DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 571 EA 004 162

AUTHOR Harman, G. S.
TITLE Pressure Groups and Education Policy and Administration in Australia.
PUB DATE May 71
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at ANZAAS Congress. (Brisbane, Australia, May 1971)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Community Control; *Education; *Policy Formation; Political Influences; *Politics; Public Policy; *School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Australia

ABSTRACT

This report discusses the role and function of pressure groups with regard to policy formation and implementation in Australian education. It is addressed to the scholar interested in gaining further insight into the structure and operation of the political and educational systems, as well as to those engaged or involved in the whole educational enterprise; and to those who seek to achieve changes in education policy and its method of being administered or to retain the status quo. (Author)

PRESSURE GROUPS AND EDUCATION

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

IN AUSTRALIA

G.S. Harman
Education Research Unit,
Research School of Social Sciences,
Australian National University

ANZAAS Congress, Section E, Brisbane,
May 1971.

In this paper I propose to discuss some aspects concerning the role and function of pressure groups with regard to policy formation and policy implementation in the field of education in Australia. The paper focuses on what I consider to be a matter of crucial importance, not only for the scholar interested in gaining further insight into the structure and operation of the political and educational systems of this country, but also for the whole educational enterprise, for those engaged or involved in it, and for those who seek to achieve changes in education policy or how policy is administered, or retention of the status quo. In a short paper, however, I can do no more than provide a brief introduction to the subject, suggest some questions that should be asked, and look quickly and superficially at a few selected aspects.

Today in Australia, as in other modern democratic societies, pressure groups occupy an important position in the political system, and they perform a number of significant functions. In the first place, they serve as a link between the individual and government. They provide the individual citizen with one very important means of participating in politics, and of communicating demands to decision-makers. Individuals can approach their member of parliament, a Minister or a government department about some grievance or issue. They can also write to the press, or possibly try to work through the branch of a political party. And, of course, at elections they sometimes have the opportunity through the way they cast their vote to express preference for a particular policy or set of policies. But in many respects, the most effective channel for individual citizens to communicate their requests to public decision-makers is through organised groups. In democratic societies it is considered that citizens should have the right and ability to participate in policy-making, and to let their grievances and requests be known. Pressure groups provide one means for the exercise of these rights. To use the words of Peter Westerway, pressure groups are

> our spokesmen on the issues which concern us as Protestants or Catholics or cheese-makers. They fill the gaps in a system which otherwise gives only a crude choice between two sets of leaders. And to say 'Away with all this pressure group idea' is to say 'Away with democracy'.[1]

[1] P.B. Westerway, 'Pressure Groups' in John Wilkes (ed.), Forces in Australian Politics, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1963, p. 146.

Of course, not everyone belongs to organisations that are active in politics. But a great many people do in fact belong to such organisations, or to organisations that on occasions become politically active, even if they do not take an active part in them. Further, there is always the opportunity for groups of people with some grievance to band together and seek to influence people in government. It can be argued that in our mass society, with primary associations diminishing in importance, secondary associations which are involved in politics help to some degree overcome the sense of powerlessness characteristic of individuals in mass societies.[2]

Second, pressure groups provide machinery for the formulation of specific and detailed proposals on policy. They thus supplement the work of the extra-parliamentary wings of the political parties. Further, because the interests represented within a pressure group generally are much narrower than those represented in the major political parties, pressure groups can afford to concentrate on a limited range of policy questions, and also put much more time and energy into formulating detailed proposals for change,and often on highly technical matters. In performing this task pressure groups can provide a useful counter-balance to the power of public bureaucracies as initiators of detailed policy proposals.

Third, pressure groups serve the important function in society of showing 'where the shoe pinches'. They give people in government, and in the community at large too, an indication of who is being affected and how by existing policies and the way they are being administered, and also about how different groups or sections are likely to react to particular changes.

Fourth, many pressure groups provide governments and government departments with a wide range of varied expertise and assistance. The major economic pressure groups, representing business interests, farmers and graziers, trade unionists and professional people (including teachers and educators), are in the position to supply people in

---

[2] The extent to which this does occur, of course, is debatable. On this point with regard to the American scene, see Thomas R. Dye and L. Harmon Zeigler, The Irony of Democracy: An Uncommon Introduction to American Politics, Wadsworth, Belmont, 1970, pp. 210-212.

government with a great deal of valuable information - facts and statistics which government departments lack; intelligence on what is happening within a profession or policy-area; well-informed guesses about how the group's members are likely to view and react to particular proposed changes in the content of a policy or details of its administration; and technical information and advice. Because of this, and for other reasons too, in many fields including education governments have drawn the leading pressure groups more and more into the structure of the official decision-making machinery, and have appointed representatives or nominees of groups to advisory boards, committees and commissions. Many pressure groups also operate in such a way to assist the administrative work of government departments. In particular, they provide a sieve and sounding-board for grievances, and a source of information on details of official policy and practice. For instance, in each state many teachers take their grievances to their teachers' union or association in the first instance, rather than to the education department. Of course, the teachers' organisations are keen to provide this service function for their members. But in so doing they ease the burden on education departments in the tedious and time-consuming business of dealing with individual complaints and requests from teachers.

Fifth, pressure groups act as watchdogs. By keeping a close eye on what is going on in governments and government departments and agencies, and also on what rival groups are doing, and by sounding the alert, they serve an important function in the public interest.

Sixth, pressure groups in many cases provide a useful channel of communication between government and government departments on the one hand, and particular publics on the other. Often one of the quickest and most effective ways of communicating information about a policy or administrative change, and of making sure its details are properly understood, is to work through the relevant pressure group or groups.

Seventh, in the process of mediating among their members and of bargaining and comprising pressure groups help take the heat out of politics, and promote cohesion in society. Of course, sometimes the reverse happens; instead of moderating conflict

groups can increase conflict. This may well be what some teachers' associations are doing at the present time.

Finally, pressure groups often command considerable political power and are able to influence not only the actual content of public policy, but how precisely particular policies are implemented and administered. Moreover, apart from their actual direct political influence, pressure groups frequently have a marked impact on government decision-making in that politicians and public servants are extremely sensitive to how powerful groups are likely to react, and consequently, their perceptions about the possibilities of trouble or fireworks from groups are often a most important consideration in the making of any major decision.

Pressure groups are by no means a new phenomena in Australia. Before the foundation of the Commonwealth, and even before the first colonies achieved responsible government, organised groups of pastoralists, merchants and workers sought to influence public policy on many questions. In the education field, as our historians of education have well-documented, a large number of different groups and interests participated in the long and often bitter struggles about church and state schools, and, once each colony set up its own system of free, compulsory public education, groups organised themselves in practically every village hamlet to press for the establishment of a government school.[3]

But in this century, and particulary since the 1930s, the importance of pressure groups in the political system has greatly increased, and the pattern of pressure group activity has acquired distinctively new forms. With their well staff secretariats, their

---

[3] See, for example, A.G. Austin, Australian Education 1788-1900: Church, State and Public Education in Colonial Australia, Pitman, Melbourne, 1961, 2nd ed.; Alan Barcon, A Short History of Education in New South Wales, Martindale Press, Sydney, 1965; A.R. Crane, 'The New South Wales Public Schools League 1874-1879' in E.L. French (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education 1964, Melbourne University Press, 1965; and C. Turney (ed.), Pioneers of Australian Education: A Study of the Development of Education in New South Wales in the Nineteenth Century, Sydney University Press, Sydney, 1969

public relations experts, and their own office blocks or office suites located often in close proximity to the government departments or agencies they wish to influence, the leading pressure groups of today differ greatly from the loosely organised and often short-lined groups characteristic of late last century, or even early this century. Pressure groups are becoming more numerous, and they are active in all the major policy areas of government at both Commonwealth and State levels - economic policy, defence, health, agriculture and education, for example.

People are sometimes surprised at the mention of pressure groups in relation to the education field. There are probably two main reasons for this. First, the term pressure group in our society in popular usage has a nasty flavour; it frequently carries with it the idea of the selfish pursuit of power by wealthy and unscrupulous interests, or the use of unfair or even corrupt practices to achieve political ends. Understandably, as a result, many organisations involved in influencing government object to being labelled as pressure groups, and generally avoid use of the term pressure group altogether. I am using the term, however, in a technical sense as employed by political scientists, and I do not mean to imply any kind of value judgment whatsoever. By the term I mean simply any group of individuals, or a formal organisation or institution that seeks to communicate demands or requests to public authorities or to influence the content of public policy and how policy is administered. It is a structure seeking political change, or opposing change sought or proposed by others. Most people in the community, if asked to name a pressure group, would probably say the RSL or some business lobby. But in the way I am using the term, any association or any group of people, whether it be the Catholic Church, the Australian College of Education, the Woop Woop Parents and Citizens' Association, or a group of individuals with a common interest and purpose working together to achieve some goal, say in education, but without the structure of a formal association, can be regarded as a pressure group once it becomes involved in exerting political influence on public authorities. Some political scientists prefer the terms interest group, organised group or lobby instead of pressure group. Admittedly, one valid objection that can be raised to the use of the term pressure group is that not all pressure group activity involves pressure in a strict sense. Some groups, at

least on occasions, simply make straight-forward requests to governments, without the use or hint of any sanction or threat at all. But on the other hand, the word pressure implies action, and it is action of a particular kind that makes a group a pressure group. Further, in my view the alternatives are all open to more serious objections. The term lobby, for instance, favoured as an alternative to pressure group by Finer[4] and others, is misleading in that it suggests political activities taking place solely within the precincts of a legislature or government department. Or again, organised group does not indicate a political organisation, while interest group can be confused with a group having interests in common without taking political action to achieve common purposes.

The second reason for puzzlement about discussing pressure groups in relation to education is that it is still widely believed that education is unrelated to politics, or at least that it should be so. Politicians, educators and members of the public from time to time assert, usually without any qualification at all, that 'education is outside politics' or that it'should be taken out of politics altogether'.[5] Yet the plain fact is that education and politics are closely linked and intertwined. Education in this country - or any country for that matter - is a thoroughly political business, and political life is closely inter-related to the whole education enterprise. In Australia education is a major and most lively issue-area in politics. It is also a major concern of governments and a major area of public spending. Public education is controlled and administered in the same fashion as most other areas of government concern. Since politics is essentially about power, rule, and authoritative decision-making, there is also a political aspect or component to every educational institution, as well as to the bodies making high policy on education.

---

[4] S.E. Finer, Anonymous Empire: A Study of the Lobby in Great Britain, Pall Mall, London, 1966, 2nd ed.

[5] On this point, see G.S. Harman, 'The Politics of Education in Australia', The Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. VIII, No. 1, May 1970. This belief, of course, has been strong in other western countries, particularly the United States.

Further, educational institutions and processes have a crucial impact on many aspects of political behaviour and the way the political system functions. Over the past decade small groups of political scientists and educators have come to realize the importance of the links between education and politics and have begun to explore the various political aspects and functions of education. The most important progress to date has been in the United States where a significant body of literature already has been built up[6]. Since 1969 the American Educational Research Association has had a special interest group in the politics of education, and courses in the politics of education are now being taught in many major American universities[7]. In many other countries including Australia interest is growing rapidly and the politics of education is developing quickly as a recognised field of research concentration and for teaching[8].

---

[6] A few of the major books published since 1964 by American scholars include: Jesse Burkhead, Public School Finance: Economics and Politics, Syracuse University Press, 1964; Ralph B. Kimbrough, Political Power and Educational Decision-Making, Rand, McNally, Chicago, 1964; James S. Coleman (ed.), Education and Political Development, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1965; Fred I. Greenstein, Children and Politics, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1965; Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, Aldine, Chicago, 1967; Harmon Zeigler, The Political Life of American Teachers, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1967; Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher, ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1969; R.L. Crain, The Politics of School Desegregation, Doubleday, New York, 1969; David Easton and Jack Dennis, Children in the Political System: Origins of Political Legitimacy, Praeger, New York, 1969; Marilyn Gittell and Alan G. Hevesi (eds.), The Politics of Urban Education: A Reader, Praeger, New York, 1969; Alan Rosenthal (ed.), Governing Education: A Reader on Politics, Power and Public School Policy, Doubleday, New York, 1969; and Michael W. Kirst (ed.), The Politics of Education at the Local, State and Federal Levels, McCutchan, Berkeley, 1970.

[7] A survey conducted in 1969 revealed that full courses in the politics of education were being offered in over forty major American universities, while others offered some work in the field within other courses in education or political science. See I.T. Johnson, 'Survey of Teaching the Politics of Education', paper read at a symposium at the 1970 annual conference of the American Educational Research Association.

[8] In Australia graduate courses, or units in the politics of education are now being offered at four or five university departments or faculties of education, while at least three departments of political science have courses or substantial units on education and politics.

High hopes are held about the possible pay-offs from research in this field for both political science and education. In education it is hoped that research will provide not only understandings about the political context in which schools, colleges and universities operate, and about power structures in education and the precise manner in which the really major decisions on education policy are made, but also help in tackling some of the pressing current problems in education today. Political scientists and insights from political science, for instance, may well be able to assist work on educational planning and innovation. In recent years so much has been spent on curriculum development, but so little attention has been directed to those political processes by which new ideas are accepted as policy, and to the problems of effectively implementing a new and often complex programme within a large public bureaucracy.

The three most striking characteristics of pressure groups in the education field today in Australia are their number, their growing importance, and their diversity. Most people are now well aware of the vocal and noisy groups that almost daily secure a great deal of press and radio and T.V. exposure - the radical students' groups, the main teachers unions and associations, and the more outspoken parents' organisations. But there are hundreds of other groups active in communicating demands related to education. They include churches and attitude groups; organizations representing community and regional interests; business and primary industry associations; trade unions and professional organisations such as the Australian Medical Association; parents' associations; independent schools; bodies representing professional educators; and even official institutions. In view of the increasing demand for more and better education, and in view of the great unrest today in our society about questions of education policy, it is not surprising that more and more organisations and groups are endeavouring to exert influence on education, and that pressure groups in the education sector are becoming more noisy and important. There are tremendous differences between these groups - in the resources they command, in their goals, in the specific demands they make and how they make them, in the targets try to influence, and in the methods and strategies they employ. Some such as the main teachers' unions and associations have the advantages of wealth, large memberships, highly structured organisations with paid staff, and recognition by education departments

as legitimate spokesmen groups and representation on departmental committees; other groups, however, lack such resources, and sometimes do not have even a clear idea of the basic structure of the official decision-making machinery in the area they seek to exert influence. Some pressure groups are primarily concerned with securing more funds for education, or a different allocation of resources in the education sector; others are interested in influencing detailed education policies or practices, while others still want to secure a new education facility or institution for their town or district. Some groups channel their demands mainly to a single centre of official power, others to a couple of centres, while others still are concerned with influencing decision-making at many different levels and in many different area of government. Some groups rely primarily on direct communication to government authorities; the Vice-Chancellors' Committee, for example, because of its membership composition, its goals and the recognition accorded to it by the Commonwealth Government, generally relies on direct communication and its public utterances are generally restrained. Other groups, however, rely more on public campaigns, and some appear to work primarily and even deliberately through strikes, protest marches, 'sits-ins' or confrontations with authorities. Recently a number of pressure groups interested in education have used election campaigns to advance their goals, some even running their own candidates[9].

Over the past decade some important research has been carried out on pressure groups in Australia. However, comparatively

---

[9] This technique has been used most effectively in a number of states by the Council for the Defence of Government Schools. The N.S.W. Federation of Parents and Citizens' Associations contemplated running candidates in the 1971 general elections, but abandoned the plan when the state Governor threatened to withdraw as Patron of the Federation.

little of this work has yet been published[10], and a great many questions remain unanswered. But more serious from our point of view is the fact that we know very little indeed about the role and function of pressure groups in the education area[11]. There is a great deal we need to know, and there are many questions that need to be asked and researched. We need information about all the various groups interested in education today, about their precise goals and objectives, about the particular targets to which they communicate demands, and about the tactics and methods they use. We need to know about how they differ in organisational resources, and the way they employ these resources for political purposes. What factors are responsible for bringing groups into existence and/or into politics, and what factors motivate groups to employ their resources to achieve political goals? We need to know in detail about the interaction between pressure group personnnel and people in government, and to look at the whole question of political influence. What are the different styles of interaction? What kind of communication goes on between different groups and government, and to what extent is persuasion or real pressure used? What are the crucial determinants of easy access to decision-makers and of effective influence? What influence do particular groups have on particular policy areas, and with particular centres of decision-making? Are some groups in the education area too powerful, and so have an unfair advantage over others? Do minority

---

[10] The only full length book on pressure groups is by a young Canadian scholar who worked for a Ph.D. at A.N.U. This study is G.L. Kristianson, The Politics of Patriotism: The Pressure Group Activities of the Returned Servicemen's League, A.N.U. Press, Canberra, 1966. Other published work includes Trevor Matthews, 'Pressure Groups' in Henry Mayer (ed.), Australian Politics: a second reader, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1969; G.S. Harman and R.F.I. Smith, ' "To Speak with One Voice": Australian Farm Organizations and the Quest for Unity', The Australian Quarterly, Vol. 39, No. 4, 1967; and Westerway, op.cit. See also two A.N.U. Ph.D. theses: G.S. Harman , 'Graziers in Politics: The Pressure Group Activities of the Graziers' Association of New South Wales', 1969; and R.F.I. Smith, ' "Organise or be Damned": Australian Wheatgrowers' Organisations and Wheat Marketing, 1927-1948', 1969.

[11] A number of theses have been written by students of history and education on teachers' associations, but few of these view such associations as pressure groups in a political science sense.

groups get on fair go, and are there some interests overlooked simply because there are no effective groups to press their claims? How do decision-makers react to pressure group activity? Do pressure groups in fact have too much influence in education today, and do they tend to frustrate unnecessarily the work of the educational administrator and planner? Recently one American scholar in education wrote:

> One suspects that policy is often dictated by the blackmailing threat of premeditated social disruption on the part of pressure groups which, though they may not be representative of our country, certainly are both vocal and obstreperous[12].

Is this true of the Australian scene, or at least is this how our professional administrators often feel? What perceptions do administrators have of particular groups and the power they command, and how do leaders and members of different groups view particular decision-making centres in government and the strength and power of competing groups? And apart from all these questions that need to be asked and problems that demand investigation, the general picture of pressure groups I have drawn needs careful scrutiny[13].

In the final section of the paper let me turn to the matter of the political influence of pressure groups in education. Here I

---

[12] Andrew W. Halpin, 'A Foggy View from Olympus', The Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. VII, No. 1, May 1969.

[13] It should be pointed out that while the literature on Australian pressure groups in the education area is slight, some important recent overseas studies are available. The best are James M. Clark, Teachers and Politics in France, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1967; Ronald A. Manzer, Teachers and Politics: The Role of the National Union of Teachers in the Making of National Education Policy in England and Wales since 1944, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1970; and Alan Rosenthal, Pedagogues and Power: Teacher Groups in School Politics, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1969.

cannot tackle the question of assessment of the overall influence of particular groups or their influence in relation to particular goals or policy areas. The identification and measurement of political influence involves a great number of complex theoretical and empirical problems; often it is difficult enough to identify the individuals and groups who participated in some major decision and who appear to have exerted some influence, let alone to weigh the relative influence of each. Instead, I plan to consider briefly some of the main determinants of the political effectiveness of pressure groups.

In the first place, political power is related to the size and importance of a group, and the interest it represents. Any group with a large membership has an automatic advantage in politics. Ministers simply cannot afford to neglect the demands of large numbers of voters; above all else they are concerned with the survival of their government, and their own survival in politics. Generally, groups with large memberships are in an even stronger position when their members are geographically widely, but not too thinly, spread over many electorates. But as well as size of membership, membership composition is important. Governments inevitably take more notice of groups made up of people of high social status or eminence, or having special expertise in the particular field concerned. Further, governments are more likely to provide easy access to well-established associations with a reputation for responsibility. Thus, for example, although the Vice-Chancellor's Committee is extremely small in actual membership, it commands considerable political influence on matters relating to universities and higher education, because of the eminence and status of its individual members, because of the expertise of its members in the field of higher education, because each member, with certain qualifications, can be regarded as a legitimate spokesman for his university, and because of the Committee's reputation as a highly responsible body. Or again, the main business groups find a ready ear in government when they make submissions about technical and technological education. This is because governments, whether they be Labor or Non-Labor, recognise that business groups are well-situated to assess needs in this area, and that the state of the economy depends among other things on the supply of trained manpower. Further, in our modern society governments have come to recognise increasingly their need of the advice, consent and cooperation of business groups

to manage the economy. In fact, as Samuel H. Beer[14] has argued concerning the British scene, it is primarily because governments have attempted to control and manage the economy more and more that producer groups have acquired such power to influence policy. The relationship between business groups and government is one of interdependence.

Political influence is also dependent on the degree of consensus and unity within a pressure group, and on its ability to speak for a whole profession or interest. Decision-makers automatically treat with caution submissions from groups rent by internal strife and dissension. Often governments have used dissension within a major spokesmen group as an excuse for delaying action. Then too, groups with a high density of representation, or to use other words, groups having within their membership a high proportion of potential members from a particular interest or profession have an important advantage. On this point, outside Victoria, the single teachers' association in each state is in a particularly strong position, since it has a very high proportion of teachers within its membership. Thus, it can legitimately claim to speak on behalf of the whole profession, providing of course that the ability of the leaders to represent rank-and-file opinion is not called into question.

The influence that any group can exert on a particular demand is also related to whether that demand is supported or opposed by other groups, and by the strength and intensity of the opposition or support. It can be argued that over the past five years or so the Catholic schools may have received an even greater level of financial support from governments if it had not been for the active opposition of state school teachers and state school parents' groups, and organisations such as the Council for the Defence of Government Schools.

Public opinion is another factor. Any group is more likely to succeed when its goals are not in conflict with the basic values of society. Further, a group's chances of success are greatly enhanced when its demands are supported or favoured by the community at large, and when it can convince the public that what it seeks is in

[14] Samuel H. Beer, Modern British Politics, Faber, London, p. 319.

the public interest. The teachers' associations,for example, because they are so industrially orientated, often find it hard to convince the public that on particular issues they genuinely seek to advance the welfare of children, and not their own financial gain. Sometimes groups are politically disadvantaged by shifts in public opinion. A good example of this relates the temperance associations, which still seek to have their outlook presented in schools, and the emphasis on temperance teaching increased , but because of changing public attitudes find their goals harder than ever to achieve.

Then too, the success of a group with any particular demand is dependent on the party or parties in office, on the particular Ministers and public servants concerned, and on the established lines of government policy at the time. Critics of pressure groups and their power in Australian society sometimes assume that government policy is simply the product of pressure group interaction, and that the strongest groups and those able to exert the most pressure in fact decide what policies are followed. This simply is not the case. Ministers and public servants are not mere adjudicators between competing pressure groups, but they are often forces of initiative and sources of ideas. And the policies adopted by the various parties when in office do reflect something of their basic outlooks and ideologies. For instance, in New South Wales during the period 1927-30 and 1932-41, when the Country Party was in a coalition ministry and when a Country Party Minister (D.H. Drummond) held the education portfolio, numerous high schools and technical colleges were built in country towns, agricultural high schools were established, and Armidale received a teachers' college and university college[15].

In the contemporary political scene organisational resources are of major importance. Any organisation which has substantial financial resources, a highly developed and well-staffed secretariat, and leaders who over many years have acquired expert knowledge and particular skills in dealing with Ministers and public servants is in an infinitely

[15] See D.H. Drummond, A University is Born: The Story of the Founding of the University College of New England, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1959; and Barcan, op.cit.

better position to articulate clearly formulated proposals, to prepared detailed, carefully documented and well-argued submissions, and to participate to its maximum advantage in negotiations, than some small ad hoc group without such resources. In politics today the quality of submissions, particularly on complex technical questions, is of crucial importance. To operate effectively any major organisations deeply involved in political business needs a well-developed and equipped secretariat, staffed by experts of comparable ability and education to the senior officers in the goverment department or departments with which the organisation deals. Such officers need to know their way around government departments, and they must be able to prepare submissions in a similar style to those prepared by departmental officers, and to be a good match for public bureaucrats in bargaining and negotiation. Unfortunately, despite their extensive financial resources, our teachers' associations unlike the main business pressure groups[16] have done little to develop impressive secretariats and to recruit really able research and executive staff. So often they recruit their top personnnel out of their own ranks! One result of this is that instead of being sources of real initiative and new ideas in education, they often provide a brake or even a barrier to progress.

Finally, the political influence of any group depends on how strongly its leaders and members feel on any particular issue, and on the extent to which they are prepared to mobilize resources to secure a goal. It also depends on their sheer persistence. Groups sometimes react angrily because they consider a particular action or policy of a government unfair; sometimes they mount campaigns over a question of principle or ideology; but one of the strongest motivations for intense and persistent political activity is a belief that members' basic interests and livelihood are being threatened.

And, of course, apart from all this, success in politics is so often largely a matter of timing and good luck.

---

[16] On recruitment of high level senior public servants to the leading business pressure groups see John Playford, Neo-Capitalism in Australia, Arena, Melbourne, 1969.