

Apprenticeship in Australia: A concise history

John Ray

... the apprenticeship system has served Australia well and it should not be swept away unless something better is put in its place. (OECD 1977, p.54)

THIS CHAPTER OUTLINES the history of apprenticeship in Australia from a national perspective. Most attention is given to the period after the Second World War, particularly over the last 25 years as apprenticeship has evolved to meet the demands of economic, technological and social change. The chapter has a policy focus and identifies key events and issues that have been important, and could still be important.¹

Characteristics of apprenticeship

Throughout history, men and women have obtained knowledge and learnt skills in a variety of ways—through accident, observation, trial and error, formal and informal learning, and combinations of these. Apprenticeship has a long history as a way of learning while working, particularly for the craft or trades occupations. However, even for work in those occupations, it has never been the sole means of obtaining skills.

The term ‘apprentice’ is defined succinctly in the current Concise Oxford Dictionary as ‘learner of a craft, bound to serve, and entitled to instruction from his employer for specific term, beginner, novice’. This definition illustrates that the term has both a specific meaning and a more generic one. The more specific meaning implies a contractual relationship between employer and employee, the more generic meaning implies a relationship but not necessarily a contract. Throughout this paper, apprenticeship is assumed to have the former meaning, which involves a formal contract of employment and training, and State regulation of such contracts.²

A fundamental feature of apprenticeship as a system of employment and training is that it is designed to directly benefit both the industrial parties—apprentices and employers.

- ❖ Apprentices benefit from having guaranteed paid employment for some years (nominally four years for most trade apprenticeships in Australia) and an opportunity to learn skills from qualified tradespeople.
- ❖ Employers benefit from having an employee who becomes more and more productive as time passes. The relatively high costs of employing first-year apprentices can be acceptable to employers on the basis that, by the third and fourth years, apprentices attain a work value about the same as a tradesperson but receive apprentice wages that are less than the qualified rate.

Striking the right balance between the benefits to employers and the benefits to apprentices has never been easy. Typically, differences arise because of the desire of employers to profit from employing apprentices and the desire of apprentices (endorsed by their parents) not to be exploited as cheap labour. Such differences have provided the basis for a large amount of industrial law relating to apprenticeship and for a high degree of State regulation. Legislation has enabled State supervision over the contracts of employment and training, including processes for resolving disputes between employers and apprentices.

Apprenticeship has also benefitted the community through its role in providing a supply of skilled people to provide quality goods and services. This community role of apprenticeship has provided another reason for governments to be involved in the apprenticeship system and to assist it financially. However, employers and unions (representing apprentices) have not always welcomed such government involvement. For example, in 1980 both parties refused calls from the Commonwealth to reduce the term of apprenticeship.

Origins of apprenticeship

Apprenticeship has a long history extending back to early Egyptian and Babylonian times. It became common in Medieval Europe, and from England it spread to the United States and the British colonies. The 1563 Elizabethan Statute of Artificers signalled the British Government's first attempt to define the conditions of apprenticeship as a way of providing sufficient skilled labour for craft and agricultural production. Under the statute, a person was not permitted to exercise a craft unless he had been apprenticed and there was a ratio system for the numbers of journeymen to apprentices that a tradesperson could employ (DEVET 1988, p.9). Similar provisions have been common in State and Territory legislation in Australia.

By the mid-1800s in England, apprenticeship was a common form of entry to skilled occupations, including many of the professions.

As the economies of the advanced countries moved through the industrial age and into the 20th century, vocational education institutions were established and/or companies decided to train their own staff. Accordingly, apprenticeship became less and less important as a means of training to the point where, in

most of the world, apprenticeship is no longer a major form of training. Its most concentrated application is in the Germanic-speaking countries where it is an integral part of the education system and covers a very wide range of occupations.

Next to the Germanic-speaking countries, apprenticeship is most common in Australia. The Australian brand of apprenticeship evolved from the English model. Although never on the scale of German practice, apprenticeship was an important form of training in England until recent years, particularly in the metal, electrical, building and vehicle trades. Gospel (1994, pp.511–513) considers that apprenticeship failed to evolve in the United States because of the dynamic nature of the US economy and its labour markets in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

The historical purpose of apprenticeship—to train artisans—has remained its main purpose in Australia. Apprenticeship has been the main way of training for both the traditional crafts (such as carpenter, plumber, hairdresser, and metal worker) and more contemporary trade occupations (such as vehicle mechanic and electrician).

Indeed, it should be noted that despite 160 years of change in the nature of work, the common occupations covered by apprenticeship in the construction industry in England in the mid-1800s are still major occupations covered by apprenticeship today (Whittock 1842). They include the trades of bricklayer, cabinet-maker, carpenter and joiner, glazier, painter, plasterer and plumber.

Over time, the Australian apprenticeship system has rarely produced a surplus of tradespeople. Indeed, the obverse has been the more common situation. This is in marked contrast to the German system where very large numbers are trained only to find that they cannot get a job in their occupational field.

One characteristic of Australian apprenticeship that appears to have changed in recent years is that the *training* role of apprenticeship has become more dominant than the *employment* role. This is reflected by the fact that, generally, State and Territory ministers for education now administer apprenticeship, whereas it used to be administered by ministers for industrial relations or industrial tribunals.

Establishing apprenticeship in Australia

Apprenticeship came to Australia with the establishment of the colony of New South Wales in 1788. The colony adopted English law relating to masters and apprentices and this became the basis of subsequent laws throughout Australia. The relationship between master and apprentice was effectively a contract of employment and training. It was subject to the law mainly because it involved the employment of children.

Because of the relatively large number of migrants coming to the new colony, it could be assumed that most of the skill requirements of the period were met by the use of immigrant and convict labour. It is also reasonable to assume that as part of English culture at the time, apprenticeship was valued by employers and the community—it was an accepted way of providing young people with employment and training and ultimately giving them some status in the community.

It would further appear that having another way (apart from immigration) of providing craft skills was important for economic development. In other words, it was important for the community and the government to have a properly trained construction and manufacturing workforce which knew how to build and construct sufficiently well to ensure that buildings did not fall down or products fall apart.

By the end of the 19th century, apprenticeship was well recognised throughout all the States, which retained the responsibility for regulating and administering apprenticeship after Federation.

As indicated in Beattie (1968, p.105), the NSW Apprentices Act 1894 established the first Australian apprenticeship legislation that differed from British law. A few years later, this Act was consolidated into the NSW Apprentices Act 1901, which included a detailed framework for the regulation of apprentices, including many features that remain at the present time.

Beattie (1968) also notes that subsequently, under the NSW Industrial Disputes Act 1908:

Apprentices received their first mention in our industrial legislation, there being included amongst the powers of a board the power to fix the number or proportionate number of apprentices and improvers and the lowest prices and rates payable to them. (p.106)

From that point on, apprenticeship continued to be an important industrial relations matter.

Other States followed with their own apprenticeship legislation. They also established the industrial relations machinery to regulate conditions for each trade and to settle disputes. Apprenticeships under federal awards (such as in the metal, electrical and boot trades) came under the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904.

A common provision in apprenticeship legislation was for the establishment of committees to advise on matters for particular trades.

These committees proved to be extremely important to the development of apprenticeship in Australia. Normally, they included representatives from the trade unions and employer associations who were genuinely interested in apprenticeship and often promoted its development. They played significant roles in moving apprenticeship training from being mainly 'on-the-job' training

to where it included a technical education component, provided by day release wherever possible. They were also concerned with the development and redevelopment of technical education courses for apprentices, in conciliating differences and disputes, and in generally ensuring employer and union support for apprenticeship.

In some cases, the committees' guardianship of the apprenticeship system engendered a conservative approach to change such that negotiations to reform aspects of apprenticeship suggested by others could become quite tedious and difficult. On balance, however, the work of these committees reflected industry support for apprenticeship and played a large part in gaining community acceptance for apprenticeship and embedding it into Australian culture.

Generally, government administration of apprenticeship in Australia was a responsibility of the ministerial portfolios of industrial relations, rather than education portfolios. This reflected the traditional importance placed on the contract of employment and training, which, until a few years ago, maintained the old English terminology 'indenture'.

Until at least 1950, wage determinations concerning apprenticeship in Australia reflected the fact that apprentices were mainly 'juniors' aged from 15 to 19 years. As shown in the following extracts from significant cases, the determinations also reflected the social and economic circumstances of the time.

Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act—1921 Engineers Case
I propose to prescribe wages for apprentices such as will enable poor parents to give boys a place in these crafts, without tempting them to put the lads when they leave school into some 'dead-end' labouring occupation.

(Beattie 1968, p.295)

NSW Industrial Commission—1948 Plumbers and Gasfitters Apprentices' Case
We think also that the rates fixed should be such that they reasonably be expected to encourage boys to enter upon apprenticeship and not discourage employers from accepting apprentices. They should be such as to dissuade parents from placing their boys in dead-end occupations.³

(Beattie 1968, p.291)

In the first half of the 20th century the Australian population doubled—from just under four million in 1901 to about eight million in 1950. As the century progressed, apprenticeship became a common form of training for the trades and was subjected to an increasing amount of State legislation and federal and State awards. Increasingly, apprentices were required to attend technical education on a 'day release' arrangement, or at night, or through a combination of both. Significantly, the period of apprenticeship was reduced from seven years to five years after the First World War. During the 1960s, it was reduced to four years.

Very little reliable statistical information is available for the period. However, it would be reasonable to assume that apprenticeship prior to the Second World

War would have been on a relatively smaller scale to what it became after the war.

Apprenticeship after the Second World War

As a system for supplying skilled trades workers, the apprenticeship system was strained during and after the Second World War. Because of the shortage of skilled tradespeople who were serving in the forces, industry resorted to the use of 'dilutees', including many women. 'Dilutees' was the term given to workers who had a limited range of skills well short of the broad skills of a 'qualified' tradesperson. After the war, the Tradesmen's Rights Regulation Act 1946 was passed to protect the rights of pre-war tradespeople who had survived the war against the 'dilutees' and unqualified migrants who were beginning to arrive in Australia from Europe. This Act gave rise to a long-standing tripartite system for assessing skills in the metal, electrical and boot trades.

During the post-war boom, the Commonwealth Reconstruction and Training Scheme (CRTS) was established to facilitate 'fast track' training for the many servicemen returning from the war. This scheme demonstrated that adults could be trained as tradespeople in much shorter time than the statutory period of five years.

The resilience of apprenticeship over this period is testimony to the individuals (particularly the many trade committee members referred to above) who kept it alive over the years. For example, the fact that women had demonstrated their capabilities was soon forgotten, as was the fact that the CRTS demonstrated that adults could gain trades skills quickly through intensive courses in technical colleges or industry skills centres without the need for long periods of on-the-job training.

Until the 1950s, the apprenticeship model had also been used for the training of some professional occupations, such as pharmacy, surveying and nursing. However, such training was totally separate to, and not covered by, the arrangements and legislation applying to trade apprentices, and was subsequently abandoned in favour of higher education courses. Nurse training retained the apprenticeship model until the early 1980s, when it also transferred to higher education following the 1978 Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Nurse Education and Training.⁴

Proposals for change 1950–1972

Between 1950 and 1970, Australia experienced steady economic development, a large increase in population from eight million to 13 million and very low rates of unemployment.

During the period, the Commonwealth Government intervened to improve all levels of education except technical education. Major inquiries were instigated, including the 1957 Murray Inquiry into university education, the

1961–65 Martin Inquiry into advanced education, including teacher education, and various inquiries into schooling. Commonwealth financial assistance followed these inquiries, and participation in all forms of education increased, particularly in higher education. For example, between 1950 and 1972, enrolments in higher education increased by 570%—from 30 630 to 209 005. Over the next 20 years to 1992, they would grow to 559 365 (DEET 1993, pp.8, 46; CTEC 1986, p.282).

In this environment, apprenticeship evolved slowly. It was largely taken for granted as a way of training for the trades and was supported by both unions and employers, and the negotiated apprenticeship provisions were included in industrial awards.

Eventually, the Commonwealth and the States became aware of the wider policy implications of the apprenticeship system and commissioned a number of inquiries. The Commonwealth recognised the importance to the national economy of having a reasonable supply of skilled tradespeople, particularly as immigration levels declined (immigration had played a major part in the development of post-war Australia).

However, despite the inquiries, little changed. Writing of the 1950s and 1960s, Kirby (1981) noted that:

Although a great deal was spoken and written about the inadequacies of the apprenticeship training system, practically no reform of the system was attempted or policy analysis of wages issues relating to labour market imbalances undertaken. (p.8)

The evidence suggests that while the Commonwealth recognised some of the reforms that needed to be made, it lacked the commitment to actually bring about change.

There was also the problem that governments did not want to cause unnecessary industrial disputes. As far as apprenticeship was concerned, governments were third parties—if either party to apprenticeship (i.e. employers or unions representing employees) did not want to change apprenticeship conditions, it was always hard going to bring about change.

Despite the poor level of resources available to technical education, the period saw a steady introduction of new ways of delivering technical training to apprentices. For example, arrangements were made for apprentices to receive technical education in a range of new formats, including day release from employment, block release, and initial off-the-job courses both within apprenticeship and prior to apprenticeship (pre-apprenticeship courses). Differing opinions developed as to the value and appropriateness of pre-apprenticeship courses—Victoria strongly preferred training within apprenticeship with the apprentices paid wages while the other States were generally willing to trial new arrangements.

A complicating factor during the period was the significant debate about the relative values of general education and technical education. The main outcome from this debate was the discontinuation of technical education (and domestic science) in high schools in favour of general education.

The first significant national policy development concerning apprenticeship during the period was the decision at the 1950 Premiers' Conference to establish the Commonwealth–State Apprenticeship Inquiry, chaired by Mr Justice Wright.

The inquiry met from April 1952 to March 1953 and reported in March 1954. It involved public sittings and 138 submissions. The very long period taken to complete the Wright Report suggests a lack of urgency. However, it turned out to be a strong confirmation of the value of trade apprenticeships. A total of 90 recommendations were made to improve the apprenticeship system, including steps to achieve more uniformity between the States in the legal arrangements surrounding the indenture process. Two of the recommendations were considered to be both provocative and unacceptable to the States.

Apprentices should be regarded primarily as training or educational units and not industrial units. (Wright 1954, p.32)⁵

A Commonwealth industrial tribunal should be established with power to fix an Australian standard of wages and conditions for apprentices which would be mandatory for State industrial authorities to adopt. (Wright 1954, p.27)

One agreed outcome was to establish the Australian Apprenticeship Advisory Committee (AAAC), an advisory body comprising apprenticeship authorities that would meet annually to discuss matters of common interest. The AAAC did not meet until 1957⁶ but remained for nearly 20 years until the Commonwealth/State Training Advisory Committee (COSTAC) replaced it. A senior officer from the Commonwealth labour department chaired both the AAAC and COSTAC.

The interest in reform was again evident in a 1959 report *Training for industry* (AIDA 1959) by a high-level committee of the Australian Industrial Development Association. This report included over 100 recommendations, including many that were recommended repeatedly over the next 40 years and would sit well in most contemporary reports on the subject. The recommendations on apprenticeship (p.29) called for:

- ❖ more avenues to the trades other than apprenticeship
- ❖ apprenticeship terms to be less than five years
- ❖ intensive pre-apprenticeship courses in trade centres or technical colleges
- ❖ re-skilling of those whose skills are out of date
- ❖ apprenticeships for adults as well as young people aged 15 to 16
- ❖ the adoption of a scheme similar to the post-Second World War CRT Scheme

- ❖ apprenticeship to be assessed by competence and testing, rather than the passage of time

In 1962, the Department of Labour and National Service, which administered the Commonwealth's interest in apprenticeship, organised a high-level conference of officials and union and employer associations at Rowville, Victoria. The conference was to ensure (again) that 'sufficient skilled workers are available to meet the needs, present and prospective, of the Australian economy' (DLNS 1966, p.2). It was notable for three outcomes:

- ❖ It canvassed the notion of group apprenticeship, which had worked successfully in the United Kingdom.
- ❖ It recommended shorter periods of apprenticeship, which were put into effect later by consent variations to the Federal Metal Trades Award in 1962. According to Pead (1981, p.15): 'Prior to the 1962 amendments, the term of apprenticeship for almost all trades was five years'.
- ❖ The Commonwealth agreed to what appears to have been the first instance of Commonwealth financial support for apprenticeship. The Country Apprenticeship Scheme involved a subsidy to employers of £3 per week during the first year of an apprenticeship and living-away-from-home allowances for country apprentices.

As immigration began to slow down in the 1960s, Australia also commenced its move away from its special economic relationship with Britain, and further questions were raised as to the adequacy of apprenticeship as a source of skilled workers. For example, in a 1966 Working Party report (DLNS 1966), the then Secretary of the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service, Sir Henry Bland, noted that: 'Apprenticeship stems from an era pre-dating the Industrial Revolution, mass production methods and modern distribution techniques . . . Fundamentally, the conceptual basis of apprenticeship in Australia has remained unchanged' (p.3).

The 1966 report recorded the view that apprenticeship was not changing quickly enough but reflected the attitude of the time by backing off any real action to reform the system. For example, the main outcome was a recommendation to establish yet another high-level tripartite committee to consider increasing intakes of apprentices, shorter terms, UK-style levies and 'further research on why apprenticeship is not attractive to lads' (p.13).

Perhaps the most extensive review ever undertaken on apprenticeship was the three-year inquiry by the Industrial Commission of New South Wales, chaired by Mr Justice Beattie. His 638-page report in 1968 was a milestone in the history of apprenticeship (Beattie 1968). It addressed every aspect of apprenticeship and played a large part in determining future policy. The following few examples of issues and recommendations illustrate the foresight of the report.

- ❖ Criteria were developed for determining whether compulsory apprenticeship should be prescribed for a particular occupation. (pp.143–144)
- ❖ If the institution of apprenticeship is to remain an effective means of training an adequately skilled workforce, it will be necessary for the community to accept a bigger share of the costs of training apprentices than it now does. (p.495)⁷
- ❖ Broad training rather than job-specific training. (p.143)
- ❖ Periodic reviews of the lists of prescribed occupations to achieve consistency and remove obsolete occupations. (p.144)
- ❖ Uniform nomenclature and skill content in all States to assist mobility of labour. (p.144)
- ❖ Extension of the apprenticeship to commercial occupations. (p.144)

The 586-page report *The training of skilled workers in Europe* of 1969 (Tregillis 1969) was another major contribution. This report followed an investigation of the methods for training skilled workers in 17 European countries, particularly in relation to the engineering and electrical trades. The investigation involved six senior officials from the unions and industry associations visiting Europe from mid-October 1968 to early-March 1969. Brian Tregillis, then Deputy Secretary, Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service, led the Mission Team.

Perhaps the most critical outcomes from the Tregillis Report concerning apprenticeship were the recommendations concerning the need to reduce the costs to employers of employing apprentices (consistent with the Beattie Report) and the possible value of a UK-style levy grant system. The report also provided much information on European training practices and led to a further opening-up of thinking about and beyond apprenticeship.

24

Subsequently, Australia's first National Conference on Training for Industry and Commerce was held at the Australian National University, Canberra during May 1971. That conference involved some 311 delegates (including seven government ministers) and broadened the debate on training beyond the trades (DLNS 1971, p.1). A departmental report to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) noted that following the conference, the Minister for Labour established the tripartite National Steering Committee on Training for Industry and Commerce to continue the work initiated by the conference (DL 1974, p.149). Later, this committee was subsumed into a new National Training Council.

Overall, the impact of the Tregillis Report and the Canberra conference was to raise awareness of the need for industry to train. It also established a rationale for Commonwealth financial support for training and apprenticeship. Another outcome was the establishment in November 1973 of industry training councils in about 14 industry sectors. These councils were the forerunners to

what are now known as national industry training advisory bodies or ITABs (DL 1974, p.152).

In summary, perhaps the main points to come out of the period from 1950 to 1972 were that:

- ❖ inquiry after inquiry confirmed the benefits of apprenticeship but at the same time criticised its inflexibility
- ❖ at the grass roots, changes did occur—day attendance at Technical and Further Education (TAFE) and pre-apprenticeship were introduced
- ❖ most of the options for systemic change to apprenticeship that were found to be effective many years later were known in the 1950s and would sit comfortably in a contemporary report
- ❖ the inquiries into apprenticeship seemed to lack urgency and grass roots support to bring about change
- ❖ the lack of action demonstrated the difficulty of making fundamental reforms, particularly in convincing employer and union representatives on State advisory committees who became suspicious of the motives of ‘outsiders’ who wanted to change the system

Commonwealth intervention 1972–1984

This period between 1972 and 1984 saw a great deal of real action on the part of the Commonwealth and States to overcome many of the shortcomings with apprenticeship that had been difficult to address in earlier years. It also saw the beginning of significant Commonwealth funding for apprenticeship in Australia.

This financial support was driven largely by economic motives, such as the realisation after 1970 that immigration was declining and that a shortage of skilled workers would have an inflationary effect on the national economy. Table 1 shows the relative contributions of apprenticeship and immigration to the supply of tradespeople from 1963 to 1985 and how higher apprenticeship completions generally compensated for the decline in immigration.

The nature of possible financial support was influenced by the earlier views of commentators such as Beattie and Tregillis that employers needed assistance to offset the costs of training apprentices. A number of options were considered to encourage employers to have more apprentices, including direct financial assistance, tax concessions, levies, grants and marketing promotions.

The Commonwealth finally acted to provide financial support for apprenticeship in January 1973 when it introduced the National Apprenticeship Assistance Scheme (NAAS). This involved financial assistance to encourage employers to take on first-year apprentices, and living-away-from-home allowances for apprentices from country areas. By 1975–76, funding under NAAS had reached \$34.9 million (Kirby 1981, p.13).

Table 1: Supply of tradespeople from apprenticeship and immigration

Year	Apprentice completions		Net settler gain		Total
	nos	%	nos	%	
1963–64	14 930	53	13 168	47	28 098
1966–67	17 071	59	12 034	41	29 105
1969–70	26 435	70	11 389	30	37 824
1972–73	22 862	79	6 240	21	29 102
1975–76	26 183	89	3 325	11	29 508
1978–79	30 632	89	3 967	11	34 599
1981–82	32 015	78	8 977	22	40 992
1984–85	36 534	95	1 921	5	38 455

Sources: Kirby (1981, p.15); DEIR (1986b, p.21)

Historically, NAAS was a landmark for apprenticeship in Australia. It marked the beginning of what was to prove to be continuous Commonwealth funding for apprenticeship and put apprenticeship firmly on the policy agendas of the Commonwealth Government and State Governments.

- ❖ Prior to NAAS, apprenticeship in Australia had worked effectively without government subsidies (apart from the costs of technical education costs and supervision of apprentices by the States). The costs and benefits of apprenticeship had always been taken into account in the various industrial determinations of apprentice wages.
- ❖ The State and Territory administration of apprenticeship had concentrated on servicing advisory committees and resolving disputes between employers and apprentices. Little attention had been given to overall apprenticeship policy.

The next major impact on apprenticeship resulted from the Report of the Australian Committee on Technical and Further Education (ACOTFE) in 1974 (Kangan 1974). This report was the final in a series concerned with improving education—earlier reports had addressed needs in universities, advanced education and schools. It recommended substantial Commonwealth funding to upgrade TAFE and played a critical role in improving facilities for trade training and apprenticeship, which by 1975 accounted for 20% of all enrolments in TAFE and 39% of total teaching effort (TAFEC 1976).

Importantly, the Kangan Report specified a philosophy for TAFE:

The emphasis . . . should be primarily on the needs of the individual for vocationally oriented education and the manpower needs of industry should be seen as the context of courses. (Kangan 1974, p.xxiii)

The 1974 decision to provide Commonwealth assistance to TAFE was instrumental in changing the whole approach to technical education in Australia. Kangan compared the decision to support TAFE with ‘Cinderella coming to the ball’. He was referring to the fact that TAFE was very much the

poor relation to universities and colleges of higher education. By 1974, the physical facilities available to TAFE were very poor—often they were worn out buildings that universities had vacated years earlier, and the equipment available for teaching apprentices was very old.

By 1977, concerns about the adequacy and quality of apprenticeship had grown. In response, the Commonwealth replaced NAAS with the Commonwealth Rebate for Apprentice Full-time Training (CRAFT) scheme, which was to prove to be a long-standing program. Essentially, CRAFT provided employers with rebates to offset the cost of wages lost when apprentices attended technical college or other approved off-the-job training. CRAFT also had other elements, including two consecutive \$1000 bonus schemes to encourage employers to take on additional apprentices.

CRAFT had the objectives of improving both the quantity and quality of trade training. It was developed in the context that even in the late 1970s, small business played a large part in training apprentices. The Australian paper on apprenticeship, presented to the OECD in 1980, noted, for example, that 68% of apprentices were employed in firms with one or two apprentices and that such firms had accounted for 80% of the growth in apprentice numbers over the previous ten years (DEYA 1981, p.8).

The availability of CRAFT to employers ensured that apprentices did attend technical instruction at TAFE and enabled the further development of block release courses, particularly for country apprentices in Queensland.⁸

As CRAFT was a program to assist in maintaining a supply of trained tradespeople, it could not be used to assist occupations that were not trades. While some new occupations could be classified as trades and became eligible for CRAFT, other proposals for coverage were rejected. Two of these proposals concerned jockeys and real estate salespersons.

The trade focus of CRAFT was often criticised on equity grounds because males made up 90% of employment in trade occupations. The only significant trade occupation with significant numbers of females was hairdressing. In later years, females also became attracted to apprenticeships in cooking and gardening.

In 1979, the Report on Education Training and Employment (Williams 1979) recommended an increase in the amount of pre-employment education and training for the trades. It also recommended 'a determined effort to base training arrangements on the analysis of skills involved and the efficient ways of acquiring them, and not on custom' (p.337). This was a 'not so subtle' criticism of apprenticeship and the difficulty of reforming it.

Apprenticeship remained firmly in the spotlight in 1980 as concern mounted nationally about the capacity of the labour market to produce sufficient skilled people to construct very large resource projects. At the time, vast projects were planned for the North West Shelf in Western Australia (natural gas extraction)

and the Hunter Valley in New South Wales (aluminium smelters and power stations).

Acting on a request from the Premiers Conference in June 1980, the Departments of Labour Advisory Committee (DOLAC)⁹ established a working party of Commonwealth and State officials. It was asked to report on ways of addressing skill shortages and 'assessing the need for change in the present trade training system, including possible new arrangements' (DOLAC 1980, p.1).

The short DOLAC Working Party Report commenced with the comment: 'The facts behind the commissioning of this report are simple, the issues complex' and made 27 recommendations to improve trade training in Australia. It received a large amount of positive publicity in the national media, and in September 1980, Commonwealth and State ministers for labour endorsed it as a blueprint for action. Subsequently, the following key outcomes from the 1980 report were tabled in another DOLAC report (DEYA 1982, Attachment, pp.5–8):

- ❖ an application in August 1981 by the Metal Trades Industry Association (MTIA) to vary the Federal Metal Industry Award in respect of provisions relating to the proportion of apprentices to tradesmen, the requirement to complete an apprenticeship by the 23rd birthday, and credit provisions for completion of pre-apprenticeship courses
- ❖ the commencement in 1981 of Commonwealth financial support for group apprenticeship, which hitherto had been only a marginal activity
- ❖ an increase in enrolments in pre-apprenticeship courses to 5416 in 1981
- ❖ Commonwealth funding for 'one off' Commonwealth–State schemes to train apprentices for major resource projects in New South Wales and Western Australia
- ❖ action to finally improve national statistics on apprenticeship

The early 1980s were a period of much official activity to implement the recommendations of the DOLAC Report and develop and put in place measures to improve the flexibility of the trade training system. Through DOLAC and COSTAC, which had replaced the AAAC in 1978, detailed position papers and action plans were prepared on a range of issues including:

- ❖ new statistical frameworks for collecting data on apprenticeships from the States and Territories
- ❖ apprentice wage fixation
- ❖ financial assistance for group apprenticeship schemes
- ❖ the German apprenticeship system
- ❖ trade-based pre-employment courses
- ❖ the feasibility of institutional trade training

In 1982, bearing in mind the overseas trend towards institutional training and the success much earlier with the post-war CRT Scheme, DOLAC referred

the matter of institutional trade training to the Commonwealth/State Apprenticeship Committee (COSAC) for examination. The subsequent COSAC report (released in March 1984) was equivocal. It recognised the potential for such training but also the practical and industrial realities of taking it further at that time.

After the 1980 DOLAC Report, trade-based pre-employment and pre-vocational courses had been actively promoted by the Commonwealth and became reasonably popular—except in Victoria, where the major stakeholders were wedded to the traditional apprenticeship model.

A major analytical product of the period was a practical and comprehensible planning model that was developed by the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations (DEIR) to estimate the level of annual apprentice intakes required to maintain an adequate trades workforce. It was eventually published in a 1986 Report to DOLAC *Review of the labour market for the trades* (DEIR 1986b, pp.32–33). Two conclusions were that the main purpose of apprenticeship was to replace wastage in the trades and that an annual intake of about 45 000 apprentices was necessary to maintain an appropriate level of trade skills.

The traineeship period 1984–1990

By 1983, unemployment (particularly youth unemployment) had risen to unprecedented levels and was a major political issue for the newly elected Hawke Government. The 604 000 unemployed compared with only 78 000 at the beginning of the 1970s.

A 1983 report *Youth wages, employment and the labour force*, by the Bureau of Labour Market Research, had opened a lively debate in the media about the possible merits of reducing youth wages to improve the job opportunities of young people relative to adults.

At the same time, concerns were mounting in Commonwealth circles about the uncoordinated nature of the Commonwealth's labour market programs and the escalating costs associated with them. To examine these matters, the Government established a Committee of Inquiry under the chairmanship of Mr Peter Kirby. The committee reported in December 1984.

The centrepiece of the committee's report (Kirby 1985) was the recommendation to establish a system of traineeships that would be similar but different to apprenticeships.

To understand the importance of the recommendations on traineeships it is necessary to understand that the 1983 context was one in which:

- ❖ The apparent national school retention rate to Year 12 was 40.6%, compared with nearly 80% in 1999.
- ❖ There were 348 577 students in higher education compared with about 600 000 in 1999.

- ❖ The apprenticeship system was working reasonably well but was costing more and more in government support.
- ❖ The comprehensive occupational coverage of German apprenticeship was widely known among the training community and had been lauded (rightly or wrongly) as one of the reasons for what was then called the West German economic miracle.
- ❖ The Government's concern with the national budget resulted in the Kirby Committee being instructed to consider 'the need for continuous restraint in the growth of public expenditure and the desirability of maximising efficiency and cost effectiveness in the provision of labour market programs' (Kirby 1985, p.13). Effectively, this meant that the committee was asked to come up with 'cost neutral' solutions.

Another fundamental background factor was the knowledge that about 100 000 young people appeared to be going nowhere:

Of the 250 000 young Australians who reach the school leaving age each year, close to 100 000 immediately continue their education and complete 12 years of schooling. Many go from there to higher education, 35 000 to 40 000 gain an apprenticeship. Perhaps 10 000 to 15 000 enter full-time vocational courses in certain areas which have no Year 12 prerequisite. The remainder, over half of whom are females, seek to enter the labour force with no substantial vocational preparation. There may be as many as 100 000 young people in this category.

(Kirby 1985, p.61)

One option would have been to simply extend the coverage of the apprenticeship system beyond the trades. Under the circumstances in 1984, this would have been too expensive if it had involved the extension of CRAFT. The report noted:

. . . we do not favour the extension of CRAFT beyond the trades in which it currently operates. To do so would provide further support for what is, in effect, an inequitable and expensive practice of subsidising full-time training on full award wages. It would be inconsistent with our view that the costs of training need to be shared more equitably among employers, individuals and governments.

(p.134)

Another option would have been to reduce the need for CRAFT by somehow changing the fundamental way in which apprentice wage rates were determined, with a view to redistributing overall costs. For example, perhaps the trade training system could be moved more towards the German model of paying allowances rather than wages.

Current rates of pay for apprentices in Australia make it imperative for many employers that apprentices be productive. Lower rates of pay in West Germany allow the employer to place less emphasis on production, more on training, and consequently allow shorter training periods.

(Kirby 1985, p.126)

Because of the long industrial history of apprenticeship in Australia, this option was too impractical.

The proposal finally presented in the report was for 'a legitimate training system' (p.117) of traineeships that would 'act as a stepping stone into primary labour market jobs' (p.114).

The traineeships would combine learning and working in a similar way to apprenticeships but would apply to non-trades occupations and:

- ❖ initially attract 16- and 17-year olds who had not completed Year 12
- ❖ take about 12 months to complete, including about 65 days off-the-job formal training which could be undertaken either two days per week or as a 13-week block

The Kirby Report proposed that formal training should include general or transferable skills 'focussing on families of occupations' (p.115).

An innovative (and critical) feature of the traineeship proposal, which soon became lost, was the suggestion for income support. The report noted:

- ❖ *We do not wish to develop a system which relies on continuing government subsidies to recompense employers for releasing trainees to formal off-the-job training.*
- ❖ *A key principle of the new system is that trainees should be paid wages only for the time spent on the job.*
- ❖ *Employers should make a contribution to the training of the future workforce and ... an industrially determined wage will ensure that more attention is given to the nature of the work undertaken, when trainees are on-the-job. (pp.116–117)*

These principles were consistent with the directions given to the committee to develop 'cost neutral' proposals. Importantly, they were also consistent with the principle that students should be treated as students, and workers as workers. In other words, the proposal was a genuine attempt to break the nexus whereby the Commonwealth subsidised the payment of full award wages to apprentices while they were in full-time training—a practice that was not followed for other groups.

In effect, the Kirby proposals were a subtle indication that apprentice wages were on the high side and that it was counter-productive to be supporting them by government subsidies. However, to avoid likely industrial opposition to reducing apprentice wages, Kirby proposed a new system of structured training that would not rely on subsidies but had the potential to encompass apprenticeships in the future.

During the continuing debates about how to fix youth unemployment in 1985, however, people were looking for simple solutions, not subtle ones that would take time to achieve results. For example, in one of many media responses to the Kirby Report, the Australian Financial Review ran an editorial

on 25 January 1985, titled: 'Kirby, youth jobs and wages'. It criticised the lack of attention (in and out of the report) given to reducing youth wages as follows:

Youth unemployment is inextricably entwined to movements in youth wages relative to the wages of other groups. While youth unemployment may have been a 'sleeping' issue at the 1984 Federal elections, the chances are that it will be well and truly awakened by 1988. (Financial Review 1985, p.12)

In such a political environment, the Government did not take long to endorse the traineeship proposals as a major response to youth unemployment. Furthermore, to hasten their introduction as part of a Priority One Youth Policy Package in 1985, the Government put aside its concern for 'cost neutrality' and agreed to subsidise traineeships in ways that were similar to apprenticeship subsidies.

For many years after 1985, the Commonwealth and the States put much energy into developing traineeships, initially under the Australian Traineeship System (ATS), with the Kirby estimate of 75 000 traineeships per year as the planning target. By 1987–88, the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) had 177 operative staff engaged in traineeship activity throughout Australia involving an appropriation of \$53 million. This compared with 78 staff and an appropriation of \$131 million administering trade training and apprenticeship (DEET 1988, pp.35, 37).

Traineeships were promoted mainly as quality training options for jobs in the service industries. The most popular fields were retailing, hospitality and clerical areas. However, progress was slow, mainly because of the need to have new industrial arrangements and new legislation in the States. The 1987–88 Annual Report of DEET reflected the work involved in its summary of progress:

At the end of June 1988, some 18 285 young people had begun a traineeship since the inception of the ATS in August 1985, and of these, 57% were in the private sector. Some 200 industrial agreements or award variations had been negotiated across a wide variety of industries . . . involving 43 unions. At the end of June 1988, 91% of all trainees were aged 16–18 years and 73% had not successfully completed Year 12. (DEET 1988, p.38)

A continual source of embarrassment to government officials was the shortfall of intakes relative to Kirby's target figure of 75 000 new traineeships each year, particularly as both the youth labour market and the full-time labour market deteriorated under the impact of industry restructuring. On reflection, however, the fact that intakes were above 10 000 annually from 1987–88 should have received more positive publicity in the light of what was happening to the youth labour market. For example, school retention to Year 12 was rising, higher education enrolments were rising and full-time employment opportunities were falling.

The effort required to develop the traineeship system meant that trade apprenticeship was virtually left alone for many years. Apprenticeship

completions averaged about 33 000 from 1980 to 1993, reaching a peak of 39 582 in 1992–93 (DEIR 1986a; NCVET 1995).

Training reform 1990–1998

Despite very large increases in the participation of young people in school and higher education during the late 1980s, the 1990s arrived with youth unemployment remaining a major problem. Industrial restructuring and new technology were also beginning to have a marked impact on the labour market.

Once again, more government reports were commissioned to come up with solutions.

By 1991, the advice of DEET was that it was time to move on from the ATS.

Traineeships are seen to be of lower status than apprenticeships and (related to this) tend to be occupations employing a high proportion of females. Traineeships are often seen as an alternative to Year 11–12 for the less able, as a transition from school to work program or as a labour market program for the disadvantaged. There have been significant 'drop outs' in some traineeships. In contrast, apprenticeships are seen as 'solid' vocational training and over 70 per cent of apprentices who start subsequently finish. (DEET 1991, p.9)

Policy-makers decided to take a new approach that would be more 'holistic', though arguably more complicated. The new approach involved moving away from training based on timeserving and the acquisition of knowledge to one based on training for competency to undertake tasks to national standards set by industry. It included national vocational qualifications, training pathways, recognition of prior learning, vocational education in schools, and a whole new language to describe it all.

During this period, the term 'Technical and Further Education' (TAFE), which had been coined by Kangan in 1974, was relegated for all practical purposes in favour of the broader international term 'vocational education and training' (VET).

The newly established National Training Board (NTB) promoted the development of competency standards based on industry needs. (By the mid-1990s the NTB was abolished with the establishment of the Australian National Training Authority).

For the providers and users of vocational education in Australia, the concept of having vocational competence as the main objective of training courses had always had great appeal. In 1975, for example, the then new Technical and Further Education Commission (TAFEC) tried unsuccessfully to enlist support to have all TAFE vocational courses classified according to their 'vocational objectives' rather than by admission criteria and length of course. Again, in 1980, the Commonwealth and States Conference of Ministers of Labour agreed that trade training should be based on competence rather than time serving.

However, little progress was made until late in the 1980s when the whole issue of competency-based training began to receive the support of unions and industry as well as the Commonwealth Government and State Governments.

In mid-1991, a DEET position paper *A new structured entry-level training system for Australia* favoured the term 'trainee' for both trainees and apprentices on the grounds that one term was preferable and that traineeship was 'a more modern term' (DEET 1991, p.31).

About the same time, other commissioned reports endorsed the move towards competency-based training.

The Australian Vocational Certificate Training System

On 21 July 1992, Commonwealth and State ministers agreed to establish the Australian Vocational Certificate Training System (AVCTS). This included Competency-Based Training (CBT), Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL), the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and the National Framework for the Recognition of Training (NFROT). The newly formed Australian National Training Authority (ANTA) was directed to take a key role in implementing the new system.

The AVCTS was designed to be a comprehensive system of training involving:

- ❖ industry participation in the development and provision of training
- ❖ quality training to national standards
- ❖ achievement and recognition of competencies, however achieved
- ❖ multiple pathways for achieving competencies
- ❖ many different training providers, such as secondary schools, TAFE, private trainers, employer training etc.
- ❖ a national framework of vocational qualifications
- ❖ provision for those with disadvantages of different kinds

In November 1994, the Ministerial Council on Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) agreed to support the translation of both apprenticeships and traineeships to AVCTS by December 1996.

The NETTFORCE traineeships

Because of their quantitative impact on the training system, the introduction of the National Employment and Training Taskforce (NETTFORCE) traineeships was another significant event in the history of apprenticeships and traineeships.

NETTFORCE traineeships resulted from a government white paper on measures to address unemployment (Keating 1994). Aiming for a target of 50 000 additional training places, the NETTFORCE arrangements included a

new national training wage, training in small business, and the establishment of industry-focussed committees and administrative support to direct the initiative.

During 1995, a massive 'crash through' Commonwealth-funded effort was made to increase the numbers of traineeships. It involved moving well beyond conventional approaches and strained the system as never before. It included:

- ❖ providing traineeships in new industries and occupations (e.g. sport, recreation, and a range of sub-trades work); in jobs that cut cross occupations (e.g. swimming pool installation, home decorating, farm-stay accommodation); and in jobs related to the trades
- ❖ accrediting training that was delivered and assessed on the job only, with no mandatory requirement to attend off-the-job training, such as at TAFE
- ❖ providing traineeships in small business, involving a mixing and matching process to provide training to suit the specific needs of individual businesses
- ❖ extending the provision of traineeships beyond basic vocational qualifications Australian Standards Framework I and II (where they had applied since 1985), to ASF III and above

Largely as a result of NETTFORCE and the later New Apprenticeship initiative, the number of trainee commencements increased from 15 437 in 1994–95 to 34 721 in 1995–96 and 48 662 in 1996–97 (unpublished NCVER data).

The intensive effort to establish traineeships highlighted the 'problems associated with achieving national goals through eight State and Territory training systems with different legislative and administrative arrangements' (Ray 1996, p.19). It also highlighted many non-systemic problems, such as:

- ❖ poor understanding of traineeships by employers
- ❖ differing local views on the real need for some proposed traineeships
- ❖ concerns about the quality of training, and quality assurance
- ❖ the place of 'on-the-job only' traineeships
- ❖ the balance between training in generic skills and job-specific skills
- ❖ the target occupations and industries for additional traineeships
- ❖ the potential for 'diluting' apprenticeship training
- ❖ lack of a training culture in some occupations and industries
- ❖ the excessive time taken to reach agreement on new traineeships

The fact that employers had a poor understanding of traineeships was not surprising. From the advent of 'training reform' in the early 1990s, the whole training environment had been constantly changing and becoming more and more complicated. By 1995–96, the training system had become almost incomprehensible to anyone outside the training community.

Concerns about the quality of training and quality assurance arose—often, they were related to the growth of ‘on-the-job only’ traineeships. Some State training officials claimed that they had struggled for years to promote traineeships as quality training programs that were similar but different to apprenticeships only to see that approach abandoned in favour of a thrust for numbers. Accordingly, there were debates about what training should or should not take place under the various State-regulated systems that covered apprenticeships and traineeships, and what should be regarded as labour market programs.

Until 1994, traineeships had applied only to occupational areas well removed from the apprenticeship trades. However, the NETTFORCE traineeships initiative changed that situation and in the process another very long-standing principle—the application of regulated training to trades assistant occupations (e.g. exhaust mechanics, brake mechanics, and tyre fixers). In the past, such trainees would have been referred to as ‘dilutees’ and would have been the cause for industrial litigation based on a long-standing legal requirement (that had remained essentially unchanged since Elizabethan times), such as the following:

An employer shall not employ a person who is under the age of 21 years in a declared trade unless the person is an apprentice or qualified tradesperson in that trade. (NSW Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1989, Sec. 24)

Although such provisions remained in most State-training legislation, they were not necessarily applied in the administration of apprenticeships and traineeships after 1994.

The realistic administrative approach reflected the reality of the marketplace where specialised ‘sub-trades’ businesses became popular. For example, in the specialist motor vehicle industry trainees did not need training as fully fledged motor mechanics nor did they wish to pursue it.

36

An important associated development in 1994 was the agreement of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) to unpaid work placements (or vocational placements) for secondary school students and TAFE pre-employment students that involve the achievement of workplace competencies. The agreement covered up to 240 hours of unpaid work—a provision that was subsequently included in the training legislation of three States and the Australian Capital Territory.

Later, the Commonwealth Workplace Relations Act 1996 effectively transferred all responsibility for work placements to the States by defining vocational placements as placements under the laws of the States and Territories. This opened up the prospect of unpaid work placements that could exceed the previous 240-hour limit.

New Apprenticeships

Following the change of government in 1996, the incoming Howard Government made its mark on the overall development of apprenticeship in Australia by introducing 'New Apprenticeships', which combined apprenticeships and traineeships under the one umbrella title and further extended the occupational coverage of apprenticeship-type training.

The New Apprentice arrangements introduced new features, such as *training packages* and *user choice of registered training providers*. Training packages were combinations of the training agreement (in place of indentures), training plans, competencies to be attained and the method of assessment and assessment guidelines. 'User choice' was a principle that allowed employers and apprentices and trainees to choose the training provider they required. Previously, TAFE had played almost an exclusive role in such training.

The new arrangements covered school-based and part-time apprenticeships and traineeships and formal training that was wholly on the job, or off the job at TAFE or a private provider.

In a major change of policy, New Apprenticeships were made available to existing employees. Previously they had been available to new employees only.

Subsequently, in 1997–98 the practice of 'declaring' occupations in State and Territory regulations was discontinued in Australia, except in New South Wales. However, even in New South Wales, traineeships proceeded in the sub-trades with the consent of unions and employers and the use of special titles for the occupations.

At the time, the legislative approach used by the States and Territories for the administration of apprenticeships and traineeships depended largely on the age of the legislation (Ray 1998, p.15). However, distinctions between trades apprentices and non-trade trainees continued to be made—either through training legislation (such as by distinguishing between training in a trade and training in other than a trade) or administration (where the legislation permitted administration by regulation).

The New Apprenticeship initiative had continued the growth trend set earlier. Within a few years, it resulted in very large increases in the numbers of trainees in non-trades occupations. It also led to a substantial increase in the amount of training undertaken outside TAFE by the newly registered training providers and by industry itself, including wholly on-the-job training.

Conclusion

The traditional form of apprenticeship has a long history and been an integral part of Australian culture as a way of training for the trades, particularly in the metals, electrical and building trades¹⁰ where shortages of skills can lead to wage-led inflation.

Involving a contract of employment and training based on well-established industrial principles and procedures that preceded government subsidies, apprenticeship has become highly dependent on financial support from the Commonwealth since 1973.

Although it has been slow to reform, it has generally worked well, particularly as a form of entry-level training. It has been less successful in meeting skills needs through economic cycles.

However, the world will keep on changing and so must apprenticeship. In this context, the impact of globalisation and information technology during the 1990s was probably without precedent in history.

It was a decade that saw radical changes in the nature of work and in the 'ways of doing things'. It resulted in many new types of work, more casual jobs, fewer 'jobs for life', higher job mobility, less job security, more contracting, and large-scale employment by labour hire companies. Many large companies and public sector organisations that used to train apprentices stopped doing so, and small businesses saw difficulty in making four-year commitments to train. For their part, young people had more job mobility than previously and often did not feel obliged to honour their employment and training contracts.

In such an environment, is it not surprising that apprenticeship has to change and evolve further from the traditional model if it is to remain relevant?

Whether the world keeps changing at the pace of the 1990s remains to be seen. The only certainty is uncertainty. The future should be interesting.

Notes

- 1 This chapter is a condensed version of a longer report *Apprenticeship in Australia—An historical snapshot*, which will be published electronically by NCVER and available on its web site.
- 2 Since 1933, New South Wales has provided for both indentured apprentices and trainee apprentices. Trainee apprentices, who make up about 16% of the total, do not enter into term indentures. Rather, they are free to move from one registered 'trainee employer' to another. The majority of trainee apprentices are in the building industry.
- 3 At that time, the award wages for 'improvers', to whom employers were not bound to teach a trade, were substantially higher than for apprentices in the earlier years.
- 4 In 1977, there were 26 525 nurses in basic training in Australia (Karmel 1978, p.132). Most were females and the annual intake of some 10 000 was significant even compared with the 1977 intake into trade apprenticeships (38 680), most of whom were males (DEIR 1986a, p.7).
- 5 It is interesting to note that in 1984, the Kirby Committee came to a similar conclusion that 'the emphasis on apprenticeship should be on its role as a training system rather than as a means of employing young people' (Kirby 1985, p.127).

- 6 It might be noted that seven years elapsed from when the premiers agreed to establish the Wright Inquiry and when any of its recommendations (such as to establish the AAAC) was taken up. Furthermore, while the AAAC was a useful co-ordinating group, it did not always have the support of senior State officials and made very slow progress with contentious issues.
- 7 At the time, the Commonwealth was spending less than \$1 million on labour force programs, excluding the Commonwealth Employment Service (CES).
- 8 Although State legislation made it compulsory for apprentices to attend formal training, some employers continued to find reasons for not releasing their apprentices.
- 9 DOLAC was a grouping of the heads of the State and Territory departments of labour that was chaired by the secretary of the Commonwealth department responsible for labour force matters.
- 10 Significantly, through all the changes in the labour market, the construction industry, which perhaps best embodies the traditional *raison d'être* for apprenticeship, continued to maintain the relatively constant share of overall employment (about 7% to 9%) that it had experienced for 50 years. Clearly, the future of apprenticeship in the construction industry will depend on the way the nature of work evolves, and particularly the extent to which it may become more specialised and 'contractible'. However, taking a long view of history, apprenticeship in the construction sector appears to have survived remarkably well.

References

- AIDA (Australian Industries Development Association) 1959, *Training for industry*, Report of Committee (Chairman W Anderson), Melbourne.
- A national employment and training plan for young Australians*, 1992, Statement by the Prime Minister, the Honourable PJ Keating, 27 July 1992.
- Beattie 1968, *The apprenticeship system in New South Wales: A report by the Commission to the Minister for Labour and Industry*, (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1968, Chairman Mr Justice Beattie), NSW Government Printer, Sydney.
- COSAC (Commonwealth/State Apprenticeship Committee) 1984, *Institutional trade training*, Report by a working party, issued by the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations.
- CTEC (Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission) 1986, *Review of efficiency and effectiveness in higher education*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- DEET (Department of Employment, Education and Training) 1988, *Annual report*, AGPS, Canberra.
- 1991, *A new structured entry-level training system for Australia*, DEET, Canberra.
- 1993, *Australia's higher education sector*, AGPS, Canberra.
- DEIR (Department of Employment and Industrial Relations) 1986a, *Apprenticeship statistics 1975–76 to 1984–85*, AGPS, Canberra.
- 1986b, *Review of the labour market for the trades*, Report to the Departments of Labour Advisory Committee.
- DEVET (Department of Employment, Vocational Education and Training, Queensland) 1988, *The apprenticeship system: Australian style*, DEVET, Brisbane.
- DEYA (Department of Employment and Youth Affairs) 1981, *Assessment of measures concerning the transition from school to working life*, Australian paper presented to the Meeting of National Experts on Assessments of Apprenticeship, Published as SME/ET/80.14/23, OECD, Paris.

- DEYA 1982, *Improvements in skills training report on implementation of recommendations made by DOLAC on the supply of skilled labour*, A Report by DOLAC.
- DL (Department of Labour) 1974, *Manpower policy in Australia: A report to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development*, AGPS, Canberra.
- DLNS (Department of Labour and National Service) 1966, *Apprenticeship and training for skill in the metal, electrical and vehicle building trades*, Report of Committee (Chairman Sir Henry Bland).
- 1971, *Training for industry and commerce—Report of the National Conference*, Report of Conference, ANU Canberra, May 1971, AGPS, Canberra.
- DOLAC (Departments of Labour Advisory Committee) 1980, *Prospective demand for and supply of skilled labour 1980–1983 with particular reference to major development projects*, Unpublished paper.
- Financial Review, 25 January 1985.
- Gospel, H 1994, 'The survival of apprenticeship training: A British, American, Australian comparison', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, vol.32, no.4, pp.505–522.
- Kangan, M 1974, *TAFE in Australia*, Report on Needs in Technical and Further Education, (Australian Committee on Technical and Further Education, Chairman Mr M Kangan), AGPS, Canberra.
- Karmel, P 1978, *Nurse education and training*, Main Report (Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Nurse Education and Training, Chairman, Prof P Karmel), Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, Canberra.
- Keating, PJ 1994, *Working nation: Policies and programs*, Paper presented by the Prime Minister Mr Paul Keating, House of Representatives, AGPS, Canberra.
- Kirby P, 1981, *An overview of Australian experience with manpower programmes*, Paper delivered at a Joint conference on Youth, Employment, Education and Training, ANU, Canberra.
- 1985, *Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Labour Market Programs*, (Chair Mr P Kirby), AGPS, Canberra.
- NCVER (National Centre for Vocational Education Research) 1995, *Apprenticeship statistics 1984–85 to 1993–94*, NCVER, Adelaide.
- OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) 1977, *Reviews of national policies for education. Australia: Transition from school to work and further study*, OECD, Paris.
- 1986, *Youth and work in Australia*, OECD, Paris.
- Pead, AD 1981, *Apprenticeship in transition. A historical perspective of apprentice training in Victoria and the development of modules*, State College of Victoria at Hawthorn.
- Ray, J 1996, *Apprenticeships and traineeships—Recognition, approval and regulation*, A report prepared for the Australian National Training Authority, Melbourne.
- 1998, *Apprenticeships and traineeships—Overcoming obstacles to school-based arrangements*, A report prepared for the Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Canberra.
- TAFEC (Technical and Further Education Commission) 1976, *Report for the triennium 1977–1979*, AGPS, Canberra.
- Tregillis, B 1969, *The training of skilled workers in Europe*, Report of Australian Tripartite Mission, Chairman Mr B Tregillis, Published by the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service, Melbourne, TJ Hughes, Government Printer, Tasmania.
- Whitlock, N 1842, *The complete book of trades or the parents' guide and youths' instructor; Forming a popular encyclopaedia of trades, manufactures, and commerce*, London, Printed for T Tegg.

Williams, B 1979, *Education, training and employment*, Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Education and Training, Chairman, Prof B Williams, vol.1, AGPS, Canberra.
Wright, SCG 1954, *Commonwealth–State apprenticeship inquiry*, Report of Committee (Chairman Justice SCG Wright), Government Printer, Melbourne.

The report on which this chapter is based is published electronically on the world wide web at:
<http://www.ncver.edu.au/research/proj/nr9011.pdf>