CAUGHT BETWEEN TWO SCHOOLS: THE NEW ZEALAND INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL EXPERIMENT

HOWARD LEE[1] and GREGORY LEE[2]
1. *Department of Education, University of Otago*
2. *Department of Education Studies, University of Waikato*

ABSTRACT Conceived with great enthusiasm in 1922, the three year (Forms 1 to 3) junior high (later intermediate) schools have remained a controversial feature of the New Zealand education landscape. Ostensibly designed to 'bridge the gap' between the primary and post-primary schools by providing specialist courses to suit the educational needs of young adolescents, the intermediates quickly became embroiled in the 'early specialisation' versus 'exploration of aptitudes' debate. In looking to successive Directors and Ministers of Education for guidance, they found neither a clear nor consistent philosophy to justify their existence. Consequently, the schools were left to develop in their own ways in the hope that a role would somehow be found for them. With the recent restructuring of New Zealand education at a time of declining school enrolments, and as more primary schools seek to recapitate, the intermediate school sector has been forced to reassess its place in the overall education system. The current policy of the New Zealand Intermediate Schools' Principals' Association envisages intermediates being translated into four year, Form 1 to 4, 'middle schools'. This paper explores and critiques the middle school concept in light of the historical origins and changes in intermediate schooling in New Zealand since the 1920s.

INTRODUCTION

In reviewing the development and progress of the New Zealand intermediate school system in 1938, Beeby wrote:

> The cause for surprise is not that the schools should have lagged along the road but that they should have gone so far, since no-one has ever quite known where they were going.[1]

These words were strangely prophetic. Nearly 60 years later, the intermediates still are no closer to discovering and developing a clear educational philosophy and identity.

Faced with falling school rolls, a number of primary schools recently have recapitated and, in so doing, have met with strong resistance from those employed in the intermediate school sector which is itself examining ways in which to increase its share of the Form 1 and 2 'market'. The intermediates' current policy objective involves increasing the length of intermediate level schooling from two to four years and the establishment of 'middle schools' which, it is claimed, will provide "a more appropriate form of educational provision for 10-14 year olds than other existing structural arrangements".[2]

In the discussion that follows, the historical developments in intermediate schooling are outlined and evaluated in relation to the intermediates' claim that they have occupied - and continue to occupy - a unique niche in New Zealand's compulsory education sector.

A VISION UNFOLDING: PARR AND 'EDUCATIONAL EFFICIENCY'

The first junior high school in New Zealand, Kowhai Junior High, opened in 1922 amidst considerable controversy. In spite of claims to the contrary, it is clear that the reasons for the establishment and subsequent development of the junior high schools had less to do with education than with political and social stability. From the outset, James Parr, the Minister of Education who championed the reorganisation of the school system, made no secret of his intention to use the junior high schools to counter what he saw as the Bolshevik evil sweeping the world.[3] The solution he advocated was to lengthen the period of compulsory education by raising the school leaving age from 14 to 15 years[4], thereby exposing more of the nation's youth to those values that Parr believed to be central to the maintenance of the social order. He declared,

> I want to keep every boy - I do not care how dull he is - at school until he is 15. Then something can be 'knocked into' him.... This is the time for the teaching of history, civics and economics, so that children will not fall an easy prey, as so many of the half-educated do today, to the soap-box orators with their unsound doctrines. Education is not being carried far enough in this country for the safety of the democracy.[5]

What was required now, Parr declared, was a new type of school expressly designed to meet the needs of those students who were unsuited to the demands of a traditional academically oriented secondary education and/or who did not intend staying at school beyond the compulsory years.[6]

Developments overseas appeared to offer promising solutions to this problem. In particular, Parr was attracted to the system of central schools which had been developed in England during the previous decade.[7] These schools were intended to provide some measure of vocationally orientated post-primary education for those students who had completed their primary schooling but who would not advance to the secondary schools proper. The curricula of these central schools had an industrial and/or commercial bias that was "eminently practical without being vocational in any narrow sense".[8] Such a system had immense appeal for Parr and seemed to offer a solution to many of the problems concerning educational provision in New Zealand. Parr proposed that all children aged twelve or thereabouts, would be 'drafted' into one of the three different types of post-primary school on the basis of their abilities and probable future vocational destinations: the great majority of primary school leavers, he envisaged, would proceed directly to the central schools while others would enrol at the technical high schools for more definite trade training courses, thereby leaving the traditional secondary schools to concentrate on preparing a small academic elite for university entrance. Such a scheme promised greater educational efficiency since course overlap between the different post-primary

institutions would be eliminated, thus silencing those critics who had condemned the existing system as wasteful.

TEACHERS' GRADING CONFERENCE, 1920

So excited was Parr by these ideas that almost immediately upon being appointed Minister of Education he invited a group of teachers and inspectors who were attending a conference on the primary school teachers' grading scheme to discuss his proposals. Although the response from the conference participants was generally favourable, some reservations were expressed by Theo Strong, Chief Inspector of Primary Schools, who clearly was concerned at the impact that Parr's scheme might have on the schools under his control. An ardent supporter of the status quo, Strong was not impressed by the Minister's references to overseas practice, arguing that in his experience it was not possible to state a definite age at which primary education should terminate.

Notwithstanding Strong's reservations, the conference clearly was influenced by the Minister's suggestions, and on the motion of the Auckland Chief Inspector, Edward Mulgan, it was resolved,

> that the whole syllabus of instruction be recast with the object of providing for (a) the termination of the primary school course at approximately the age of 12 years; (b) the preparation of pupils for admission to the secondary schools at the age of 12 years; and (c) the establishment of central schools at which pupils who do not proceed to secondary schools will be able to continue their education up to the age of 16 years.[9]

These suggested reforms engendered widespread discussion amongst all education groups. Support for more clearly differentiated post-primary schools, each with a particular role to play in the training of future citizens, was surprisingly strong, given that the proposals clearly implied major changes in the provision of education at both the primary and post-primary levels.

CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION, 1921

Ten months after his initial approach to educationists, Parr arranged for another conference of "primary and post-primary school teachers and inspectors" specifically to consider further modifications to the existing school structure.[10] Once again he indicated his belief that post-primary education was too narrow in its aims, and that efficiency demanded the provision of courses with a more definite vocational bias than those currently provided. After lengthy discussion the conference resolved that, "In order to secure continuity of education, to provide adequately and profitably for post-primary education, and to meet *the special needs of adolescents*, the present courses of primary and secondary education must be modified particularly at their point of juncture".[11]

A subcommittee set up by the conference later recommended that the primary school course should end at about 12 years, or approximately Standard 5; that pupils aged 14 years who had not completed the primary school course be

removed to a suitable post-primary school; and that each post-primary institution offer a discrete course of instruction. While the committee agreed that 'no secondary course of instruction should be closed to any boy or girl fitted to benefit by it', it also warned that "the utmost care should be taken to direct the pupil into the course of study most profitable for him to undertake....(This committee) recommends reliance on the evidence of fitness provided partly by intelligence tests, class examinations, and the teacher's general estimate of the pupil's ability."[12] Parr was pleased with the committee's deliberations inasmuch as its recommendations were totally consistent with his own conception of the ideal organisation of education, and seemed to promise greater efficiency in educational provision. Since a stable and well-ordered society required different citizens to perform different tasks, it followed that the curriculum should be differentiated to provide courses in line with the capacities that scientific measures of ability would reveal.

MILNER REPORT, 1921

What is clear from these early proposals is the importance attached to the idea of early specialisation. One of the frequent criticisms levelled at the primary school course was that it did not prepare children adequately for either secondary education or for the work place. Now it was suggested that at about the age of 12 years children would be directed to different schools and given a different educational experience in order to prepare them more effectively for their future social and economic roles.

A different approach, however, was recommended by Frank Milner, Rector of the Waitaki Boys' High School. Asked by Parr to examine and report on developments in early post-primary education in the United States of America, Milner was particularly impressed with the junior high school system which provided a broad range of exploratory courses within which pupils could "try out" a variety of subjects to discover where their interests lay. Accordingly, he urged Parr to abandon the notion of early specialisation because "[In early adolescence] a pupil is led aside by novelty or influenced by social prestige. He needs a preliminary survey of a broad range of subjects in the junior high school and is then allowed to take intensified work in his selected province. This scheme functions directly for a more contented and efficient democracy."[13]

Having observed different types of curriculum organisation overseas, Milner concluded that the goal of social cohesion could best be achieved by a 'constants-with-variables' type of curriculum which included 'common core' subjects together with a variety of short elective courses that pupils could 'try out' before a final decision on their future educational paths was made.[14] The socially-integrative potential of this system made a deep impression on Milner who claimed that in these schools he was "repeatedly given evidence of the redemption of the retarded - the translation of the incipient Bolshevik into the usefully employed citizen who has found himself."[15] This was indeed good news for a government preoccupied with 'militant socialism' during the early post-war years.

GENERAL COUNCIL OF EDUCATION, 1921

The General Council of Education sided with Parr and Milner regarding the potential for schools to improve economic, civic and domestic efficiency. Responding to Parr's suggestions for reform, the Council recommended that three-fifths of the new Form 1 to 3 curriculum should be common to all pupils. The remaining two-fifths of the curriculum would be divided into two distinct streams: one with an academic bias (Course A) and the other more practically oriented (Course B).[16] The Council's scheme, however, was more restrictive than the American system because some degree of early specialisation was retained in the curriculum structure. To counter the potentially divisive effect of this, the Council insisted that "both courses 'A' and 'B' as well as the continuation of either of these courses for the full post-primary period of six years should be provided for in schools which offer both courses of instruction."[17] In essence, what the Council was promoting was the development of the fully comprehensive high school.

CONFERENCE ON POST-PRIMARY EDUCATION, 1922

The recommendation to establish junior high schools in New Zealand was made in March 1922 at a conference consisting of the Minister, four departmental officers, four post-primary principals and a primary school headmaster. While individual members of the conference disagreed sharply on a number of points, there was unanimous support for overhauling the existing system. Accordingly, the conference proposed that three-year junior high schools be established as stand alone units, separate from both the secondary and technical schools.[18] It also reiterated the General Council of Education's earlier recommendation that three-fifths of the curriculum be common to all pupils. However, no mention of exploratory or 'trying out' courses was made at this stage. Instead, the conference suggested that the remaining portion of the curriculum be broadened to include courses having an academic, commercial, industrial (including domestic for girls), agricultural, or art bias.[19]

THE 1922 REGULATIONS: A CONFLICT OF AIMS?

From there, matters moved quickly. Regulations governing the establishment of junior high schools were gazetted in September 1922,[20] and the following month Kowhai Junior High School opened in Auckland. In his report for that year, Parr remarked that Kowhai's curriculum had "a more vocational or practical bent than that of the secondary school...to give a more complete training for industry and commerce."[21]

While it seems that the Minister still considered the new school to be modelled on the English central school system, Robert Rudman, the first principal of Kowhai, had rather different ideas. In his view, Kowhai's function was to prepare pupils for secondary education and therefore he had no desire to admit into the school anyone considered incapable of completing a post-primary course. Consequently, within a year of Kowhai being opened, Ernest Marsden, Assistant Director of Education, felt compelled to warn the Auckland Education Board that

Rudman had an unfortunate "tendency to wish to produce pupils of high academic attainment'[22] and that this contradicted the official aim of sending out 'into industry and domestic homes...pupils with an education as useful, complete and rounded off as is possible for the time spent in the course."[23] The Department of Education therefore overturned Rudman's decision to refuse admission to any pupil who had not passed the Standard 4 examination[24] by ruling that all pupils from contributing schools who had spent a year in Standard 4, but who had failed to qualify for promotion, must be admitted to Kowhai upon reaching the age of 12.5 years.[25] Marsden justified this decision on the grounds that "the junior high school course is supposed to be designed specially to meet the case of this class of retarded pupil".[26]

It is perhaps not surprising that Rudman had a different conception of the purpose of the junior high school from that of the Department. Official statements revealed a certain lack of clarity or "confusion of thought"[27] in regard to their function. For example, while the Minister's Reports for 1923 and 1924 implied that the schools were to help pupils discover their "special aptitudes" by allowing them to 'try out' various courses, it is clear that this function was incompatible with the requirement that each pupil follow a general course of instruction and, at the same time, make an early beginning on secondary studies.[28] Furthermore, the junior high schools were obliged to prepare their pupils for the Standard 6 Proficiency Examination. Obviously it was impossible for the schools to carry out all of these diverse tasks adequately, and so choices had to be made as to which function should have priority. In the case of Kowhai, the streaming procedures in place reflected a definite policy of early specialisation.[29]

TATE REPORT, 1925

Aware that there were problems with the junior high school system, Parr commissioned Frank Tate, Director of Education for the Australian State of Victoria, to report on secondary education and its relation to the primary sector.[30] Tate was disappointed with what he discovered; in particular, the failure to "provide different types of post-primary instruction suited to the future occupational needs of the youngsters".[31] He agreed that primary schooling should end for pupils aged 12 years; that all qualified pupils be encouraged to enter the secondary schools; and that short stay pupils be provided with specialised vocationally orientated courses, preferably in separate junior high schools. Where it was impractical to establish such schools, Tate suggested that the Standards 5 and 6 curriculum be reorganised to prepare pupils for subsequent entry to "schools of special character" - for example, junior technical, domestic art, and preparatory commercial work schools.[32]

Tate concluded his report on an optimistic note. The junior high schools, he claimed, were ideally positioned "to give pupils a broad outlook upon the world's work and help them ascertain their own aptitudes, interests and abilities with reference thereto".[33] However, he stopped short of explaining how those aptitudes and abilities were to be discovered. Tate did recommend that a common core of subjects be taken by all pupils but, as Beeby pointed out, "beyond that common core, in a single-purpose school, is specialisation not exploration".[34] Essentially, Tate favoured a highly selective form of post-primary schooling such

that instead of 'bridging the gap' between the primary and secondary school the junior high school would become an end in itself for the non-academic pupil, while the bright child would proceed directly to a full academic secondary course.

SYLLABUS REVISION COMMITTEE: 1926-1928

While this scheme undoubtedly appealed to Parr, being reminiscent of his own early suggestions for reorganisation, a change in government and the appointment of new educational administrators meant that little attention was paid to Tate's report. Nevertheless, the new Minister of Education, Robert Wright, (1926-1928), was sympathetic to calls for reform, and in November 1926 he appointed a committee to review and report on the whole of the primary school syllabus. The Lawson committee was instructed to consider the desirability of modifying the Standard 5 and 6 curriculum to provide for an earlier commencement of post-primary subjects and exploratory courses.

In presenting its report in April 1928, the Committee noted that because it had been unable to reach agreement on a number of important issues - including the subject of separate junior high schools - it was forwarding both a majority and a minority report.[35] The majority report of 16 members reaffirmed the view that primary schooling should terminate at the age of 12; that all pupils should then be transferred to a post-primary school; and, like the Tate Report, that separate schools should be provided in the towns for those pupils who were likely to leave school before their fifteenth birthday. Although the majority committee was alert to the reality that different types of schooling arrangements created "distinctions which are educationally unsound and socially undesirable"[36], it continued to advocate a differentiated post-primary schooling model whereby pupils were allocated to a post-primary school on the basis of the age at which they intended to finish their education.

The minority report of three lay members, however, was vehemently opposed to the junior high schools because they "destroyed articulation" between the primary and post-primary sectors.[37] It urged the Minister "not to sacrifice the primary schools - and the child - on the altar of costly and unsound experimentation",[38] and recommended that the curriculum prescribed for Standards 5 and 6 be modified and enriched to allow for the earlier commencement of post-primary subjects. Although the minority committee was aware of the dangers inherent in early specialisation and argued that it was "fundamentally fallacious to suggest that the aptitude and bent of a child can be infallibly ascertained at 11 years",[39] as with all the previous commentators, however, it failed to explain how any real exploration of aptitudes could be combined with the earlier commencement of secondary subjects.

ATMORE REPORT, 1930

The confusion over the primary function of the junior high school finally was resolved when Harry Atmore, the newly appointed Minister of Education, commissioned yet another investigation into "all matters relating to public instruction generally". From the outset it was apparent that the Atmore Committee's perception of the junior high schools was markedly different from

that originally envisaged by Parr. Whereas Parr had seen nothing incompatible or problematic in having early specialisation and exploratory courses operating alongside one another within the one institution, the Atmore Committee did. Accordingly, the committee urged that the Minister abandon early specialisation in the junior high schools in favour of exploratory courses in which the "special aptitudes of the pupils may be discovered and developed".[40] After eight years of uncertainty, it now seemed that the junior high schools were to be established as a permanent institution in New Zealand education, with a purpose uniquely their own.

RETHINKING POLICY: THE 1932 REGULATIONS AND THE 'LOST' THIRD FORM

On 15 December 1932 notice was served by Order-in-Council that the policy laid down by Parr a decade earlier, that the junior high schools be three-year institutions straddling the last two years of the primary school course and the first year of the secondary (or technical), was to be extensively revised, without prior warning.[41] From that date the course length was reduced from three to two years; the junior high schools were renamed intermediate schools or departments (when attached to secondary schools); and less liberal staffing ratios and salary scales were introduced.[42]

Commenting on these changes in his 1938 survey of intermediate schooling, Beeby stated that the reasons given for the abrupt change in policy direction were vague and "not very satisfying".[43] In like manner, Watson, writing on the intermediate school phenomenon 26 years later, agreed that both the purpose and suddenness of the new regulations were "mysterious to say the least".[44] Nevertheless, we shall argue that while the situation undoubtedly was complex, if not confusing at times, closer inspection of the historical record, coupled with an understanding of the social and educational contexts in which the changes had been made, offers a more sophisticated (and arguably fuller) account of the reasons that underlay the 1932 policy change than those offered to date.

Following the announcement of the new regulations, the Minister of Education, Robert Masters (1931-1934), outlined the 'exploratory' function of intermediate schooling in his 1933 Report. He wrote,

> The aim of the intermediate school is to remove pupils at the age of eleven or twelve from the environment of the primary school and place them in separate schools or in departments attached to post-primary schools where they will be given the opportunities of displaying their natural aptitudes, inclinations and interests, and of indicating whether they should continue their education at a secondary school for academic or professional courses, or at a technical school for vocational courses in industry, commerce, or the domestic arts.[45]

The Director of Education, T.B. Strong (1927-1933), was more forthcoming:

> If pupils remained for a third year in the intermediate school there would be a tendency for them to regard their education as finished at

> the end of their third year, and they would not be so likely to link up with the part-time evening instruction provided in the technical schools. The principle underlying the adoption of a two-year intermediate course is a very important one: it is that the school system should be so organised as to make education a continuous process. This aim would certainly not be realised by introducing into the system a school unit that tends to become an 'end-in-itself'....The educational stream should not divide until the aptitudes and inclinations of the pupils have been discovered at the end of the intermediate school stage.[46]

From this point on, all official pronouncements on intermediate schooling emphasised the importance of the exploratory course and the need for the Department to "devise a method by which the aptitudes of [intermediate school] children will be discovered as soon as possible and will be developed as rapidly as possible".[47]

Ironically, Strong's argument that two-year intermediate schooling would make education a 'continuous' and not a terminal process is all the more confusing when judged against the reality that fewer than half of the children remained at school beyond their fourteenth birthday as required under the compulsory attendance legislation then in force.[48] With the majority of fourteen year olds leaving school from Form 1 or 2, the intermediate was in point of fact an 'end-in-itself' school and not a preparatory one. Until such time as the retention rate improved and more pupils undertook post-primary schooling, the name 'intermediate school', suggesting as it did an educational institution positioned between the primary and secondary school, remained as inaccurate as it was misleading.

To make matters worse, Strong admitted to being uncertain about the philosophy underpinning intermediate schooling. On the one hand, he rejected Parr's view that these schools should provide academically able pupils with the opportunity for an early beginning to secondary subjects; e.g. foreign languages, mathematics, and science.[49] On the other hand, however, he made no secret of his belief that the concept of 'exploratory' courses was equally troublesome.[50] The lack of a definite philosophy behind intermediate schooling meant that these schools were destined to remain in some sort of educational wasteland.

The attempt to combine in a single institution the two incompatible functions of early specialisation and the exploration of pupil aptitudes, Campbell suggests, arose from a "failure to adapt and synthesise ideas borrowed from abroad".[51] New Zealand drew heavily upon intermediate schooling theory from England and America to buttress the indeterminate status of its own intermediates. Campbell summarises the position thus:

> From England was derived the idea that the main purpose of the intermediate school was to provide for an early beginning with secondary subjects (such as foreign languages) and with commercial and technical subjects. From the United States came the idea that the school should be primarily exploratory in purpose, a place in which

> children could 'try themselves out' before embarking on specialised courses.[52]

Although the main emphasis in official educational statements prior to the change in intermediate school regulations in 1932 had been on early specialisation, and thereafter on exploratory courses, it was generally accepted - if not expected - that the schools would carry out both of these functions simultaneously.[53] Herein lay the wide gulf between intermediate school policy and practice. No explanations were forthcoming as to *how* intermediate school children were to cope with the numerous demands being made on their time: first, they were expected to cover the full course laid down for Standards 5 and 6 in the ordinary primary schools, including preparation for the Proficiency Examination that gave entrance to 'free place' secondary education; second, to commence secondary school studies; and, finally, to test themselves 'experimentally' on a fairly wide range of other activities.[54] To this problem was added another - the wholly nebulous concept of 'exploration'. Staffing reductions, coupled with a lack of equipment and resources - much of this the result of the 'Regulations for Intermediate Schools' issued in 1932 - in practice served to obstruct the development of the 'exploratory' side of intermediate schooling.[55]

Pressed by opposition politicians for an explanation of the change in regulations in 1932, the Prime Minister (George Forbes) responded by refusing to allow the Education Committee of the House to scrutinise the new intermediate school proposals.[56] In the absence of any public disclosure, speculation was rife.

It has sometimes been suggested that the decision to change from a three to a two year intermediate school course was made at the behest of the secondary school authorities (i.e. boards of governors) who understandably were most anxious to avoid losing their third formers to the new intermediates.[57] Evidence for this claim is readily available. Declaring that the junior high schools could "rob them of their third form pupils" and thereby seriously affect "the whole tone and morale of the [high] schools", the Otago High Schools' Board of Governors in 1930 urged the government to "preserve the true identity and character" of the secondary schools by continuing with the existing practice of transferring "the best" pupils to its schools at the end of Form 2.[58]

But other explanations also exist. During periods of economic uncertainty and depression, attention is drawn to retrenching in those areas regarded by the state as being unnecessarily expensive. As provided for in the *Finance Act* of 1931, the salaries of civil servants and teachers were cut by 10 per cent in April; education boards' funding allocations were reduced; subsidies to public and school libraries were abolished; and other 'economies' introduced, such as the prohibition of land purchases for, and the construction of, school buildings.[59] With economic conditions worsening, the government appointed a National Economy (Shirtcliffe) Commission early in 1932. Its interim report was released in March of that year, and its final report published four months later.[60] Many of the Commission's recommendations were implemented immediately and hit the education sector especially hard.[61] With economic considerations uppermost in its mind, the Forbes government was not about to introduce any measures that would add to the cost of education.[62] Any proposals for reform, therefore, were to be judged against the criterion of cost savings.

Paradoxically, the fact that the regional education boards had survived the retrenchment process paved the way for the introduction of two-year intermediate schooling on the grounds of administrative, if not financial, expediency. Most of the education boards, whose task it was to administer the primary sector, had been unenthusiastic about the junior high schools when they began to be established from 1922.[63] Much of the reason for this involved the contentious issue of administrative control. The *Education Act* of 1924 had authorised the further establishment of junior high schools under their own administrative authority; namely, junior high school boards.[64] This meant that now there were to be four autonomous bodies responsible for administering primary and post-primary education: education boards (for primary and district high schools), junior high school boards, boards of governors (secondary schools) and boards of managers (technical schools and technical high schools). The 1932 regulations, however, suddenly abandoned the concept of a separate 'intermediate unit' (and board) between the primary and post-primary schools, and from this point on the intermediate schools were placed under direct education board control and staffed almost entirely by primary trained teachers.[65]

The advantages of two-year intermediate schools were said to be many. First, since competition between the primary and post-primary schools for Form 3 pupils would be eliminated, administrative friction would disappear.[66] Second, by retaining the third forms within the post-primary system, the need for drastic and costly reorganisation was avoided.[67] Finally, with Form 3 pupils accounting for approximately one-third of all post-primary school enrolments, their removal from this sector would have resulted in much smaller, and presumably less efficient, institutions.[68] Moreover, the impact on capitation grants, staffing and salaries would also have been marked.[69] Given that there was no shortage of accommodation in the post-primary schools - between 1930 and 1933 post-primary enrolments actually declined by 9 per cent - it seemed only logical to allow them to keep their third form classes.[70]

On balance, and in retrospect, the 1932 regulations can be viewed as an attempt to formalise existing intermediate schooling practice. In 1932, there were 10 junior high schools in New Zealand: nine were attached to other schools (i.e. six to secondary, and one each to a primary, district high and technical high school), with Kowhai still the only separate three-year school a decade after regulations for them had been gazetted.[71] The issue now was whether or not the junior high (intermediate) schools should, as a matter of general policy, be attached to the existing post-primary schools or operate as stand-alone institutions. As one might expect, the conflict of interests between the primary and post-primary sectors was far from being resolved.

REACTION TO THE 1932 REGULATIONS

Incensed at the lack of consultation over the 1932 policy decision and the dictatorial manner of both the Director and Minister of Education, the teacher unions were quick to notify the government of their concerns. For its part, the New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI), although never unanimously supportive of the junior high school movement,[72] nevertheless officially endorsed its continuation on the lines originally planned in 1922. At its May 1933

Conference, the NZEI Executive urged the government to postpone the introduction of the new regulations pending an improvement in the country's financial position.[73] The Conference resolved to oppose the reduction of the course from three to two years on the grounds that "a three years' course is necessary to uncover the interests, aptitudes and capacities of pupils and start each upon studies leading to a suitable goal".[74] The NZEI membership also objected to what they viewed as being "inequitable and unjustifiable" intermediate school staffing and salary scales, and called for "unification of control" to enable primary, intermediate and post-primary schools to "form one continuous system through which the child can pass without disastrous breaks".[75] Despite remits being circulated among NZEI branches throughout the country and further, lengthy correspondence with the Education Minister, the case for the continuation of the pre-1932 situation was lost.[76]

A similar plea was made by the Primary School Headmasters' Association in December 1933. Admitting that its members were divided over the desirability of intermediate schools *per se* - in particular, they were concerned about the effects of decapitation on the primary school rolls - the Association agreed to follow the NZEI's lead and support their continuation at the same time as criticising the reduction of course length to two years.[77]

The Secondary Schools' Association (SSA) also sided with the NZEI. Intermediate education, the Association complained, was "being introduced without a definite philosophy behind it".[78] There were other criticisms of intermediate schooling: poor staffing and salaries, the lack of teacher training, inadequate classroom equipment, and curriculum deficiencies.[79] Although the Association endorsed the general NZEI policy that transfer from the primary schools should occur at about the age of 11 years, they parted company on the question of *location*; the secondary teachers wanted intermediates attached to post-primary schools.[80] In an attempt to reach some kind of consensus regarding intermediate schooling, the Association resolved that a thorough, independent survey of the matter should be undertaken "to ascertain exactly what function the intermediate school is to perform in the (education) system".[81]

With the full backing of the NZEI and the TSTA (Technical School Teachers' Association),[82] the Minister of Education (Peter Fraser) in July 1936 invited the newly established New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) to survey the intermediate school system "with a view to evaluating the system as at present established in New Zealand".[83] The Council agreed to Fraser's request and asked its Director, Dr Clarence Beeby, to undertake the work personally.[84] The report - *The Intermediate Schools of New Zealand* - was published in 1938.

By this time there was considerable overseas interest in the New Zealand intermediate school phenomenon. Visiting New Zealand in 1935, Professor (later Sir) Fred Clarke of the University of London's Institute of Education expressed his intense dislike of two-year intermediate schooling on the grounds that no school should be regarded simply as a 'bridge' between two other schools. Instead, he suggested that each school be autonomous in terms of the particular function(s) it was to perform.[85] In like manner, Dr William Boyd, Head of Glasgow University's Education Department, in addressing the New Education Fellowship (NEF) Conference held in New Zealand in July 1937, blamed the intermediate system for

the "incompetent muddle" and the "grievous lack of co-ordination" that existed between the primary and post-primary education spheres.[86]

THE PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION AND ITS 'SHADOW'

Much of the blame for the intermediate school's lack of success was attributed to the Proficiency Examination which had long been criticised for dominating the primary school course in general and Form 2 work in particular.[87] In practice, while the intermediates were expected to do all that the primary schools did and more - i.e. to provide for the 'exploration of aptitudes' - the public's and employer's considerable faith in the Proficiency Examination as a hallmark of a school's success meant that there was little opportunity for anything of an experimental/exploratory and non-examinable nature to be pursued in classrooms.[88]

The 1932 regulations had done nothing to relieve the intermediates from burdensome examination requirements:

> All pupils in an intermediate school or intermediate department shall for approximately seventeen hours per week receive instruction in English, arithmetic, history and civics, geography, elementary science, drawing, singing and physical education, and the instruction shall follow on broad lines the prescriptions for Forms 1 and 2 in the Syllabus of Instruction for public (primary) schools. During the remaining portion of the school week all pupils shall receive manual or home arts instruction for not less than one and a half hours weekly, and also a supplementary course of instruction chosen from the following courses: Academic, commercial, agricultural, art, or manual training.[89]

In actual fact, so great were the demands on intermediate school teachers to provide instruction in the ordinary primary school subjects leading up to the Proficiency Examination that few dared to devote more than two hours per week to exploring aptitudes and giving an early start to secondary school subjects.[90]

Economic constraints also meant that intermediates were inadequately equipped to carry out their 'exploratory' function. Even if materials had been provided, it is most likely that timetabling and examination pressures would have limited the teachers' freedom to experiment with different subjects and to make full use of the facilities available.[91] An even more serious difficulty was that of staffing; many intermediate teachers struggled unaided and often alone, desperately seeking direction about policy, methodology, and practical means by which to implement the poorly-defined 'exploration of aptitudes' policy.[92] A related complication was that career-conscious teachers in the intermediates remained but a short time because greater promotional opportunities were to be had in the primary service.[93]

Welcoming the abolition of the Proficiency Examination in September 1937, Beeby declared that this was "the biggest step yet taken towards real intermediate education".[94] Disappointment quickly set in, however. The theoretical freedom promised by its abolition should have made for a better articulation between the primary and post-primary sectors, a more expansive curriculum, more attention

to individual needs, and a greater emphasis on aesthetic, practical, and social experiences,[95] but for a considerable time to come the old practices persisted and the pedagogical reforms hoped for were slow to arrive.

BEEBY'S 'INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS OF NEW ZEALAND' (1938)

Beeby's report on intermediate schooling was the first comprehensive and systematic investigation of the New Zealand intermediate 'experiment' that had begun 16 years earlier. Having surveyed in considerable detail the historical origins of intermediates, Beeby confidently declared that the absence of a coherent policy regarding the functions that these schools were expected to perform constituted "the greatest single obstacle" to their development.[96] Devoid of direction, he believed that successive Ministers and Directors of Education had simply been content to allow the schools to develop along their own lines.[97]

Of the 29 recommendations made by Beeby[98] the first was the least surprising since it reflected the status quo. "Based in part upon what the intermediate school is, but even more upon what it might be", he proposed that the system be "continued and extended".[99] Next, Beeby outlined seven specific functions for New Zealand intermediates:

- To provide a socially integrative period of schooling for all children passing through the public school system at a point before they diverge along specialised lines...that will give all future citizens a common basis of experience and knowledge. No other function should be allowed to interfere with this.
- To introduce all children gradually and sympathetically to the world of industry, commerce, and the professions....
- To help every child to a rational choice of future school course and occupation based on a knowledge of his own aptitudes and interests, and on the nature of the work involved.
- To give a rounded-off education to children not intending to take a reasonably complete post-primary course.
- To assist children who are not going on to post-primary school to secure suitable employment, and to provide education for them until such employment is found.
- To provide for the children continuing schooling to a higher level an environment mid-way between that of the primary school and that of the post-primary.
- To continue teaching the fundamental tools of learning to individual children when necessary.[100]

In the remaining 27 recommendations on intermediate schooling, Beeby went on to discuss matters such as control, method of establishment, optimum size, age of entry, attachment versus independence, length of course, classification of entrants, organisation of the curriculum, staffing, equipment, exploration of aptitudes, and name.[101] As a final touch Beeby suggested that intermediates be renamed 'junior high schools', to "emphasise the fact that the school has a function

of its own which can be satisfactorily exercised only if it is given a status equal to that of other schools within the system".[102]

In the light of these recommendations, the differing opinions held by primary, intermediate and post-primary teachers alike, and all of the difficulties mentioned by Beeby in his report, one is left with the distinct impression that he felt duty-bound to support the Labour government's policy of continuing with intermediate schooling. The growth in the number of new intermediates built and enrolments thereat, coupled with the fact that the education sector was not wholly convinced of their educational advantages, led successive governments after 1938 to question seriously both the viability and direction of the intermediate schooling movement.

DEVELOPMENTS POST 1938

Soon after the outbreak of the Second World War in September 1939, the newly appointed Director of Education (Beeby) made it clear that wartime stringencies would delay the development of separate intermediate schools. Intermediates, he stated, would be established only when communities could satisfy the Department that their existing primary schools were genuinely overcrowded.[103] Acting on one of the recommendations in his 1938 report, Beeby appointed an intermediate school planning officer in 1941 whose chief responsibility was to survey school accommodation needs in all the main cities, towns and townships.[104] Such a task involved the compilation of data relating to school enrolment trends, accommodation needs of existing schools, staffing, and statistical predictions of the likely population growth rates of those areas where new intermediates were being requested.[105] After consultation with the appropriate education board, the report was sent on to the Department for its consideration.

When Beeby's intermediate school study was released in 1938 there were 16 intermediates (5 independent and 11 attached to post-primary schools) with a combined roll of 4523 pupils.[106] Five years later there were 23 intermediates (12 independent and 11 attached), with 8670 pupils in attendance.[107] As a consequence of this expansion, the Department broke its silence on intermediate schooling in April 1943 and placed on public record its opinion regarding the type of scholastic programme, corporate life, and internal organisation needed to make such a school 'successful'.[108] The intermediate schooling philosophy outlined by the Department, as might have been anticipated, was entirely consistent with the 1932 regulations and Beeby's 1938 report.[109]

Beeby was careful to point out that since the Department preferred two-year, separate intermediates, there would be no need for "earlier specialisation on post-primary subjects such as foreign languages, mathematics, book-keeping, shorthand and typing".[110] His resistance to early specialisation can best be understood in terms of the Labour government's stated commitment to the twin goals of democracy and equality in education, its deep concern about the lack of control/discipline being exercised over adolescents in wartime, and its decision to raise the school leaving age from 14 to 15 years from 1944.[111] What this meant in practical terms was that more pupils could be expected to appear in the Form 2 classes of primary and intermediate schools and in the lower forms of all three

types of post-primary school (i.e. secondary, district high and technical high). That this in fact happened is now a matter of historical record.[112]

After World War II, the circumstances surrounding the establishment and growth of intermediate education changed dramatically, largely as a result of the colossal expansion in the school-age population, the lengthening of schooling and school attendance, and the growth of the suburbs. Alongside these increases came the need for more teachers, new school buildings, and additional resources, all of which meant additional educational expenditure. Against this background, the newly elected (late 1949) National government announced that it would carefully audit the Education budget to determine whether or not money was being spent prudently.[113] Part of that inquiry involved an assessment of the place and cost of intermediates in the New Zealand education system.[114]

THE ALGIE YEARS: 1949-1957

Doubts about the purpose and future of intermediate education finally were confirmed in 1950 when the new Minister of Education, Ronald Algie, addressed the House and frankly admitted that although intermediates "did not fit smoothly into the present pattern of our education system" he would not recommend their closure.[115] What was needed, he reasoned, was "a good objective investigation" into the existing system to see how it might be improved and to settle the controversial question of "the break" between primary and post-primary schooling.[116] Four years later, with the full support of the NZEI and its Executive, the NZCER was asked to undertake such an evaluation, the results of which were released in 1964 with the publication of John Watson's book, *Intermediate Schooling in New Zealand*.[117]

In the meantime, the Minister's apparent lack of commitment to intermediate schools drew an immediate response from the NZEI. In October 1950 the NZEI President wrote to Algie, claiming that intermediates were cost-effective institutions and welcoming any inquiry into costs provided that the relative costs of establishing primary and post-primary schools were also included in the analysis.[118] Within six months the NZEI Executive had compiled a report on intermediate schools and sent it to the Minister. In what amounted to a reaffirmation of its traditional policy, the Institute claimed that because intermediates were less expensive than the alternatives the government should endorse three-year independent schools under education board control.[119] The Institute also signalled its opposition to early specialisation on three grounds: first, that it took intermediate-age children "into an environment suited to older adolescents"; second, that it "makes them junior members of a new age group"; and, finally, that it "fixes the course of later educational development before the needs of children can be safely diagnosed".[120]

But continued expansion of the intermediate school system did not find favour with the Post-Primary Teachers' Association (PPTA). At its annual conference in August 1951, the Association urged the Minister to appoint a consultative committee along the lines of the Thomas Committee (1942-1943) to investigate the position of intermediates.[121] Although the Minister rejected the idea of a consultative committee, he did convene a conference on intermediate education two months later to which numerous primary, intermediate, and high

school headmasters were invited. The conference strongly endorsed the status quo, much to the satisfaction of the Department.[122] Now, for the first time, Algie's own views on intermediates were relayed to conference participants. Intermediates, he announced, were "an integral part of the education system" that should seek to remain independent of the primary and post-primary schools.[123] Moreover, he envisaged intermediates offering courses of varying lengths in line with their pupils' future destinations. Thus, pupils who intended going on to a post-primary school would take a two-year course while those wishing to leave school at age 15 would stay for three years.[124]

Despite Beeby's assurance that the fundamental principles upon which the intermediate school system had been built were still as sound and relevant as they had been in the mid 1940s,[125] the PPTA remained unconvinced. It argued that not only were intermediate schools expensive but also that there was no justification at all for a separate school inserted between the primary and post-primary stages.[126] Finally, as mentioned earlier, the PPTA recommended that the NZCER undertake a thorough and independent investigation to evaluate the New Zealand intermediate schooling system. A brief summary of the principal findings and conclusions was released to the Currie Commission in February 1960, with the full report completed three years later.[127]

During Algie's eight-year tenure as Minister of Education the number of intermediates had risen from 28 (17 independent and 11 departments), to 48 (36 independent and 12 departments), with every indication of further expansion occurring over the next few years.[128] As more intermediate schools were established and "proved their worth", Beeby confidently reported that "the old controversies about them flare up less often".[129] Furthermore, he recognised that the rapid growth in the number of pupils who remained at school until at least their fifteenth birthday meant that intermediates had become "less concerned with the job of helping children to make a wise choice of their future career" and more interested in easing the transition to post-primary schooling.[130]

Overseas commentators, however, were less confident about the purpose of the New Zealand intermediates. Appointed in September 1953, the Wyndham Committee on New South Wales secondary education reported its views to expatriate Robert Heffron, Minister of Education, on 28 October 1957. The Committee dismissed the New Zealand intermediate school system as educationally unsound. Their report concluded that "The New Zealand 'intermediate school' does not appear to offer any real solution to the problem [of secondary school reorganisation]...[it] would appear to be suspended between the primary and the secondary school and to be properly integrated with neither."[131]

Interestingly, no mention was made of the Wyndham Committee's conclusions by the New Zealand primary and post-primary teachers' organisations, although it is clear that the Committee's observations were entirely consistent with those of the PPTA.

THE CURRIE COMMISSION (1962)

In the face of mounting public and political criticism regarding 'falling standards' in the New Zealand state education system, the 'poor quality' of school leavers, shortages in staffing and pupil accommodation, and the escalating cost of

educational provision, the government conceded that a "general survey of the organisation, the methods and the results of our system, its present achievements and future prospects, was necessary and, indeed, overdue".[132] Set up by the Minister of Education, Philip Skoglund, in February 1960, the Commission on Education (known also as the Currie Commission) published its *Interim Report on Post-Primary Staffing and Recruitment* in July 1960 and a much longer (850-page) report two years later.[133] The Commission's terms of reference were wide: "to consider the publicly-controlled system of primary, post-primary and technical education in relation to the present and future needs of the country".[134] Although the terms made no specific reference to intermediate schools, the Commissioners had been instructed "to inquire into the aims and purposes of the curricula" and "the organisation and scope of the school system",[135] and therefore were able to include some discussion of intermediate schooling in their report.[136]

The Commissioners began their discussion of intermediate schooling by noting that attempts to provide a curriculum to meet the needs of all pupils, not just those who were academically inclined, had been both slow and controversial.[137] Nonetheless, they confidently believed that the point had now been reached where there was considerable public support for retaining the intermediate schooling system.[138] Intermediates, they claimed, offered many educational advantages over primary schools: better classification of pupils; a smoother passage of pupils from primary to secondary schooling; specialist tuition, particularly in subjects such as music, art, physical education, and manual subjects; and they were "more economical and efficient", both educationally and financially.[139] Such was the confidence in the future of two-year intermediates that the Commissioners predicted that within 10 years they would "embrace most (11 plus to 13 plus) pupils in cities, large towns, and thickly settled country districts".[140]

Of the Commission's 14 recommendations on intermediate education 13 were virtually identical to those arrived at by Beeby 24 years earlier.[141] Where the Commissioners and Beeby parted company, however, was over the question of early specialisation. Unlike Beeby, the Commission envisaged secondary education beginning in Form 1 at an average age of 11+, thereby enabling the early introduction of secondary school subjects.[142] The Currie Commissioners' recommendations on intermediates were echoed in Watson's longitudinal survey of 45 intermediate schools and departments two years later.[143]

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLING AFTER CURRIE

Commenting on intermediate schooling trends over the years 1935-1960, the Currie Commission observed that the number of independent intermediates had risen from 5 to 51 while the number of attached intermediates had fallen from 11 to 8.[144] The number and proportion of Form 1 and 2 pupils attending intermediate schools over the same period testified to their rapid expansion. In 1935 there were 4277 pupils in intermediate schools and departments. Twenty-five years later there were 31,449 pupils; i.e. an increase of 635 per cent.[145] Pupils attending intermediate schools accounted for 9.1 per cent of all Form 1 and 2 enrolments in 1935 and 36.3 per cent by 1960.[146] Thereafter, the rate of growth was even more remarkable.

Within ten years of the Currie Report being released the number of intermediate schools built and enrolments thereat had doubled.[147] Alongside this growth was the realisation that a much higher proportion of the primary school population than in the past were going on to secondary school and remaining there beyond the 15 year old compulsory school leaving age. As a direct consequence of this increased retention, the education system was confronted with the challenge of providing courses of instruction for a very diverse student population. The (National) government turned to the public and educationists for help.

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE: 1973-1974

At the end of 1971, the Minister of Education (Brian Talboys) announced that an Educational Priorities Conference would be held to undertake four tasks: "to review existing policies in education; to consider proposals for further educational development; to take full account of the financial and other implications of existing policies and the introduction of new ones; and to recommend priorities for further educational developments with regard to the share of the national resources that could realistically be allocated to education during the next decade".[148] The Advisory Council on Educational Planning, chaired by Professor Frank Holmes of Victoria University (Wellington), was asked to act as the steering committee of the Conference.[149] The Conference first met in August 1972, and three working parties were set up to work on educational aims and objectives, improving learning and teaching, and the organisation and administration of education.[150] Three months later there was a change of government and Philip Amos, the new Minister of Education, announced that the Priorities Conference would be replaced by an Educational Development Conference (EDC) whose task would be to invite wider community participation. Seminars were organised in 30 regions throughout the country in May 1974, and over 8000 submissions were received from the study groups, seminars, public meetings, and from private individuals, business groups, and education organisations.[151] The Advisory Council's secretariat categorised and summarised the opinions of the 60,000 Conference participants, and these were published in 1975.

Although the EDC Conference did not address intermediate schooling in particular, the report of the working party on 'Improving Learning and Teaching' (the Lawrence Report) did examine the 'discontinuity' between the primary and secondary schools. It concluded that the transition function of intermediates "affected the efficiency of learning and teaching", and cited the lack of a "unified teaching profession" as the reason why many of the Currie Commission's recommendations on intermediate schools had not been implemented.[152] The Advisory Council's summary report, *Directions for Educational Development*, also devoted some space to discussing intermediate schooling. Although the Council did not appraise the advantages and disadvantages of intermediate schooling, and seemingly chose to ignore the strong opposition to their continued existence from most of those making submissions, it declined to recommend their abolition in the belief that such schools "offered a pragmatic solution to a number of problems".[153]

At the same time as the Education Development Conference was being organised, a dispute arose between the Minister of Education (Amos) and the NZEI concerning the effectiveness and length of intermediate schooling in New Zealand. Writing in the November 1973 issue of *National Education*, the NZEI President (Roy Norman) declared that:

> No sector of the education system has been so closely and so often scrutinised as have the intermediate schools....It is significant that each investigation has confirmed the value of intermediate schools and what contributions they make to children's education... Mr Amos should realise that the kind of statement he has made undermines the confidence and tends to create confusion within the educational system.[154]

Furthermore, Norman concluded, the NZEI's position was entirely consistent with the findings of the Currie Commission and Watson, both of whom had recommended that the two-year age span was appropriate and that the intermediate schooling system was effective.[155]

Replying to Norman the following month, the Minister expressed surprise that his comments should have evoked such an outburst. Explaining his position in a letter to the NZEI National Secretary, Amos reasoned that because intermediates dealt with children at such a critical time in their development, "we need to know whether the changes of the past decade are fully meeting the wide range of intellectual and human needs of the 68,000 pupils in those schools".[156] But the exchange did not end there. In October 1974 the PPTA published two provocative articles in its *Journal*. In the first, Kenneth Rae took exception to the NZEI President's comment that intermediate schools had been studied carefully and not found wanting, and instead argued for even greater scrutiny of their functions.[157] The second article, by James Irving, concluded that the lack of a unified teaching profession and the fact that both the NZEI and PPTA had vested interests in intermediate schooling was "one of the greatest imponderables in solving the problem of the place of the intermediate school in New Zealand".[158] In an attempt to encourage dialogue between the two teacher unions, and to minimise the division existing between them on the matter of intermediate education, the Minister set up yet another conference in 1974 - the Futuna Conference.

FUTUNA CONFERENCE, 1974

The Conference identified six objectives for Form 1 and 2 education. Intermediate schools and their teachers were encouraged to help each child to develop a positive self-image and sense of identity; to foster the growth of individuality; to develop social awareness and appreciation of human values; to develop a sense of responsibility in children for their own behaviour; to foster a school climate where there was mutual respect between pupils and teachers; and to provide a school curriculum which recognised each child's physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development.[159] Arguably, these recommendations shed little

additional light on the distinctive functions of intermediate schools because they could be seen to apply equally to *any* level of the schooling system.

NATIONAL SURVEY OF INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS (1976)

In the face of further growth at the intermediate school level - by 1976 there were 77,315 pupils (71.6 per cent of all Form 1 and 2 pupils) attending 140 intermediates[160] - the Department of Education decided to appoint a committee to conduct a national survey of intermediate schools. Formed in August 1975, the three-person committee (James Milburn, John Magee, Kenneth McKay), all of whom were intermediate school principals, subsequently visited 130 of the 140 intermediates and interviewed principals and staff. Their findings were reported to the Intermediate Principals' Association Conference in November 1976 and published the following year.[161]

The Committee was instructed to investigate a number of matters relating to intermediate education: school organisation; curriculum development; pupil guidance and counselling; community and parental involvement; and cooperation with contributing primary schools.[162] The survey results echoed the conclusions arrived at by all of the studies undertaken on intermediate schooling to date; i.e. that intermediates provided a distinctive education in accordance with the particular learning needs of 11-13 year olds.[163] The majority of principals and staff interviewed claimed that the greatest advantage of intermediate schooling was its "ability to meet the social and emotional needs" of the 11-13 year age group.[164] Asked to comment on the distinctive nature of the programmes offered, most staff replied that it was the variety of cultural and sporting activities that marked the intermediates out as being unique.[165]

Turning to the 'exploratory' function of intermediate schooling, the Committee argued that "the wider range of pupil interests and maturity has heightened the importance of using the two years as a time to allow pupils to discover aptitudes and interests...and undertake an extensive range of experiences in music and the arts".[166] To facilitate this aim, the Committee recommended that the Department provide clearer policy direction and curriculum guidelines, more resources, better career guidance and counselling for pupils, and strengthened teacher training programmes.[167]

Reviewing their findings, the Committee acknowledged that intermediates still were surrounded in controversy because of the great *"difficulty in defining to the public the nature of the added dimension provided by Intermediate education".*[168] The issue was further complicated by the existence of regional, rural-urban, and social stratification differences between all of the intermediates surveyed. Consequently, the Committee noted that it was no longer possible to "generalise about the nature of the Intermediate school population: there appears to be not one, but several".[169] But generalise it did.

INTERMEDIATES IN DECLINE: 1976-1989

Unbeknown to the Milburn Committee, the popularity of intermediate schools had peaked in 1976. Thereafter, their share of the Form 1 and 2 'market' began to decline: in 1976, intermediates held 71.6 per cent of the total Form 1 and 2

population; by 1989, it had dropped to 65.9 per cent.[170] Although the number of intermediate schools had increased slowly between 1976 and 1989 (from 140 to 149 schools), the number of enrolments fell sharply, from 77,315 to 60,774 over the same period.[171]

In the light of these data, the New Zealand Intermediate Schools' Principals' Association in 1989 surveyed parents' views on the effectiveness of the intermediate schooling system.[172] Of the 130 schools that were sent questionnaires, 99 (76 per cent) responded.[173] Most of the respondents (71 per cent) thought that two years at intermediate school was "long enough"; the remainder felt that their children should remain longer.[174] Summarising all of the 22,714 responses received, the report noted that support for intermediates was far from unanimous. Forty-two per cent of the replies expressed positive support for intermediates whereas forty-four per cent stated that they either did not like these schools or that they would prefer some alternative arrangement.[175]

THE SCENE SINCE 1989

As a result of the Labour government's decision to restructure the administration of primary and secondary education, the Picot Taskforce was established in July 1987. Its report, *Administering for Excellence*, was published in April 1988. Four months and 20,000 submissions later, the government released its blueprint for administrative reform - *Tomorrow's Schools*. Central to both reports was the principle that Boards of Trustees were to be the employing and administrating authorities for each of the 2086 primary and intermediate schools, and 261 integrated and state secondary schools.[176] This, and the abolition of school zoning, served as a catalyst for change. The passage of the *Education Amendment Act* in 1989 gave legislative authority for the *Tomorrow's Schools* reforms to proceed and for community education forums to be established.[177] These forums were intended to allow communities to discuss the types of education best suited to their districts; e.g. full primary, contributing, intermediate, area school, and Form 1-7 schools.[178] On 6 September 1990, the Minister of Education, Phil Goff, appointed a *Taskforce on Recapitation* to consider the implications of, and criteria for, recapitation.[179] Representatives from the Ministry of Education, NZEI, Intermediate Schools' Principals' Association, PPTA, and the Maori community met five times between 27 September and 29 November 1990, and recommended further detailed investigation into early (10-14 year old) adolescent education.

Since the report's release in 1991, 'decapitation', 'recapitation', and 'merging' have featured prominently in the renewed debates over the future of intermediate schooling. A number of small primary schools, in the interests of economic viability, have sought permission to recapitate (i.e. to have Forms 1 and 2 attached).[180]

MIDDLE SCHOOLING

Threatened from both sides by primary and secondary schools, and desperate to preserve their (falling) roll numbers and staffing entitlements, the Intermediate Schools' Principals' Association first questioned the ability of primary schools to offer an education similar to that of the intermediates[181] and, second, turned to

"middle school education" to justify their existence.[182] Welcoming the opportunity afforded by the recapitation taskforce to re-examine Form 1 and 2 education, the Association's Vice-President, Paul Ferris, confidently asserted that "intermediate schools would not be found wanting. They had been reviewed many times before. Many countries were using a middle school type of education. We should explore the expansion of the intermediate school period".[183]

The Intermediate Schools' Principals' Association had an ally in Phil Goff, Minister of Education after David Lange's resignation from office in 1989. Echoing the conventional rhetoric, Goff declared that intermediate schools "made a considerable contribution to a first rate education system: they provided a useful bridge between primary and secondary education; they widened the range of subjects for children; and their style of education helped pupils in their adjustment to life at secondary school".[184]

Goff's view directly contradicted that of his predecessor, David Lange, who was scathing in his criticism of intermediate schools. Confessing that he "never understood the reason for intermediate schools" and that he was "in favour of closing them", Lange continued:

> Intermediate schools took youngsters from the security of their primary schools, gave them two years to become familiar with them, then placed them in another strange environment at high school. Falling rolls and strong community opposition to the philosophy behind them would no doubt lead to their demise.[185]

Pinning its hopes on the middle schooling movement, the Intermediate Schools' Principals' Association in 1992 commissioned Massey University's Educational Research and Development Centre to produce a report on middle schooling. The study, co-authored by David Stewart and Pat Nolan, and published in November 1992, set out to "review the North American and United Kingdom literature on middle school education; summarise the research evidence in a form that may enlighten the contemporary debate; and draw conclusions regarding the future direction of education at the intermediate level".[186] Following a very brief (six-page) review of the historical origins and development of New Zealand intermediate schools, the report moved on to consider middle schooling in the United States. Beginning with the bold claim that "the middle school movement in the USA has contributed more to the restructuring of education in that country than any other development in the last 100 years",[187] Stewart and Nolan provided four reasons to account for its success.

1. The creation of middle schools was, in reality, an acknowledgement that emerging adolescence is a unique stage of development worthy of recognition in its own right and deserving of special educational provisions;
2. Middle schools were seen as having the potential for the development of a student centred philosophy and educational approach comprising curricula, pedagogy and systems of assessment and evaluation which would draw upon the best of both primary and secondary practice yet be uniquely designed to meet the needs of their special clientele;

3. Middle schools had the potential to develop a partnership between school and community involving active parent participation that is necessary to sustain optimum school growth and development; and,
4. Middle schools, more than primary or secondary schools, could present teachers with the opportunity to experiment with new educational ideas and strategies in a way that is often precluded by the credentialing focus of secondary schools and by the underlying custodial function of primary schools.[188]

Apparently satisfied with the research evidence supporting middle schooling practice overseas, Stewart and Nolan then proposed that such a model be adopted "as the preferred form of schooling for emerging adolescents in New Zealand".[189] Were this to happen, they suggested that:

- emerging adolescents be educated in middle schools with either a three or four year grade span, preferably grade 6 to 8 (Forms 1-3);

- the best features of existing intermediate approaches and characteristics be extended in ways that are consistent with the middle school philosophy outlined in the report; and

- existing Intermediate School administrators and teachers, along with prospective new middle school staff, engage in professional development and training that will equip them to develop their schools in accord with middle school philosophy, and enable them to convert this philosophy into educationally defensible middle school programmes.[190]

Finally, in summarising their findings, Stewart and Nolan acknowledged that intermediate schools' contribution to the education of 'emerging adolescents' in New Zealand could not be gauged, owing to the absence of 'empirical data' regarding their overall effectiveness.[191] However, such considerations were quickly swept aside in their enthusiasm for the middle school philosophy which they claimed was "a unique educational approach especially suited to meeting the needs of the emerging adolescents".[192] Consequently, Stewart and Nolan concluded their report by urging middle school advocates to "establish a clarity of purpose which defines the school's distinctive competency and to use this to promote the value of middle school education in the community".[193]

Interestingly, while Stewart and Nolan acknowledged some similarity between many of Watson's (1964) recommendations on intermediates and their own proposals for middle schools, they nonetheless reported that their recommendations 'go well beyond Watson's'.[194] In point of fact, however, the resemblance is striking: where Watson wrote 'intermediate schools' and '11-13 year olds', Stewart and Nolan simply inserted 'middle schools' and '10-14 year olds'!

Following the release of the Stewart-Nolan Report, the Intermediate Schools' Principals' Association met with the Minister of Education, Lockwood Smith, to enlist his support for the introduction of middle school education in New

Zealand.[195] The Association also asked the Minister to "commission a survey to document the role and contribution that schooling (in all its various forms) currently makes to the education of emerging adolescents in New Zealand".[196] At the time of writing, no such survey has been undertaken.

PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

As we have seen, there have been numerous investigations, reviews, committees of inquiry, and discussions held throughout the history of junior high/intermediate schooling. Most have highlighted the intermediate schools' lack of a 'separate but equal' status when judged against the long-established primary and secondary schools. The historic separation of the primary and secondary school sectors - each with its own teacher union - has created a patchwork structure of separate salaries, conditions of employment, regulations, inspection, and training programmes. Thus, while intermediate schooling evolved from the primary education sector, it has failed to achieve equal recognition and partnership.

In attempting to claim educational stewardship of the Form 1 and 2 classes, the junior high school (later intermediate) teachers positioned themselves as 'the experts' in providing an education suited particularly to young children in the 11-13 year age band. Evidence to substantiate this claim, however, remains elusive. Research undertaken in America, for example, has shown that there are considerable social and physical maturational differences between adolescents.[197] Other studies, notably those on brain development, have challenged the notion that adolescent intellectual maturation falls conveniently within a fixed chronological age grouping in line with expected rates of development.[198] Taken to its logical conclusion then, *every* age group can be viewed as having special needs; since every child is different, it might be suggested that 13-15 year olds attend a different school than 16-18 year olds!

That intermediate schools should still feature in the New Zealand education landscape is not surprising. Many of the surveys on intermediate education have been compiled by intermediate school principals and/or those with a vested interest and commitment to their continued existence. The Education Department, for its part, also has been very defensive about intermediate schooling, often resorting to "hackneyed arguments of the past" to support the status quo.[199]

In 1924, the Minister of Education (Parr) proudly announced that "there is no need for experiment regarding the value of the junior high school principle itself. That stage has passed".[200] Seventy two years on, we believe that the 'experiment' has only just begun. Prophetically, perhaps the last word in the intermediate school saga belongs to Beeby: "The intermediate school, if it is to serve any useful purpose, cannot be slipped between [the primary and secondary school] like a stone in a wall, but must be grafted into their living bodies".[201] But for this to occur, the intermediates and/or middle schools urgently need to forge an educational philosophy that is demonstrably and uniquely their own.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. C.E. Beeby, *The Intermediate Schools of New Zealand*, Wellington: NZCER, 1938, p. 37.
2. D. Stewart & P. Nolan, *The Middle School: Essential Education for Emerging Adolescents*, Palmerston North: ERDC, Massey University, 1992, p. iv.
3. R. Openshaw, "Lilliput under Siege: New Zealand Society and its Schools during the 'Red Scare': 1919-1922", *History of Education Quarterly*, Winter 1980, pp. 403-424.
4. The *Education Amendment Act*, 1920, made provision for this, although economic considerations meant that implementation of the clause had to be deferred.
5. *Otago Daily Times*, 22 June 1920.
6. *National Education*, 1920, Vol. 2 No. 15, p. 173 (1 June); *Otago Daily Times*, 23 February 1921.
7. *Ibid.*
8. Board of Education, *Report of the Consultative Committee on the Education of the Adolescent* (Hadow Report), London: HMSO, 1926, p. 32.
9. *National Education*, 1920, Vol. 2, No. 15, p. 175 (1 June).
10. D.G. Thomson, "Policies, Problems and Politics in New Zealand Education", MA thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 1972, p. 47.
11. *National Education*, 1921, Vol. 3, No. 24, p. 106 (1 April) (authors' emphasis). It is interesting to note that for the first time in the discussions reference was made to the status of adolescence as a separate stage in development, with its own special educational needs.
12. *Ibid.*
13. *AJHR*, 1921, E-11, p. 5; F. Milner, "Junior High School Movement in the United States of America".
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.
15. *Ibid.*
16. J.E. Watson, *Intermediate Schooling in New Zealand*, Wellington: NZCER, 1964, p. 33; *Otago Daily Times*, 21 June 1921.
17. Education Department, *Conference on Post-Primary Education*, 30-31 March 1922 (Chair: J. Caughley), Wellington: Government Printer, 1922, p. 24.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
20. *New Zealand Gazette*, 1922, Vol. 3, pp. 2389-2390 (4 September).
21. *AJHR*, 1923, E-1, p. 3.
22. Memorandum: E. Marsden to Secretary, Auckland Education Board, 2 August 1923 (private file).
23. *Ibid.*
24. Letter: R.E. Rudman to J. Caughley, 27 July 1923 (private file).
25. See footnote 22.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Beeby, 1938, p. 6.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 16.

29. G. Faulds, "Mental Testing and Social Selection", in M.E.H. Olssen (ed.), *Mental Testing in New Zealand: Critical and Oppositional Perspectives*, Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 1988.
30. F. Tate, *Investigation into Certain Aspects of Post-Primary Education*, Wellington: Government Printer, Special Report on Educational Subjects No. 16, 1925.
31. *Ibid*.
32. *Ibid*., p. 74.
33. *Ibid*., p. 31.
34. Beeby, 1938, p. 26.
35. Department of Education, *Report of the Syllabus Revision Committee* (Chair: R. Lawson), Wellington: Government Printer, 1928.
36. *Ibid*., p. 16.
37. *Ibid*., p. 37.
38. *Ibid*., p. 43.
39. *Ibid*., p. 39.
40. *Report of the Recess Education Committee on Educational Reorganisation in New Zealand* (Atmore Report), 1930. *AJHR*, 1930, I-8A, p. 34.
41. "Education Act, 1914: Regulations for Intermediate Schools and Departments", *New Zealand Gazette*, 1932, pp. 2773-2778 (15 December 1932).
42. *Ibid*.; Beeby, 1938, p. 31; A.E. Campbell, *Educating New Zealand*, Wellington: Department of Internal Affairs, 1941, p. 141; Watson, 1964, p. 55; J.L. Ewing, *The Development of the New Zealand Primary School Curriculum: 1877-1970*, Wellington: NZCER, 1970, p. 189.
43. Beeby, 1938, p. 31.
44. Watson, 1964, p. 55.
45. *AJHR*, 1933, E-1, p. 3; Beeby, 1938, p. 42.
46. *Education Gazette*, 1933, Vol. 12, No. 4, p. 48 (April), authors' emphasis; Beeby, 1938, p. 32.
47. *Ibid*., p. 50.
48. Beeby, 1938, p. 32; Watson, 1964, p. 57.
49. T.B. Strong, "Education in New Zealand", *The Year Book of Education*, London: University of London Institute of Education, 1932, p. 619; Watson, 1964, p. 58.
50. T.B. Strong, "New Zealand: Reorganisation of the Education System", *The Year Book of Education*, London: University of London Institute of Education, 1933, p. 555.
51. Campbell, 1941, p. 141.
52. *Ibid*.
53. *Ibid*.
54. *Ibid*., p. 142.
55. *Ibid*.
56. *NZPD*, 1933, Vol. 235, pp. 1185-1194; Watson, 1964, pp. 55-56.
57. Evidence of R.E. Rudman, ex-Headmaster of Kowhai Junior High School, to the Parliamentary Recess Education Committee (Atmore Committee), *AJHR*, 1930, I-8A, pp. 18, 19 (paragraph b); Evidence of W.A. Armour, Headmaster of Wellington College, p. 21: Evidence of J.H. Howell, Director of Wellington Technical College, pp. 21-24; Beeby, 1938, pp. 32-33; Watson, 1964, pp. 51-54; 59-60.

58. Otago High Schools' Board of Governors, *Educational Reorganisation in New Zealand: Review by the Otago High Schools' Board of certain aspects of the Report of the Recess Education Committee*, 19 November 1930, Dunedin: Otago Daily Times, 1930, p. 9, Part VI.
59. A.G. Butchers, *The Education System*, Auckland: National Printing Co., 1932, p. 248.
60. I. Cumming & A. Cumming, *History of State Education in New Zealand: 1840-1975*, Wellington: Pitman Pacific, 1978, pp. 247-249.
61. Teachers, like other civil servants, suffered further salary cuts (under £225 per annum - 5%; £225-£720 - 10%; over £720 - 12.5%); five year olds were excluded from the public schools; the Wellington and Dunedin Teachers' Training Colleges were closed; student teachers' allowances were cut from £100 to £20 per annum; and a great number of other payments and subsidies were either abolished or reduced (Cumming and Cumming, 1978, pp. 247-249; Butchers, 1932, p. 248). Finally, and arguably most importantly, the Commission recommended the abolition of the regional education board system on the grounds that it was too costly (it was estimated that the Department of Education could undertake the boards' duties and thereby save approximately £50,000 per annum) and overly complicated (*Ibid;* pp. 219, 248. New Zealand Education Boards' Association, *Report and Suggestions regarding Sections of the Report of the National Economy Commission which deals with Education Administration in New Zealand*, Wellington: Whitcombe & Tombs, April 1932, pp. 13-22). Predictably, the Education Boards' Association retaliated with data to refute this claim and the recommendation subsequently lapsed (*Ibid*).
62. Vote Education was £4,058,222 (1929-1930), £4,174,855 (1930-1931), £3,469,843 (1931-1932), £2,920,000 (1932-1933); i.e. a reduction of £1,200,000 over the period 1929-1933. See Butchers, 1932, pp. 218-219.
63. Campbell, 1941, p. 143; Watson, 1964, pp. 51, 59; Cumming & Cumming, 1978, p. 251.
64. Watson, 1964, p. 59.
65. *Ibid*.
66. *Ibid*., pp. 60-61.
67. *Ibid*.; C.E. Beeby, "The Education of the Adolescent in New Zealand", *The Year Book of Education*, London: University of London Institute of Education, 1937, p. 236; Beeby, 1938, pp. 33, 174-175.
68. *Ibid*.
69. Watson, 1964, p. 60.
70. *Ibid*.
71. Beeby, 1938, p. 22; Watson, 1964, p. 55.
72. NZEI, *Annual Report*, 1929, pp. 16-17; Beeby, 1938, p. 34; Campbell, 1941, p. 144; Watson, 1964, p. 52.
73. *National Eduction*, 1933, Vol. 15, No. 159, pp. 325-326 (July); Beeby, 1938, pp. 34-35; Campbell, 1941, p. 144.
74. *Ibid*.
75. *Ibid*.
76. *National Education*, 1933, Vol. 15, No. 156, pp. 103-104 (April); *Ibid*., 1933, Vol. 15, No. 161, pp. 385-386 (September); Watson, 1964, p. 61.

77. *Ibid.*, 1933, Vol. 15, No. 164, pp. 552-559 (December); Beeby, 1938, pp. 35-36; Watson, 1964, p. 61.
78. *STA*, 1933, Vol. 1, No. 6, p. 5 (November); Beeby, 1938, p. 36; Campbell, 1941, p. 144.
79. *Ibid.*
80. *Ibid.*
81. *Ibid.*
82. *Ibid.*, 1936, Vol. 3, No. 3, p. 12 (June); Beeby, 1938, p. 37.
83. Beeby, 1938, p. 1 (introduction).
84. *Ibid.*
85. Cumming & Cumming, 1978, p. 253.
86. W. Boyd, "A Scotsman Looks at New Zealand Schools", in A.E. Campbell (ed.), *Modern Trends in Education: The Proceedings of the New Education Fellowship Conference held in New Zealand in July 1937*, Wellington: Whitcombe & Tombs Ltd, 1938, pp. 470-471, 484-485; Watson, 1964, p. 62.
87. Beeby, 1938, pp. 46-50; H. Lee, "The Credentialled Society: A History of New Zealand Public School Examinations 1871-1990", PhD thesis, University of Otago, 1991, pp. 1-110; H. Lee, "Examining the New Zealand School Curriculum", in G. McCulloch (ed.), *The School Curriculum in New Zealand: History, Theory, Policy and Practice*, Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992, pp. 123-138; H. Lee, "Initiating the Paper Chase: The Proficiency and Junior Civil Service Examinations", in R. Openshaw, G. Lee, H. Lee, *Challenging the Myths: Rethinking New Zealand's Educational History*, Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1993, pp. 192-202.
88. *Ibid.*
89. "Education Act, 1914: Regulations for Intermediate Schools and Departments", *New Zealand Gazette*, 1932, pp. 2776-2777, Sections 16(1) and (2) (15 December 1932).
90. Beeby, 1938, pp. 51-52, 195.
91. *Ibid.*, pp. 52-56.
92. *Ibid.*, pp. 56-58.
93. *Ibid.*, pp. 57-58.
94. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
95. Watson, 1964, p. 63.
96. Beeby, 1938, p. 44.
97. *Ibid.*, p.45.
98. *Ibid.*, pp. 209-244.
99. *Ibid.*, p. 209, Recommendation 1.
100. *Ibid.*, pp. 210-211, Recommendation 2.
101. *Ibid.*, pp. 212-244. Beeby's major recommendations were that there should be a closer relationship between the authorities controlling primary, intermediate, and post-primary schooling; that intermediates be established only after full consultation with parents and teachers; that a senior Department of Education officer oversee the establishment of further intermediates; that children enter intermediates after passing Standard IV or as soon as possible after the age of 12; that intermediates in the main centres remain independent; that the length of the course be determined in accordance with the pupil's future employment and educational intentions;

that ability-grouping be adopted; that the classification of entrants be based on more than one criterion; that an increasing number of optional courses be open to children as they rise through the intermediate school; that promotion opportunities be made available to intermediate school staff; that intermediates be better equipped than at present; and that exploration of aptitudes be a continuous process, gradually intensifying as the higher forms are reached.

102. *Ibid.*, p. 244, Recommendation 29.
103. *Nelson Evening Mail*, 17 September 1940; *Taranaki Herald*, 14 November 1940; Watson, 1964, p. 81.
104. Watson, 1964, p. 82.
105. *Ibid.*, p. 83.
106. *New Zealand Official Year Book*, Wellington: Government Printer, 1940, p. 186.
107. *Ibid.*, 1946, p. 132.
108. *Education Gazette*, 1943, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 63-73 (April).
109. *Ibid.*
110. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
111. Watson, 1964, p. 77.
112. H. Lee, 1991, p. 243, Table 29.
113. Watson, 1964, p. 100.
114. *Auckland Star*, 8 July 1950; Watson, 1964, pp. 100-101.
115. *NZPD*, 1950, Vol. 291, p. 2559.
116. *Ibid.*, p. 2564.
117. *NZPPTA Newsletter*, 8 October 1954; Watson, 1964, pp. xi, 107.
118. *National Education*, 1950, Vol. 32, No. 349, pp. 242-243 (1 October); Watson, 1964, p. 101.
119. *Ibid.*, 1951, Vol. 33, No. 354, p. 98 (2 April); Watson, 1964, pp. 102-103.
120. *Ibid.*
121. *PPTA Journal*, August 1951, p. 18.
122. Watson,1964, pp. 103-105.
123. *Evening Post*, 31 October 1951; *Dominion*, 31 October 1951; Watson, 1964, p. 105.
124. *Ibid.*
125. *AJHR*, 1954, E-1, p. 22.
126. *NZPPTA Newsletter*, March 1954; Watson, 1964, p. 107.
127. Watson, 1964, p. xi.
128. *Ibid.*, pp. 107, 449-450 (Appendix C).
129. *AJHR*, 1958, E-1, p. 31.
130. *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.
131. *Report of the Committee Appointed to Survey Secondary Education in New South Wales* (Wyndham Committee), Sydney: Government Printer, 1957, p. 71.
132. *Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand* (Currie Commission), July 1962, Wellington: Government Printer, 1962, p. 5.
133. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
134. *Ibid.*, p. 1.
135. *Ibid.*
136. *Ibid.*, pp. 81, 149-150, 164-167, 172-179, 184-197, 223-225, 269-271.
137. Currie Commission, 1962, pp. 81, 164-167, 172-179.

138. *Ibid.*, pp. 166, 172-179.
139. *Ibid.*, pp. 173-175.
140. *Ibid.*, pp. 176, 197.
141. *Ibid.*, pp. 223-225.
142. *Ibid.*, pp. 223, 726 (Recommendation 1); pp. 224, 727 (Recommendation 13); pp. 374, 730 (Recommendation 10).
143. Watson, 1964, pp. 418-435.
144. Currie Commission, 1962, p. 166, Table 2.
145. *Ibid.*.
146. *Ibid.*
147. *AJHR*, 1973, E-1. In 1972 there were 67,506 Form 1 and 2 pupils enrolled at 117 intermediate schools.
148. Education Development Conference, *Directions for Educational Development: A Report Prepared by the Advisory Council on Educational Planning*, 1974 (Holmes Report), Wellington: Government Printer, 1975, p. 140.
149. *Ibid.*
150. *Ibid.*, pp. 140-141; Educational Development Conference, *Educational Aims and Objectives: Report of the Working Party on Aims and Objectives* (Osborne Report), Wellington: Government Printer, 1974; Educational Development Conference, *Improving Learning and Teaching: Report of the Working Party* (Lawrence Report), Wellington: Government Printer, 1974; Educational Development Conference, *Organisation and Administration of Education: Report of the Working Party* (Nordmeyer Report), Wellington: Government Printer, 1974.
151. *Ibid.*, p. 141.
152. Lawrence Report, 1974, pp. 89, 125-126.
153. Holmes Report, 1974, p. 111.
154. *National Education*, 1973, Vol. 55, No. 603, p. 293 (November).
155. *Ibid.*
156. *Ibid*, Vol. 55, No. 604, p. 345 (December).
157. *The Journal*, 1974, Vol. 22, No. 10, pp. 28-29 (October).
158. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
159. *Report of the Futuna Conference on Form 1 and 2 Education*, 1974. Cited in *Report of the 1976 National Survey of Intermediate Schools* (Milburn Report), Wellington: Department of Education, 1977, pp. 96-97.
160. *AJHR*, 1977, E-1, p. 42 (Table 1).
161. Milburn Report, 1977, pp. 1-2.
162. *Ibid.*, p. 1.
163. *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.
164. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
165. *Ibid.*
166. *Ibid.*, p. 107.
167. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-113.
168. *Ibid.*, p. 96 (authors' emphasis).
169. *Ibid.*, p. 97.
170. *AJHR*, 1977, p. 42 (Table 1); *Ibid.*, 1990, E-1, p. 23 (Table 1).
171. *Ibid.*

172. New Zealand Intermediate Schools' Principals' Association, *Survey: Report for Committee*, 1989, p. 1 (private file).
173. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
174. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
175. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
176. *Administering for Excellence: Effective Administration in Education*, Wellington: Government Printer, 1988, pp. 13, 17.
177. *Education Amendment Act*, 1989, Section 157, in *New Zealand Statutes*, 1989, p. 2486.
178. *NZEI Rourou*, 1991, No. 13, p. 9 (August).
179. *Report of the National Taskforce on Recapitation*, Wellington: Ministry of Education, 1991.
180. *Otago Daily Times*, 15 August 1991. Schools wishing to recapitate included: Abbotsford Primary (Dunedin), Arthur Street (Dunedin), Forbury Primary (Dunedin), George Street Normal (Dunedin), Green Island Primary (Dunedin), Mosgiel West Primary (Dunedin), Hamilton West Primary, Rhodes Street Primary (Hamilton), Richmond Park (Hamilton), Whitiora (Hamilton).
181. *Otago Daily Times*, 13 August 1990; *Ibid.*, 22 August 1991.
182. *Dominion Sunday Times*, 9 September 1990.
183. *Ibid.*
184. *Otago Daily Times*, 13 August 1990.
185. *Ibid.*, 17 January 1990.
186. D. Stewart & P. Nolan, 1992, p. 1.
187. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
188. *Ibid.*, pp. 49-50.
189. *Ibid.*, pp. iii-iv.
190. *Ibid.*, p. 54.
191. *Ibid.*, pp. 69, 71.
192. *Ibid.*, p. iii.
193. *Ibid.*, pp. iii, 68 (Recommendation 8).
194. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
195. *Eduvac*, 1993, Vol. 4, No. 131, p. 1 (19 April).
196. *Ibid.*
197. J.B. Koch & A.C. Stewart, *Children's Development Through Adolescence*, New York: Wiley & Sons, 1983, p. 382; J.W. Santroch, *Adolescence*, Texas: William Brown Publishers, 1990, p. 85.
198. H.T. Epstein & C.F. Toepfer, "A Neuroscience Basis for Reorganising Middle Grades Education", *Educational Leadership*, 1978, Vol. 5, No. 35, pp. 656-660.
199. J. Ennis, "Intermediate Schools - A Contemporary Anachronism?", *North and South*, October 1991, pp. 14-15.
200. *AJHR*, 1925, E-1, pp. 2-3.
201. Beeby, 1937, p. 238.