

THE UNIVERSITY TEACHER STRIKES — OR ALMOST!

The initial drafts of this paper were completed whilst the author was Visiting Fellow at the Industrial Relations Research Unit, University of Warwick. Thanks are offered to the Director and staff of the Unit, to my colleagues at the Industrial Relations Programme, University of Melbourne and to Professor Bill Howard, Monash University for comments and assistance. Responsibility remains mine.

Introduction

The BBC news on the morning of Wednesday, 16 November 1977 announced that 6000 university teachers would march on Parliament that afternoon in a mass demonstration 'against the government pay policy'.

Subsequently that afternoon over 6000' congregated at Central Hall, Westminster in the shadow of the Abbey and after a mass meeting marched, under police escort, across to Parliament House to lobby MPs. Later, a delegation met the Secretary of State for Education.

Was this the seeds of an intellectual revolt against the broad ineptitudes of the government? Or was it a case of militancy of the weak in search of increased sustenance? Was this a 'strike', a 'lobby', a 'day of action' — all words used by commentators to describe the activities, both prior to and subsequent to the event.

The posters issued by the Association of University Teachers (AUT) to advertise the event had referred to a 'National Meeting' and 'National Lobby'. One correspondent to the *Guardian* earlier in the week exemplified this confusion of terminology in a letter, which at one and the same time denounced the excesses of the AUT, announced publicly resignation from the Association, and concluded by saying that it wasn't a strike at any rate because the lecturers had arranged to give their classes at other times.

Academics were away from campus in large numbers but few of the easily recognisable features of a 'strike' were apparent. Strike pay was not involved, picket lines were not established, learning (production) continued in the libraries, student rooms, cafes and bars, and with a few exceptions, deductions were not made from the individual pay packet. The demands of the public image and private consciences made the emphasis on terminology important. Although the action may not have been a strike, it certainly was official. The

Kevin Hince

Industrial Relations Programme
University of Melbourne

events had been organised and publicised by the Association, after the decision had been taken at an Emergency Council meeting called under the AUT rules and held on 30 September.

The semantics referred to above have a relevance to one aspect of this dispute, namely, the use of 'nice' and 'nasty' words to rationalise, explain, justify human behaviour in general, and industrial relations behaviour, in particular. Nevertheless, the 'name' is not central, and certainly not as significant as the event itself, and more particularly, why it happened. It is to these aspects that the following comments are directed.

Two key themes emerge from this micro case study; one specific and narrowly related to the academic community, the other broader and more general in its implications for students of industrial relations. The specific theme is the focus on the slow, but steady creation of industrial militancy in a group of workers who, historically, (and in a contemporary social sense) embody conservatism, elitism, industrial weakness and characteristics of a positive anti-militancy.² The broad and more general theme is that yet another case study focuses on the implications of government sponsored 'voluntary' income restraint for public sector employees or public funded work groups, as well as the industrially weak.

Succeeding sections of this paper look at the background to the event — the unions involved, the procedures of salary determination in academia, the relationship to government pay policy and the events and attitude in the period leading up to November 16 — before outlining the events of that day, and the aftermath. A final section seeks to identify and assess the 'happening' with regard to industrial relations generally, and to industrial relations in universities in particular.

The Background

The Associations (Unions)

The AUT is the dominant union organising academic, senior administrative and library staff in universities. Membership is approximately 27,000, or about 65 per cent of the potential. Organisation is strongest in the provincial red brick universities, weaker in the London metropolitan area and weakest on the Oxbridge campuses.

Discontent among the non-professorial staff at the then new provincial universities before the first World War provided the origins of AUT. The non-professorial staff claimed that, relative to the professors, they did a large part of the work without appropriate salary or status levels. A conference was first held in 1917, the AUT was formed nationally in 1919, and a Scottish association in 1922. A merger in 1949 made the single union of today.³

The AUT is comprised of approved local associations each based on a campus of a university, college or associated institution. Council is the governing body of the Association charged with the determination of policy. It consists of representatives elected by local Associations,⁴ members of the Executive (ex-officio), and up to eight co-opted members. Ordinary meetings of Council are held twice-yearly at a minimum of eight weeks notice. The rules provide for calling special Council meetings at 21 days notice for a specified purpose at the request of 25 Council members. Alternatively the President may at his discretion after receiving such a request convene an Emergency Meeting of Council at 7 days notice. In such cases the meeting comprises one representative of each local association voting on behalf of the group.

Council elects a President, five Vice-Presidents and a Treasurer. These officers, the Honorary Secretary of the AUT of Scotland, fifteen ordinary members (also elected by Council) and up to three co-opted members comprise the Executive of AUT. All are lay officials. The Executive is responsible to Council for the execution of policy and the general administration of the Association. A General Secretary, a Deputy General Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries and approximately fifteen support office staff service the Executive and Councils.

The Association has a long history of involvement in issues related to salaries, superannuation and conditions of service of university staff, as well as concern with the 'state of the profession'. Nevertheless it had no prior history of centralised official direct action on any issue at all — industrial or otherwise.

The Association of Scientific, Technical and Managerial Staff (ASTMS), a conglomerate union of technicians, lower and middle level managers, has a component of academic membership as well as organising technical and laboratory staff in universities. Reasons for academic staff joining ASTMS in preference to AUT included a reaction of junior staff to the involvement of more senior academic colleagues in AUT local associations, a reaction against the general lack of militancy by AUT, and the fact that the AUT was not (until 1976) affiliated

to the Trade Union Congress. Nationally, however, ASTMS accounts for a small minority of academic staff, and has no official bargaining recognition.

The main events of 16 November were conducted under the auspices of AUT, although as we shall see, a small glimmer of inter-union (association) rivalry was evident. Clerical staff, secretarial staff, junior administrative and library personnel on university campuses are organised (if at all) by the National Association of Local Government Officers (NALGO), and were not, along with the manual unions, involved in the 'day of action'.

Salary Determination Procedures

For some twenty years prior to 1963 the salaries of university teachers in the UK were settled on the basis of a recommendation to Government by the University Grants Committee (UGC),⁵ made after discussion with the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals, and the AUT. In 1963-64 there was a departure from this practice when the National Incomes Commission was asked to investigate university salary levels. Increases averaging 14 per cent were recommended. The old procedure was resorted to in 1966, but two years later the National Board for Prices and Incomes was given the task of 'investigating and reporting'. Subsequently the current negotiating structure emerged. This structure is based on two negotiating committees known as Committee A and Committee B, supplemented by third party mediation and arbitral procedures.⁶

Initial negotiations occur in Committee A between representatives of the AUT and the University Authorities Panel (UAP) with a member of the UGC as observer. Negotiations here are to determine a 'joint' university claim to go forward to Committee B. An independent chairman can assist this initial process by mediation, or, if necessary, arbitration.

Subsequent to an initial agreement the AUT and UAP 'jointly' negotiate on Committee B with representatives of the Department of Education and Science (DES) supplemented by one Treasury and one UGC observer. This departmental representation on negotiating Committee B brings government and ministerial involvement to the negotiating process. Further governmental control exists via funding and the freedom to implement or refuse to implement (as occurred in the case under review) the results of these negotiations or a subsequent arbitration.

Looked at from the point of view of the academic staff member it must be realised that his association, the AUT, must reach agreement with the 'employers' organisation (the UAP) on a single proposal before negotiations with the 'funding' authority (the DES) are commenced. The procedure

involves negotiating twice over (with the possibility of arbitration each time) to complete the process. Even then government policy exercised by the Secretary of State may (did) preclude implementation of the result of the process.

Government Pay Policy — A General Statement
The Wednesday in question, the day of the AUT lobby, was the third day of a national strike of firemen. A week earlier a compromise formula had emerged which enabled a planned national strike of policemen to be called off at the eleventh hour. In the months immediately prior to the day, industrial action, both in the form of noises and overt action, by more traditionally militant groups — engineering workers, car workers, miners, transport workers — had been continuous. First time official strike action had been undertaken by groups such as bakers and air traffic control assistants, as well as the firemen referred to above. In most cases the central target was the pay policy of the Labour Government, or more specifically the restraints imposed on collective bargaining and wage determination generally by that pay policy. The unevenness of the impact of the 'freeze' added to sectional pressures.

The public stance of both private and public employers in the face of wage demands had been one of 'regret' and a reply around a variant of the theme, "we can't, because of the pay policy", or "it is outside the guidelines". The private stance of many private employers when faced with a crisis and when backs were forced to the wall was to seek a way through the guidelines. The 'self-financing productivity deal' was often the means. In at least one case the government's bluff was called.

However, the private stance of the public employer could not diverge as much from the public stance and, in general, was limited to expressions of sympathy. The closer connection of government funding and/or ministerial control was one explanation, whilst in the service sectors of public activity and enterprise productivity deals were more difficult in theory as well as reality.⁷

The Government pay policy in question had been formally introduced as part of the 'Social Contract' by the White Paper 'Attack on Inflation' issued in July 1975, and was to be implemented in successive stages. Stage 1 of the policy operative from July 1975 placed a limit of £6 per week on wage increases from that date. Stage 2 (July 1976) provided £2.50 to £4 with a maximum of 4½ per cent, whilst a 10 per cent limit was placed on Stage 3 settlements to be operative in 1977-78. Associated with these stages was the 'twelve month rule' seeking to limit settlements to that length of interval.

Provision for exceptions (self-financing productivity deals, is one already mentioned, 'rectifying anomalies' (see later), was another) was included in the announced government policy. Each stage of the policy was endorsed by the TUC at executive and Congress level, and the Government sought to operate the policy in the private sector by exhortation.⁸ More direct control existed in the public sector — via funding, provision of subsidies or direct ministerial decision making.

Government Pay Policy — the case of the AUT
Negotiations to establish new salary levels for academic staff during 1975 were ultimately abortive, and reference had been made to arbitration.

Agreement had been reached at the Committee A stage, and negotiations with government at Committee B level focused on a two part claim. Part I involved a claim for increases based on broad comparability along the 'Houghton Report' principles. Lord Houghton of Sowerby C.H. had been appointed by the Government as a committee of inquiry into the pay of non-university teachers. Salary increases in the range of 22%—30% backdated to May, 1974 flowed to teachers in further education colleges as a direct result. University staff argued a disturbance of traditional and justified relativities. Part II of the AUT claim involved a cost of living component from a base date of October 1974.

The DES concurred with the underlying principles but negotiations broke down on the quantum of the Part I claim. The independent Board of Arbitration sat on 29 May. A joint Committee A submission stressed the structural differences as between further education and university salaries 'post Houghton', whilst a separate UAP memorandum stressed recruiting difficulties and that the comparability claim was a 'once for all exercise'. Additional AUT arguments covered comparability with further education colleges, in addition to arguing that the absolute levels claimed were justified on the grounds of responsibilities of academic staff, entry standards, research requirements, qualification levels and outside comparisons with professional public employment.

The Tribunal decision of 2 June, accepting these arguments in the main, recommended a 24 per cent average increase on 1974 levels, and that a separate cost of living increase for the 1974-1975 period be negotiated for addition to this amount. All parties agreed on retrospectivity to October 1974.

The award of the arbitration tribunal was not implemented and the anomaly of the 1977 'protest placards' came into existence.

Two separate actions by government were involved. First the government through the DES refused

to accept the retrospectivity to October 1974, and announced the implementation date as 1 October 1975. Second, the government announced 1 July 1975 as the commencement date of the 'pay policy' and in accordance with these provisions the immediate increase to flow from the tribunal award was limited to £6, (£312 p.a.).

The 1977 pay issue for AUT therefore comprised 16 per cent to fully implement the 1975 arbitration (and rectify the anomaly) and an amount to be negotiated for the 1977 Stage 3 increase. The Association maintained a tactical stance of seeking to make up the 16 per cent before commencing negotiations for the 1977 quantum. This tactic itself was subject to a wide debate at Executive and rank-and-file level during the immediate period leading up to the 'day of action'.

The Events — 1975 to November, 1977

A flurry of localised, low key militancy occurred as an immediate response to the interference with the arbitrated award. At Warwick, for example, the local association had voted to suspend teaching and held a mass meeting. However, during the remainder of 1975, during 1976 and most of 1977 there was little activity at the local or rank and file level, and Executive action was low key. It has been suggested as part explanation of this that the £312 increase was itself a substantial increase and the largest for some time, and that during 1975-76 there was a general community acceptance of a need for an effective pay policy and that a further increase under this policy — of 5 per cent up to a maximum of £208 p.a. — occurred in October 1976.

But attitudes changed with the passage of time and the lack of results. In August 1977, the local staff association at Glasgow started in train the procedures (a petition of twenty-five Council representatives) necessary to call an emergency meeting of the AUT Council. This action appeared to force the hand of the Executive.

The AUT secretariat had continued to press for the implementation of the 1975 arbitration award through the normal negotiating and department channels, and the Executive had continued to accept assurances that a settlement was imminent. The Executive of the AUT could be described, in common with the executives of many other 'professional' or 'white collar' associations, as more militant than the general run of membership, and the reticence of the Executive can be explained by an uncertainty of rank-and-file responses to more militant postures. The Glasgow move precipitated a chance for the Executive to test the current feelings and attitudes of the membership.

The Emergency Meeting of the AUT Council was held on 30 September. The Executive recommendation to Council was, that

... as a first step a national meeting of all university teachers to be held in central London in November, coupled with a lobby of Parliament. This would necessarily entail the cancellation of lectures and tutorials for that day. It would be backed by a campaign of letters and deputations to MPs with special attention paid to those in marginal seats.⁹

Other agenda items called for a withdrawal of labour by AUT members working for the Universities Central Council (so that the admissions procedure would grind to a halt), the establishment of a strike fund, withdrawal from all government committees, refusal to release examination results and consideration of strike action on undergraduate teaching in the autumn of 1978.

The more militant proposals were defeated but voting 230 to 9 Council endorsed the Executive recommendation for a mass meeting and lobby. The date was set for 16 November.¹⁰

The decision having been taken it remained to organise the activities. Three aspects of the action were to be a mass meeting (2 pm Central Hall, Westminster), a mass lobby of members of Parliament (from 3.15 pm on) and a delegation to the Secretary of State for Education. The first two of these (and probably the third) required mass membership support to achieve any semblance of tactical gain. Posters announcing the events were distributed to individual campuses together with basic organisational information. Organisation of the numbers and the mechanical arrangements of transport etc. were left to activists at the local level. The equivalent of the barnstorming, flag rallying sweep and solidarity call by the official hierarchy was not used.

In retrospect the ultimate size of the rally (which must be gauged *inter alia*, against this background of organisation and non-involvement of association officials) is more clearly indicative of the feeling of injustice motivating at the activist and general rank-and-file level. The writer was, perhaps, initially observing the activism in a slightly artificial atmosphere — that of an Industrial Relations Research Unit and School of Industrial and Business Studies. However, even if local interest observed by the writer could be explained by professional background or discipline, industrial relations researchers and teachers could not be (praised, blamed) for the extent of rank-and-file support on the day that mattered. The descriptive cliché used in the report of the rally appearing in the *Morning Star*, of Thursday, 17 November, aptly

describes the all embracing nature and extent of this support. It stated, 'Contingents had travelled from Aberdeen, Ulster and Aberystwyth . . .'¹¹

Administrative arrangements for the day — hall bookings, banners, steward recruitment and organisation, and liaison providing for police assistance — were undertaken by the central office of the Association.

Prior to detailing the events of the day it is useful to briefly note the reaction of other interested parties. In general the stance of university administrators was low key, and they 'played it cool'. As expected university administrations turned down a request from AUT to officially close on the day. However, most administrations refrained from public comments, and many from internally circulated comment. At least one administration circularised staff asking them to notify the accounts officers if they attended the lobby, so that appropriate salary deductions could be made, but in other cases internally circulated memoranda were limited to dealing with the desirability of making alternative arrangements to fulfil teaching commitments.

Positive messages of support were issued by some authorities. In addition the Vice-Chancellor of Leeds University and current chairman of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors (Lord Boyle — who incidentally, but possibly, irrelevantly, was a former Conservative Education Minister) joined the AUT executive on the platform at the mass meeting.

The Day Itself

Events on the individual campuses and in London are each relevant to the ultimate assessment and impact of the actions. The writer observed the activities at Warwick and in London first hand (you could say he was a fraternal delegate).

On Campus

There were no overt signs of industrial action — picketing, pre-meeting meetings or assemblies — on the Warwick campus.

Secretaries were busy (on the backload of past productivity), junior library staff were issuing books, the hum of clerical activity continued, and students walked, talked, ate and read around and about the campus.

Academic and other senior staff are, of course, a small proportion of the total university population. Moreover, a large proportion of the work of the academic is not clearly observable, need not be carried out in the plant and hence the evidence of the 'stopped machine' does not exist. At Warwick — except for some postponed classes — it appeared to be largely, business as usual. Given

the stated object to minimise the impact on others this was to be lauded. The effectiveness (or otherwise) of the action was not to be gauged by the physical appearances of the campus. It is more positive and appropriate to gauge this from events elsewhere.

At the Demo!

The Warwick delegation assembled soon after 11 am in the booking hall of Coventry station. A cheap group excursion fare had been arranged and about sixty travelled together. Others had proceeded independently by earlier trains, or from more convenient stations. A few had driven down the motorway.

An announcement was made on the train by one of the local shop stewards, a Senior Lecturer in Industrial Relations, that delegates should 'make their own way from Euston Station to Central Hall'. Was this an attempt by AUT to subvert the arrangements for a 'march' from Euston to Central Hall organised by the rival ASTMS? As it turned out, this was not a result of inter-union conflict, but merely the failure of inter-union communication. Whilst the rest of the Warwick contingent proceeded independently the 'steward' belatedly seeing the march, marched.

At Central Hall the capacity (approximately 3500) was reached soon after the scheduled 2 pm starting time, and a queue of academics extending 2-3 deep for 200-300 yards still waited. Surprise was the clear and immediate reaction of many who arrived at this time to see the length of the queue, and to hear of the packed hall. The overall size of the participating group was a comfort. The presence of an extremely large foot and mounted police contingent, controlling the queue, traffic and pedestrian movements (together with reinforcements sitting in nearby buses), produced many smiles and chuckles which could perhaps have been interpreted as saying, 'Do they think we are like dockers, or miners?' or 'Do they think this is another Grunwick?'¹² It was for many, a matter of disbelief that police (and in such numbers) would be needed to control us! To others it added to the importance, reality and legitimacy of the occasion.

Academics cheerily greeted colleagues from scattered campuses whom they normally only saw in the more cloistered serenity of academic conferences and conventions. The general mood was cheerful and of 'bonhomie'. In fact, the writer believes that the description offered by Lane and Roberts of the reaction of the 'first ever strikers' at the St. Helens Pilkington plant is quite apposite. They said:

The strike for most of the RFSC (rank-and-file Strike Committee) was then a liberating

experience, because for the first time in their lives they had cast aside all the bonds that constrain most people in their everyday life.¹³

The academic was behaving like a worker—or almost, and enjoying it. Stewards announced to the waiting queue that the hall was full, a second meeting would be held at 3.15 pm and requested the queue to disperse. The queue dispersed. This was orderliness in industrial(?) disputation(?) at its best. Inside the hall the General Secretary reviewed the history and issues of the dispute (traditional) from an 'objective' standpoint (of a partisan), made the (also traditional) calls for solidarity and outlined the arrangements for the events to follow the meeting. Perhaps the highlight of the meeting was the reception (expected) to the well stage managed presentation of the written parliamentary answer from the Under-Secretary for Education to a question asked earlier in the House by one Professor James, the Conservative MP for Cambridge. The question, which had been carefully framed for effect, had asked what the arbitration tribunals recommended figures would be today if updated with movements of the Retail Price Index. The answer, received with acclaim, stated that if the national scales of 1974 were updated in this manner the increases would be in the range of £1314—£5371. The function and impact of this 'question and answer' exemplified the role of 'orchestration'; events do not just occur.

Lobby tickets were distributed and the meeting concluded. After the posed press photographs on the steps of the hall the procession moved off under police escort through the grounds adjoining Westminster Abbey, across Parliament Square and the Embankment to form the lobby queues—invitation holders to the left, ticket holders to the right—along the footpaths outside the main lobby doors of Parliament House.

The good humour, cheerfulness and decorum continued to be a feature of the long and patient waiting queue, and a heavy shower of rain did not dissipate the crowd or the mood. A less than charitable observer could explain this by the suggestion that the British were so used to queuing—for meat, bread, buses etc.—they were even prepared to queue to protest. Needless to say such an observer would have to be a 'colonial'.

The same observer would also have noted that the dignity and decorum of the procession was not marred by the official banners. These read simply, 'AUT, LOBBY' or 'AUT SAYS RECTIFY THE ANOMALY'. They were clearly in sharp contrast to the more conventional 'WE WANT MORE', and one could almost wish for at least one wag (you usually get at least one in a procession) to alter his banner

to read 'ANOMALISE THE RECTIFIER'. Those who waited for the militancy of the mood to be increased and the chant of 'Rectify the Anomaly, Rectify the Anomaly . . .' to begin, were doomed to disappointment.

Meanwhile the AUT Secretary addressed the overflow meeting. A delegation of AUT officers was to meet the Secretary of State for Education later in the evening.

The Aftermath

The immediate press coverage was extensive and favourable. London evening papers carried reports, and next morning most national dailies presented reports with headlines including, 'Government admits Dons are Badly Paid' (*Daily Telegraph*), 'Dons' Salary Scales Lagging By 35%' (*Financial Times*). *The Times Higher Education Supplement* included a lengthy and sympathetic report in the issue of November 18, 1977 and continued to report events and comment weekly during November and December.

The meeting of the AUT deputation with the Secretary of State produced little result and was an anti-climax to the events of the day. The Minister had told the deputation that the university teachers' case was an anomaly that needed righting but any settlement must be within Government pay policy. This, of course, represented no advance in the position of AUT.¹⁴ And no further change in the position occurred prior to the normal Winter Council meeting of AUT held at Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh on 15-17 December 1977.

At this meeting the Salary and Grading Committee proposed a modified pay strategy which involved, in effect, postponing for at least 12 months any further move to 'rectify the anomaly'. Council agreed.

However, it has been shown in retrospect that the temporary gloom of the December annual meeting was premature. It is now a matter of record that on May 5th, 1978 the Government announced a 30% (approx.) salary increase for University academic staff, including an immediate 10%, (the Stage 3 increase), and 20% to be phased over three years (to 'rectify the anomaly'). The first cash instalment was received in October 1978. A brief chronology of intervening events is encapsulated in the following headings appearing in *The Times Higher Education Supplement*:

2 December	Hopes for phased settlement of 1977 lecturers' pay fade.
23 December	Members will refuse to put pen to examination paper.
10 March	Dons give Government deadline for improved pay claim.
30 March	Legal threat if Dons don't mark finals.
1978	

28 April 1978 Pay surprise as Dons get 'special case' treatment.

The official announcement was made on 5 May, and then:

9 May 1978 Lecturers' boycott off (*The Guardian*).

Assessment

A brief assessment of the events, actions and attitudes outlined above is warranted. In addition to a general overall evaluation of the specific case some points of general industrial relations interest warrant brief reference.

The overall evaluation of the campaign

The campaign had, in a technical sense, extended over a long period. Initially, with a quiescent executive and membership, the actions were formal and low key. The threat to withhold exam results and the first day of action of 1975 faded into the past. The effluxion of time itself was the first factor to permit a changed mood, and once the initial moves for an Emergency Council meeting were in train there were some sustaining events which assisted the momentum to challenge government dilatoriness. Subsequently external events would have a more deleterious effect on the momentum of the campaign. In each case we have clear examples of the importance of a 'proximity influence'¹⁵ at work in industrial relationships.

Air Traffic Control Assistants had had a similar 'anomalies' claim which arose at about the same time with the first implementation of the pay policy. A six week strike, which followed a work-to-rule campaign and shorter strikes, culminated in negotiations that produced an offer and a settlement recognised by the men (and observers) as substantially rectifying the anomaly. The Air Traffic Control Assistants with a clear non-militant record had been forced to the threshold, and had driven through the 'proviso' provisions of the voluntary incomes policy. Clearly the AUT was not likely to mount similar action, even if for the only reason that the short-term cost-effectiveness of stopping lecturing university students is quite different from that of stopping civil commercial aviation traffic.

Nevertheless, the Air Traffic Control Assistants' case did provide moral support in that it demonstrated the willingness of the Government to redefine or re-interpret the precise meanings of the guidelines of the pay policy. Furthermore, this case again re-affirmed the necessity for public sector employees to engage in a continuous challenge during a period of income restraint policy. Otherwise the non-policy of 'let sleeping dogs lie' would continue to apply.

However, the national strike by firemen which commenced three days before the London protest of

the university teachers continued into its ninth week and a return to work occurred without concessions straying outside the pay guidelines. The firemen's case was a straight pay claim and not an 'anomaly' issue, but the hardened attitude and the extent of resistance demonstrated by government in defence of its pay policy when under threat from firefighters clearly suggested that AUT should take, with appropriate seriousness, the views expressed by the Secretary of State at the deputation and in the letter of 29 September. The changed position on the salary campaign taken at the December Council meeting was not unexpected. Nevertheless, the academic pay anomaly was to be rectified. Cause and effect, the reaction to the action, are not always precise and identifiable in industrial relations. But if the demonstration of November 16, the subsequent letter writing campaign, the announcement of the ban on marking final papers, the press releases and briefings, and the publicity associated with such activities, did not 'cause' the government to change its stance, they did serve to keep the matter 'hot' and under active consideration, and, at least, provided a rationale for government reaction.

The relevance of a sympathetic management

The existence of a sympathetic management was of importance in the general campaign and in assisting the scale of response to the 'day of action'. The positive response of university administrations and senior academic staff may have been based more on concern with 'the brain drain' or recruitment difficulties, but it was not without its significance. An even more critical point was that the absence of condemnatory or disparaging remarks by those important elements of 'management' allowed the freer participation of many who would normally identify through aims, aspirations, innate conservatism, or fear, with such elements.

Perception and industrial relations issues

Green is a bright colour with images of nice things; the park, lawn tennis, the countryside. Black denotes nastiness, evil and is symbolic of the darker side. 'Green bans' are therefore better, nicer and more socially acceptable than the trade union tactic of the 'black ban'. In essence, of course, they are the same thing. The relevance and importance of terminology and related perceptions in industrial behaviour was reiterated in the AUT 'lobby', 'demonstration', 'protest', 'rally', 'day of action', 'strike'. The confusion surrounding the writers' inability to clarify the terminology used in this paper should not be allowed to obscure the issue, and the lesson that, in the final analysis, it is the events and actions which are significant rather than the terminology. However, it is the terminology which may enable the events and actions to take place.

A case for progressive militancy

Militancy is not necessarily a synonym for strike action. In fact, many of the more militant unions rarely strike or strike in few situations. The concept of progressive militancy is often relevant in such cases. It is also relevant as a means of changing the nature of an 'association' and its response to industrial issues.

November 16, and the events of that day are significant in the slow but fundamental change in the nature of the AUT. The campaign for affiliation with the Trade Union Congress and the ballots of 1973 and 1976¹⁶ were other events indicative of this evolutionary change occurring under the pressures of time, changed externalities and an education for militancy.

Conclusion

The hard cash question was ultimately settled in favour of the academic staff and, although the tenuous chords of causality are recognized, the idea of a link between militant action and positive results has been effectively demonstrated. Even if the money result had not been as favourable it can still be argued that the AUT will never be the same again. The size of the demonstration, the geographical spread of the participants and hence the relative difficulties overcome to attend, and the spirit of the day, clearly suggest, at least to this observer, that given the cause and the issue it would be easier next time. It remains to be seen whether the same could be said about the Australian counterparts—the academics and their associations.

Notes and References

1. Close to an average of published estimates: for example, *Daily Telegraph* required two guesses, stating early in the text '... nearly 7000', and following up with '... police estimates in excess of 5000'; BBC news—'8000'; *Morning Star*—'over 7000'; *Financial Times*—'more than 5000'.
2. The British academic, in a general sense, has not shown the same degree of group activism on contemporary social and political issues—e.g. Vietnam, apartheid, abortion, nuclear power, the environment, etc.—as students; nor, in so far as one can compare, as the Australian academic, (although one wouldn't necessarily place the latter with the ultra militant on all of these issues). Moreover one commentator has suggested that the British academic has even failed to rise to defend academic freedom. See, for example: A. Arblaster, *Academic Freedom*, Penguin, especially Chapter 6.
3. See H. Perkins, 'Manchester and the Origins of AUT', *British Universities Annual*, 1964, pp. 88–91. Also H. Perkins, *Key Profession—The History of the Association of University Teachers*.
4. Local associations elect council representatives in the ratio 1:125 or part thereof of financial membership, with a minimum of 5 representatives.

5. The University Grants Committee (UGC) comprised of (in the main) academics who advise government on the overall needs of Universities, receives the total grant and is responsible for the allocation of capital and recurrent grants to individual universities.

Other bodies to be referred to by initials in this section include:

DES—Department of Education and Science, being the government department currently charged with responsibility for universities in particular, and education, in general.

UAP—University Authorities Panel, being a representative of Universities as institutions or administrative entities, input occurs at the Vice-Chancellor, Registrar level. The UAP is concerned solely with salary negotiations. A separate Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals exists for discussion of other matters of common interest at that level of the university hierarchies.

6. The national negotiating procedures described here have been used to establish salary levels and structure, annual leave, maternity leave and sick pay. Local negotiations cover other issues, including *inter alia*: holiday entitlement for library and administrative staff, health and safety, creche facilities, car parking and the initial support of individual grievance cases.

7. Although it can be noted that publicity surrounding the AUT case was quick to point out that in the current academic year student numbers were up 6.5% yet the number of full-time teaching staff increased by only 0.7%. Mr. L. Sapper, General Secretary of AUT; speaking on this point was quoted as saying:

Can you imagine the miners or the engineers being expected to take a 6.5% increase in their workload just like that without any talk of reward for the effort involved? (*Daily Telegraph* 17.11.77)

The potential double-edge of this argument should be noted, however, before joining the applause.

8. Minor cases of announced sanctions occurred in relation to potential breaches of the policy (e.g. threat of cancellation of export insurance, governments orders etc.). Spurious self-financing productivity deals could, in theory, rebound if the firm sought permission from the Prices Commission within twelve months to increase prices. This, of course, did not affect the case of the firm with resources who wanted to pay more.

9. *Times Higher Education Supplement* 30.9.77.
10. Less than charitable observers pointed to the choice of Wednesday as a further example of the conservative, non-industrial image conscious nature of the academics. Wednesday being in the UK, as in Australia, traditionally, a lighter day in terms of lecture and teaching commitments (historically, sports afternoon to be more precise), disturbance to the individual conscience would be lessened.

The experienced industrial relations observer would have, perhaps, been more charitable and seen practical wisdom and public relations benefits in this choice, and in the decisions to rearrange rather than cancel lectures. Each of these actions sought to minimise the effect on that off-injured and much quoted casualty of employee-employer disputation—innocent third parties. In any event the National Union of Students announced support for actions of AUT.

11. The cliché refers to the three relative most geographically dispersed campuses in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales.
12. In the week prior to the academic 'day of action' over 100 arrests and 70 injuries were reported on the picket line at Grunwick Processing Laboratories, North London.
13. T. Lane and K. Roberts, *Strike at Pilkingtons*, Fontana, p. 167.
14. The position held by the Secretary of State was the same as that expressed in a letter from her to the AUT dated 29 September, stating, *inter alia*:
It has been and remains our declared intention to see the anomaly rectified as soon as the Government's pay policy permits.

- See *AUT Bulletin*, November 1977, p. 4.
15. See J. Shister, "Logic of Union Growth", *Journal of Political Economy*, October 1953, pp. 413-433 for discussion of this concept.
 16. In 1973 a proposal to affiliate with the TUC was rejected by a 2:1 majority (approx.) in a ballot of membership. The campaign for affiliation restarted almost immediately. For example, Mr. L. Murray, General Secretary of the TUC, accepted an invitation to address the Executive in December 1974. Correspondence and debate on the issue was recommended in the *AUT Bulletin*. In 1976 a 2:1 majority (approx.) voted in favour of affiliation.

BARON BOOKS

ANTIQUARIAN BOOKSELLERS

P.O. BOX 58,

HAPPY VALLEY, S.A. 5159

SPECIALISING IN AUSTRALIANA

with sections on
PACIFIC, SOUTH-EAST ASIA, INDIA, AFRICA & AMERICA

Catalogue No. 4 will soon be available

Please write to be included on our mailing list

UNIVERSITIES AND TEACHER TRAINING

In Australia, as in Britain, America and other "western" countries, some sectors of tertiary education face reduced enrolments resulting from a falling demand for teachers. In addition, the adverse economic climate which has prevailed since 1974 has encouraged moves to economise by consolidating the number of institutions undertaking teacher training. Rationalisation, redundancy and retrenchment have become the 3 R's of tertiary education.

University involvement in teacher training is a recent development in Australia. True, in the 19th century a few students at training schools attended universities part-time. The training colleges were saved the expense of providing academic courses, the thinly-populated universities obtained a few more students. But the universities took no part in the actual training of these student-teachers. In the first half of the 20th century a few universities conferred diplomas in education. But these training courses were actually provided by neighbouring state teachers' colleges. Although some of these colleges were located in university grounds, this arrangement was simply to give the college administration closer contact with undergraduate students on teacher training scholarships. It also made it easier for college lecturers to offer Education as an undergraduate Arts subject. But these Education subjects were academic or general ones, not professional, teacher training subjects. In many cases the Principal of the Teachers' College was also part-time Professor of Education.

It was the growth of post-graduate research work (B.Ed., M.Ed., and even Ph.D courses) which forced the separation of universities and colleges. Full-time Professors of Education were appointed at Melbourne in 1939, at Sydney in 1947. University Faculties or Departments of Education started to expand.

The growth of secondary education in the 1950's and 1960's increased the demand for graduate teachers and provided an opportunity for other universities to move into teacher training. In 1948 the University of Tasmania took over all teacher training in Tasmania. This arrangement proved unsatisfactory and the Department of Education soon re-established teachers' colleges, though the university continued its teacher training programme. After about 1954 most other universities entered directly into the job of training future secondary and even primary teachers. This great incursion of universities into teacher training raised

Alan Barcan

Department of Education
University of Newcastle

little discussion at the time, partly because of the great shortage of teachers and the willingness of state Departments of Education to let universities meet some of the cost of teacher training. The articles and other writings which did discuss the new trend were mainly by proponents of university participation in teacher training.

Today the falling demand for teachers makes university participation in teacher training programmes a matter for debate. It has also raised the question of the role of colleges of advanced education in teacher training. Once again, however, the danger is that decisions will be taken and a new pattern emerge without much serious discussion.¹

The Falling Demand for Teachers

In 1976, for the first time since 1940, the supply of teachers started to exceed the demand. "Our present production of teachers means we will soon be in over-supply" the Federal Education Minister, Senator Carrick, warned in July, 1976. He remarked that many students were now being trained in areas in which they could not expect employment.

The current surplus of teachers applies equally to primary and secondary schools. In 1971 enrolments in N.S.W. state primary schools reached a peak of 504,110. By 1975 they were down to 490,769, a fall of 2.6%. This fall will continue with the declining birthrate. However there is a slight bulge in enrolments within the primary school and this should reach secondary schools in 1982.

In N.S.W. state secondary schools, however, enrolments have been consistently rising:

1971	257,600	1975	298,400
1972	277,800	1976	303,400
1973	282,000	1977	307,400
1974	286,900		

Enrolments should continue to increase until 1980.

The annual increase has fluctuated — 20,200 in 1972; 4,200 in 1973; 4,900 in 1974; 11,500 in 1975; 5000 in 1976; and 4000 in 1977. This fluctuation reflects variation in the number staying on at school in Years 11 and 12, i.e. beyond the minimum school leaving age. The "persistence rate" responds to economic conditions, particularly the condition of the labour market. In 1971 29.2% of the 1966 Year 7 intake had reached Year 12. In 1972 the proportion which had persisted to year