLE SEX SCHOOLS:	56%	66%	63%
MIXED SCHOOLS:	56%	61%	59%
GIRLS SCHOOLS:	57%	65%	63%
BOYS SCHOOLS:	51%	68%	64%
GIRLS IN MIXED SCHOOLS:	56%	60%	58%
BOYS IN MIXED SCHOOLS:	56%	64%	60%
GIRLS:	56%	63%	60%
BOYS:	55%	66%	62%

APPENDIX SIX

MINIMUM PERCENTAGE OF AVAILABLE WEEKLY HOURS REQUIRED FOR
THE 'USUAL' SUBJECTS UNDER THE 1945 SECONDARY REGULATIONS

SCHOOL	HOURS PER WEEK	THIRD FORM	FOURTH FORM
RONGOTAI	25.00	36%	30%
WELLINGTON COLLEGE	26.08	35%	29%
WAITAKI BOYS	25.33	36%	30%
SOUTHLAND BOYS	25.67	35%	29%
CHRISTCHURCH BOYS	24.60	37%	30%
AUCKLAND GRAMMAR	25.50	35%	29%
PALMERSTON NORTH BOYS	23.92	38%	31%
OTAGO BOYS	25.00	36%	30%
TIMARU BOYS	25.50	35%	29%
MOUNT ALBERT GRAMMAR	25.00	36%	30%
CHRISTCHURCH GIRLS	24.83	36%	30%

WELLINGTON GIRLS	25.00	36%	30%
TIMARU GIRLS	25.00	36%	30%
SOUTHLAND GIRLS	24.33	37%	31%
PALMERSTON NORTH GIRLS	24.97	36%	30%
WANGANUI GIRLS	25.00	36%	30%
OTAGO GIRLS	24.25	37%	31%
AVONSIDE	24.50	37%	31%
WAITAKI GIRLS	25.83	35%	29%
AUCKLAND GIRLS	25.00	36%	30%
WELLINGTON EAST GIRLS	24.27	37%	31%
EPSOM GIRLS	25.00	36%	30%
CHRISTCHURCH WEST	24.75	36%	30%
DANNEVIRKE	24.50	37%	31%
THAMES	25.00	36%	30%
SOUTH OTAGO	25.35	36%	30%
ROTORUA	25.40	35%	30%
HAMILTON	26.56	34%	28%
GISBORNE	26.67	34%	28%
MARLBOROUGH	24.00	38%	31%
WAIMATE	24.00	38%	31%
TAKAPUNA	25.74	35%	29%
ASHBURTON	26.25	34%	29%
HUTT VALLEY	25.42	35%	30%
RANGIORA	25.61	35%	29%
HASTINGS	25.14	36%	30%
WHANGAREI	26.50	34%	28%
GORE	25.83	35%	29%

APPENDIX SEVEN

MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE OF WEEKLY HOURS AVAILABLE FOR 'USUAL'
SUBJECTS UNDER 1945 SECONDARY (ie POST-THOMAS) REGULATIONS

SCHOOL	3rd & 4th FORM	% OF TIME AVAILABLE FOR 'USUAL' SUBJECTS
RONGOTAI	25.00	82%
WELLINGTON COLLEGE	26.08	83%
WAITAKI BOYS	25.33	82%
SOUTHLAND BOYS	25.67	82%
CHRISTCHURCH BOYS	24.60	82%
AUCKLAND GRAMMAR	25.50	82%
PALMERSTON NORTH BOYS	23.92	81%
OTAGO BOYS	25.00	82%
TIMARU BOYS	25.50	82%
MOUNT ALBERT GRAMMAR	25.00	82%

CHRISTCHURCH GIRLS	24.83	82%
WELLINGTON GIRLS	25.00	82%
TIMARU GIRLS	25.00	82%
SOUTHLAND GIRLS	24.33	82%
PALMERSTON NORTH GIRLS	24.97	82%
WANGANUI GIRLS	25.00	82%
OTAGO GIRLS	24.25	81%
AVONSIDE	24.50	82%
WAITAKI GIRLS	25.83	83%
AUCKLAND GIRLS	25.00	82%
WELLINGTON EAST GIRLS	24.27	81%
EPSOM GIRLS	25.00	82%
CHRISTCHURCH WEST	24.75	82%
DANNEVIRKE	24.50	82%
THAMES	25.00	82%
SOUTH OTAGO	25.35	82%
ROTORUA	25.40	82%
HAMILTON	26.56	83%
GISBORNE	26.67	83%
MARLBOROUGH	24.00	81%
WAIMATE	24.00	81%
TAKAPUNA	25.74	83%
ASHBURTON	26.25	83%
HUTT VALLEY	25.42	82%
RANGIORA	25.61	82%
HASTINGS	25.14	82%
WHANGAREI	26.50	83%
GORE	25.83	83%