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Introduction

It is important to understand the role of people who do not create educational policy, but – in fact - help to implement it. In some cases, they cooperate. In other situations, they actively or passively refuse. In other examples, they may simply feel disconnected to the state apparatus and harbour feelings of resentment or frustration. What they do is not criminal but rather a form of social protest either independently or collectively. In some instances, their actions are conscious and in other situations their actions subconscious. The purpose of this paper is to examine how effective the policies of the Ontario government were applied by educators between 1969 and 1999. By examining various theories on how the state controls its population and by interviewing those who taught in this time period, one may better be able to understand the reasons why educators cooperated or did not fully cooperate with the province. Above all, in the future, those who devise changes may be aware of certain factors that may lead to more effective policies in education.

Once a segment of the population, and in some cases it is a slight majority of the voting population, votes politicians into positions of power, those individuals or their party attempts to carry a mandate based on their constituents. In the end, the party in authority makes decisions, these leaders propose bills, modify them to appease the opposition in the case of a minority, pass bills, and create laws. It is arguable that a top down-approach to educational reform is often followed, but there may be a lack of full implementation. ‘Foot dragging’ or a lack of agreement among teachers, administrators and members of the community may lead to a revamping of rules or amendments to original reforms. In the case of the history of education in Ontario, one can view ‘the
Crowd’ or members of ‘non governmental forces’ as key players in the reshaping of educational policy. The veteran teacher or seasoned administrator operates on the ‘ground level’ or ‘shop floor’ of this hierarchy.

It is their ‘public opinion’ and their level of involvement that may promote change. Furthermore, it would be incorrect to view change only as a ‘top-down’ model, since these ideas do not always ‘trickle down’ to the roots or foundation of the system for which they are intended. Between the two, those who decree and those who initiate, there exists a literal tug-of-war. On a philosophical level, there is ebb and flow to this dynamic on what constitutes education and how students should be educated. There is a physics of action and reaction between the two forces at play. It is arguable that the views of teachers, principals, and the community affected whether the policies of various governments were fully implemented, modified, or simply abandoned. Essentially, non ministerial players, men and women in the ‘trenches of teaching,’ opposed reform and pursued their own versions of education within their own parameters. The Ministry of Education sometimes ‘back peddled’ to incorporate public opinion into further educational reforms. Various acts were repealed. Unions opposed. Individuals refused. Opposition or forms of active and passive aggressive defiance among teachers and administrators helped to shape change.

It is arguable that Ontario educators responded to provincial changes in education with levels of compliance, non compliance, or alienation between 1969 and 1999. By examining the role of the state and its attempts to control its population, one can better understand how educators helped to deliver or modify change in Ontario’s schools. Most
importantly, valuable lessons may be learned to better assure that reforms are generated from the teaching community and better carried out by this community.

**The ‘Crowds’ attempts to Protest in Pre and Post Industrial France and England**

Historians have examined the role of the population in influencing or opposing change. If one studies social protests in eighteenth and nineteenth century France and England, one can find salient features that help to explain the relationship between those who were in positions of authority and those who were subject to their decisions.

According to Cobb (1959), the French historian Lefebvre began studying peasants in the 1920’s. This was departure from traditional political interpretations. Lefebvre began to point out the importance of studying history from a social perspective. Cobb also pointed out that historians such as Soboul and Rudé had studied how movements stemmed “from below.” Former historians, such as Soboul, essentially focused on revolutionary elites, such as the sans-culotte, whereas Rude focused more on the crowd. (pp. 61-3)

In order to fully incorporate the argument of the importance of the ‘common people’ and their ability to affect change, one can furthermore examine the works of George Rudé. In his book, *The Crowd in the French Revolution* (1959), the author looked at how common people played a role in the outcome of history.

In the case of France, Rudé viewed the role of the masses as the following:

“…revolutionary crowds, far from being social abstractions, were composed of ordinary men and women with varying social needs, who responded to a variety of impulses, in which economic crisis, political upheaval, and the urge to satisfy immediate and particular grievances all played their part. Are such conclusion only valid within the comparatively restricted context of the French Revolution, or have they a certain validity, as well, in the case of other ‘revolutionary crowds’, whom historians have been inclined, either for convenience or from lack of sympathy, to depict as ‘mobs’ or as social riff-raft?” (p. 233)
Those who oppose change can be labelled “malcontents,” but in reality as Rudé would term this vocabulary merely as a “symbol of prejudice.” (p. 239) The crowd who opposes change or protests government reforms may be depicted in a less positive role. In fact, they may be viewed, as discussed later by other historians in this paper, as criminal in their acts and intentions.

Rudé also noted that there existed similarities in the crowd of the French Revolution and British rioters of the eighteenth century. Rude stated that “there is a certain continuity of pattern …[for example]…The East London riots of July, 1736 were largely the work of journeymen and labourers, who had been roused to violence against the local Irish by the employment of Irish at lower rates of wages.” (p. 237) Rudé continued to discuss the importance of journeyman and others in the Wilkes and Liberty Riots of 1768-9, which were prompted from Jack Wilkes’ decision to imprison himself, and the Gordon Riots, which were brought about from the abolition of anti-Catholics laws, nearly a decade later.

E.P. Thompson, in The Making of the English Working Class (1966) produced a seminal work on the understanding of the role of those who did not control their means of production. However, E.P. Thomspn in Customs in Common (1991) furthermore extended his arguments from The Making of the English Working Class by examining how those who were in positions of authority were in opposition with the customs of the masses. He provided examples of traditions, which included folklore, bread riots, music, and the sales of wives that suggested a certain mentality existed among the people.

The general population in places such as Wales and England were resistant to changes brought through the Enlightenment and literacy. Those top down reforms
created “a profound alienation between the culture of patricians and plebs.” (p. 1)

Demographics and the Industrial Revolution combined to affect the “authority of customary expectations.” (p. 14)

In negotiations, Thompson wrote of an ‘ebb and flow’ that existed between the crowd, which attempted to articulate their displeasure, and their leaders. (p. 71) Likewise, the workers, in an attempt to resist change or to express disdain to reforms, pressured authorities to revoke or modify decisions. This argument can be further extended to education in the late twentieth century in Ontario. Here, one could argue that there existed a dynamics between those who wished to change education and those who were required to implement change.

In the case of protesting against enclosures, fences were often destroyed and forms of resistance were often more “sullen than vibrant.” (pp. 115-116) In regards to the price of bread, the general population strongly felt that during hard times the government should fix prices. Hence, they would use authority figures to help their cause. (p. 229) Other examples included direct “threats” to those in positions of authority. (p. 247) Market forces and morality were essentially in conflict. (pp. 270-271)

Most importantly, in the chapter entitled “Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism,” businessmen such as Thomas Wedgewood spoke of the importance of educating the ‘masses’ in certain qualities that promoted industrialism. (p. 403) It was the intention to use division, supervision, incentives, and penalties to teach the workers to better comply with the habits of an industrial age over a long period of time. (p. 394)
Finally, “rough music” or forms of public mockery were used to display disdain for those who offended customs and practices. Likewise in the case of France, the charivari was another form of tormenting others. (p. 467)

What truly threatened the authority of masters over their servants was that their non compliance was connected to a perceived lack of discipline, the seasonal aspects of work, and their lack of dependence. (pg. 37) Those in control were not truly in control.

Darnton (1984) in The Great Cat Massacre and other Episodes in French Cultural History examined similar forms of social protest. In the chapter entitled “Workers Revolt: The Great Cat Massacre of the Rue Saint-Severin” he reported that a worker named Leveille staged a mock trial in which the master’s cats were put on display as “guards, a confessor, and a public executioner.” (p. 77) It was a symbolic gesture to highlight or acknowledge how the cats were treated better than the workers at the printing establishment. The journeymen continued with ‘rough music’ and other attempts at expressing their grievances for their working conditions and their hatred for their employers. (pp. 75 to 106)

In 1830, with the introduction of mechanization to farming in Sussex, Kent, and numerous other counties, labourers reacted by protesting and rioting. Not only did the crowd damage the machinery, but they also demanded changes. The protestors were calculating. In accordance to tradition, they approached magistrates, radicals, and church leaders. The riots were violent in terms of arson, but also less violent in terms of physically harming other people. Anonymous letters, signed by a writer using the pseudonym, Captain Swing, helped to illustrate their opposition to change or mechanization in rural life.
What can be understood from these riots is an understanding that existed between employers and workers or those in power and those who are not. According to Hobsbawn and Rudé (1969) “By and large, the labourers of 1830 fully deserved the good reputations that their employers and neighbours gave them. They were not criminals: comparatively few had even mildest form of prison record behind them. But they believed in “natural right- the right to work and to earn a living wage- and refused to accept that machines, which robbed them of this right, should receive the protection of law. On occasion, they invoked the authority of the justice, or government-and even the King and God himself-to justify their views and actions…they were firmly convinced that justice-and even the law- was on their side.” (p. 249)

In regards to protest, there are some notable features explained by Cobban (1964). One is the rivalry between “Country against Town.” Those who opposed change are a varied group. The urban groups differ from the rural groups and those in opposition are a motley crew of people. According to Cobban (1964) “…the peasant hated the towns under three different heads: as the authority from which came the laws, as bank and industry which drew towards its money, and finally as his social superior.” (p. 106)

There often existed a delicate balance between the repressive nature of the state and the people in 19th century England. If magistrates felt that mob activity was unruly then executions became more common. However, Matthews refers to a “careful balance had to be struck.” If punishment was too harsh, then it would affect the people’s acceptance of laws. (p. 15) Public opinion was a barometer of the times. The rioters of the Swing Riots clung tenaciously to traditional ways that were being affected by Industrialism. They used the support of skilled labourers who helped dismantle the
machines and were arguably the predecessor to workers in the cities. Mathews even sees them as succeeding more than the Luddites of the textile mills. (pp. 110 to 112) Overall, there existed a clash between those who laboured and those who wanted to reform traditional systems. The state attempted to mediate between two forces. Although the government mediated, its laws helped to ensure that those in positions of authority remained socially and economically superior in the long run.

There seems to be a connection between what is considered criminal and social protest by the eighteenth and nineteenth century. D.J.V. Jones (1979) in “The Poacher: A Study in Victorian Crime and Protest” examined how many of the offences or crimes were tied to a rural tradition and method of people supplementing their livelihoods. (pp. 825-860)

Rudé (1973) in “Protest and Punishment in 19th century Britain” examined how deviant or criminal behaviour can also be considered a form of social protest. Cobb (1970) in the Police and the People: French Popular Protest, 1789-1820 also discussed how the “principal weapon of the people is collective violence, or the threat of it-more often the threat than the thing itself.”(p. 86) Fear is an effective tool in popular protest. Similarly, as discussed later by Richter (December, 2006), in the twentieth century, Ontario teachers prior to the formation of collective bargaining would often threaten to resign ‘en masse’ in order to pressure trustees to improve working conditions.(source)

Even, according to Cobb, desertion was a popular form of protest during the Napoleonic Years of 1810 to 1812; the regime was unable to stem this trend despite threats of fines and imprisonment. (pp. 96 to 97) The military ranks often rejected government mandates by simply abandoning their posts.
Overall, prior to the Industrial Revolution in France and England, the general population of workers felt that those in positions of authority were obligated to protect certain rights. In efforts to persuade the authorities, the crowd would rely on customary traditions that were either violent or non-violent means in order to oppose change. Opposition or non-compliance was often viewed as a crime or a form of treason.

**The State’s attempt to use Crime to Subjugate the Working Class**

According to some historians, the state has attempted to control its population through various government sponsored institutions. Michael Ignatieff (1978) in *A Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution 1750 to 1850* examined how prisons and forms of punishment changed over the course of the century. Although this essay is not on prison reform, nevertheless, it is rather an essay on the role of the state and its need to control its population. It is arguable those who were in positions of authority attempted to control the minds, bodies, and classes of a nation.

In the mid-eighteenth century, a felon would be whipped in public and returned to his master. By mid nineteenth century, a prisoner would be physically confined with a straight-jacket, be forced to walk on a treadmill, and placed in solitary confinement. (pp. 208-209) The strict prisons “had appeal because the reformers succeeded in presenting it as a response, not merely to crime, but to the whole social crisis of a period, and as part of a larger strategy of political, social, and legal reform designed to re-establish order on a new foundation… it was seen as an element of a larger vision of order that by the 1840’s commanded the reflexive assent of the propertied and powerful.” (p. 210)

Ignatieff comments further that social change “had to be guaranteed by something
stronger than a frayed and increasingly hollow paternalism, backed up by hanging. Social stability had to be founded on popular consent, maintained by guilt at the thought of wrongdoing, rather than by deference and fear.” (p. 211) Similar parallels can be drawn between reforms in education. Traditional schools were intended to preserve social classes and hierarchy. Traditional theories of education were meant to enslave rather than liberate individuals- or, to be more generous, habituate the lower order to “their place”.

In some sense, prison institutions had an eerie parallel to traditional schools in terms of architecture, hierarchy, routines, corporal punishment, repetitive acts, and philosophy. In effective, like prisons, schools helped to entrench class warfare in a society. Citizens could be morally improved with characters of “ascetic rectitude” or values that were supported by the upper classes. (p. 214) Further extensions of the prison model became applied to the business model. Those who pioneered factory protocol, such as Boulton, Wedgwood, and Strutt, used similar methods to control their work population (p. 215). Most importantly, corporation later used various diagnostic tests such as IQ to “select, compare, position, hire, improve, and control individuals.” (p. 219)

Prior to the American Revolution of 1776, the British could send convicts to colonies. However, the Gordon Riots of 1780’s and the rise in crime between 1783 to1785 stirred the population in England. As a result government officials chose a penal colony in Botany Bay, Australia, in 1788, as a solution to social problems. However, in order to combat the population’s fear and to deal with the inability to transport criminals, the government set about finding new ways to establish order in society.
It is arguable that the state attempted in these instances to control its population through various means. By studying prisoners, peasants, and schools, one can find that a form of social control existed that tried to pit individuals against themselves rather than the state. In *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, Michel Foucault (1970) also examined the changes made in the prison system in France. His notions advanced that the state wished to control the population at a much different level than previous centuries. There now became an issue of having control over the population on a physical level. The arguments can thus be extended to other government institutions after which prisons were crudely modelled. It is arguable that modern schools, hospitals, and defence departments had similar characteristics that allowed the state to be more powerful. Here, the good intentions of the reformers were challenged. By controlling forms of punishment, enforcement, discipline, and confinement, the state exerted a certain ‘bio politics’ on its population. Foucault examines how the state tortured its ‘deviant’ members in public and later privately carried out forms of torture. This, of course, coincided with the Industrial Revolution which needed a more obedient population of workers. Law, an extension of the state, was intended to demand payment for crime. Hence, laws were enacted to enforce torture on the ‘deviant’ members of society. Likewise, the body of the criminal had to have some signs of infliction, so the public would have something to see. This is graphically demonstrated by the torture and execution of Damiens in 1757. (p. 3) The importance of displaying each part of the body to the population represents not its destruction, but the triumph of the state. What remains today is still the relationship between “truth” and “power” and the relationship between crime and punishment. However, public executions often inspired sympathy and riots. (pp. 51-63) Therefore, the
state avoided this over time since it produced disorder in society. Overall, there becomes an evolution of crime and punishment from the public sphere to private sphere over a period of time.

In regards to punishment, in order to consistently apply retribution to the prisoner chain gangs became a common form in prison reform. Work was seen as a form of repayment to society. “Let those condemned to penalties short of death be put to the public works for the country for a time propionate to their crime,” as referred to by Cahier de doleaneces. (pp.109-110) As a result, two forms of punishment exists in which work and repayment to society are both displayed. In effect, the state has “tiny theatre’s of punishment.” (p. 113)

Furthermore, discipline became crucial. By controlling inmates’ bodies through discipline a form of “bio politics” develops. Just as the state oversees the education, observation, and regulation of professions, so it also did it to its prisoners to make them reformed members of society. Foucault looks at the cellular, organic, genetic, and combinatory factors that allow for this type of bio politics. He sees the detail to a soldier’s life and every physical act by the late eighteenth century as crucial. (p. 135) This too becomes applied to the classroom after 1762 when rank became connected to each student and each task that was to be performed in a rigid manner. This “organization of serial space” in a new “learning machine” required supervision, reward, hierarchy, and cleanliness which rivalled the traditional apprenticeship system. (pp. 146-7) Foucault quotes Jean-Baptiste de La Salle in Conduite des ecoles chretiennes who wrote the following in 1759:
Each of the pupils will have his place assigned to him and none of them will leave it or change it except on the order or with the consent of the school inspector...those whose parents are neglectful and verminous must be separated from those who are careful and clean; that any unruly and frivolous pupil should be spaced between two who are well behaved and serious, a libertine either alone or between two pious pupils. (p. 147)

The state wished to have students and soldiers who worked and behaved in a precise, organized, and disciplined manner. In order for a society to participate in an industrial age or mass warfare its population must be able to perform its various roles. Special and detailed “training, observation, and control” are needed. Documentation is required to record the learning process of discipline and a level of internalized discipline must occur.

The architecture of the prison is highly important as displayed by Jeremy Benatham’s plan of Panopticon. The prisoner was never fully aware whether he was being studied or observed. Very much Orwellian in scope, the fear of ‘Big Brother’ or someone in authority overseeing an inmate helped to discipline the individual. In the case of elementary teaching, as enrolment increased, there was a need to carry out a new form of supervision which differed from the traditional teacher-student relationship. This new “mechanism of power” allowed the running of the classroom in parish schools and the correction of “misbehaviour” by the “intendants” of the teacher. In terms of “normalizing judgement,” Foucault saw that humidification, regulation, reward, and distinctions in school systems led to a form of controlling the student body. (pp. 175-183)

Finally, the prison is overseen by a plethora of bureaucrats, doctors, and social scientists who help guarantee that deviant behaviour will not be accepted. The holy trinity of these prisons included masses, classes, and working space. Discipline becomes a form
of power that is governed by “specialized institutions” and state approved authorities who may judge which behaviour is considered normal or abnormal. (pp. 215-216) In this respect it is no longer the role of the family to determine what is right or wrong. This responsibility is now replaced by the role of the state.

In conclusion, the Foucault develops an argument that the emergence of bio politics coincides with modernity and above all the Industrial Revolution. The greatest example of this is in public institutions such as prisons, armies, and schools.

James Scott in (1985) *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* also tied in the argument of oppositional defiance, but on a philosophical level. Like prisoners, peasants have been held captive by their feudal lords. However, a form of indentured labour has continued through neo-liberal markets in Malaysian villages during the 1970’s.

Scott summarized his stance well, “Here I have in mind, the ordinary weapons of relatively powerless groups: foot dragging, dissimulation, desertion, false compliance, pilfering, feigning ignorance, slander, arson, sabotage, and so on... [These forms of class struggle] have certain features in common. They require little coordination or planning; they make use of implicit understandings and informal networks; they often represent a form of individual self help; they typically avoid any direct, symbolic confrontation with authority. To understand these common place forms of resistance is to understand much of what the peasantry has historically done to defend its interests against both conservative and progressive orders...” (p. xvi). By studying the history of feudalism in the Old World, the history of slavery in the New World, and peasant resistance in the
Developing World, Scott encapsulates the ‘history of foot dragging’ quite succinctly. Overall, it demonstrates how powerless groups attempt to empower themselves by destroying what they feel threatens their livelihoods and mentalities.

The reader gains insights by studying peasant protests. One is better able to understand class consciousness and resistance when active and aggressive forms of uprisings or opposition are not an option. (Scott, p. 27) Historically, people have ‘voted with their feet’ and merely moved when change was not an option. Instead, workers, and in this case teachers and principals, employ methods of opposition which “…make no headlines. Just as millions of anthozoan polyps create, willy-nilly, a coral reef, so do thousands upon thousands of individual acts of insubordination and evasiveness create a political or economic barrier reef of their own…the ship of state runs aground on such a reef…the nature of the acts themselves…thus conspire to create a kind of complicity of silence that all but expunges everyday forms of resistance from the historical record. (p. 36) By examining what the peasants admired in folklore, one can challenge the social order imposed by the elites of society. (p. 41) Sedaka’s workers, the Malaysian peasants, in defence against double cropping and mechanization, which led to poverty, often participated in collective and midday strikes that would disrupt the harvests and further their economic bargaining. (p. 259)

Sennet and Cobb provided an equally thought-provoking look at class consciousness. In The Hidden Injuries of Class, the authors saw that schools helped to perpetuate a form of social control on the American working class. Through the interviews conducted of working class men in the Boston area in the early seventies, the
authors conclude that American workers developed a sense of inadequacy rather than a sense of revolution against the betrayal of the American Dream of prosperity and equality.

Workers, they felt, saw their place in society as just, despite resentment, because they confused their skills with dignity. The source of social control or injustice is seen in science and schools. Tests such as the Stanford-Binet intelligence quotient helped to challenge the notion of equality. (Sennet, p. 59) This paper will later examine the attempts at using science to classify and exclude members of society based on pseudo scientific reasoning. Furthermore, Sennet argues that intelligence, therefore, becomes equated with a “commodity” that can be shared, traded, and valued. An intelligence test thus becomes a “badge of ability” that allows those to ascend ranks not on birth, but of a pseudo form of merit. (pp. 61-62) There becomes a competition to earn these perceived “badges of ability” and social classes begin to injure each other in a frenzy to stand out among the masses. One must earn a value in order to earn respect. This only heightens inequality and class struggle.

How does the school system reinforce this form of alienation to both the students and the teachers as individuals who must be categorized and slotted in ranks of obedience? The term ‘atomization’ refers to the breaking down of social bonds to help build the bond between the state and the individual. How does the state use schools to reinforce Sennett’s theories? In the case of Josiah Watson Grammar School and many other schools across North America, several things occur. First, what is perceived as ‘good’ and ‘proper’ is deemed by the teacher. Second, authority reinforces the running of
the school or system. Third, those of certain racial and ethnic backgrounds are encouraged implicitly and explicitly to pursue leadership roles. Fourth, certain students assume they will be rewarded with certain jobs while others have lost the belief that school will help them rise above their social stations in life. Finally, those in positions of power, such as the teacher, must “legitimize” their own sense of dignity. (pp. 79-86)

Overall, one can argue that it is the role of the state to control its population by creating an artificial sense of ‘ability’ through various means in order to ‘divide and conquer’ its population. One may theorize that through government institutions, such as prisons, schools, and neoliberalism, the state attempts to ‘atomize’ its population or break down social bonds in order to help reinforce class struggle or inequality. Why would a state wish to change its hierarchy and allocation of wealth when its institutions merely reinforce its own perpetuation? The answer is simple. It doesn’t. However, individuals attempt to overcome these inequalities through a form of passive oppositional defiance.

**The Use of Mass Education to Inculcate the Population**

In order for a nation to initiate control over its population, the state requires two main components: institutions and bureaucrats. These elements are key and necessary in order to foster conformism and social reproduction.

As far back as the Protestant Reformation, German principalities took an ambitious effort to introduce schools to the masses. Strauss (1978) points out that German “Schools grew in number and quality as a consequence of the Protestant and the Catholic Reformation…Instruction became more professional. Orderly bureaucratic processes brought about a desirable measure of coordination among schools and universities…Religious goals and civic objectives combined to gather the ways of
teaching and learning in that web of ecclesiastical and secular administrative procedures...” (p. 1) These early beginnings mark the beginnings of mass literacy in Germany and state control.

Early forms were characterized by rote learning in which “Education was mainly training.” (p. 57) Prior to attempts at “indoctrinating society,” it was the intention of the German reformers to establish the training of an “instructional cadre.” (p. 9) Later, “Education was to take place in a setting of fixed institutions governed by bureaucracies whose competence pervaded entire domains, from capital to hamlets.” (p. 3) Overall, Strauss believed that state operated schools acted “As preservers of the peace and order of the community, schools come under the power of governments. Magistrates exercise rights equal to those of parents in determining what shall be taught.” (pg.6)

Foucault’s notion of state control has been applied to the early beginnings of Ontario’s educational system. Curtis (1988) examined the role of the educational bureaucracy in Ontario’s educational system by looking at the superintendents who helped to introduce the reforms under Ryerson. One must understand that prior to Ryerson’s attempts to implement a common curriculum in Ontario; there was resistance to new methods of schooling.

Various social, economic and political factors allowed Ryerson to replace the largely private school system with a public education system. Most importantly, the Educational Office eventually introduced standardization and compliance in Ontario. According to Houston and Prentice (1988), Lord Durham recommended an educational system that would produce a more “governable people.” (p. 36) By inculcating certain values, the population would be more compliant. In order to raise the profile of education
in early Ontario, by the mid nineteenth century, superintendents were carefully picked to help govern schools. (pp. 140-170)

Curtis (1992) in True Government by Choice Men examined how the superintendents modelled Ontario’s educational after progressive European nations such as Prussia (p. 56) As outlined in the book, Building the Educational State, Curtis (1988) studied how the Educational Office in the 1860’s could control education by setting the standards for school funding and by providing a system that replaced an educational system based on private patronage. (p.15) According to Prentice (2004) the school promoters offered a solution to the perception of ‘social decay’ by infusing the curriculum with Christian and upper class values. (pp. 70-73)

Stamp (1982) studied how patriotic values were infused into Ontario’s educational system in order to support the war effort prior to and during W.W.I. (p. 7) Sutherland (1997) described schools in Ontario from ‘the Great War to the Age of Television’ as very conformist in nature.

A salient feature of schools up to the early sixties in Canada was the formal setting in which teacher-centered learning stressed the theory that memorization and reasoning through subjects such as grammar and algebra would best prepare students for life. Likewise, certain values such as Anglo Saxon heritage and gender roles were inculcated through state and privately funded schools. Sutherland goes through the typical day of a student in elementary school and the culture in and outside of the classroom. Schools strove to ensure the ideal pillars of Canadian society: peace, order and good government. In the end, the author examines how schools established or tried to encourage certain identities among the children. (pp. 186-219)
In conclusion, social historians have indicated a tendency for schools in Europe and Canada to replicate social classes, to inculcate values, and to encourage conformism. This was made possible through the role of the superintendents which extended the authority of the state.

**The Rise of Neoliberalism in Educational Policy**

It is arguable that neoliberalism has become more common in educational reform among several Western democracies over the later part of the twentieth century. Elected officials and their constituents have applied more private methods to reshape public institutions such as education.

Durkheim (1961) was among the first sociologists to recognize the role that schools had in societies. To him, schools represented a sense of political bodies, collectivism, social values, and cohesion. (pp. 230-236) For Dewey, as pointed out by Molnar (2005), schools were equated to laboratories in which a sense or “habit” for democracy would be encouraged. (p. 80) Unfortunately, during the last twenty years of the twentieth-century, Harvey (2005) in *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* pointed out that there had been a deconstruction in numerous public policies under Reagan in the United Stated and Thatcher in the United Kingdom. (p. 38)

In Canada, there is an increasing trend for commercial or corporate intrusion into schools. Froese-Germain (2006) in “Commercialism in Canadian Schools: Who’s calling the shots?” studied how schools had to begun to rely more and more on sponsorships, advertising, incentives, and fundraising to help pay for a decrease in provincial funding.
In the case of Ontario, one can argue that the Progressive Conservative Party began applying a neoliberal agenda to Ontario’s educational system during the 1990’s. This is not the first time that governments have attempted to include business notions in schools. After the Industrial Revolution, according to Stamp (1982), Ontario schools introduced vocational and business courses to their curriculum. (p. 46)

Friedman (2005) makes note that the world was drastically changing in the 1990’s. The world economies were changing because of “uploading, outsourcing, offshoring, supply-chaining, insourcing, and in-forming.” (p. 93) Businesses began to “collaborate” differently and the “flattening effect” - a euphemism used to describe the merging of economies through technological innovations and free market forces- became more common. The political boundaries began to blur and the demise of centrally planned economies such as the former Communist Bloc countries greatly changed economies such as India. (p. 53) As Zakaria (2008) explained in The Post-American World that “Since the 1980’s, these three forces-politics, economics, and technology-have pushed in the same direction to produce a more open, connected, exacting international environment. But they have also given countries everywhere fresh opportunities to start moving up the ladder of growth and prosperity.” (p.28) Essentially, “The United States still plays a pivotal role in the world, but it is not what it once was.” (p. xiii) Politically, the world has changed since the collapse of the former Soviet Union and 9/11 but most importantly technology has created a new economic playing field with a greater number of teams. The world and the dialogue regarding educational reform had changed.
Ranu Basu (2004) in “The Rationalization of Neo liberalism in Ontario’s Public Education System, 1995 to 2000” examined how Mike Harris’s government was able to manipulate the voting population to accept a more corporate or business model approach to educational reforms, despite objections from various groups. The neo-liberal agenda contained the mantra of “efficiency, accountability, and equity.” (p. 622) Likewise, voters were lured into believing that taxpayers would pay 1/3 less in provincial income tax and have a massive reduction in the Ontario deficit. (p. 625)

The three stages, according to Basu, were quick, confusing, and hopeful. First, by using some of the points outlined in “The Royal Commission on Learning” in 1994, the government was able to use organizations such as the Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO), Education Improvement Commission (EIC), the Ontario College of Teachers (OCT), and the Ontario Parent Council to “legitimize” these reforms. Likewise, school boards lost their previous powers through amalgamation and so did the trustees. Furthermore, principals were removed from the teachers unions and the number of principals at sparsely populated schools was reduced. Above all, Basu saw that the requirement of councils and their requirement to be involved in decision making processes such as “the selection of principals” were very much in line with the rhetoric of neo liberalism. It was Harris’s intention to create a classroom that would be able to “remain globally competitive in a ‘knowledge based economy’ while at the same time maintain fiscal efficiency and accountability.”(pp. 625-629)

Second, two bills, Bill 160 “The Education Quality Improvement Act” and Bill 104 “The Fewer School Boards Act”, created such wide and sweeping changes that the public was not able to fully understand their consequences. Although teacher groups
opposed the bills, the public was convinced that the reforms would be cost effective. However, the funding formula for students proved to be woefully inadequate and needed revisions. In the case of the Toronto District School Board, it required the immediate closure of 138 schools. (p. 630) The public was ‘not amused.’  

Third, prior to the election in 1999, the Conservative party promised to fine tune the funding formula, extend accountability, and to continue to improve education. Basu writes that it was a “Period of Quiet Anticipation.” (p. 631) Overall, the authors of the Common Sense Revolution used “double speak” or rhetoric very similar to Orwell’s 1984. Basu best sums up the rhetoric of this time by a quote from Foucault, “My problem is to see how men govern (themselves and others) by the production of truth. “(p. 624) Basu cites Flyvbjerg (1998) who argues that “communication is established via the mode of communication that is eloquence, hidden control rationalization, charismas...” The best example Basu points out is rhetoric such as “putting children first.” (p. 632) It is difficult to argue with such language unless one addresses the semantics of the words. Equally important, Basu cites Shore & Wright (1999) who interpret the publication of school test scores as a “disciplinary mechanism” of the state. (p. 628)  

Neoliberalism in education has also occurred in other English speaking nations. In the case of the United States, Australia, and England, over the past 20 years, there has been a tendency to see the public system as inefficient and the need to reform curriculum and borrow terminology from the “work force.” (p. 246)
Overall, with the rise of neoliberalism in many western democracies, including Ontario, educators began to protest these reforms and become increasingly alienated from a more conservative and commercial oriented agenda.

**Oppositional Defiance as a form of Social Protest to the State’s Definition of Normalcy**

There have been numerous historical examples in which the state has used scientists to help label ‘deviant’ or less favourable forms of behaviour. Gould (1981) in, *The Mismeasure of Man*, extensively documents historical examples of how scientists have attempted to quantify intelligence and mental health issues through biased tests in order to help bolster discriminatory practices. Psychologists, in certain cases, have labelled those who do not adhere to certain subjective ‘norms’ as mentally deficient. In this case, science is used as a tool to label those of lower social economic orders, minorities, or in positions of servitude as being defiant or oppositional.

Nancy Nyquist Potter (2012) in the article “Mad, Bad or Virtuous?” examined the moral, cultural, and creative use of medical jargon to help explain defiance. She argues that defiance is an admirable quality when it comes to unfair power imbalances. In terms of class struggle and Aristotelian thinking, she believes that biological terms have been used to describe defiance as a disease towards groups that have been exploited.

Defiance is a natural inclination to for those who live in oppression to maintain their own sense of decency under the tyranny of those who are in control of the society. However, there is a clear difference between those who defy for virtue and those who defy for things that do not lead to, what Potter, refers to as the “flourishing” or the
advancement of a society through equality. The lines between the two often become blurred in the case of one group exploiting another group. (p. 24) In the case of Rosa Parks, her defiance to give up her seat to another individual, because of discriminatory segregation laws, helped to draw attention to racism and prompted African Americans to boycott the use of public transit. In this example, this act of civil disobedience is a ‘noble’ form of opposition and a passive form of defying authority.

Although social protests are organized and pre-planned, nevertheless, defiance can be intentionally impolite and provocative. She argues furthermore that defiance must be “active rather than passive, and for an act to be a defiant one, it must be more than merely refusing to participate… [since] acts of omission are not emphatic or direct enough to function as a challenge to oppressive norms and practices…Defiance acts in the face of direct authority.” (p. 25) Defiance can also be the refusal to comply fully or to abide completely by certain rules. In the example of building a house, a worker who defies his employer’s wish to build a home certainly hammers home his defiance. The structure is never built. However, a worker who shoddily builds a home that does not pass building code or slowly falls apart over time has brought his level of defiance to a different and more philosophical level. It is a more calculating and erosive nature in challenging authority since imposed systems eventually become inferior in structure and eventually operate in a dysfunctional manner. It is the other shoe or sabot that sabotages the cogs of the state apparatus.

Potter does point out that those who do not abide by civil behaviour are labelled as either immoral or psychologically flawed. (p. 26) Overall, virtues to Potter are equivalent
to a “social glue” such as the act of “giving” which allows for society to be fair.

According to Potter, defiance acts as a virtue when it is to the betterment of society and it is able to correct any imbalances. (pp. pg 28-9)

In some cases, those who are defiant are seen criminals or mentally ill. In the case of African American boys who defy the disciplinary methods of traditional schools, in some instances these students are labelled as suffering from O.D.D. (Oppositional Defiant Disorder). (pp. 32-33) Potter also cites the sixteenth century story of a twenty-two year old woman who was defiant to her father and chained to a table for six months. (p. 34) By contrasting this historical example to a modern example, the author raises questions as to the subjectivity of normalcy.

Finally, Potter refers to Best to points out that “the authority of teachers in the classroom is situated within complex relations that divide, exclude, classify, hierarchize, confine, and normalize.” (p. 35) In a Canadian context, Gleason (1999) connected the concept of what was considered normal as the promotion of middle-class values regarding sexuality and ethnicity in schools. Psychological tests also began to help teachers define what was considered ‘abnormal.’ (p. 35) Between 1930 and 1960, children were encouraged to adhere to certain values regarding gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and class. Above all, the aim was to create a self-replicating society that helped to foster certain democratic principles and forms of capitalism. (p. 52) Very similar to Foucault arguments, the state and its bureaucrats have the ability to define normalcy through various institutions. These institutions intentionally or unintentionally have arguably acted as bodies of authority above the teaching community.
Passive Aggressive Forms of Protest among Ontario Teachers during the 1930’s

Historically, teachers have opposed and advocated for educational change in Ontario’s history. Several attempts were made to reform education throughout the ‘Great Depression,’ but they proved to be mixed and unsuccessful in terms of implementation by the end of W.W.II. The ‘little grey book’ or the new curriculum was intended to change the role of the teacher. However, Milewski (2008) in his article “‘The Little Gray Book’: Pedagogy, Discourse and Rupture in 1937” has raised questions whether the reforms of the 1930’s were fully implemented.

Milewski (2003) in “Modern Schooling in Ontario: An Archaeology of Pedagogy” discussed how reforms were made early in the early part of the twentieth century to have schools that promoted hygiene, democratic ideas, and improved fitness in order to fight the fears of declining standards. (p. 39) The schools in the province were also required to go beyond rote memory and contribute to the overall well being of the child. Most importantly, it was the intention of the new curriculum to provide new opportunities for learning and to emphasize the importance of imagination over memorization. (pp. 110-113) Overall, it was the hope that new methods would improve the health of the population in hopes of averting further social decay.

There are several reasons why educational reforms were not fully implemented during the 1930’s in Ontario. According to Milewski (2012), in his article “I paid no attention to it:” An oral history of curricular change in the 1930’s,” the Department of Education intended to bring about dramatic reform through the document entitled Programme of Studies for Grades I to VI of the Public and Separate Schools. There are
several reasons why these dramatic reforms failed: after W.W.I, teachers received
limited training because of the need to graduate educators ‘en masse’ to match the
increase in Ontario’s schools and their enrolment. Teachers also remained faithful to the
traditional Socratic methods through which they were schooled. The necessary in-service
training sessions were not fully provided. By 1943, four years into W.W.II, the
population voted in a Conservative provincial government which further delayed the
reforms introduced from the previous Liberal government. Finally, Thornton Mustard –an
adamant proponent and head of the Department of Education in Ontario - drowned in the
sinking of a transatlantic ship (p. 1) Essentially, progressive curriculum literally ‘sank’
and was never fully implemented for that matter.

Demographic and systematic impediments kept Ontario from full reform. First, the
majority of teachers and trustees were males who kept the traditional status quo.
Secondly, during the 1930’s, there existed over 14 000 teachers who were governed by
8 000 different employers, all of which varied from rural to urban. Those who were
further from Toronto were under less scrutiny from the Department of Education but
rather parents, trustees, and inspectors. Those retired teachers from rural areas had little
recollection of the reforms of 1937 and had, according to one, “they had poor buildings,
they had poor equipment, and they had the poorest qualified teachers.” (p. 22) Other
glitches included a polio outbreak in 1937, which delayed the opening of school for a full
month. (p. 12)

According to oral interviews, Milewski discovered little evidence of educational
reform among the 21 retired teachers whom he interviewed. Work entailed a mix of
“independence, regulation, and surveillance.” (p. 6) Basically, the community monitored the teacher’s practices and on occasion there would be an ‘unpleasant’ inspection.

Those who were interviewed do recall educational change. According to William, who was an inspector in 1947, “The curriculum was changed to present a more flexible program and new textbooks…You had one a year, a brown reader. Everybody had to use it…” (p. 12) However, one must go back to 1934 to see the attempts at changing the educational system.

After the defeat of the Conservative government in 1934, Premier Hepburn introduced new bureaucrats to the traditional Department of Education who were more aligned with child centered learning. (p. 10) Unfortunately, Thornton’s term became short lived. In terms of leadership, Thornton J. Mustard who was appointed as the principal of Toronto Normal School a year after the introduction of the new curriculum in 1937. (Ryerson first established this school in 1847 to standardize teacher training in Canada West. Likewise, master teachers were appointed by an order-in council.) Despite his efforts to promote education reform, he died during the sinking of “The Athenia” in 1939. One interviewee, Helen remembered Mustard since he taught her at the Toronto Normal School. He was described as “a leader and his lectures were delightful.’ (p. 13) One retired teacher commented that “…we all said that if Mr. Mustard hadn’t been drowned in the ocean everything would have been different.” (Ibid)

There was also the contradiction or a gap between the theories inspired by John Dewey and its practices. Helen, one subject, brought attention to the fact that “when you had forty children in the classroom you couldn’t have too much emphasis on any child.”
The government had not introduced caps or limits to classroom sizes, so the true notion of child-centered learning became one of theory rather than practice.

Although Milewski interviewed a small sample of retired teachers and some may contest the accuracy of memory and the validity of oral interviews, nevertheless, one respondent made a comment that best epitomized the ‘zeitgeist’ of her time. Margaret stated in regards to the new curriculum that “It nearly drove our principal crazy. He thought he couldn’t get it through his head just; I paid no attention to it [because] I had my own way of teaching and paid no attention to any of it…They left me alone and I taught successfully.” Furthermore, teachers, like her, were not amused by guest speakers who made them “nearly sick listening to how they wanted you to teach…and I would come home and forget about it… [because it was]…too incidental. They didn’t get to the nitty gritty.” Margaret taught for other 38 years in Toronto and claimed to have never have changed her style since she was unaware of any complaints. (p. 15) What mattered to her was “as long as you kept to your course of study and you covered it and the children were successful they left you alone.” (p.16)

According to Milewski, Sharon who taught in Hastings County had little recollection of new teaching methods bur rather having the ‘little grey book’ in your possession in order to satisfy the inspector and his checklist. (p. 19)

Another item raised in regards to the implementation of curriculum is the retention of teachers. Historically, teaching had a very low profile and was seen as ‘stepping stone’ or career for single women prior to marriage. One needs to examine the percentage of teachers who remain within the profession over a long period of time. As for Josephine,
in Milewski’s study, she was a teacher who left after eight years and commented that she “had a lot more things on [her] mind than just making kids very educated children.” (p. 20) Various reasons can be attributed to high attrition rates in the teaching community. They include the following: stigmas, stress, pay, and a host of other working conditions that made the profession unsavoury for some.

As Milewski points out, for some, the curriculum allowed “a measure of flexibility for children to do things for themselves.” (p. 23) However, the new methods ran contrary to the traditional methods of assessment. In reality, according to Milewski (2003) many school inspectors merely emphasized the need “to drill, review, and test student knowledge in the core subjects.” (p. 1114) The learning activities or the results were not used widely by teachers for promotion, so they gained little admiration. (p. 1116) Overall, the reforms were well intended, but poorly implemented and not supported by the population. Despite the good intentions of educational reform and its proponents, the “little grey book” found itself more of a feature on a teacher’s desk rather than a classroom practice.

**Various Trends in Ontario and the World between 1969 and 1999**

Baskerville (2002) examined the social, economic, and political trends that occurred in Ontario in the later quarter of the twentieth century. Socially, dramatic changes occurred in education, health, demographics, and the work force. From 1940 to 1975, there were 1.5 as many students enrolled in elementary schools and nearly 5 times as many educators. Ontario introduced OHIP (Ontario Health Insurance Plan) in 1972. (p.213) Premier Davis also expanded French language services in 1971. (p. 216)
Ontario’s diversity increased to an extent that 25% were no longer of French or English descent. (p.219) In the 1960’s, the Women’s Movement extended itself to the workplace where Premier Robarts began the Women’s Bureau in order to extend maternity leave and address inequity in the workplace. (p. 223) Ontario furthermore committed itself to build an extensive welfare system in order to adapt to an expanding and diversified population by extending educational, health, and labour issues that promoted greater equity and coverage.

Economically, agriculture and manufacturing gave way to the service industries. The number of farms declined over the last half of the twentieth century by over 80%. By the early 1970’s, 60% of the workforce was employed in the service industry mainly through welfare, education, and health. (p. 210) The auto industry in Ontario enjoyed protectionism through the Auto-Pact agreement in 1965, but faced increased foreign competition over more fuel efficient foreign manufactures. (p. 211) After the formation of OPEC (the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) the price of oil increased by over 20% which prompted increased costs for consumers and companies. Although provincial government spending increased, revenues did not match expenditure. (p. 224) Premiers such as Peterson in the late 1980’s and Rae in the early 1990’s had difficulty managing Ontario’s expanded welfare state and gaining support from the Federal government. By the eighties, Ontario had faced challenges with rising labour costs, taxes, and competition. After 1990, NAFTA (the North American Free Trade Alliance) had allowed manufacturers to seek southern American states that offered lower operating costs. (p. 226) In contrast to the 1960’s, Ontario had declined in its economic status.
Between 1986 and 1993, Ontario’s political landscape was no longer dominated by the Conservative government. Premier Peterson increased welfare payments despite reduced revenues from Prime Minister Mulroney’s Conservative Federal government. (p. 225) The NDP under Premier Rae introduced the controversial Social Contract that imposed nearly two weeks of unpaid days on government workers. In 1995, Mike Harris imposed conservative policies on government workers. (p. 228) However, acrimonious policies that reduced spending, promoted deregulation, and encouraged privatization deeply divided the province. Environmental scandals, such as the contamination of drinking water in Walkerton, and cuts to health and education raised the credibility of Harris’ “Common Sense Revolution.” (pp. 229-230) According to Struthers (2000), in regards to attitudes to welfare “…the workfare policies of the Harris government represent not so much a sharp break from the past as a return to the punitive traditions and moral categories that dominated welfare policy before the 1960’s…” (p. 449) The political pendulum had swung back to the right by the close of the century and the role of the welfare state was challenged. Overall, socio-economically and politically the province was at a crossroads in terms of its direction and attempts to solve new challenges.

The Elementary & Secondary Panel’s attempts at Shaping Government Reforms

One may consider simple and traditional forms of non-compliance as forms of protesting against a government or a corporation. In the case of the 13 American colonies, Patriots opposed taxation without representation, navigational acts, military occupation, and non democratic institutions. These ‘rebels’ also attacked tax collectors, damaged Loyalist homes, and destroyed British goods. However, people were also non
compliant by boycotting British goods or simply drawing a skull and cross bones in the place of a postage stamp.

Non compliance, a form of social protest, can be viewed as being actively aggressive or passively aggressive through various forms of social, economic, or political resistance. In the case of teachers and administrators, some practiced these forms of opposition because of a sense of alienation. Their levels of compliance can be gauged on a spectrum of complete to incomplete. Historical examples of resistance include revolutions, rebellions, marches, and other forms of protest involving the individual or a collective whole. According to Barbara Richter (2006 & 2007)), in a series of four articles, Ontario teachers have organized themselves against conditions in the workforce for over the past hundred years.

What makes the teachers’ forms of non compliance quite unique is that it was private rather than public form of resistance in its nature. Although teacher labour groups organized themselves to directly address government policies through democratic, legal, and public channels, nevertheless, these peaceful and lawful methods are quite different from the forms of non-compliance which occurred in the classrooms of Ontario schools from 1969 to 1999. Furthermore, this form of non compliance had occurred in earlier periods of Ontario’s history of public education. In effect, it is a method of ‘boycotting’ government policy by poorly implementing it or simply ignoring it. It is a method of ‘foot dragging’ and a method sabotaging a system both cognitively and non-cognitively. Technically, teachers are not ‘breaking the law.’ They are merely badly enforcing it.

The opposition of the workers, in this case, is much different than the notion of private companies that exploit the factory workers. Workers can, in effect, shut down or
economically damage their employers. In the case of teachers, according to Radecki (1980), they can effectively help to oust certain parties or elected officials, but they cannot shut down the government for good, as pointed out by the 1980 secondary schools strike in Sudbury. (p. 169)

In Teachers’ Unions in Canada (1999), in the chapter entitled “The Battle over Ontario’s Bill 160” the authors see that Harris’ government used a concept termed ‘Benthamite Centralization.’ In effect, the term derives from an author who was affected by Napoleonic reforms. Essentially, government agencies, such as school boards, “are faithful executors of centrally defined mandates.”(pg. 117) Bill 160 was a “restructuring of the decision making process” of educational funding in Ontario. (p. 117) Overall, it is seen as a measure that only works for a short period of time that is easily overturned by new governments since it affronts collective bargaining and ignores local issues. (pg. 121) One model does not work well in all cases.

One has to examine the very root of why there exists struggle between the government and its workers. It is partially a matter of inheriting a system that lacked clear division of rights and responsibilities in a changing society. Downie (1992) quotes Donald Noone who in 1970 saw that three stages occurred between school boards and teachers: a differentiation in power between two groups, the rise in power of one group over the traditional one, and the equalization of two powers. (pp. 17-19) The teacher unions moved from less militant methods of influencing boards by deterring members to apply to certain boards to outright strikes that shut down school boards.

The late 1960’s marked a trend in which society had changed: there existed new demands for schooling, a change in teaching philosophy, union militancy, and board
consolidation. Most importantly, one could interpret Ontario’s education system was a ‘Balkan of pedagogical states.’ The system of change or power struggle did not allow teachers the right to bargain or to be recognized. According to Downie, “The mechanisms had simply grown up without the definition of the rights and responsibilities of either party.” (p. 35) Provincial-wide provincial bargaining is seen by Downie as the worst possible way to resolve differences since it stifles “innovation and problem solving.” (p. 170) Likewise, “talks would degenerate to the lowest denominator on both sides of the table and important trade-offs which now take place at the local level would be extremely difficult if not impossible to make.”(p. 170)

According to Radecki (1982) Teachers in Sudbury were willing to not comply by staging the longest teachers’ strike in Ontario history. In 1980, secondary teachers were out for a total of 56 school days or approximately 11 weeks. Teachers passively refused to fill in anonymous questionnaires as to the reasons for the strike. However, Radecki suggested that teachers did not comply since they would be blamed for the prolonged strike and if students were able to catch up it would imply that teachers would not be worth the salary increases for which they fought. (pp.163-4) Because of the socio-economic nature of Sudbury, those parents put faith in the Sudbury Board of Education since parents trusted their “expertise.” Essentially, workers in service and industry were reluctant to bring an end to the lengthy strike. Working class parents had difficulty, according to parents, to sympathize with the teachers’ plight for better working conditions, when mining jobs required greater risk and hazardous conditions. (p. 165)

By the 1970’s, unlike the 1960’s, teachers feared being declared ‘surplus’ because of the decline in enrolment and other economic activities. INCO had also
endured a long strike and the Sudbury Board was convinced that taxpayers would not pay more for the rising cost of education. Hence, few concessions were given to teachers. This was considered as “contract-stripping by the teachers.” (p. 166) “Possibly, teachers’ demands became more inflexible after a member of the provincial OSSTF (Ontario Secondary School Teachers’ Federation) unofficially joined their negotiation team.” (p. 167) Both sides were not willing to make concessions.

Alienation was significant. The SBE (Sudbury Board of Education) was unaware of “dissatisfaction among teachers.” Radecki (1980) found a clear lack of communication between the two groups. What also prolonged the strike was an advertisement that expressed that teachers were both well compensated, worked in good conditions, and had been offered acceptable improvements. (p. 167) This ad only added insult-to-injury and merely increased the animosity between the two groups. The teachers’ publication, The Rock, suggested that its readers would not vote for trustees who did not support the teachers. (p. 168) The report concluded that teachers saw themselves as “workers” and were more concerned with “work conditions and job security.” (p. 169) The report recommended province-wide rather than local negotiations since this would “permit the establishment and maintenance of amiable relations between teachers and local school representatives and administrators.” (p. 169)

The report recognized that Bill 100 allowed the teachers the right to strike, but did not see that it was effective. Striking workers close factories, but striking teachers do not close government. Instead, they put pressure on parents to resolve the strike. Hence, the writer saw it as “misdirected form of sanction.” (p. 169) In the case of Sudbury, a stalemate occurred since parents were reluctant to put pressure on officials to end the
lengthy strike. Overall, non compliance resulted from an atmosphere of alienation, miscommunication, and animosity. One can learn that unresolved disputes and a lack of “province wide uniform scale of salaries and working conditions” contributed to this form of non-compliance or extended strike action. (p. 169)

According to Barbara Richter (2006, December), in regards to gender, as early as 1880 in Ontario, women were the cheapest means of keeping an affordable education for the province since “a school board could hire two women for the price of one man.” Likewise, she points out that both limited employment prospects and the period between completing school and marriage would further drive down their ‘market value.’ (p. 3)

According to Richter, Perth County was the first to form an association for teachers entitled the Teachers’ Protective Association in 1886. In cities, the Ontario Teachers’ Alliance was also formed. Even then, government officials viewed this as unsavoury since they feared that they would demand better wages and working conditions. (p. 3)

Men and were segregated in terms of their associations: the Ontario Public School Men Teachers’ Federation (OPSMTF) and the Federation of Women Teachers’ Association of Ontario (FWTAO). These bodies existed between 1888 and 1920. Richter attributes the organization of the FWTAO with coincidence of the suffrage movement and an anti communist sentiment after the Bolshevik Revolution. (p. 4) Non-compliance or organization of early unions was essentially limited since membership was voluntary and communication, especially between rural schools, was severely limited. Overall, there was a very slow and long period of time for Ontario teachers to organize themselves and articulate their various concerns regarding their genders, divisions, religion, and language issues. These concerns also coincided with various historical trends in workers’ rights
and suffrage. These members, such as the OPSMTF, faced criticism or dismissal. (p.5) The economic uncertainties of the 1930’s and the surplus of teachers led to increased strain on wages and working conditions. Hence, by 1943, various groups pressured the government to adopt the “Boards of Reference Act” which allowed teachers to challenge boards for being fired. The FWTAO also provided legal support for those who felt they were wrongfully dismissed. (pp. 5-6) According to Richter, “these early services expanded and adapted to become today’s professional relations service (PRS).... [and] a Legal Support Committee to deal with request from members for representation in criminal and civil cases.”(p. 6) Richter felt that there was a long and challenging march for the organized labour of Ontario teachers; it was a movement that coincided with equality and the desire for better working conditions, salaries, and job security. Despite opposition from government leaders, teachers were in some respects non compliant. Opposition stemmed from the fear of non traditional advances, socialist beliefs, and economic reasons.

Richter (2007, February) argued that unions largely advocated for the improvement of the conditions and profiles of Ontario teachers. According to the ETFO, both the FWTAO & the OPSMTF worked providing in-service training. However, with a burgeoning population and a shortage of teachers, the government in 1952 provided temporary teaching certificates to high school graduates. (pp.2-3)

After WWII, the women’s branch of elementary school teachers pushed for equal pay. By 1951, the provincial government approved the Fair Remuneration for Female Employees Act. Despite this, male teachers still gained additional salaries through being married or doing extra-curricular activities such as coaching. (p. 3) One could argue that
elementary teachers were divided because of gender issues which helped to not only perpetuate inequalities but to fragment teachers and to ensure compliance with traditional methods of schooling. By raising the level of professionalism and establishing a guideline for salaries, the unions were able to establish a minimum salary by 1954. By 1971, salary grids were established through the “Qualifications Evaluation Council of Ontario” (p.3) Essentially, teacher unions were unwilling to accept the status quo. Pay was no longer based upon gender or grade division but rather seniority and academic qualifications. (p. 4)

Richter saw this as an early stage of collective bargaining since teachers no longer would bargain for their salaries. Likewise, the incentive to remain in teaching and to gain additional qualifications raised the profile of teachers. (p. 4)

Teacher unions fought against boards that required women to retire after marriage. By 1954, the OTF established guidelines for retaining married women and for maternity leave. It was not until 1970 that Ontario introduced similar required in the “Women’s Equal Opportunity Act.” Overall, women’s rights still needed what Richter referred to as “federation vigilance” to help female teachers assert their rights. (p. 6)

Richter felt that the 60’s & 70’s was commonly known for the feminist and environmental movements that began to reshape society. Hence, the 1968 report entitled “Living and Learning” advocated an educational system that went far beyond the traditional methods of teaching and learning. With the province’s restriction on spending in the early 1970’s, teachers advocated for better conditions for both themselves and their students.
In the fall of 1973, members of 17 “local bargaining units” of OSSTF and OECTA were unable to agree with their school boards. As a form of mass non-compliance, these teachers gave notice to resign from their jobs at the end of December. On December 18th, these teachers left their schools. After a rally at Maple Leaf Gardens, the protestors staged a mass rally at Queen’s Park. As a result, the provincial government repealed legislation (Bills 274 & 275) that imposed contracts and barred strikes. (p. 7)

Surprisingly, collective bargaining did not occur until 1975. “The School Boards’ and Teachers’ Negotiations Act” or Bill 100 allowed teachers the “statutory right to bargain and boards had to bargain with them in good faith.”(p. 7) Teachers could now have input on issues such as preparation and supervision time.

In 1975, in order to control inflation, price and wages were controlled. Federation groups, such as OPSTMF & FWTAO, lobbied against these measures. (p. 7) The Federation fought against traditional practices. To avoid ‘laying off teachers’ some boards new teachers “were told to sign letters of resignation when they signed contracts” to prevent redundancies for the board. Likewise, it was usually women who were pressured to take part time positions in order to save jobs for others. (p. 8) Finally, according to Richter, administrators “selected” which programs or rather teachers who would not be made redundant. Overall, the resistance was mainly over the inequality of pay and promotion for teachers, mainly women, who made up the elementary panel. (p. 8)

Richter (2007, June) felt that it was necessary to implement the Canadian Charter of Rights. A legal fund was needed and established by the FWATO to enforce women’s legal rights. To further implement equity, trade unions, such as the Ontario Federation of
Labour and other unions added minorities to their executives. (p. 2) Later, ETFO reserved executive posts for females. (p. 3) Federations defended teachers in regards to wrongful dismissal and discrimination. Women were largely removed from administrative roles during the consolidation of schools in 1969, since mainly small schools with female principals closed, and they were discouraged to apply for administrative positions in their boards. (p. 3) Finally, in 1982, Federations fought against the “Inflation Restraint Act” of 1982 and its affects on capping salaries. (p. 3) Under Harris’ government the “Employment Equity Act,” which encouraged the promotion of other minorities, such as those with physical disabilities, was ended. (p. 4)

Members of the former Metro Toronto teachers’ union held a strike in 1987 which helped usher in further preparation time in most future collective agreements. (p. 2) Likewise, *The Pay Equity Act of 1988* encouraged equal pay between genders; however, since nearly 20% of public elementary teachers did not hold university degrees, those who were overwhelmingly women and discouraged by boards to apply for principal positions, dominated the lower echelons of a standardized pay grid. (p. 5) Overall, despite laws that fought for equality, traditional practices such as not pursuing post secondary education and simply entering teaching prior to marriage reinforced gender roles and stereotypes.

In 1989, during a Liberal Convention, OTF members demonstrated in Hamilton and pressured the Ontario government to share in the management of its pension. By 1991, the government complied. The Federations were able ensure the “85 Factor” which ensured the best years of pay for one’s retirement and surviving benefits for partners. (p. 5)
By 1990, the NDP party, under Bob Rae, added further provisions to the *Employment Standards Act* regarding various leaves. Since unions were unable to agree with a decrease in spending on education, Bill 48 was initiated. Union leaders practiced a very common form of non compliance or acceptance. They simply walked away from the bargaining tables. Termed, “The Social Contract Act,” cost saving measures were imposed on public sectors which forced teachers to have salary caps, wage freezes, and 12 unpaid work days. (p. 6)

In 1995, a Royal Commission on Learning, published the report ‘For the Love of Learning’ which encouraged a variety of measures such as standardized testing, EQAO (the Education Quality Accountability Office), and OCT (the Ontario College of Teachers). After Harris changed labour laws, reduced social spending, and antagonized educators, Richter states “They generally made Ontario a meaner place to live.” (pg. 7) The ‘Days of Action’ involved protest across Ontario in order to bring attention to various reforms in health, education, and assistance. (pg. 7)

In 1997, “The Education Quality Improvement Act,” or Bill 160, was introduced and this led to a legal walk out that lasted for ten days. Richter claims that “teachers’ actions created more interest in education than ever before... [and] the actions of teachers and their supportive partners helped to prevent even deeper cuts to education.” (p. 8)

There has, however, existed a division among teachers to fully unify because of gender and divisions. Teachers have failed to comply, in some respects, with the notions of equity between these divisions. Surprisingly, the FWTAO rejected merging with the OPSMTF since women felt that the amalgamation would not suite their specific needs. Despite this, in 1985, the OPTF formed itself and used both the Charter of Rights and the
Ontario Human Rights Code to ensure amalgamation. By 1998, the FWTAO eventually merged with the OPTF to form the current ETFO. (p.8) One could argue that infighting and difference kept various labour groups from amalgamating. Ironically, the Harris Years almost acted as catalyst for unifying them as one group.

With the formation of the ETFO, (the Elementary Teacher’s Federation of Ontario,) two former groups (the FWTAO or the Federation of Women’s’ Teachers of Ontario) and the OPSTF or the Ontario Public School Teacher Federation) began to consolidate against the unpopular reforms of the Harris government. There has been a long history of non compliance or forms of social protest according to Barbara Richter. Aside from the contentious issue of amalgamating boards, the source of revenues for schools changed. Boards no longer gained funding from their local tax basis. Likewise, principals were excluded from the teachers’ union. Other issues included a new curriculum, new report cards, and the call for teacher testing. Overall, 1998 marked a challenging year for Ontario teachers.

According to Richter (2006, October), in terms of challenges, 1998 was an important date in Ontario’s educational history. The Harris government forced school boards to amalgamate from 129 to 72. Furthermore, other contentious issues included the following: a new funding formula that did not allow boards to levy taxes from their jurisdictions, the separation of administrators from the teachers’ unions, a challenging curriculum, and standardized report cards. All of these factors or reforms placed tremendous stress on the teaching force in Ontario. To complicate matters, Richter points out that little support was given in terms of resources and training. (p. 2)
Various forms of social protest were used to fight the Harris government. First, in 1998, the “85 factor” was offered to teachers for the first time. Hence, teachers were able to retire if their age plus years of service added to 85. (p. 2) Thousands of teachers took this opportunity to retire early. This ‘opting out’ of teaching and simply retiring could be viewed as a passive form of protesting the reforms under Harris. However, this theory will be explored further in the interviews conducted.

Second, in the same year, the Federation was involved at this time with three strikes and one lockout in order to maintain salaries and working conditions. The Federation lobbied and waged an aggressive advertising campaign against the Harris government and was able to take away seventeen seats from the Progressive Conservative Party (p. 3)

Third, the ETFO published a study entitled “Ensuring Professional Standards in Ontario Education: A Response to Teacher Testing Proposal” which challenged the need for such testing and recommended alternative methods to monitor professionalism among Ontario teachers such as standard model for growth and evaluation. (pp. 3-4)

Fourth, the repeal of Bill 74 was won by the ETFO and the OSSTF challenging the mandatory implementation of extra curricular activities as an intrusion to its right for collective agreements. By using the Charter of Rights and Freedom, teacher groups were able to fight Bill 74, and defeat it by June of 2001. ETFO again lobbied politicians, established a website against the bill, and mounted further media campaign entitled “No More Bullying.” Most importantly, between 2000 and 2001, teachers were encouraged to withdraw their services as a form of protest against this controversial bill. (pp. 4-5)
Fifth, by 2001, the “Stability and Excellence in Education Act” required the recertification of teachers every five years through various courses. In response, the ETFO offered an alternative program to guarantee accountability in the teaching profession and it consistently used a policy of gathering data, providing alternatives, lobbying against politicians, waging media campaigns, and aligning themselves with other labour groups. (p. 5)

Sixth, in 2002, the concern of funding was brought to the government’s attention through the “Education Equality Task Force.” As a result additional funds were provided to alleviate problems with overcrowding of students and other “overloads” to teachers. (p. 6) According to surveys, ETFO reported a deterioration work conditions such as “bigger classes, heavier workloads, more paperwork, fewer programs, and crumbling schools… [also]...more teachers under review; more stress-related LTD (long term disability) claims; increased workloads due to the loss of administrators, support personnel, and specialist teachers; lack of supply teachers to cover absences; inadequate training and supports for teachers in new positions.”(p. 7)

Overall, teachers inherited a system that lacked equity and fair practices. Elementary teachers over the twentieth century amalgamated themselves under a larger organization, lobbied politicians, waged media campaigns, used the Charter of Rights, and withdrew extra curricular services in order to protest against various educational policies. Many of the early attempts to organize elementary school teachers most importantly were tied to the improvement and recognition of women in the workplace.
The Secondary Panel’s attempts at Protesting against Government Reforms

The Ontario Secondary School Federation has had a history of organized protest. Head & Hutton (2005) saw the role of the OSSTF in four distinct phases: the sixties involved the importance of pay; the seventies stressed economic matters; the eighties addressed pensions; and finally, the nineties involved political mobilization. (p. vii) The OSSTF pursued both active and passive methods of social protest. In terms of active methods of protest, one needs to examine various acts that prompted the mobilization of its union members. Tactics among organized labour leaders ranged from subtle to strong methods. They ranged from public rallies to quieter forms of protest. The leaders of the secondary panel have used a variety of tactics that have included the following: fear, rallies, publications, walk outs, elections, ‘self-praise,’ petitions, symbolic gestures, the media, creative solutions, increasing membership, alliances, physical force, and passive aggressive behaviour.

It was not unusual to use fear as a tactic to retaliate against the status quo or government reforms. Prior to the 1970’s, organized labour leaders had two main methods of pressuring or threatening school boards to change their policies. Authors, such as Hutton, referred to these tactics as “games of chicken.” (p. 13) Prior to having the right to strike, there was only the threat of resigning ‘en masse’ in December in order to disrupt the new school year. The other alternative was for union leaders to issue a ‘pink letter’ or strongly urge union members not to work for certain boards that did not give into union demands. (p. viii) This, in effect, was a form of boycotting certain school boards and depriving them of the necessary pool of labour needed to perpetuate a traditional system. It also applied pressure to school boards for change.
In addition, in 1970, during the Metro Toronto Teacher Strike, the union used the ‘pink letter’ to deter members to apply to the Metro Board. (p. 9) Two years later, OECTA (Ontario Elementary Catholic Teachers’ Association) used the threat of mass resignations in Essex, Windsor, Timmins, and Lambton in order to protest against their trustees’ ability to bargain with teachers. (p. 11) The OSSTF was willing to use tactics which used financial threats. For example, in 1973, the union asked its members to submit promissory notes of $600.00 each in order to create a strike fund. Although none of these notes were used, it proved to be an effective tool in convincing the Ontario government to make reforms in education. (p. 12) Members too were willing to forsake a day’s worth of pay to further their causes. On December, 18th 1973, Metro teachers walked off their jobs while 17 other board threatened resignation. (p. 14)

Legal threats also served as a form of opposition. In an effort to provide feedback in teacher testing under the Harris government, the OSSTF promised to refrain from pursuing a libel suit against the Conservative government. Bills, which made extra-curricular activities law under the Conservative government, were repealed. (pp. 63-5) It was very similar to a ‘land-for-peace’ policy in which wins were sacrificed for losses; unions were able to at least mitigate losses.

In order to gain media attention and to impress opposition with sheer numbers, the OSSTF relied on mass rallies. Organized labour often uses mass rallies to help bring attention to their cause through their presence at Queen’s Park and other strategic locations. What further strengthened these rallies was the amalgamation of other labour groups. In 1973, the OSSTF protested against Bill 274, which opposed mass resignations,
four organizations (FWTAO, OSSTF, OECTA, & OPSMTF)\(^1\) and over 2000 Metro Toronto teachers rallied against the bill. (p. 15) A smaller version of a rally would include a “study session” or pressuring the office of a political representative. In 1974, the OSSTF organized a “one day study session” at the office of Tom Wells. He was a MPP under Premier Robarts and Premier Davis between 1963 and 1985. Tom Wells represented Scarborough North. In addition, union representatives conducted polls to see if voters were willing to pay more taxes for smaller class sizes. (p. 13) Queen’s Park proved to be an ideal place to host rallies since the outside could host a large congregation but also these bills came from the very site. In the case of Bill 127 when all six Toronto boards were made as one bargaining unit, the secondary panel staged a protest at the provincial seat of power. (p. 31) Rallies also contain a symbolic pageantry that motivates protesters through camaraderie and public theatre.

The authority of scholars and universities has added to the OSSTF’s campaigns. In order to add credibility to the OSSTF and their arguments, the union approached its opposition through publications. In opposition to the Hall-Dennis Report, in 1976, the union published a response entitled “At What Cost?” in an effort to counter the Hall-Dennis initiatives and return to traditional or core subjects for Ontario secondary students. (pp. 22-23) Newsletters, such as the Bulletin, were able to convince teachers that individual bargaining was ineffective in comparison to collective bargaining as early as 1965. (p. 2) Further publications included (ROSE) The Renewal of Secondary Education in Ontario which opposed (OS: IS) Ontario Schools: Intermediate/Senior reforms in secondary curriculum. Two other publications, one in 1986 entitled The

---

\(^1\) The following acronyms are explained: FWTAO (Federation of Women Teachers’ Association of Ontario), OSSTF (Ontario Secondary School Teachers’ Federation), OECTA (Ontario English Catholic Teachers’ Associations), & OPSMTF (Ontario Public School Men Teachers’ Federation)
Adolescent Experience and a second in 1990 entitled The Good School brought light to individualization and characteristics of successful schools. (p. 41) Most importantly, by promoting field testing or pilot projects, unions could better provide input into change and oppose things that were deemed detrimental. For instance, the union recommended that OS: IS needed pilot projects and responses from teachers. (p. 45) In the case of “de-streaming,” Jim Head, president of OSSTF in 1989, felt that the reform had not been properly tested before implementation. (p. 44) Finally, in 1997, the OSSTF published Recipe for Success to protest the Conservative reforms in education. (p. 62) Historically, a list of grievances that has been effectively distributed has brought attention and strength to a group’s plight.

By physically leaving the job site, workers can make a profound statement. Mass desertion has been a historic concern for governments. In 1974, as militancy grew among unions, teachers in Windsor walked off their jobs in an effort to improve their salaries. (p. ix) In some school boards, secondary teachers walked out ‘en masse,’ but rotating strikes also were employed to bring attention to opposition. (p. 18) However, the greatest demonstrations occurred from 1995 to 1998. In efforts to protest a reduction in educational spending, the end of Ontario Academic Courses, the amalgamation of boards, the separation of principals from teacher unions, and the reduction of authority of trustees, unions launched what was termed as “Days of Action.” For eleven days, various groups publicly protested across Ontario cities to raise awareness. (p. 60) These episodic strikes formed a series of disruptions that reminded people of the valuable services provided by public sector employees. Although it may be debated whether it brings sympathy to the cause, the action certainly brings attention to the matters.
Democracy -in itself- is a powerful tool. Ironically, teacher unions have used the very democratic system that elected certain governments into power to help advance their causes; the OSSTF was able to protest against certain reforms. This was apparent in 1990 when the union was able to help end a Liberal majority in exchange for a minority government. (ix) The Ontario Legislature also held the ideal stage for opposition. President Jim Forster, head of the OSSTF on October 13, 1974, challenged the Prime Minister, Pierre Elliot Trudeau and Premier Davis for a debate (p. 21) Here, the hopeful involvement of federal and provincial leaders would be used to help bring about opposition to educational reform. Using the judicial branch of the government, the OSSTF was willing to bring matters to the Supreme Court of Canada and to employ constitutional experts to further their cases. When members of Renfrew County union were not granted wage increases (because the federal government tried to curb inflation through wage freezes) it was argued by Professor Lederman, a constitutional expert, that the federal government could not intervene in this provincial matter. (pp. 23-24) The secondary union was willing to send representatives to help promote the cause of pay equity to Legislature Standing Resources Committees in 1984 (p. 32) The union would continue to send representatives to advance their causes. In the case of opposing Bill 30 in 1986, which extended funding to Catholic secondary schools, they sent representatives to three provincial commissions (p. 33) Other methods of protest include providing political expertise for MPP candidates to run as independent seats to provide alternatives main political parties. For instance, a secondary school teacher, Stuart Cole, ran in 1985 for political office. (p. 35) Moreover, by focusing on certain ridings, the union attempted to derail candidates and parties who opposed the policies of teachers’ unions. In twenty
ridings, the OSSTF tried to defeat Liberal candidates to help create a minority government. These efforts included ‘door-to-door’ canvassing in order to promote an NDP win over the Liberal Party in August of 1990. (p. 48) Furthermore, in 1999, the Ontario Teachers Federation used “strategic voting” to oust conservative politicians Bruce Smith (a parliamentary assistant) and David Johnson (the Minister of Education and Training). (p. 63) Laws too, especially regarding equity and safety, helped to protest reforms. By 1985, the secondary panel began using the Occupational Health & Safety Act to improve working conditions. (p. 42) By using other bills, unions could support their own aims.

Unfortunately, teachers have not always been highly regarded within some communities. In an effort to raise the profile of a group, the secondary panel extended funds to various efforts to demonstrate their importance. These included the following: awards to improve school and community relationships, conferences to improve job prospects for general level students, funding to research drop out rates, and funding reports that fought against the censorship of contentious books. (pp. 27-28) Here the union becomes more synonymous with ‘generous’ if not ‘noble’ pursuits which help to bolster the organization. The government was obviously vilified by conservative or religious parents who opposed books such as *Catcher in the Rye*. (p. 30) By promoting Salinger, unions could also promote their own causes and freedom of speech.

Petitions have even been employed to pressure leaders to change. In an effort to help facilitate teachers to implement changes to grade 13, in 1967, OSSTF pressured Premier Bill Davis to fund conferences and workshops for teachers. (p. 5)
The media can be a powerful tool in mobilizing the population. School boards were known to wage ad campaigns against teachers, such as the case of Huron County in 1971. Billboards were used to convince tax payers that taxes would raise dramatically if the demands of teachers were met. (p. 9) In response, the secondary panel used similar methods to counter their opposition. In 1985, OSSTF placed advertisements against these Bill 30 or the funding of separate schools. The secondary panel leaders argued that funding for separate schools at the secondary level would hamper the province’s need to expand and introduce further special education programs. For example, a media blimp was used to express the secondary panel’s displeasure for Bill 30 at the CNE and public school students were encouraged to wear t-shirts at East York Collegiate. (p. 36-7) During campaigns, union representatives were willing to confront the premier at speaking engagements, such as Cobourg, in 1990, in order to gain more attention to their issues on television. These guerrilla tactics often caught politicians off guard and unprepared. (p. 48) TVO was used to hosting debates. In the case of destreaming, in 1993, the OSSTF president and the Minister of Education had a debate over the pros and cons of this educational reform. (p. 54) Media leaks helped to highlight flaws in government policies. In one case, the union pointed out how the government allowed for more than 25 in-service training sessions, so teachers at Rosedale Heights Secondary School could better implement destreaming. (p. 54) By demonstrating the lack of transparency to field testing, the union was better able to display how reforms were not fully tested.

Some forms of opposition bring attention to opposition through their subtleness. In the case of “back-to-work” legislation, Metro Toronto public secondary teachers wore black arm bands when they returned to classes in January of 1975. (p. 21)
Bill 30, funding was provided to send out pre-cut ballots that displayed opposition to the bill. (source) On April Fool’s Day, in 1989, teachers symbolically protested the “foolish” measures of Premier Peterson at Copps Coliseum in opposition of controlling the teachers’ pension plan. (pp. 45-6) Solidarity songs helped to express displeasure. Nearly 30 labour representatives from various unions walked out of government meetings and sang solidarity songs in opposition to Bill 48 or The Social Contract. (p. 56) Teachers would carry signs that used clever puns to help illustrate their displeasure. One sign read, “Ontario High School Teachers give Bob Rae an F” (p. 56) Overall, teachers used clever means to show their protest or opposition to change.

Perhaps the most aggressive response to change occurred with the treatment of Janet Eckert. In 1999, the Minister of Education, Janet Ecker, received silence rather than questions to a speech delivered to the AMPA (Annual Meeting of the Provincial Assembly) (p. 64) Perhaps one of the most controversial methods of opposing the government is “work-to-rule.” By withholding extra-curricular activities, teacher unions attempt to disrupt the system by complying to the letter of the law in regard to classroom teaching yet withholding their unpaid services or voluntary acts of ‘goodwill.’ In opposition to Bill 62 or legislation for teacher to return to work, Durham secondary school teachers no longer participated in these services, such as coaching volleyball. (pg. 63)

In an effort to avoid teacher layoffs due to declining enrolments, the Teachers’ Federation promoted creative alternatives to the traditional methods of cutting staff. These means included a four-over-five policy, early retirement, and the creation of more adult education classes. (pg. 27)
By extending the membership of a teacher’s union to include members outside of the traditional classroom and principal staff, the union would increase its authority and strength. This proved to be the case in numerous instances. In Ottawa, in 1983, night school teachers were incorporated into the union. (pg. 32) By 1989, school boards recognized the membership of speech pathologists, social workers, and psychologists in the secondary school union. (pg. 49)

Although it largely constituted a threat, in 1988, in opposition to Bill 30, delegates at AMPA promised to physically occupy schools that were transferred from the public to the separate school system. (p. 39) After the passage of Bill 48, opponents loudly jeered at politicians. In fact, some had to be physically removed from the gallery. (p. 56) However, violence was a rare occasion for most teachers.

This survey shows that secondary public school teachers displayed passive to active forms of protest against government reforms from the late sixties to the late nineties. The later part of the century marked not only more aggressive and military tactics but also subtle and soft spoken methods of displaying disapproval. In the case of threats and the physical occupation of buildings, these could also be seen as very aggressive. Very few could be considered physically aggressive or violent. These would likely have brought negative attention to a group’s cause.

In the case of the OSSTF, one could argue that a multitude of approaches were used. They included the following: anti-government publications, peaceful rallies, walk outs, the use of political institutions, the self promotion of labour groups, the expansion of union membership, the use of the media, symbolic acts, and creative alternatives to government measures. All are examples of non aggressive forms of organized protest.
Factors that led to the Compliance of Teachers and Administrators in Ontario

In regard to compliance with educational reforms, according to those who participated in the interviews, it was found that certain features became evident during the conversations. The following areas will be examined: 1) the role of gender; 2) the inability to avoid legislation; 3) the reinforcement of existing situations; 4) the age of the teaching force; 5) the level of support and the affluence of the community; 6) the role of the principal; 7) the zeitgeist of the time; 8) demographics; and 9) the nature of the elementary panel. A tenth possible factor was not examined. Did religion play a role in compliance with the state? This question is another thesis in itself. However, it is worth noting that this may be a factor in compliance.

The Role of Gender

First, it was found that gender played a large role in the level of compliance with the government. It also resulted in a disproportionate number of women in the elementary panel and a predominately male population in the secondary panel. One could also argue that men who occupied the high school levels were the main providers of income and they set a tone for non-compliance, which will be examined in the next section.

Prior to the ‘Women’s Movement’ in Canada from the mid to later part of the century, women occupied traditional roles in and outside of the home. At the secondary level, men mainly occupied positions of teaching, administration, and ministerial levels.

Women had fewer options in terms of the workplace and were not seen as the primary income earners or as permanent member in the workforce, but rather as individuals who would manage homes or raise families. As the society changed through
the 1980’s and 1990’s, the imbalance in genders ratios began to diminish; however, a
tone was set that influenced behaviour.

Quite frankly, one person stated, “Elementary was very different from secondary.
Secondary had a much larger male population and their salary was the main salary.”
(Subject #11) Even more bluntly, another quipped, “Men wouldn’t just put up with that
crap whereas women were more nurturing and complaint to begin with; and in some
cases, it was a second income and they came and went as they had children.”
Furthermore, the same individual felt that the male administration at the elementary panel
saw themselves as “little kings.” (Subject #1)

A subject who started her career in the late fifties described the difference between
the expectations of women in her time versus those today by themselves and by society.

“It was as simple as this: you came out of high school [and] you were a teacher, a
nurse, or a receptionist. I was told what I was going to do by my parents…."

The level of compliance or simply the reality of her workload was quite impressive. What
impressed the interviewer was the individual’s willingness to work with such large
numbers of students and to teach all day kindergarten, decades before the mandatory
introduction of all day kindergarten under the recent McGinty Liberal Government and
before the issue of capping class sizes in Ontario. She stated, “In my first year in
kindergarten, there were 38 kids all day. Here we are arguing [about it] and that was
[19]59 and that would be 53 years in September and they are still arguing about all day
kindergarten.” (Subject #9) Despite these challenges, she spoke fondly of her students
and her teaching experience.

Overall, there is a considerable degree of overlap regarding this topic. One’s
gender influenced one’s perception and how society perceived that person. As there
became a bipolar arrangement between the two panels, the women –largely under the guidance of elected males in politics- helped the province to establish compliance in reforms and in the classroom.

**The Inability to Avoid Legislation**

For two main reasons, there was no opportunity to resist reform. First, the principals and the schools could not “knowingly break the laws” introduced by the party in power. In one situation, a former superintendent related that even if the trustee was against change, one could not then and now break laws. “I recall an incident in the early 80’s when secondary was going through a variety of reforms and there was a pilot programme to make changes to grade 9 and 10. That became mandatory that fall and [with] the board I was with at that time….the trustees voted not to implement it at that time. At that point of the board meeting, the director said ‘[Chairperson] with all due respect, we will implement this programme in the fall.’” (Subject #11)

Although some did not like the reforms under the Hall-Dennis Report, teachers “complied, but they had to rewrite everything with a lot of mumbling and grumbling.” (Subject #1) Essentially, once the elected party became a minority or majority government and once their bills passed, with some modifications in the case of minority governments, these bills became laws and could be easily enforced. The Ministry of Education then instructed the directors, superintendents, and principals to comply. It is very much a top down model.

Secondly, some changes were so structural, especially under Harris, non-compliance was not an option. In the case of the amalgamation of school boards, “There was no ability to resist change.” (Subject #11) Another administrator mentioned, “With a
stroke of a pen, several boards became one. Even the adoption of new software, such as Trillium, forced the teachers to use it, albeit begrudgingly…Some had to admit that it in some cases the new software was better than the previous system.” (Subject #12)

**The Reinforcement of Existing Situations**

Another subject had to admit that some reforms were just better. In the case of IEP’s (Individual Education Plans), it made little sense if each board had their own method of dealing with children with special needs. “In essence, in the case of IEP’s the information becomes very public…Absolutely, my staff liked it…There was no resistance by staff.” (Subject #8)

Other reforms, especially at the secondary panel, were well received. “I believe that the document called OSIS was the best received in my career. That was brought in under Premier Davis.” (Subject #8)

“OSIS took us from the old grade 13 to the newer programme. There was still a 5 year programme but it was new and reformed. The OSIS sped up the educational system it took us from courses that endured from the 60’s to the 70’s and it upgraded them to include technology and specialized education.” (Subject #6) It would be a misleading generalization that all teachers opposed change. Some changes were welcomed.

In some situations, existing programmes already complemented educational reforms. In the case of Hall-Dennis, teachers were encouraged to customize lessons around themes and around the learner. In the case of a special needs classroom, which already had a much smaller class size; it was much easier to introduce these changes. One teacher remarked that Hall-Dennis “did not impact on me as much. I don’t recall if I
was doing enrichment or remedial at the time… We already had everything individualized.” (Subject #1)

**The Level of Support and Affluence of the Community**

The community would support change depending on its rapport with the teachers and its level of affluence. These factors helped to facilitate and enforce change. During the seventies, the funding model allowed for the purchase of new teaching materials such as projectors and overheads. One subject was pleased with this. In fact, “We were all enthusiastic. We had good communication with the parents and there were many audio visual luxuries that were brought in and parents were positive about that.” (Subject #2)

One retired principal stated that “The richer school is more compliant. In my two years there I saw two teachers driven out by parents.” (Subject #3) Another retired principal recalled the challenges of dealing with parents who were judges or lawyers and arguing about educational law. (Subject #7)

It depended on what reforms were being introduced as to whether a higher or lower socio-economic group would accept change. “With new technology and advances, in higher areas, it will be embraced. It is already being used in their jobs. Other changes, more subjective curriculum wise, I found greater acceptance in lower socio economic areas. Trying to introduce a new self contained class in an affluent area [there was] strong resistance in a lower socio economic if they had an empty classroom, sure why not. In the higher areas, there was a feeling that that student didn’t belong there.” (Subject #11)

When it came to standardized tests, one subject commented that in “… less affluent communities what the teacher did was fine.” Whereas in more affluent areas, “In
some of the affluent schools, they refused to do EQAO testing. They knew that this did not prove anything…and you can give different tests.” (Subject #10)

In the case of more affluent communities, socio-economic realities allowed the teachers to become more involved or less involved with change in schools. In higher socio-economic areas, parents, especially mothers, were more vocal and vigilant in ensuring that their teachers complied with ministry reforms or adhering to their roles in their school. The type of change was either accepted or rejected, according to some, by the affluence of the community.

The Role of the Principal

It is hard to ignore the role of the principal. He or she must, according to the Educational Act, “…act in the best interest” of the students.” (Subject #11). That person carries out policy and as discussed later in the essay inherits a staff or has the ability to hire teachers who are eligible to be hired. Some principals simply hired younger and more recent graduates who were grateful for work and used to change. “I guess that is why administrators like young teachers because young people like change. They are not always resistant to it. They are more flexible. They are more adaptable.” (Subject #3) In many respects, the principal plays a crucial role in the implementation of change.

The ministry is responsible for carrying out the reforms, but there is a chain of command. At the level of the principal, the changes too may be stalled at this point. One teacher commented, “I would tend to think a major factor on getting changes made to education or evaluation. You must have the acquiescence of the principals because they determine what happens, not the ministry.” (Subject #2) The laws ensure that policy is enforced; however, principals initiate, impede, or act as catalysts of change.
The principal must be in agreement with the reforms and be willing to provide release time for his or her staff to be retrained. One subject commented that change happened according to the level of “…enthusiasm of the principal and his (sic) willingness to provide materials and time …which would [as a result] permit you to do so.”

A retired principal felt her staff when it came time to standardize and computerize report cards “… had a lot of difficulty. I had a lot of in-servicing. I would have someone come in and get a supply. They got in-service during lunch hours. Some were not getting it. I thought [some] couldn’t do it.” (Subject #3) Schools are unique in the respect that they have a captive audience of students whose attendance is mandatory. Funds had to be made available for supply teachers to cover classes or instructors to come in and assist in this transition.

Another former administrator commented that “There would be ministry and then there would be support documents to that change. The board would be adding to the ministry. There was a boat load of new programs. The key was that there would be time for in-service and things of that sort and then it was an easier transition. If you tried, PD after school, then it was always challenged, so you had to identify this staff meeting for organization and most teachers understood that a staff meeting was vital.” (Subject #11)

Reform itself has to filter down through layers of the educational apparatus. One stated that “Whenever you have reforms you have several forms of resistance. One of your keys is your principal. Does the principal support the change or not? Other keys include the superintendent’s role, the director’s role, and -of course- the trustee.”
(Subject #11) Overall, those implementing change must be in tune with change to ensure a better level of enforcement.

When examined, there became two distinct styles of administration. There were principals who inspired and there were principals who ‘bullied’ their staff members. It is not in the scope of this essay to determine which method was more influential, but both methods affected the degree of compliance with the subjects interviewed.

Teachers spoke fondly of certain principals. When asked what made them want to comply, one recalled how the staff was motivated to get involved in a conference “This guy [the principal] was a gifted person and he could inspire people and before you knew it, his vision became your vision…He spoke with such certainty. It was very difficult not to get swept with that.” (Subject #10) In this case, the principal was highly motivational as an administrator.

Another teacher admirably described the thoroughness of her principal, her level of respect for him, and his zeal to introduce whole language to the curriculum, “I would say the last one that I had… he was an English man and he brought in ‘whole language;’ he was on top of everything…He was more than very thorough.” (Subject #9) She spoke highly of his ability to be consciousness of change.

It is difficult to ensure that the staff is teaching according to both the required content and the method of evaluation. In this case principals at the elementary level, they used ‘benchmarks’ while chairs at the secondary panel used ‘evaluation methods.’

In order to monitor teachers, benchmarks were provided by principals, “Unless you monitor that, it is very difficult, so you say ‘OK what benchmarks did you use this
year?’ They would [all] give the same three. It was sort of like exemplars.” (Subject #10)

Administrators at the secondary level would use evaluation as a technique for teachers to comply with the curriculum. The teachers would have to communicate with the parents and students on how they were being evaluated. Hence, as word got around on how you were being graded, teachers would follow the curriculum closer. (Subject #5)

Some principals were described as passive aggressive in their behaviour. For one, it seemed to change by 1999 in comparison to 1969; the principal could make one’s life difficult. One commented that “it changed around 2000 and it became very ‘Do-your-own-thing-creativity was gone.’ I think that all principals told their staffs that, ‘Hey, you wanna’ teach. You follow the rules!’” (Subject #2) The issues of zeitgeist, transparency, accountability, and curriculum reform will be addressed later under the Harris years.

To get around non compliance, one could enforce health and safety more easily than the Educational Act. According to the Educational Act, the principal must ensure “What is the best interest of the child and the well being of the school.” Perhaps there is a conundrum here, since it is really subjective as to what is in the child’s best interest. However, there is no debate on the issue of Health and Safety. Here a retired principal could simply state, “That is not in the best interest of the child, but that is a health and safety issue. ‘How can you teach physical education in high heels? …No. I am sorry, but the kids are expected to wear running shoes. ‘What if you have to run across to help a student?’ This is a health and safety issue.”
To avoid the accusation of the harassment of workers, one principal was advised, “… I was told very clearly to make sure you are documenting 3 or 4 [teachers] so he can’t come at you for harassment.” In these examples, the issue of compliance revolves around safety.

Likewise, it was commented that the style of the principal had a lot to do with compliance. “The previous principal I worked with was autocratic and no teacher challenged him. The secretary mentioned that ‘I didn’t know half the teachers who worked here,’ because nobody came into the office. They were not [encouraged] to entertain any questions.” (Subject #3)

Other methods were more aggressive in their nature and somewhat contradicted the notion of bullying within the school. According to one, when it came to reforms regarding standardized testing and other matters, “[for] most teachers, changes were forced upon them. They accepted them.” (Subject #4)

A few teachers mentioned that their administration would avoid objections by choosing compliant teachers to carry out change, by resolving conflict prior to meetings, and by excluding staff members from ‘after school’ parties. In the case of Subject #4, he commented that “The administration would resolve problems by addressing these problems before staff meetings in order to get their agenda done... There was politics done around the teachers. The administration or the administrator would influence certain teachers or what he referred to as ‘his men.’ They omitted information to the parents. Only certain kids were picked to work around the office and only certain teachers were picked to go on tours. ..The hand picked teachers were compliant; …some teachers were excluded from the staff parties.”
In this situation, according to the same subject, opposition was challenged. Those who were “outspoken” or ‘stood up to this administration’ became marginalized in terms of their treatment or they eventually left the school. For example, he felt that “They were eventually ostracized by other groups…Others were forced out once they stood up to the administration…They would change the classroom and put them in the worst classroom in the building.”

The administration even tried to contain complaints by not allowing teachers to transfer out after one event that garnered media attention. The same teacher stated, “The teacher felt that things would've happened much differently. A number of teachers wanted to transfer out of the school after the incident. Transfers were not given…” (Subject #4)

Among those interviewed, it was never stated that teachers left because of change. In one case, a principal was seen as key to one teacher’s early retirement, “The principal got the lady to retire 10 years before. It was a personality thing. He was constantly in her classroom inspecting. He gave her very bad timetables.” (Subject #2)

The age, experience, and history of the principal had an effect on compliance. Earlier, the paper discussed the removal of principals from the Teacher Federation under the Harris Years. In two cases, the lack of experience among younger principals led to a breach in tradition. It was commented by others that there was a difference in the administration of the seventies versus the nineties. “You needed a minimum 25 years experience before applying, a real wealth of experience, [and] you knew how to get people on board without playing those games.” (Subject #8) Those games referred to excluding or bullying staff members.
Inspiration or fear motivated teachers to comply. When asked about the difference between the administration and personalities of the two panels, one subject softly chuckled, “[There is]…quite a bit of difference. They have a stronger administration and a weaker union in the elementary school system. People are much more afraid of what a principal can do to them, at least what they used to be able to do to them. They could move you down to grade 1 if you are in grade 8.” (Subject #5)

Whether it was fear, respect, or the auspices of a safety requirement, some teachers chose to comply simply to make their careers less complicated.

**The Zeitgeist of the Time**

Among those interviewed there became a shift in society from the seventies to the nineties. There was a perceived change in the number of hours teachers would willingly do or volunteer before and after school. Legislation and collective agreements regarding supervision became a contentious issue. This topic is examined in greater detail in the section pertaining to non-compliance.

One commented that “I think I was a part of a group that worked together that stayed in the evenings. We went to the bar. We drank. We planned. We had wonderful festivities. We had plays... A lot of teachers wouldn’t think of putting in the extra hours now.” (Subject #3)

One attributed her level compliance not to her religious background, but to her work ethic. When asked about this, she responded, “I think so. When you started, you did it, and you continued along that way, and you didn’t have rebellious people. Some of us didn’t like it, but this is how it was going to be and we never caused trouble in those days.” (Subject #9)
One retired principal felt that teaching had changed greatly since the earlier days because now everything, including supervision, arrival, and departure was more structured by legislated hours regarding the minimum time to arrive or depart from a school. “I find that staff is very much on the clock now. Whatever the collective agreement says, that is what we comply with. In my early years, there had been staff between 4:00 or 6:30…The union has taken a firm stand on things like supervision. Even within my own former responsibilities. I have found it interesting with supervision. Everything is geared toward time.” (Subject #8)

By the 1990’s society had changed. The mantra of creativity had fallen to the rhetoric of accountability. The public wanted proof as to whether the educational system was working. Likewise, the TIMS results for Ontario in the 1990’s placed the province behind other nations in math and science. In some respect, this was somewhat of a catalyst for change. In a smaller scope, it was similar to the Soviets’ launch of Sputnik and its role in motivating North Americans to improve their math and science programmes. Once could argue that these international results and the fear of falling behind other nations made educators more accountable.

Society, according to one, had truly changed from the late sixties to the late nineties. In regards to standardized testing, “The school results were published in the paper and that changes people in a hurry. That is high visibility, so the pressure on the principal now that person had to deal with militant unions so you had to part of one. Society began to change... companies were going through major restructuring, in education, in policing, the concept of accountability. ‘Father did not always know best.’ You had to prove that what you were doing was right, to say it was one factor would be
misleading.” (Subject #11) Overall, a neo liberal tone of the Harris Years had replaced the restructuring of the Davis Years. The pendulum had swung.

**Demographics**

An equally powerful force next to gender is demographics. The age and the size of the population had a profound influence on the behaviour of reforms and the behaviour of teachers. Among those interviewed, all were young and new to the teaching profession when they first began their careers. This youth led to zeal among some. It was mentioned that “I do not recall much opposition. That would be in the early 70’s. Everything then was based on child centered and was unstructured…We were all young, except for the one teacher and that individual never joined in.” (Subject #2)

Another teacher recalled the enthusiasm of those days, “When I started in 1972, there were a lot of initiatives. There were no textbooks used. The lessons were unit based. It was up to the teachers on what they would teach and how they would teach it…The teachers were young and enthusiastic. There was a lot of active learning.” (Subject #7) In a somewhat romantic tone, a subject did not feel that she was underpaid or undervalued, “I was always happy with what I got. For some people, there was talk that people should be paid according to their worth. That was at a time when teachers were getting B.A.`s and when I started that was not the case. You took courses and you moved up a level and then you got the BA. Well, there were a lot I could say… they were more ‘rounded people’ but did not do the job they were supposed to be doing.” (Subject #9)

It was notable that these subjects spoke fondly of their early years in teaching and they were not reluctant to work long hours. There was an attraction to work with like
minded individuals. In sharp contrast to her schooling in another country, the student
centred learning was a welcomed experienced. A teacher explained how she loved not
only attending the Ontario system and enthusiastically participated in it, but the fact that
it stressed comprehension rather than rote memory. “When I left [my country] in [19]59,
it was all rote learning. You were tested on a passage or a chapter. Even then, I knew that
it was wrong…So when we came here, and teachers asked questions and elicited
comprehension I said, ‘That is what education is about!’” (Subject #10) For one subject,
she was perplexed with the question of opposition or non compliance to the reforms of
Hall Dennis. She replied in a matter-of-fact way, “As far as I can remember, we did
what we were told to do. It was as simple as that.” (Subject #9) In fact, there was simply
no opposition “There was no discussion about it or people saying, ‘I don’t want to do it.’”
(Subject #3) Basically, she felt that non compliance was not a paradigm that existed in
her situation.

Finally, the economic realities of a teacher did not favour him or her to leave their
profession. The Ontario Teachers’ Pension in comparison to others is very solid. By
leaving the profession as a form of protest or social abandonment, one would leave a
lucrative pension and enter an Ontario that had changed dramatically in terms of its
economy in the 1960’s versus the 1990’s.

One individual touched on the main reason why most people complied or just
‘stuck it out.’ It was the pension and the reality of economic times and the difficulty of
changing occupations. Few teachers recalled people getting out of the profession. “In my
age group, people were nearing retirement and I think a lot of them were going to keep
working because the pension was there…” (Subject #7)
The drastic change in the curriculum under Hall Dennis was attributed by one to, “Partially the baby boom…partially the demographics changed by quite a bit…a lot of younger people came in and they were receptive to change. I know of teachers who retired earlier in the late 60’s because they did not like what was coming in. They were used to a very structured programme. I can think of two teachers to be specific.” (Subject #2)

The demographics had a lot to do with the embracement of the Hall Dennis Report. “The board up until [19]69 was hiring 200 and that dropped to 50 and that was due to declining enrolment. Enrolment always goes in up and down cycles. The funding for building at that time, the funding from the ministry, schools were designed in a manner that supported the implementation of that open concept.” (Subject #11) The fact that enrolment dropped and the funding for building remained the same allowed for changes. Just as change occurred in the 1960’s, there was change that occurred in the 1990’s. The same generation that ushered in the reforms of Hall Dennis were now retiring during the neo liberal agenda of the Harris Years. There was a demographic shift that occurred and noted by some teachers. This arguably had an effect on the morale among teachers and furthermore a method to swiftly introduce new reforms in the late 1990s’. One teacher candidly remarked of the new generation that entered the ranks of teaching, “When I started teaching, you came into teaching, you kept your mouth shut and you honed your craft. You worked on perfecting your lesson plans. I was up till 8 or 9 every night preparing lessons and you had no aspirations of going up the ladder. Hell, in the nineties there were people after 1or 2 years who thought that they could be a vice principal. They did not know what was going on in the classrooms. They got so much
time off when they were new teachers because they were on this committee that committee. They did that so they could go up the ladder.” (Subject #6)

Another stated, “At my time, you did not consider it [administration] until your 40’s because of the surplus of teachers. That was a period of declining enrolment in the 70’s. For 8 years, I was one of the youngest teachers in my school if not the youngest.” (Subject #11)

Overall, the demographics played a role in compliance. Younger teachers were zealous to comply with change, but as they grew older, another group began to enter the profession without the previous generation’s need to serve their time in the classroom. Principals were also removed from the Federation. Hence, a lead teacher with years of service could be a thing of the past. In other words, there was little movement in terms of promotion during the seventies and eighties, but with a retiring workforce in the nineties younger teachers could enter the profession and enter administration at a faster pace than the previous generation. One could argue that this helped to increase the speed of reform. During one interview, the individual did not see the elementary panel as a resistant group because of their nature. When asked about oppositional defiance among this panel, the person felt that “… oppositional defiance has not been there previously. No one wants to be pioneer,” and that in regards to his panel, “I think that passive people are drawn. …They were brought up that way and therefore they passed it on…You are not old enough, so do what you are told. That is how I will be.” (Subject #2)

**The Nature of the Elementary Panel**

Although evidence has been found where the Ottawa Carleton Board in 1952 attempted to pilot a project to devise a test to filter teacher candidates, it seemed that a
filtering test to find compliant or ideal teacher candidate is not necessary since those who showed an interest were, one could argue, in their nature most likely to comply.

Another commented that some are “…drawn to the teaching profession because they are linear sequential thinkers. That is how schools are designed.” (Subject #11) In addition, those who entered the teaching profession were seen not as pioneers and as those who largely wished to duplicate the system through which they passed. As mentioned through the writing of Foucault, it is very much the intention of the state to duplicate itself and its methods of discipline and punishment in order to create a system of self regulation.

In one case, a teacher was more than willing to comply with a pilot project. Teachers sometimes complied but ‘secretly’ tried to assist in changes, so these reforms could run smoother. In one case, a teacher, prior to his boards consolidation helped to prepare his grade 8 class for a standardized test, “it was brought in as a trial basis for 1 year, but begun again a year and a half later. At that point, it remained…at the time of consolidation of [school boards]. I am trying not to give specific dates for the possibility of identifying principals involved…They [the teacher] prepared for the test before hand. …They got hold of standard questions and made up questions from it, so it was the teacher who in effect structured the test and let the kids do practice tests and told the kids if you ever encounter a question like that then this how you can answer it best.” This practice was not really challenged by anyone since, at that time, “…parents were concerned with their children moving to grade 9 and being prepared for high school.” (Subject #2) In this case, preparing students for standardized tests or ‘teaching to the
test’ made the implementation of a board policy easier for those left with the task of implementing it.

The students also reflected the nature of their teachers. One person who did not work at the secondary panel felt that “Elementary teachers follow the rules because they expect their children to follow the rules. Secondary you are working with a different type of student. You teach them differently.” (Subject #3) This could influence one’s behaviour and level of cooperation with authoritative government structures. Secondary teachers are not rebellious teens in their behaviour, but they might be more reluctant to being told what to do.

**The Role of Religion**

Because of the small sample of research candidates, it was difficult to see if those who worked for the Catholic school system were more compliant for those who worked for the public school system. It would be of interest to examine whether religious people were more accustomed to authoritative structures and therefore comply with change. This, in itself, is another research paper. Overall, several factors - gender, the enforcement of laws, tradition, demographics, community support, educational trends, administrative control, and the character of the two educational panels – played roles in ensuring that the province of Ontario could introduce educational change between the late 1960’s and the late 1990’s. Equally important, a number of issues led to the non compliance or resentment of educators to provincial reforms in education.
Factors that led to the Non-Compliance of Teachers and Administrators

There are several reasons why teachers did not comply with changes in educational policy. The following areas will be discussed: 1) the defiance of the secondary panel; 2) the structural flaws of implementing change; 3) passive aggressive behaviour; 4) the reality and workload of teachers; and 5) the lack of consultation with teachers.

The Defiance of the Secondary Panel

There was a difference in compliance between the elementary and secondary panel. A retired teacher who worked on both panels said outright that, “In high school, if teachers do not agree with something they have no qualms about saying it or just refusing to do it. They will band together and get confrontational with administration…” (Subject #1)

An elementary teacher noted that there was also quite a difference between the two panels. It was mentioned that “The reputation of secondary students was not a positive one. Elementary teachers, being much milder, did not want to get into the militant union set up of secondary schools.” (Subject #2)

It was not uncommon for other teachers to refer to the “militant” nature of the secondary panel. There exists two trains of thought as to why secondary teachers were perceived as more aggressive in their defiance. The first argument reflects that this panel is a reflection of their own students. A secondary teacher who taught elementary reflected on this reason, “Secondary were more of independent thinkers. They did not want to be treated like children. They did not want the parental model of authority; it was almost like the adolescents that they taught. They wanted their own ideas and input.” (Subject #5)
One principal commented that “ Generally, the elementary panel was easier going. I was shocked….when I walked into the junior high and I asked a grade 9 teacher to cover a class and she said, ‘No, it was not in my contract.’” (Subject #7) Basically, some of these teachers had no qualms in simply refusing to do things.

A retired superintendent discussed the historical reasons for this defiance. In effect, it also relates to the issues of compliance and gender. Generally, men tended to dominate the secondary division and they were at one time the main source of household income. Consequently, they tended to be more aggressive in terms of change. This led to a different tradition and dynamics in how this panel dealt with new government initiatives. (Subject #11)

**The Structural Flaws of Implementing Change**

Realities on the ground also impeded changes. The very size of a school would make it more difficult for a principal to physically oversee change in a school. This is especially the reality in secondary schools where it is less likely for an administrator to micro-manage. As plainly put by one teacher, “I think that part of it is the principal in a high school is responsible for a larger staff and larger number of students. Then you get to an elementary school you got a principal in charge of a much smaller group.” (Subject #1)

Since the superintendent of the school boards and even inspectors in the Ministry of Education did not visit classrooms on a regular basis, inspections were a rare occurrence. This gave some teachers greater latitude and less scrutiny whether they were complying with government initiatives. In one interview, the person commented, “People did what they were used to. I myself was inspected by the provincial
superintendent in my first year in the late 60’s. You had to be inspected once in your first two years of teaching. After that, you could get your certification. I was never seen by an elementary inspector after that.” (Subject #2)

The chain-of-command is somewhat flawed since Premier Harris removed the principals from the Teacher’s Union, but he did not remove the position of chairperson at the elementary and secondary level from the teachers’ union. A former chair at the secondary school level stated, “There is a problem with the structure of education in secondary panel. Department Heads in the secondary panel have no power. They are ‘straw bosses.’ They can’t really make anyone do anything. Their role is to guide and to provide resources. They are not allowed to discipline or make a negative report on a union member. That renders you pretty useless.” (Subject #5) Quite simply, a movement for change would lose initiative once it trickled down to the classroom level.

Although amalgamation was unavoidable, in some cases, it allowed educators to go on less observed than before. The sheer size of newly-formed boards, some consisted of seven previous boards, allowed some to ‘carry on’ or to do things with less scrutiny. “Boards became so large then it became easier to do things as you had always done them. Because you were no longer highly visible, people continued to do things.” (Subject #11) It is arguable that without a government representative physically entering the classroom then it is more likely that teachers simply closed their doors and taught as they traditionally did.

There are different forms of resistance as discussed earlier in this paper. Teachers, in some cases, ‘dragged their heels’ in an effort to sabotage change. This ‘Quiet Revolution’ made it difficult for administrators to get full compliance.
Staff members quietly phased out things they felt that did not work. A former male elementary teacher stated that “They introduced the open area where they had up to eight classrooms in one area with no walls. We had that. We found that it did not work, so we quietly modified it so it was open in terms of physical structure but separate classrooms in terms of actual material being taught to the students.” (Subject #2)

**Passive Aggressive Behaviour**

Another form of passive aggressive behaviour to meetings or completing report cards on time was simply using one’s sick days. One subject bemoaned, “Ooh yaah! And you knew. Even now, like yaah, it still goes on. You know which teachers are gonna take time off.”

The former female principal mentioned that “It was usually around report cards that they were sick. If there was a concert or a presentation, the teacher would be sick. I found it interesting because you would want to learn something new, but the teachers would say, ‘Oh, I know this stuff.’ When all the teachers would phone in sick, I would think that it was for their benefit. They were learning. So it is very difficult when you have professional development for teachers and you have supply teachers or nobody there at all.”

In one of a more extreme case, one teacher did not comply and sabotaged the system by feigning illness. “Every time I had to evaluate him, he would be away on that day. You put a teacher on appraisal you have to re-evaluate that teacher on the 20th day. He would make sure that he as away for 20 solid days and then I would have to start the process all over again. This teacher was on appraisal for 3 years… He knew exactly what he was doing.” (Subject #3)
Just as Milewski (2008) referred to teachers who ignored implementing the policies of the ‘Little Gray Book,’ one person commented that the staff, “...would close the door, in some cases, and do what they always did. Some of them did do [the changes], but I felt overwhelmed. Some of them did not have an English background …You could see the fall out at the senior levels…” (Subject #5) In one case, a retired principal mentioned that some would conveniently forget things, “They would say things like, ‘Oh, I forgot.’” (Subject #10)

The final method of passive aggressive behaviour involved avoiding compliance by passing the duty of responsibility elsewhere. In the first case, it involved differentiating or individualizing learning for children with special needs. In the second case, it pertained to preparing students for the grade 10 literacy test. Rather than sharing the cross curricular test it was usually ‘dumped’ or given to the English Department.

**The Reality and Workload of Teachers**

According to one, teachers avoided implementing IEP’s (Individual Education Plans) and introducing differential learning to the programmes by stating “I am not teaching to 30 different kids. This is my program.” Those were the teachers who fought to get their kids into Special Ed., because they wanted the problem off their desk. They were the ones that supported the withdrawal programmes. Heaven forbid, they had to stay in the class and they had to differentiate their programmes.” Furthermore, the subject added that “If you think about it, a lot of behavioural problems occur….because of poor programming.” (Subject #3) Hence, the problem or challenge of complying with differential learning was passed onto the administration. The program was not implemented and it became the responsibility of a special education teacher or the office.
When teachers engage in a ‘work-to-rule-strike,’ extra curricular duties are often withdrawn as a form of social protest. Over the course of thirty years, supervision time and the participation in extra curricular activities became contentious issues.

One remembered that “… [when he] started teaching there was no mandate. Principals said, ‘I want everyone out in the hallway, including custodians;’ people were out in the hallways. Once the ministry introduced time constraints, what is teaching time, then you saw resistance to that and the principal set the tone.” For one individual, time constraints affected resistance. (Subject #11)

Teachers did not simply refuse in all cases. Two retired principals felt that those who left teaching altogether or simply ‘abandoned their posts or professions’ were simply not suitable candidates for the profession rather than people who used quitting as a form of social protest. At the elementary panel, no one could recall teachers who simply quit the teaching profession because of the reforms. Those who did not comply, according to one retired principal, felt that those teachers left because of the reasons why they got into teaching. This individual stated, “Do I know anyone specifically who left teaching [because of the reforms]? No. I believe it was a build-up over the years. I guess I started teaching in 77. There were a lot of changes. There were those who were there because it was a ‘calling’ and those who were there because it was a job. I think that is important to differentiate between the two: the people who went into it because it was a ‘calling’ did it because they loved the kids and they loved what they did.” (Subject #3)

The other person commented that those who left the profession were very rare and those who did were not suited from the very beginning. One individual stated that “No, we did not see an exodus. The few teachers that I saw leave in 10 or 12 years were people
who should have left the profession anyway. It had nothing to do with the changes.”

(Subject #11)

Although reforms or campaigns in education were often well-intended, the reality was that they were devised by those who were not currently in the ‘trenches of teaching.’ Teachers often had a large workload in regard to covering the curriculum, marking, and a host of other initiatives. Multiple aims often led to an overload and a refusal to participate in some cases.

Some felt that they were not a part of the decision-making-process. They felt it was someone who was unfamiliar with the area or lacked experience in that particular classroom. As mentioned by one teacher, “I think that it comes from up there and you are not part of it and you are expected to carry it out but you are never part of that decision making and you are not consulted. I think that some of these people live in ivory towers…we had coordinators who had never taught and they got around it by getting them to cover some classes to get in some hours. They had never taught special Ed- and they were coordinators! To me that was like a surgeon saying, ‘I’ve never done surgery but I know a lot of theory.’” (Subject #1) This top-down rather than bottom-up approach made regarding change made one subject remark “…it seemed to be something imposed from high.” (Subject #12)

For some, it seemed that the teacher was overwhelmed by the number of needs within the classroom and the needs of the society. Depending on the teacher, he or she could only take on so much work. Some felt that there was simply too much. As commented by one,
“I think that as an education system we take on far too much. It is like lunch duty. Why are we doing lunch duty? We teach sex education. That is the domain of the parent or the church. We take on so much that we do not do anything well in some cases. We should be there for the core subjects or the skills. We are not psychiatrists and shame on us for trying to be. That was something that really bothered me.” (Subject #1)

One retired principal noted that attempts to engage teachers in ‘active research’ was not well received. He felt that they had too many responsibilities on top of teaching. He commented “When we introduced active research, people were asked to come up with a hypothesis or a research topic. A lot would look at you and say, ‘Are you out of your friggin’ mind?’” (Subject #8)

**The Lack of Consultation with Teachers**

When the government did provide examples, they did not always match what was being used in the classroom. One teacher commented, “We would get lesson plans for *A Midsummer’s Night Dream*, but we would get something else or another Shakespeare text, so it was not very useful. I would not have the budget to reorder all our course texts.” (Subject #5)

Some teachers noted that the volume of ‘paperwork’ increased and this detracted from their actual time spent teaching the students or covering the curriculum. She reflected that “I found that the paperwork got greater, greater, and greater, certainly in the 90’s. There were some teachers who spent most of their time writing up the IEP’s or testing and retesting two weeks later and they very seldom saw kids…What’s the point of having this wonderful piece of paper with all these wonderfully sounding things and that it’s never getting done.” (Subject #1) This quote raises the question whether teachers
were consulted if these thoughtful efforts could possibly be introduced into the reality of the classroom.

Another individual mentioned how the local culture or the tradition of that school would dictate whether change was met with difficulty. Just as the socio-economic level dictated compliance, the tradition or culture of the school would determine if change was fraught. Rather emotionally, one principal remembered that “At one school, tradition was a huge factor, and you could take an assembly from 1980 and it was the same as 1990. If you wanted to take a chair from one room to another, it would take a 3 year implementation period in that school.” (Subject #7)

One teacher was particularly fed up with how the government attempted to introduce ‘de-streaming’ into the schools. The person recounted, “Now, the biggest resistance came when they ‘de-streamed’. That was about 1992/3. It was called the transition years. IT was all in the same classroom. The government set out pilot projects and this principal of an elementary school had this system working and you had 22 kids and a teaching assistant in the class. When it came to the reality of it, there was a class of 28 and no assistant.” (Subject # 6)

He elaborated further that “There wasn’t the technology either to give you support and our principal resisted it for years. Finally, he was forced into implementing it. We went to a meeting in September, and we did not have a text book or a course of study and the coordinator was questioned. I said to him, “We do not have any text books. We do not have any course of textbooks.” And he said, literally to me, “Wing it for the next few weeks.” I said, “What the hell do you mean wing it? This is not a classroom where you blow a whistle and everybody runs around the room.” You need highly structured
thinking and you are being asked to wing it. And he said, “I can’t deal with your anger”
And I said, “I can’t deal with your incompetence!” and I got out of the room and walked
out” Eventually, despite the time, effort, cost, and level of frustration, the programme was
abandoned after 3 years at that school.

Another example included the introduction of computers in the classroom and self-paced learning. One teacher commented on an ill-fated programme at his school.

“Another thing was this change for technology. The kids were going to do their courses
on the computer. I was a department head at the time and I did not want to do it. It was
supposed to be that all grade 9 classes would be done on computer.” The programme
proved to be disastrous and ineffective in delivering the programme. It was eventually
abandoned. (Subject #6)

When posed on how reforms could have been done differently, the subject
reflected and stated that there could have been more, “consultation with people in the
trenches. It was way too much being top down. Things were implemented because of
political reasons rather than pedagogical. Not enough piloting of programmes…of
grids…rubrics. It should have been done at a slower pace.” (Subject #7)

The lack of consultation was made analogous to the use of ‘thalidomide’ by one
teacher. It was a well intended drug that was not properly tested and caused horrible
defects. Similarly, students were introduced to well intended but poorly tested methods
that had contradicted with the teacher’s pedagogy. (Subject #6) Overall, it was found
that teachers refused to cooperate with reforms for four main reasons. The secondary
panel had historically been male dominated, more educated, more aggressive, and more
like their rebellious students. They simply refused to comply and have had a more
militant behaviour when tackling the government. The educational systems had some loopholes that allowed teachers to continue with their traditional methods. Teachers chose to passively resist change. Finally, some of the projects or attempts to reform lacked consultation with the men and women who worked in the classroom. Future governments may wish to consider these factors prior to implementing change, so policies are more successfully implemented. The final hindrance to change, alienation, will be discussed in the last section of this research paper.

**Factors that led to the Alienation and Frustrations of Educational Workers**

The final section of this paper will examine the alienation of the teachers who experienced changes between 1969 and 1999. It is arguable that five factors led to this sense of frustration. The following trends will be discussed: 1) The rapport of the principal; 2) the reality of the reform; 3) the duality of technology; 4) the policies of the government; and 5) the opposing philosophies in education. This, too, impeded change by creating a sense of frustration, futility, and resentment among workers. The mood of teaching, for some had soured, over the course of the three decades.

**The Rapport of the Principal**

One subject felt bothered when she thought that she was viewed as an ‘inferior’ to her supervisors. “That was a huge difference [between elementary and secondary] and I had a few problems in my first year. My principal did not care for me. He thought that I was outspoken… [that] I was making trouble.”

Likewise, a principal would make a teacher feel inferior if that administrator was too controlling with school supplies for his staff. In one example a teacher stated, “…in elementary school you had to beg and plead for the simplest little thing. Some principals
even passed out the damn pencils. You could not even go into the stock room to get them, but that varied from school to school.”

**The Reality of the Reform**

Under Premier Bob Rae, the introduction of ‘Rae Days’ was a 1993 effort to solve the provincial deficit by civil servants sacrificing twelve unpaid days a year in order to avoid lay offs and to prevent deficit spending. When these austerity measures were introduced, some teachers felt that it unfair since it affected both their pay and their retirement. One replied, “There were concerns about the cut in salary and concerns about it affecting your retirement date.” (Subject #1)

In 1996, in response to a Royal Commission on Learning in 1995, the Education Quality and Accountability Office or EQAO was formed in an effort to ensure ‘accountability’ in the Ontario educational system. Some teachers felt that the standardized tests for EQAO were not well devised when they were first implemented. The subject reflected that “I thought that the demands were unrealistic for grade 3. Some of the questions were almost a test in literature. I just felt it was something that you would expect from grade 5 or 6. The demands were way too much.” (Subject #1)

Likewise, a retired principal commented that “They [the parents] felt it was too stressful particularly in the beginning when it was a full day particularly for the grade 3’s.” (Subject #10) In essence, the return to standardized testing or tests similar to Departmental Examinations was not welcome by all.

Some parents did not like the standardized report card comments when they were first introduced under Premier Harris since “They did not feel that they applied to their kids. They were not personalized.” (Subject #2) After the ‘Growing Success’ document
was introduced in 2010 there was a push to personalize comments to avoid jargon and general statements, so parents could more easily read report cards.

Some did not balk at the volume of responsibility or the desire to individualize report card comments or even the use of computers. One person commented, “When report card comments came in, a lot of English teachers did not mind using computers because we are in language…this is what we do…we write, so a lot of that was intimidating to other teachers. I would individualize comments and I did not mind doing that but there was such a time constraint and I felt really squashed and not enough time to think... We made up over 100 comments and they felt that they were too many and could not be put into the system bank. It was also punishment for working harder.” (Subject #5)

Some felt that the reforms were too quick and lacked consultation. “There was too much coming down from above too quickly.” (Subject #1) When the new curriculum was introduced, there seemed to be quick reforms that lacked planning. One stated, “We were told to implement it in September, but there were no guidelines. I remember having a staff meeting in August, and we were trying to figure out what we were going to do. The textbooks had not been completed yet…There were attempts made, but there wasn’t a real understanding by what was meant by these different levels. That continued for years. We did have workshop and we had to say what was level 1, 2, 3, or 4 and there was no consensus and no agreement.” (Subject #7)

Another teacher feared that there was not enough consultation. This level of involvement was seen as crucial to some since “…they feel a part of the process, but when you get the changes on the 30th and the next year on the 30th. There is no time to
get teachers together for input. It keeps on snowballing with 3 years of reform and nobody really having any input.” (Subject #5) Despite the time required, it was seen as a common approach to taking ownership and a good method to avoid adversarial approaches that eventually led to alienation, frustration, and non cooperation among the teaching workforce.

Teachers sometimes were unable to meet the demands of the new reforms. One principal simply had her staff complete a more reasonable target, despite the demands of the board. Likewise, the teachers and students were overwhelmed by the pace of change, “I remember we had a meeting with administrators and the Ministry of Education and I remember at that meeting and I remember saying that we could not do 5 strands of math in 2 months and report on them. This is impossible... It was really the speed of the reform. The grades 9’s were just reeling with the science.” (Subject #7)

On a final note, the volume of work and additional responsibilities would interfere with the teacher’s ability to deliver the new curriculum under Premier Harris. “A lot of teachers did not want to participate in fundraisers, collecting chocolate bar money in the morning. That became the norm at the end of my career rather than the beginning of my career. I think because there became a greater emphasis on curriculum and teachers complained that they did not want to spend half an hour every morning collecting chocolate bar money when they had to cover curriculum.” (Subject #3) Over the years, some felt that the new funding formula under Harris led schools to rely heavily on fundraising to help pay for these costs.
The Duality of Technology

Although new technology -such as using computers to write IEP’s (Individual Education Plans) and reports cards- was intended to help teachers, it also led to the retirement and frustration of some teachers. “That is one reason why I retired when I did, but also because the 85 factor came in. I had planned to stay longer, but I was computer illiterate and that following year all the IEP’s had to be down on computer.” (Subject #1)

Rather than a catalyst, technology was sometimes an impediment that raised the rancour of the staff. Another person commented, “Resistance. Unbelievable! I came from a time of hand written report cards. Resistance was unbelievable. We had in-services after school. We had teachers angry about that.” (Subject #3) Furthermore, the principal commented that a staff member said “I’m a teacher. I don’t know how to use a computer. Why would you expect me to learn how to use a computer on a report card?” (Subject #3)

There was a level of stress introduced with technology. According to one, “The boards had different levels of technology. I was with a former board that had nil on technology but big on people. Then some places were very good on technology. When the cuts came, the boards suffered twice. First it was there people. Then they introduced technology and they had to get up to speed and these were people who worked for many years and had not been hired for their skills. It was unrealistic to expect that from people. That was very difficult.” (Subject #10)

When the new systems kept crashing, it raised the ire of many teachers, “When the system did not meet the high demand and the system kept crashing. The network did
not have the capacity at peak demands and that led to frustration and people said, ‘Why can’t we do it the old way?’” (Subject #13)

Contrary to popular belief, one subject challenged the idea that teachers were resistant to technology, “Most loved it. They wanted more computers. English desperately wanted their own computer lab. They were always fighting for computers; the lab was always booked; the lab belonged to the business department.” (Subject #5) Others admitted that despite the challenges of new technologies or software. Programmes such as Trillium were much better than the old system. (Subject #12)

Overall, there existed a duality in new technologies. It both helped and hindered teachers in its initial introduction.

**The Policies of the Government**

When Premier Harris removed the principals from the teacher’s union, it created a rift between the teachers and the administration. Among all educators interviewed, not one spoke favourably of Premier Harris or Minister of Education John Snobelen.

Another person commented that “I think that is detrimental. Well, now that administration is just not part of you. We are going back to that same thing what I said earlier when I said that he is no longer a colleague anymore, who is not going to share as much.” (Subject #1)

Even those who became administrators shunned this decision, according to one “When I was a teacher, principals looked out for each other and when we left the union, you no longer looked out for each other. There became a very distinct ‘us’ and ‘them.’ I think most of my friends didn’t like to be booted out. We felt that if you worked together
you would achieve a lot more rather than being on different sides of the coin.” (Subject #3)

The Harris Years were not positive for many teachers. One retorted, “Under Harris, it became very negative and very factual. It was result orientated. Individuals were not given priority.” (Subject #2) Another teacher stated, “The staff felt devalued during the Harris period of time; I think there is sensitivity within the profession when they feel valued for what they were doing… Accountability was a big theme during the Harris time. Accountable in someone’s view of what that meant.” (Subject #8)

However, in one case, although people opposed it, the subject felt there was no effect on the principals leaving the teachers’ union since “associations and friendships were already established.” (Subject #2) In this case, as long as the staff remained the same, including the principal, the tone or dynamics did not really change.

However, the dynamics for some did begin to change. As one principal commented, “It became more of an issue in 1995. Unions are stronger. Now you have people phoning their unions. If I challenge a teacher, more to clarify, they are phoning the union right away…..before, you did not go over somebody’s head. You went to the person.” (Subject #3)

From the perspective of a former secondary chair, the individual made reference to the perceived need of the government and the public for schools to be more accountable and the drastic pace of change for subjects such as English and their three levels at which they were taught. She stated, “With secondary school reform, first there was the adversarial approach of the government. We were attacked constantly for not being ‘supposedly’ accountable. We got the changes to the system easily around June
30th... My department would feel they did not have time to get use to changes and they did not have a chance to put input into the changes. They got resistant or went about what they would normally do.”

There were advantages to keeping the principals in the union since that person was usually a former teacher with years of seniority and experience who belonged to the same union. In contrast to the new system, one added, “You could not say anything bad about a principal because you could get reported or disciplined on it. Whereas when the principals were taken out, there was an attitudinal change with some of the principals. There was more of an 'us' versus 'them' mentality. It got worse. Principals began to approach teachers with almost a factory on industrial mentality like we are the white collar workers and you are the blue collar workers.” (Subject #5)

In contrast to the 1980’s, Ontario teachers went on strike for prep time, but by the 1990’s under Premier Harris, teachers went on strike because of they were targeted by officials such as Minister of Education, Snobelen, who vilified teachers and created a false sense of crisis in the system. Teachers felt that they had little control over their system. One individual stated, “With Snobelen, before he started the job or after he was appointed, he mentioned that he wanted to create ‘a crisis in education.’ And that was exactly what he did. And that for me was the beginning of the end. In terms of teachers and educators having control over what was best for kids or I should say input into...There was a lot of negativity directed at teachers. Teachers became resentful and bitter and we felt like we were the 'scapegoat' for things that we didn’t know.” (Subject #7)

When principals were taken out of the union, one initially felt that it was not a big
deal, but there became a greater deal of animosity towards administration and some more militant teachers used ‘work to rule’ as an opportunity to get back at administration. One retired principal recalled, “I felt really isolated. When directives came down and they did not agree with them, I was made to feel that it was my fault and it was not like we were in it together anymore.” In fact, one Federation leader saw that position as the alternative principal and once stated to the principal, “My job is to make your job as difficult as possible.” For work-to-rule, she commented that “They [the teachers] would do things like not do the attendance. They would do the attendance, but not send a kid to the office. That meant that administration had to go from classroom to classroom and pick up attendance. Another thing is that they refused to administer EQAO. That meant that admin had to administrate the test. That meant 180 grade 9 students doing the test and collecting the papers. There were 5 … 6 classes … almost 200.” To complicate matters, the same principal mentioned that she was obligated to carry garbage when a caretakers’ strike began after this incident. (Subject #7) Both administration and teachers arguably suffered from this change in policy.

Premier Harris, furthermore, pitted parents against teachers. One commented, “As an administer…you get some volatile parents, but what I think what happened, and I go back to the Harris years, his idea was to empower the parents, which he did. Which he overdid. What he did not factor into this is that many of the parents are afraid of their kids.” (Subject #7) Likewise, another commented about principals being removed from the union by stating that, “I did not feel that it was beneficial because it put a wall between teachers and administrators. It became a ‘them’ versus ‘us.’” (Subject #10)

One challenged the notion that by taking the principal out of the union there was
more resistance. It was the thought of being mandated. A subjected said, “I felt there is always resistance when you are told what to do like you are a child…you must do so many minutes. That I found a more a source of resistance than your principal being a member of the Federation.” (Subject #11)

Premier Harris and his policy regarding the amalgamation of boards were not well received by some. Subject #10 stated, “In my mind, he [Harris] did more to destroy education than all the people combined. He was detrimental. The whole thing of the amalgamation of the boards. With a stroke of the pen, seven boards became one. You know like…every board here was functionally very well. It was a reasonable sized board in comparison to others. They were very effective and they all had their own policies and procedures.” (Subject #10)

The appointment of a high school ‘drop out’ to manage the system seemed to add insult-to-injury. Another felt that various boards were imposing their systems on them during amalgamation. “[Harris] said that he was going to create a crisis and he appointed John Snobelen, the Minister of Education, who was a high school ‘drop out,’ that, was the first sell though, people knew who he was and his attitude toward education. The amalgamation … was ganging up on [my board] and the feeling that the suburbs were going to subsume the city, so we adopted other school models.” (Subject #12) Finally in regards to legislating time for teachers, it somewhat backfired because, according to one, “The government has micromanaged the hours of a professional and you have resentment to that…just as are told you must do five extra curricular activities a year. People might have done ten or twelve.” The government’s heavy handed techniques and its level of micromanagement led to a further sense of alienation. (Subject #11)
The biggest sense of frustration seemed to stem from the loss of certain activities. One teacher commented that there was a huge loss of extra curricular activities such as outdoor education, “What was very apparent was that people were not doing the extra curricular anymore…I remember, because I became a coordinator, and in the Harris and Rae Days, we stopped. What happened that was the end, once we did not do it for that year; we never went back to doing it. What happened is that all the boards had outdoor education center…The long and the short of it is that that is long gone.” (Subject #12) In the end, these programmes became discontinued or have become mere shells of their former selves.

For two teachers, there was a sense of alienation with the new guard of administrators who replaced the old guard. One person commented, “There is little respect among some of the new principals for your years of experience but the older principals would listen…. [This subject had published extensively on education and had spoken for various education groups]…I was rated as a satisfactory teacher whereas someone who was on a few committees was ranked as an excellent teacher. It had little to do with what you did in the classroom.” (Subject #5) In fact, one referred to new teachers who were motivated to become principals as individuals who, “…came through a system of entitlement.” (Subject #6)

The morale among teachers arguably eroded over time from 1969 to 1999 because of various reforms and the inequity between the two panels. Even as early as the seventies and eighties, “There was more acrimony in the staff room. There developed different opinions. Are we teachers or are we plumbers? Are we professionals? I did not mind the long hours. I felt that was what you had to do. I liked the idea of prep time and
I did go out on strike. It was mainly because of the inequity between the elementary and the secondary panel.” (Subject #10)

Overall, a former teacher commented that over time, and through the decades, highly respected professions such as nursing and teaching later became less valued over time. (Subject #11) That person also commented how these two areas are and have been the most expensive costs for a province to fund. The direction of society and its views toward health and education were thought to be changing over the course of three decades.

**The Opposing Philosophies of Education**

Some felt that the pendulum had swung too much in terms of curriculum reform. One individual felt that “We seemed to go where the curriculum expected way too much for these kids to do and therefore there was not enough time to practice…but they did not master anything…” (Subject #1) With so many reforms, some teachers just waited for the reforms to pass knowing that nothing would be permanent and taught the same as they did before. “A lot of teachers who had been around for a while, they would say, ‘I’m just gonna’ wait this one out.’” (Subject #7)

There was some notion that some teachers felt that the new reforms were ‘flavours of the month’ and they would eventually pass. One remarked, “Absolutely, I’ve seen it before. Even from an administration before, I worked with four other principals and you too shall pass…” (Subject #8) There was a sense by another that because of the contentious matter of educating a society that these reforms would eventually pass “because of the nature of the political party process.” (Subject #2)
Some truly questioned the nature of new programmes and whether they were for the best interests of the students or to appease a voting population. Some principals liked to expand the gifted programmes and make them more inclusive in order to win over parents. One teacher commented that “We were identifying kids as gifted whereas to me they were solid high achieving average students. They were not gifted. I mean when you are talking gifted we are talking about a very small percentage of the population. I think we were very inclusive and it was very popular …it was political…parents loved it because they go around ‘Well, my child is in the gifted programme and therefore I must be gifted myself.’ It was more for the parents than for the kids, in my opinion.”

An equally thorny issue, the promotion of bilingualism in the schools, also irked the same teacher. She commented that “French is a big disturber. As much as I love the subject, I don’t believe that it should be compulsory at the elementary level. The whole damn timetable revolves around that damn French… For the 6, 7, & 8’s the whole language arts programme is at the end of the day because we had to work around the damn French. It is so isolated. They never get a chance to practice it. What a waste of time and money… You have these kids with disabilities who are struggling and now you have French.” (Subject #1) Ironically, she was a former secondary school teacher who taught French and moved to the elementary panel.

There were other instances of alienation. A secondary teacher felt that politicians unfairly compared Ontario students to students from different countries, but they would skew the statistics since other countries screened their students through rigorous testing in order to take advanced maths and sciences. He emotionally recalled, “I remember this idea of ramping up the math programmes and I remember this… we placed so-an-so
behind in math from some country like Albania. But when you looked at it, in Albania, only 20% were in school. The rest were working, so you had the academic elite. In a lot of these other countries that we were being compared to, the lower students were already in separate trade schools and were not being tested. In 1992, they were testing at all levels; the students were selected to write certain tests according to their transcripts. We had students writing an OAC, grade 13 tests in biology and had never taken a biology course. I had students who were taking a math test in calculus and had never taken a calculus course.” (Subject #6)

Another teacher felt conflicted over the standardized English at the secondary level since it did not emphasize the process of writing. The teacher pointed out, “To me, if you are going to teach writing, that is how you should evaluate writing and this is how people write. You plan, draft, and revise. There are kids who do not do well on a one time test. The choice of topic comes into play when you test and it has been shown statistically that when students choose their own topics and their own reading materials students score higher on that material. Teachers were not allowed to see, but we were given samples and those were extremely dry reading. The were no issues important to teens…If it is dry as dust, the tune out. People went with it because it was mandated but that whole test wags the English system. The other problem it is not an English test but a cross curricular test in literacy. Other teachers needed to buy on board. You English teachers deal with it. We really don’t know how to teach English. Meanwhile, they are all university graduates. Some felt they could just dump it on the English teachers, even among the principals.” (Subject #5)
One retired teacher saw the problem was that those who introduced change lacked the necessary foundations or background in the areas they were reforming, “We felt so often that these things were done by people who had never taught in a math classroom. You would get people with no experience with teaching mathematics. You would get stuff from people in a committee and you would look at the committee and there would be two geography teachers on this committee and what would they know about teaching math. They are completely different styles. Teaching math is different from English. There is a whole different approach and so there should be, because mathematics you want to teach exact, follow the rules and so on. In English, you are more on the creative style.” (Subject #6) Finally, teachers disagreed also with “… separating learning skills from achievement.” (Subject #7) Essentially, does a grade on an assignment reflect mastery if marks are deducted for it being late? Some parents and teachers disagreed on this issue.

One teacher in regard to compliance, best summed it up when she was required to do an assigned topic through her supervisors. What ‘stuck in her mind’ was the following, “If I am after skills, which I can teach using whatever context, is it the attitude and the values and the actual skill set of paraphrasing or outlining. I did not think of it as compliant but it did not make any sense. Does this add value?” (Subject #10) Quite basically, she did not see the point of the exercise because it did not impart skills.

There seemed to be more of a neoliberal agenda by the late nineties. As discussed by one teacher, “I could feel that this business culture was creeping into education…There is a focus on the team. You are told to sit with your English department and you are part of a team. Teaching is individual. It’s just oppressive.”
(Subject #5) The business model offended some and the series of strikes made some leave. The subject stated, “It was just given with the 85 factor that you would just leave. Most of us left at that time, but it was that string of strikes ...that was a huge factor in my decision to leave. I had entered administration with the idea of the job involved working together with a group a teachers and it became something totally different. It was a business model that was being applied.” (Subject #7) There was a lack of solidarity over time and the new model almost eroded or wore down some teachers. One stated that under Premier Harris it felt like, “…we were producing cars. We will jiggle this around and make a better model.” (Subject #10) Other contradictions or forms of ‘double speak’ included Harris’s claims of improving literacy, “In the Harris Years, Harris was claiming that he wanted to ‘up literacy,’ before Harris, a kid had to take 5 English credits and a social science credit and Harris got rid of that, he eliminated subjects that encouraged those things. It was Harris who got rid of grade 13.” (Subject #12)

Some of the perceived problems such as certain ethnic groups performing poorly in schools was seen more of an urban problem and it really did not apply to other parts of the province. One member of the secondary panel felt that “This de streaming was a problem in the city. They forced a solution to the whole province, and this was not a problem in our area.” (Subject #6)

Teachers and educational administrators did not break laws between 1969 and 1999. They operated within their legal confines to exercise a level of individual and collective social protest against unpopular governmental reforms. In effect, the educators were unwillingly to comply with top-down methods of reforms. As a result, those who
were required to implement change cooperated, pursued their own pedagogy, or felt disconnected to their employers.

**Conclusion**

Historians, such as Cobb (1959) and Rude (1959), stress that revolutions also began “from below” rather than “from above.” As outlined by E.P. Thompson (1966), in *The Making of the English Working Class*, the masses used traditional methods of social protest from destruction to pressuring authoritative figures. As well, Darnton (1984) demonstrated in his book *The Great Cat Massacre and other Episodes in French Cultural History* that workers were willingly to show their distaste for working conditions through public theatre.

The Industrial Revolution marked a change in social protest since the Captain Swing Riots, according to Hobsbawn and Rude in *Captain Swing* (1969), represented a sense of violation between the role of the those in control and those in servitude. In some cases, the teachers and administrators expressed that there existed an imbalance in policy making.

According to Ignatieff (1978) in *A Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution 1750 to 1850*, and Foucault (1970) in *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, social control or the punishment of ‘deviant’ members of society became a private rather than a public spectacle. There became and emphasis on the control of mind and body of the disobedient members of society through self replicating government institutions. Scott (1985) in *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* extended the arguments of master and servant feudal relationships to capitalist markets in Malaysia. Finally, Sennet and Cobb (1973) in *The Hidden Injuries of
Class argued that educational systems help to foster class inequity and a lack of social mobility. Historically, prior to Industrial England and France, state officials attempted to control the population yet those in control faced active and passive forms of opposition from the masses.

The state required institutions and bureaucrats to control its population. Strauss (1978) in *Luther’s House of Learning: the Indoctrination of the Young in the German Reformation* showed that schools in Germany operated to “indoctrinate society.” As well, Curtis (1988) in *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871* stressed the importance of effective superintendents who helped to carry out Ryerson’s vision of an educational system in nineteenth century Ontario.

Froese-Germain (2006) in “Commercialism in Canadian Schools: ‘Who’s calling the shots?’” detailed examples of how public funding has given way to corporate funding in Ontario schools. Likewise, Basu (2004) in “The Rationalisation of Neoliberalism in Ontario’s Public Educational System, 1995 to 2000” demonstrated how the Progressive Conservative Party used a neoliberal agenda on its population. Overall, as part of worldwide phenomenon in the West, there has been a corporate approach to public-funded institutions such as schools. Corporate interests have eroded public interests.

Both Gould (1981) in *The Mismeasure of Man* and Potter (2012) in “Mad, Bad or Virtuous?” demonstrated that the scientific community has used scientific jargon to explain defiance or opposition has a form of psychological illness or malady. In the case of Ontario teachers, Milewski (2012) in “I paid no attention to it: ‘An oral history of curricular change in the 1930’s,’” documented teachers who ignored or defied educational reforms in the 1930’s because of the lack of acceptance of new teaching
methods. Richter (2007) examined a long history of inequality between male and female teachers and Ontario’s history of improving working conditions and the right for collective bargaining. Finally, Head & Hutton (2005) wrote extensively on the Ontario secondary panel’s struggle for better pay, job security, pension benefits, and political mobilization. The OSSTF used a variety of threats, political rallies, strikes, strategic voting, petitions, and the media to help further their causes.

It is important to examine whether the literature provided a “test for these ideas.” In which cases did the literature apply? In which cases did they not apply? What factors, such as gender and working conditions, led to compliance, non-compliance or alienation?

In term of relevance, Richter (2007) wrote extensively on the role of gender at the elementary panel and the importance of attaining equity in the 1980’s. ‘The Crowd’ in this case was largely composed of women at the elementary panel. EFTO was very active in advancing the women’s movement throughout the 1970’s and 1980’s. Subject #1 made the remark that the male administration saw themselves as “little kings.”

Curtis (1992) saw the importance of competent intendants of the state. This was a re-occurring theme. Just as Ryerson chose ‘choice men’ to carry out an extensive educational system in Ontario, teachers complied in many cases according to the rapport they had with the principal. For example, Subject #10 was overtaken by her principal’s inspirational personality and leadership skills. Subject #13 discussed the key roles of the superintendent, the director, the trustee, and most importantly the principal. Just as Foucault (1970) saw prisons as institutions to reinforce change and just as Strauss (1978) saw school has state tools to inculcate values, Curtis (1992) saw the importance of the bureaucratic class to ensure change and self-regulation.
Basu (2004) was correct in terms of the rise of a neo-liberal agenda in Ontario schools under Premier Harris. Subject #5, Subject #10, and Subject #11 explained how educational reforms conveyed a more business-model approach to educational policies. Subject #3 lamented that teachers complained of the additional burden of fund-raising to the demands of teaching. Overall, the language of education began to change.

Head & Hutton (2005) discussed the economic challenges faced by teachers in the 1970’s. Neither Subject #2 nor Subject #7 recalled people leaving the educational system as a form of protest largely because of friendships formed and the economic challenges of changing occupations. Among those interviewed, teachers did not ‘vote with their feet’ and leave the profession in droves. Likewise, Head & Hutton (2005) discussed the militancy of the OSSTF. Subjects #1, 2, 5, 6 & 7 all made references to the difference between the elementary and secondary panels. However, Rude and Thompson present ‘the Crowd’ and ‘The English-Working Class’ as uniform.

Milewski (2008) found that among the teachers whom he interviewed during the 1930’s many did not follow the provincial reforms in Ontario. This too occurred. Subject #5 commented that teachers “conveniently forgot things” while Subject #8 remarked that teachers seemed bewildered when asked to do “active research” on top of their already heavy work loads.

In terms of irrelevance, the body of literature examined does not discuss the internal struggle demographically of the ‘old guard’ versus the ‘new guard.’ For further analysis, one needs to analyze the conflict within the work force regarding the struggle among two generations in one workplace. They would include the Baby Boomers from 1943 to 1960 and Generation X from 1961 to 1980. Subject #6 expressed his animosity
towards the new guard of teachers who quickly became administrators during the Harris Years because his generation during the 1970’s faced job constraints and promotion was often limited or a lengthy process. The issues of entitlement was raised by Subject #6. In the case of the United States, authors such as Twenge and Campbell (2009) in The Narcissism Epidemic: Living in the Age of Entitlement have studied questionnaire results of American college students to conclude that “Almost every trait related to narcissism rose between the 1950’s and the 1990’s, including assertiveness, dominance, extraversion, self-esteem, and individual focus.” (p. 33) However, Subject #3 was very positive among the new generation entering the teaching force since they were willing to embrace technology and change.

Social historians and sociologists have extensively studied the impact of demographics. Flower & Dychtwald (1989) popularized the topic in the book Age Wave: the Challenges and Opportunities of an Aging America. Other writers such Filipczak, Raines, & Zemke (1999) in Generations at Work: Managing the Clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers, and Nexters in Your Workplace have also written about the challenges faced with four generations working in one workplace.

Overall, the literature does not examine how a social movement or protest fragments itself because of internal factors such as demographics. It raises questions whether resistance or a lack of resistance occurs with a new generations entering ‘the Crowd.’ Likewise, the role of religion was not examined in the literature since Cobb, Rude, Thompson, Darnton, and others mainly studied English and French popular forms of protest among groups that shared similar religious denominations.
Although Head and Hutton discussed the OSSTF’s opposition to secondary school funding for separate schools in Ontario, it is not examined whether the struggle for better working conditions and better education was fragmented by this division from the late eighties to the nineties. Could the provincial government use the division between the separate and public school boards as a convenient method to ‘divide and conquer’ during contract negotiations? This question is unanswered in the literature.

Matthews (2006) made note of how peasants destroyed threshing machines during the Captain Swing Riots. However, teachers had a different rapport with technology. Older teachers required additional support, but other teachers, according to Subject #6, embraced change. Subject #12 admitted that certain software was a great improvement. Quite simply, teachers cannot be generalized as ‘Luddites’ when it comes to educational change. Sennet & Cobb (1973) discussed how the educational system reinforced existing social classes, but there is no discussion in the literature examined on whether income levels of teachers and parents ensured the acceptance or rejection of educational reforms. Subject #3 discussed the affects of high-income parents had the time to enforce standards on the teaching staff in their community whereas working class parents who had less time. Subject #11 also commented on how high income families would embrace technology if it was available at home. However, there needs to be further research on whether various income levels within ‘the Crowd’ affect resistance to changes or the solidarity of ‘the Crowd.’

Darnton (1984) and Head & Hutton (2005) discussed the theatrics of social protest. In the former, the Darnton examined the French workers who created dramatic acts with their owner’s cats. In the later, Head & Hutton made numerous references to
rallies that mocked their leaders and their reforms. These cathartic rituals seem evident of pre and post industrial Western societies. However, among the subjects interviewed, none of them discussed any theatrical forms of protest against reforms. Potter (2012) discussed the psychology of defiance and its virtues. Subject #3 mentioned that some teachers used ‘sick days.’ In this case, it was not seen as a form of protest or resistance but rather as a self-serving means. Finally, Richter (2007) did not examine whether the male dominated male administration also fractured or divided the ETFO’s ability to unify and fight against certain educational reforms. Did the gender disparity in administration affect the elementary panel’s ability to resist unpopular educational reforms? Overall, the body of literature used did not examine the role of internal struggles such as demographics trends, gender, and religion and their effect on resistance.

In conclusion, between the late sixties and the late nineties, Ontario teachers and principals responded to reforms in education with compliance, non-compliance, and frustration. Historically, groups that share a collective and rather public opinion on how society should function express themselves through a series of active and passive forms of protest. The working class of pedagogy does not always agree with the status quo or top down approaches to reforming the current system. Groups in positions of authority or government have also used the legal system, the public school system, and neoliberalism to inculcate certain values and to exercise a degree of state control over the social hierarchy of society. In response, ‘the crowd’ or population of civil servants has employed various means of cooperation, defiance, and harbouring of resentment to help create a balance of power between those who govern educational models and those who operate educational models. Ontario teachers and principals from 1969 to 1999 exercised
a degree of cooperation and non-cooperation both at a passive aggressive level and an aggressive level. What can be learned from this period of time is that educational reform is ineffective if it does not have the cooperation of the individuals in the classroom. The lack of consultation, dialogue, and cooperation between workers and employers both on a historical level and a modern level demonstrates that future educational reforms largely hinge on the ability of reformers to consult workers in the fields or trenches prior to reforms. Overall, despite the edification of certain laws to reform, workers will attempt – where given the opportunity- to exercise their own interpretation and operation of laws to better serve their communities.
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