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The purpose of this research is to investigate career and promotional opportunities of female teachers of personal development, health and physical education (PDHPE) in the New South Wales (NSW) Department of Education and Training (DET). This research firstly established that there was a disparity between promotion positions for women and men in the NSW DET and that this disparity was significant. Secondly the research clearly identified a number of barriers to promotion women in PDHPE in the NSW DET.

In 1979 a report published by the NSW Anti Discrimination Board predicted that by 1990 there would be no women principals in secondary schools, even considering the arrival of anti discrimination legislation. Whilst this is not the case it does however indicate a legitimate claim for concern in relation to promotion and women in NSW secondary schools.

The participants in this study were male and female teachers whose background was in the key learning area (KLA) of PDHPE in NSW DET secondary schools, district offices, curriculum directorate, state offices and board of studies. PDHPE itself is an area which may be considered to be marginalised and therefore women in this area have factors to contend with that are peculiar to this KLA.

The data collection and analysis drew largely on quantitative methods and also involved open questions which allowed for some supporting qualitative information. The main tool of data collection was a comprehensive questionnaire. Archival data was also collected from the NSW DET and the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), and information and data from the literature and other research were also used. The main type of analysis involved percentage comparisons and chi square and qualitative analysis involving identifying themes and trends which supported the quantitative information.
The study found that there was a significant difference between the number of male and female PDHPE teachers in promotion positions within the NSW DET. A number of predisposing factors of women who had gained promotion was identified including that they were less likely to see child care, child rearing and family duties as an issue for them and less likely to be the primary carers of children. They were predominantly permanent full time workers, less likely to believe they had the same chances for promotion as men, less likely to be married than men and more likely to gain promotion at a younger age than men.

By investigating this area, recommendations have been made in relation to ways and means of breaking down the barriers to promotion for women in teaching generally, and more specifically for those women who teach in the marginalised KLA of PDHPE. This research, while being specific to the NSW DET, may in fact be useful for other educational bodies, in other states, and in other countries, as there is likely to be common ground amongst institutions and systems.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND / RATIONALE

In Australia and specifically New South Wales, teaching and schooling has to some extent been a reflection of the larger society. Australian schooling has a significant heritage which in many ways is still reflected in the education system in Australia and New South Wales today. This unique heritage has contributed to the development of a history of teaching and schooling, and women’s place in that history.

Teaching as a profession has been viewed by society in many different ways. At times it has been seen as a high status profession, while at other times it has been viewed more as a relatively low status profession (Kyle, 1986). Within the teaching profession and the larger society, different subject areas have been viewed more highly than others and the status of various subjects has shifted throughout the years. Physical education is one such subject which has been given marginal status within the teaching profession (Bloomfield, 1993; Delmage, 1992; Hendry, 1975). Women’s status and place in the teaching profession has also seen various shifts. These shifts in status often ran parallel with the change of the status afforded teachers and teaching. Women in teaching, therefore, fall into a category which can only be viewed as marginal and of a lower status than men (Limerick, 1991; Porter, 1995; Randell, 1993). Female teachers of physical education may be seen to teach in an area of the curriculum which has constantly had to fight for recognition and status. Given this, it is of great interest and significance to examine the promotional status of a group of teachers who fall into both categories, that is, women who teach in what could be seen as a ‘marginalised’ area of the New South Wales school curriculum: Personal Development, Health and Physical Education (PDHPE).

As Wright (1991) suggests, physical education has been from its inception, a profession concerned with bodily practices, always marginal and required to justify its existence. This is supported by Sparkes’ (1990) study which indicated that physical education teachers were quite concerned about the low status of their subject and felt that this had definite implications for their career prospects.
History has shown that women in the teaching profession in Australia have been required to work within a state bureaucracy which has perpetuated their subordinate position in society. Kyle writing about female teachers in the nineteenth century describes them as being:

caught in a web of structural barriers as well as the social conventions which operated both in subtle and not so subtle ways to hinder their public life. Yet female teachers were ambitious and adventurous. They tried in the few ways available to make some improvement to their position. (Kyle, 1986, p.154)

Blackmore (1993), also points to an historically gendered division of labour in education. She argues that men have been the instruments in enacting what is critical and important in education based on their 'male' perspective. For instance, positions of promotion in education related to administration and policy making have long been, and remain, male dominated (Milligan, 1994). Milligan points specifically to State and District Offices in Australia. In 2000 in New South Wales for example, 32 of the 40 District Superintendents positions were held by men.

Information from the NSW DET 1998 EEO Annual Report supports the case for the need to research women in teaching and promotion. It shows that in 1998, 87 percent of all female teachers in secondary schools were not promoted and only 73 percent of all males were not promoted. Almost twice as many male as opposed to female secondary teachers were at the head teacher or district guidance officer level and nearly three times as many men were at the deputy principal or leading teacher level in comparison to women. When it comes to principals, 391 of the 447 positions were held by men, leaving just 86 positions held by women. This becomes even more meaningful when we look at this figure in terms of the total men and women at this level. Of the secondary principals Class 2 (lower level) men hold 77 percent of the total positions and for the position of secondary principal Class 1 (higher level), men hold 79 percent of the total positions.

In NSW the once separate category of PE teachers is now categorised into the Key Learning Area (KLA) known as Personal Development, Health and Physical Education (PDHPE). This came about in 1988 in response to a restructuring of
the curriculum which grouped together interrelated subject area to form eight KLAs to produce an integrated approach to curriculum.

Reviewing the case specifically in regards to PDHPE there is little information in the area. What is known however is that in 1996 27 percent of heads of department (HOD) in PDHPE were female and 73 percent were male, and in 2000 35 percent were female and 65 percent were male (NSW DET, 1997). This is comparable to the State overall secondary figures where women comprised 36 percent of HODs (DET EEO Annual Report, 1998). Comparing the 2000 figures for female HODs in PDHPE with mathematics, PDHPE appears more favourable for women. For instance, in NSW compared to 35 percent of female HODs in PDHPE, only 23 percent of HOD in mathematics were women (NSW DET mathematics consultants, 2000). However, this data was extremely difficult to obtain and only by contacting the CEO for mathematics in NSW who in turn sought the information from each of the 40 consultants statewide. Accessing comparative information on other subjects was not possible because of the absence of relevant data bases related to these subjects. Anecdotal evidence would suggest that areas such as English and home science fair far better in terms of women and promotion. What is evident, however, is that currently substantially less women in PDHPE in NSW are in HOD positions than their male counterparts. It remains an open question as to whether PDHPE is poorly done by in relation to women and promotion in relation to other key learning areas (KLAs). The lack of statistics or information on other KLAs within the NSW DET indicates that in this thesis it is a struggle to establish PDHPE as a special case. However, information from other states help to provide a background rationale for this research. Data from the Queensland Department of Education (QDOE), 1995, demonstrates that there is a disparity in women in HOD positions across various subjects. The number of females in HOD positions in the QDOE in Health, Physical Education (HPE) (i.e. 13.5%) is considerably lower than the average number of female HODs across all subjects, (i.e. 42%) and comes in second only to mathematics / science (11%) in regards to the lowest female HOD representation.

It is a particular purpose of this study to understand how PDHPE fits into the larger picture. It is argued that female teachers continue to work in an organisation which perpetuates their perceived societal roles. It is in this context that an investigation into the career paths and promotional opportunities for
female teachers of PDHPE working for the NSW DET, is considered a significant area for investigation.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE INQUIRY

The career paths and promotional opportunities for women in teaching in Australia has long been a source of interest and debate for people in educational circles (Limerick, 1991; Marshall & Rusch, 1995; Milligan, 1994; Porter, 1995; Sampson, 1987). Whether the debate has occurred in published research, staffroom discussions or lunchtime debates, it is still an area that brings out many strong and varied opinions from both men and women in teaching.

In 1979 a report published by the New South Wales Anti Discrimination Board (cited in Kyle, 1986) predicted that by 1990 there would be no women principals in secondary schools, despite the development and implementation of Anti Discrimination Legislation. Whilst this is not the case in the 1990s, it does, however, indicate a legitimate concern in relation to the promotion of female teachers in New South Wales secondary schools.

Most of the research that has been conducted looks at the promotion of women in teaching in general and is not subject specific (ABS, 1993; 1995; 1999; AEC, 1991; Milligan, 1994). Again, much of the research is from overseas (Kelly & Nihlen, 1982; Leaman, 1984; Middleton, 1987; NUT, 1980; Pauan & D’Angelo, 1990) and that which is not comes from other states in Australia such as Western Australia (Bloon & Browne, 1994; Wills, 1984) and Queensland (Limerick, 1991; Sampson, 1983). Research reported here will be looking at the NSW DET and will be specific to PDHPE.

The purpose of this research is to examine the factors that influence career and promotional opportunities for female teachers in the key learning area of PDHPE in New South Wales secondary schools, and the perceptions of PDHPE teachers in relation to these factors. It is intended that this research will firstly seek to establish if there are inequities in promotion between males and females in PDHPE, and secondly, if there are imbalances, what are the barriers that exist for women?

By investigating this area, possible recommendations may be made in relation to ways of breaking down the barriers to promotion for women in teaching and,
more specifically, to women who teach in the marginalised area of PDHPE. This research, whilst being specific to New South Wales, may in fact be related to other Australian states as there is much common ground.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

A study into the area of career paths and promotional opportunities for female PDHPE teachers does not necessarily lend itself to the proposal of a hypothesis but, rather, guiding questions. The general overarching questions generated by this research are:

1. *Are there disparities in promotion between female and male PDHPE teachers in the NSW DET?*
2. *How do female PDHPE teachers in the NSW DET view their situation in relation to promotion?*
3. *Are these perceptions the same as or different from those of male PDHPE teachers in the NSW DET?*
4. *What are the inequities and barriers to promotion for female PDHPE teachers in the NSW DET?*

In investigating this issue the following more specific questions were examined:

1. What are the relative comparisons in terms of promotional positions for female and male teachers with a PDHPE background within the NSW DET?

2. Are female teachers of PDHPE gaining promotion in NSW DET secondary schools and to what extent?

3. What factors differentiate female PDHPE teachers from male PDHPE teachers in their chances of achieving promotion?

4. What are the predisposing factors for female PDHPE teachers in New South Wales DET who gain promotion?

5. Do male and female PDHPE teachers have a different perspective on whether or not barriers exist for female PDHPE teachers gaining promotion?
6. If perceptions of females are different from those of males why is this the case and what are the implications?

1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

Whilst some studies have been conducted in relation to the status and nature of women's careers, women and teaching, as well as women and physical education, there appear to be few, if any, which have focused specifically on promotional opportunities for female physical education teachers and teachers of physical and health education in Australia. A search of literature from the United Kingdom (see for instance Scraton, 1986; 1992) reveals that some studies focusing on female physical education teachers and promotion do exist. Whilst these studies assist our understanding of the situation in Australia and provide a sound basis for inferences to be made in relation to Australian physical education, it is not sufficient to simply apply these findings to Australian conditions. Some work in this area has been done in Australia in relation to physical education, particularly in Western Australia and Queensland (Bloot, 1993; Bloot & Browne, 1994; Webb, 2001) and in education generally, particularly in Queensland (Lingard, 1995; Sampson, 1983). However, there has been little comparative research conducted in New South Wales.

Potentially, research into female physical education teachers and promotion in New South Wales has wide ranging significance. Firstly, the major stakeholders in this research would be female teachers in New South Wales, currently in the key learning area of PDHPE in DET secondary schools. The research also has a wider significance. This research could provide insights into women's careers and promotional opportunities in general, and could provide information in terms of community and societal attitudes and barriers faced by working women.

In terms of the significance of the study for teachers and those involved with the DET, there are a number of groups who may benefit. There is much commonality in the teaching and status of physical education in all Australian states (Bloot & Browne, 1996; Browne, 1991, Webb, 2001) and as such, findings from this study have relevance for female physical education teachers Australia wide. It is also possible that the research and findings involved in this study will have implications for female teachers in other subject areas. This study will also enable researchers into promotional opportunities for female physical education teachers
from other countries to raise questions and further study their own particular situations.

It is also to be hoped that an understanding of factors influencing the careers and promotional opportunities of PDHPE teachers will be used by government agents and policy makers to improve the situation for female teachers.

1.5 LIMITATIONS

Circumstances which exist outside the control of the study and may have affected the results are:

1. In any given set of questions in a survey it is possible that respondents may not answer truthfully. Survey responses are also completed at a particular point in time and attitudes and perceptions might change.

2. There will be aspects of the study which are only relevant to female teachers in the New South Wales DET. For instance, the integration of PDHPE has been instituted in NSW schools, in a way that is different from most other states in Australia. Increasingly now PE and health are being coupled together in teacher education in other states, in syllabuses and in expectations of teachers’ roles.

3. Teachers in the key learning area of PDHPE who were working in independent and Catholic schools were not represented.

1.6 KEY TERMS / DEFINITIONS

Following are some specific terminology used in this research:

PDHPE - Personal development, health and physical education
This is one of the eight key learning areas (KLAs) within the New South Wales Department of Education and Training secondary schools curriculum.

Physical Education
This an integral part of the key learning area of PDHPE. In some states and countries physical education is a separate subject area. Physical education could be described as “education through or of ... and about the physical” (Kirk, 1992, p.4).
DET
Department of Education and Training is the name given to the New South Wales public school system from 1998 onwards.

DSE
Department of School Education was the name given to the New South Wales public school system prior to 1998.

Promotion
Advancement of position (in the NSW DET system) beyond classroom teacher and / or at head teacher level or higher.

Factor
Element contributing to the advancement or impediment to promotion.

Head Teacher
Head of department (HOD), teacher in charge of a faculty or curriculum area such as PDHPE or general area such as welfare.

Deputy Principal
Assistant to the Principal, generally described as “second in charge” of secondary DET schools.

Leading Teacher
At the same level as deputy principal in DET secondary schools. This promotional position was introduced in 1990 for the purpose of providing additional promotional positions and initially to focus on teacher training and development.

Principal
Head of the school.

Board of Studies
Workers in this area work for the NSW Office of the Board of Studies. The BOS is responsible for syllabuses in NSW.
Curriculum Directorate
Workers in this area work for the NSW DET Curriculum Directorate. Their focus is that of curriculum and projects related to enhancing the curriculum in each of the KLAs and related areas.

District Superintendent
Are responsible for all DET schools in his/her particular district. There are forty districts within the NSW DET.

SEO1, SEO2, PEO, CEO
These promotion positions are that of senior, principal and chief education officers in the New South Wales DET. The role is largely consultancy, but there is much variation according to the actual position. They are there to support DET schools. The hierarchy from highest to lowest is as follows:
CEO = Chief Education Officer
PEO = Principal Education Officer
SEO2 = Senior Education Officer 2
SEO1 = Senior Education Officer 1

1.7 SUMMARY

This research was intended to examine the career paths and promotional opportunities for female teachers of PDHPE in the New South Wales Department of School Education. Whilst undertaking this research it the Department of School Education has been restructured and is currently referred to as the Department of Education and Training. This title change should have little impact on the results and analysis of data.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 OVERVIEW

In researching the career paths and promotional opportunities for women in the area of PDHPE in NSW DET secondary schools and organisations and, in turn, the barriers to promotion, it is necessary to review literature that covers a much broader range than merely that of the specific topic involved in this research project. It is important to look at feminist literature and literature related to women in society and, more specifically in Australian society and careers as this allows some insight into a study such as this which is about women, conducted by a woman and for women. The history of teaching, and women’s place in it, is a vital area to investigate to more fully understand the conditions for women seeking promotion in PDHPE.

Factors which have influenced female teachers’ career paths past and present are naturally some of the indicators to the barriers for female teachers who work specifically in the area of PDHPE. The literature points to a range of barriers to promotion for female teachers which include issues around children, such as maternity leave, child rearing and child care (Porter, 1995; Randell, 1993), difficulties around mobility (Limerick, 1991), a dearth of senior and promotion opportunities (Porter, 1995), and also society’s influence in relation to its traditional views on women and promotion (Blackmore, 1993; Limerick, 1991; Randell, 1993).

2.2 FEMINIST THEORY, TEACHING AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Most of the research looking at women, careers, women and teaching draws on a feminist perspective, although not always the same feminist perspective. A feminist perspective seems to be a useful and necessary ingredient in any study about women and particularly for this study which looks at women in education and physical education. This is the case because this is a study ‘about women’ and ‘for women and feminism is in the broad sense a movement which is opposed to women suffering systematic social injustice because of their sex (Richards, 1980). Acker (1994) explains that feminist sociologists analyse and oppose systematic social injustice by pointing to “taken-for-grantedness biases” deeply embedded in their own discipline.
Whilst framing the study with different feminist approaches the most prominent is that of liberal and socialist feminism. The researcher’s concern was with the issue of equity and concern with regards to the differences between women and men and within groups of women.

While there are many variations on the dominant feminist perspectives, feminists often draw on one of the three basic feminist positions: radical, socialist and liberal feminism. In general, socialist and liberal feminism have the most relevance to this study and have had the most impact on the area of gender and work because of their attention in different ways to issues around labour relations, the gendered division of labour and issues of equity.

2.2.1 Liberal Feminism

Liberal feminism does not hold as central to its discourse on equality a concern with the economic or political structures which are part of the broad social context, but rather the actual practices of discrimination and socialisation (Acker, 1994). The importance of liberal feminism is the focus it provides on sex discrimination, equal opportunity and women’s rights (Acker, 1994; Kenway, 1991; Scraton, 1990). The main focus of liberal feminist strategies tends to be legal, administrative and educational reforms, where calls for equal access, equal opportunity and equal treatment are made (Kenway, 1991; Tong, 1989; Yates, 1986). In doing this it has been important in raising awareness, attempting to promote and implement Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and devising strategies to advance women’s rights and provide equal opportunities of access and outcomes..

Critiques of the liberal feminist perspective (DuBois, Kelly, kennedy, Korsmyer & Robinson 1985; Hill - Collins, 1989; Kenway, 1991; King 1988) argue that it ignores historical, structural and material aspects which help generate women’s social positions, and that, in general, it ignores class, ethnicity and age. Proponents of a liberal feminist perspective have been predominantly white, middle-class, heterosexual women. Liberal feminism describes and documents differences between females and males with little explanation and provides no critique of such practices as capitalism or patriarchy. Power structures which engender and perpetuate discriminatory practices are not seen by liberal feminists as a target for alteration (Scraton, 1986; Tong, 1986).
Critiques of the liberal feminist approach charge liberal feminism with a failure to alter or change power structures which give rise to discriminatory practices. This can be seen to be due in part to the emphasis on individualism in the perspective and the inability to theorise broader gender dynamics as a result (Kenway, 1991; Scraton, 1986; Tong, 1986).

**Legislation and Policy**

When looking at the literature regarding women’s under representation in promotion positions in education it is necessary to investigate feminist literature which focuses on policy and legislative changes in order to see the developments that have occurred and impacted, or otherwise, on the lives of women. It is in the context of policy and legislation that liberal feminism has put the issue of under representation of women on the agenda. Examining this it is possible to understand the place of liberal feminism in the areas of policy and legislation and to see how we have arrived at the current positions in terms of women, work and careers.

In Australia, liberal feminism via various lobby groups and the efforts of feminist bureaucrats have been responsible for policy and legislation designed to improve the conditions of women in the context of domestic and paid work. For instance, in 1972 the Women’s Electoral Lobby (WEL) gathered to discuss a campaign for the federal election with the notion of placing the six demands of Women’s Liberation (free, safe abortion on demand, 24 hour child care, free contraceptive, and equal pay) on the political agenda. The WEL as a liberal feminist organisation had a significant place in feminist involvement in policy and legislation in Australia (Eistenstein, 1990; Ryan, 1990).

Ryan (1990) argues that WEL was the political bombshell of 1972 which dramatically changed the nature of public debate by and about women. It was in this context that the liberal feminist concern with equal opportunity suited the Whitlam governments radical liberal concerns and found a space in the political agenda with WEL as the ‘pragmatic face of feminism’(Ryan, 1990, p.71).

During the 1970s liberal feminists were influential in putting legislative and policy changes into the government’s program and small but important women’s issues were addressed (Ryan, 1990; Watson, 1990). For instance, the government intervened in favour of the equal pay case before the Arbitration Commission and removed sales tax on contraceptives. Ironically, the current Federal Liberal government has seen fit
to rule that tampons are not essential items and as result have placed a GST on these and other feminine hygiene products. During the 1970s feminists were appointed to the staff of several ministers and in 1973 Elizabeth Reid was appointed as advisor to the Prime Minister in women’s affairs. According to Summers (1986) the governments advertisement for an advisor in women’s affairs to the Prime Minister was seen as a political rather than bureaucratic appointment held at the whim of the Prime Minister. Summers (1986) argues that Reid’s appointment forced the women’s liberation movement to confront the relationship of feminists to the State and in some instances this caused division and suspicion.

However, Reid’s appointment showed a serious commitment on the part of the Labour government to introducing feminist ideas into the government decision making process and many other women soon joined the bureaucracy to become the first ‘femocrats’ (Ryan cited in Watson, 1990, p.76.) Feminists, once having entered the bureaucracy, were in a much better position to effect policy making. By 1974, Reid was able to get the “Whitlam government to make a substantive change in direction in the provision of pre-school and childcare services and salvaged a considerable budget with which to fund it.” (Ryan, 1990, p.78). This had obvious implications in terms of women and work in relation to not only acknowledging a particular barrier to women and the pursuit of a career, but actually implementing change (albeit small) to assist women in work and their careers.

Two particular events are significant when looking at feminism in policy and legislation: first, the decision, implemented in 1975, to establish an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) section in the Public Service Board, the policy maker and implementers of employment practices for the Commonwealth Public Service; second, the implementation, in 1976 of a recommendation to establish women’s units in key government departments. According to Ryan (1990) these events formed a foundation for EEO within Australia and became a trailblazer for other bureaucracies in Australia.

During the Fraser government’s term in office, other feminists, most notably Sara Dowse, were able to persuade the government to establish and introduce policy related to key women’s issues (Ryan, 1990). These included: establishing women’s units in a range of key government departments; establishing the Office of Child Care headed by Marie Coleman, the only woman to hold First Division status in the Commonwealth Public Service at that time; extending women’s refuge funding; establishing an Inter-Departmental Working Group (IDWG) on women’s affairs;
supporting the moves by women in the Liberal party to prepare a report to establish a National Women’s Advisory Council; and introducing family allowances in the next budget. After the resignation of Dowse, Kathleen Taperall took over with the goal of keeping the Office and the women’s units alive. She took on the role of developing networks outside the bureaucracy, liaising with feminist bureaucracies in the States, promoting sex discrimination legislation, promoting Australia’s role in the International sphere and supporting the extension of EEO in the Commonwealth Public Service (Ryan, 1990).

The Office of Women’s Affairs was changed in late 1982 to the Office of the Status of Women. This period saw the formation of a national childcare lobby, the adoption of EEO policies in the trade union movement and the commitment by the Labour opposition to anti-discrimination legislation (Ryan, 1990).

According to Watson (1990) this was a pioneering decade, despite the fact there seemed relatively few real changes in policy and legislation. Nevertheless the possibilities as well as the limitations to change were beginning to be recognised. This period was in many ways, one whereby a foundation was laid for future legislative and policy changes, which have affected and will continue to affect women in their career pursuits (Ryan, 1990; Watson, 1990).

The ‘femocrats’ (Watson, 1990) commitment to feminism saw the emergence of further significant changes to legislation. The most notable was the introduction of the EEO legislation in 1980 in NSW as an amendment to the Anti Discrimination Act of 1977. The first step in its implementation was the requirement that departments and their authorities submit their EEO management plans by a set date.

According to Watson (1990) this caused problems for the Department of Education because of its imbalance in the distribution of women teachers. The male domination of the teaching service at the senior levels had already been critiqued and documented via reports of the Anti Discrimination Board. The EEO legislation was a possible vehicle to overcome this (at least in theory), however, according to Ryan (1990) it required an agreement to dismantle the system of appointment by seniority that had shaped the NSW system for many years. It was not until 1987 that an approved package which involved the promotion of Principals by comparative assessment, affirmative action for women teachers for 40 percent of promotion positions below the principal level and the removal of the service undertaking (a situation in which a teacher pledged their readiness to teach anywhere in the state)
which had been a requirement for permanency, was signed into law. However, as has been the case in recent years the victory was short lived when the Liberal National Coalition was elected in March 1988 and the 40 percent measure was withdrawn (Eistenstein, 1990).

Having gains withdrawn by subsequent governments has been a common experience for women in education. Most recently this was evident in the weakening of promotion by merit provision. Introduced in 1991-92, promotion by merit appeared to be an important provision for women seeking promotion, however, soon after, in 1997, the ‘rules’ were changed whereby transfer (a seniority system) would supersede merit. Positions could only be advertised under the new merit selection criteria if there was no candidate for the position on the transfer list. (DSE, 1997).

2.2.2 Socialist Feminism

It is not always easy to distinguish liberal and socialist feminism when it comes to activism and lobbying around work issues. However, socialist feminist perspectives draw on an understanding of both patriarchal oppression and class oppression rather than assuming equality is a sufficient outcome (Baker, 1993). Those who espouse a socialist feminist perspective stress the importance of notions of indoctrination and social reproduction. Gender and class are the two variables which are interconnected under capitalism. The social feminist perspective attempts to integrate gender and class which looks beyond that of patriarchy (Baker, 1993). The recognition of the patriarchal relations within the social system is of importance. Socialist feminism points to a struggle between men of different economic classes and between men and women to control society’s productive resources and hence the reproductive capacity of women (Baker, 1993; Jagger, 1984).

Women writing from a social feminist perspective have done much to highlight the exploitation of women in work both in public and private sectors, and those involved in paid and unpaid work. Socialist feminists have highlighted the way in which this exploitation benefits men in more powerful classes, as well as the way in which women in more ‘powerful’ classes may oppress other women. As with liberal feminism, socialist feminism fails to identify race as an important variable (Kenway, 1991; Scraton, 1986).

A socialist feminist perspective looks at the gendered division of labour and at how and why this has come about. From this perspective women’s assigned family roles
are linked historically by society to women’s capacity to bear children. Jagger (1984) argues from the socialist feminist view that there has been a continual struggle to control the reproductive capacity of women. “This struggle has occurred not only between men of different economic classes but also between men and women.” (p.136)

Socialist feminism is particularly relevant to this study as this perspective emphasises the gendered division of labour, the subjugation of women in work, and the propensity of society to assign women to unpaid work (domestic duties) and men to paid labour.

Within education, socialist feminists seek to describe and account for the role of schooling in the reproduction of class and gender (Middleton, 1987). Socialist feminists argue that through education girls are socialised into accepting a life of domesticity with expectations of intermittent job prospects and low wages in occupations directed and dominated by men (Acker, 1986). Schools are implicated in reproducing class and gender divisions of work within both the family and workplace.

Socialist feminists in education have argued that schools tend to focus on motherhood at the exclusion of many other roles and support the notion of the sexual division of labour which places women at home and men in the public sphere. They argue that schools reproduce differences in labour based on class and gender. Girls’ and boys’ different subject selections tend to steer many girls and women into low paid employment. Some analyses have highlighted how boys’ and girls’ different subject selections and career entry restrictions act to put many girls and women in restricted, low paid sectors of employment, such as secretarial, sales and housework (Acker, 1989; Foster, 1992; Kelly & Nihlen, 1982; Russell, 1986).

Socialist feminists point to the way in which the implications of the gendered division of labour and the ‘feminisation’ of teaching have had a negative effect on women in the teaching profession. According to Kyle (1986) the predominance of women in teaching is mainly due to the hours of work which enable women to be home for children quite early, due to the nature of the work which may be seen by some to have a ‘mothering’ aspect to it, and also because teaching at various times throughout history has been seen to be a relatively low status and low paid job. The ‘feminisation’ of teaching and the gendered division of labour work together to disadvantage women in that there are many women in teaching but they are lower in the hierarchy. From this position it is no surprise that women are located in
considerably lower numbers in the higher status, higher paid positions of deputy principal and principal (Milligan, 1994).

Blackmore (1992) offers an explanation for the absence of women in leadership positions. She suggests that,

the values, ideologies and structures which are part of administration and its culture are masculine in nature; and marginalise women and masculinity’s other than that which is dominant. Such a culture is difficult for women to join. Also, this masculine administration will not be able or willing to understand the needs and position of women and effect appropriate change. (p.26)

Women’s access to leadership positions is also blocked, according to Sinclair (1998), by men’s need to maintain their dominant positions in society and this is exacerbated in times of uncertainty.

Men who have traditionally built an identity, and a life, around work and their roles as primary breadwinners are likely to respond defensively to changes in the workplace. For some, pre existing ambivalence about women with authority is magnified under conditions of economic uncertainty and the cultural turbulence of post-modern multicultural Australia. (p.180)

2.2.3 Men and masculinity studies

While feminist perspectives which are concerned primarily with improving outcomes for women were initially judged to be sufficient as a theoretical framework for this study, the results of the pilot study suggested that there was a need to go beyond these to understand the obvious ‘issues’ associated with this topic for the male respondents.

When the pilot survey was sent out, it was sent to both women and men in order to get a more gender balanced perspective on women and promotion. The initial intent however, was to only ask questions about women in education. This caused such a violent reaction from some of the men surveyed evidenced by the number (50% of male respondents) of negative comments about the researcher only asking about women’s careers made by male respondents that it was decided that it was important to discuss the literature around masculinity’s and the backlash against feminism and
women in leadership. It was also felt to be important that both men and women be surveyed and that the survey be modified to ask about both men and women. The responses by some men to the survey further confirmed the need to explore the male perspective so as to better interpret the responses. The male respondents for instance, seemed to interpret the questions asked and the assumptions they suggested as further evidence of discrimination against men.

These responses from the male teachers seemed indicative of a wider adverse reaction or 'backlash' to feminism amongst some groups in society (not only men). Connell (1995) argues that a gender order where men dominate women cannot avoid men being concerned with defence and women with change. This is particularly the case where hegemonic forms of masculinity are associated with behaviour that is managerial, macho, heterosexual and powerful (Connell, 1995; Lingard & Douglas, 1999).

As Blackmore (1997) suggests a resistance to gender equity had been around for a long time.

I would argue that backlash has always been here, with resistance to gender equity going underground in the 1980s only to emerge reformed and recycled in more subtle and insidious ways in the 1990s. The current media representations of backlash are, I suggest, merely an overt and public manifestation of an ongoing set of institutional processes that resist gender equity reform. Backlash is a powerful part of the discursive field surrounding feminism and feminist practices in education. (p.77)

Blackmore argues that educational restructuring itself is a form of backlash, a 'structural backlash' (p.120). Lingard and Douglas (1999) argue that policies have become more masculinised in a context of economic restructuring where there is a focus on outputs as measured by performance indicators. They point out that 'structural backlash' appears to be a useful way to digest the gendered results of the restructuring of educational systems as a part of the broader restructuring of the state. It is within the circumstances of structural backlash that men are currently engaging feminism within those educational systems.

Performance indicators as proof of achievement of policy goals have become pervasive within state structures such as education (Lingard & Douglas, 1999). Blackmore (1997) argues that performance based outcomes within structured
educational systems have become evident with pressure on teachers to be seen to perform. This situation has gendered impacts. Educational systems have been gendered and teachers, a high percentage of whom are women, have to bear 'the brunt of stress devolved down the line in order to deal with the new emotional labour demands of marketised schooling system' (Kenway & Epstein, 1996, p93 in Lingard & Douglas 1999).

According to Lingard and Douglas (1999) the policy culture within bureaucracies in the restructured state is not productive in achieving further feminist goals in education. In a broader political context of backlash and post feminist political developments, including attempts to establish men as the new disadvantaged, feminist goals in education become even more difficult to achieve.

While the notion of backlash goes some of the way to explain the responses the male teachers had to the pilot study, it is also useful to understand why this might happen particularly in the context of physical education. As pointed out above the forms of hegemonic masculinity associated with western cultures contribute both to the backlash against feminism and to a institutional context which limits women's opportunities in relation to their careers as teachers. Connell (1995) points to the close relationship between sport and such forms of masculinity. He argues that in historically recent times, sport has come to be the leading definer of masculinity in mass culture. He argues that

The institutional organisation of sport fixes definite relations of competition and hierarchy among men and contributes to the exclusion or domination of women. Thus men's greater sporting prowess has become a theme of backlash against feminism. It serves as a symbolic proof of men's superiority and right to rule. (Connell, 1995, p. 54).

In Australia, traditional team games comprise both the content and provide the pedagogy for teaching physical education. In a subject which is dominated by sport (Wright, 1999), physical education potentially 'becomes the domain in which women ... become second to, less than and less able than men' (p.15). It is likely then that men in physical education have a considerable investment in their superiority to women.
2.2.4 Feminist Theory and Physical Education

Physical education as part of the overall educative process has great potential to create change from various feminist perspectives. It has, however, remained absent from many feminist analyses. The basic assertion and commonly held notion that divisions between boys and girls were made as a result of biological differences has been a hindrance in feminist reform in physical education (Drinkwater, 1980; Lowe, 1982). However, the notion that gender has a social and political construction has now been acknowledged by many and hence allows a more critical analysis of physical education in terms of its oppression and disadvantaging of women (Scraton, 1992; Vertinsky, 1990; Wright, 1991, 1999).

In challenging women’s oppression in areas such as physical education it is necessary to consider how feminism can potentially contribute to, or impact on, our understanding of gender relations and physical education and in turn impact on women who teach in the area of physical education.

The dominant feminist discourse has been that of liberal feminism (Scraton, 1990). This is largely due to the Sex Discrimination Act introduced in 1984 which among other things looks at equity and access. The Sex Discrimination Act (1984) was intended to redress any imbalance in opportunities for girls and women, and to eliminate discrimination and promote equality of men and women. In regards to physical education, liberal feminism as a perspective appears to sit more easily with both educators and the community, in so far as it appears less threatening and has practical applications and, hence, is seen as a means of ‘politically correct’ reform (Wright, 1999).

Basic to liberal feminism are the notions of gender bias, equality of opportunity, sex discrimination and women’s rights. The focus is on practices such as discrimination and socialisation which create inequality and the need is to challenge discriminatory laws and practices and socialising processes. Therefore, a liberal feminist approach to physical education centres on the division of activities, discriminatory practices, stereotyping which lowers possibilities of participation, as well as unequal access to facilities, equipment and curriculum.
One of the main strategies adopted in the context of a liberal feminist approach in physical education has been a move to coeducational classes (Scranton, 1990; Wright, 1996). This was brought about largely because ‘equal’ opportunity has often been interpreted as the ‘same’ opportunities (Wright, 1999). It soon became clear however, that the experiences of girls in coeducational classes were different from those of boys. Macdonald’s of 1995 research on interaction in the classroom (cited in Wright, 1999), suggests that teachers gave boys more of their attention and that they tended to dominate in games situations. Teachers became concerned with the high drop out rate and resistance of girls to school sport and physical education and found coeducational physical education to be problematic. Anecdotal evidence (Wright, 1996) suggests that as a response to students’ resistance, and to what teachers perceived as harassment, there has been a move in some instances back to single sex physical education classes. The question remains, however, as Wright (1999) states “does single sex physical education address the major issues of sex based harassment or the power relations operating between females and males - or does it only contain it?” (p. 183).

The relationship of this to women teaching in the area of physical education is that the division of activities, discriminatory practices, stereotyping and unequal access to facilities, equipment and curriculum all impact on the way women teach in physical education and how they are perceived by others. It is important to remember that while there may be areas of the equal opportunities discourse that are problematic, it continues to have “an important influence in reminding us that inadequate access, resources and opportunities have important negative consequences for groups of girls and boys” (Wright, 1999, p. 185). It also has vital negative effects for teachers in the area of physical education.

Firstly, in considering the division of activities, liberal feminists would argue that girls not be channelled into ‘girls’ activities such as dance, gymnastics and netball, and boys should not be channelled into ‘boys’ activities such as football, soccer and cricket. There is a traditional association of certain activities with women and girls which is different to activities associated with men and boys. Traditionally so called ‘girls activities’ have required grace, finesses, and had an emphasis on appearance, whereas ‘boys activities’ were associated with power, strength, speed and aggression. The impact for women teaching in physical education is that they may be expected to teach those areas of the curriculum they may not consider girls to be particularly interested in, and they are perpetuating the devaluing of activities such as dance, gymnastics and netball. If co ed curriculum is dominated by team games, often those
which 'keep the boys happy', then female teachers may find themselves teaching in areas where they feel less skilled, often than some of the boys in the class. On the other hand areas such as dance and gymnastics may receive little attention. While not wanting to stereotype female teachers into areas of dance and gymnastics (indeed some are more likely to be interested in competitive sports) if the curriculum is dominated by traditional male sports they are going to be at a disadvantage. An example of this can be seen in Wright (1991) where she interviewed women in PE, and where an interviewee described her experience of the dominance of a set of practices which privileged male PE achievements. Although the teacher is talking about her experiences in the 1960s, from my own experiences as a teacher similar inequities are still prevalent today.

I'd worked just as hard with the girls athletic team as (the male teacher) had worked with the boys athletic team. The boys team always did ... remarkably well ... and this year we had some really good girls and then all of a sudden the principal decided the exams would go on in the same week as the girls CHS. And I went to him and pleaded with him to change the date of the exam because all of the girls who had trained so hard ... wouldn't be able to go to CHS. Ahh, I had an absolute war about it. (Interviewer: Did you win?) No, the girls just all had to be pulled out ... I was ... so upset to the point where I was in tears because we had worked equally as hard as the men ... I could see it was so unfair, so unjust to the girls. (Rees Interview, 1989, quoted in Wright, 1996, p.344)

The move to co ed classes may not necessarily be a positive reform for both girls and female physical education teachers. Whereas female physical education teachers were likely to be in charge of all girls' physical education, in the shift to coed physical education they have often taken a second place to their male counterparts in schools and education bureaucracies. They have had less autonomy over the curriculum and therefore areas such as dance and gymnastics have been compromised to please male students and teachers (Wright, 1996). Shifts to co education were motivated by Anti Discrimination Acts and in the USA Title IX has had opposite consequences to what was intended. Separate male and female departments amalgamated with women inevitably lower in standing of senior positions. For instance when departments were combined following 'equal employment' legislation, as has been reported in the US and UK, men have generally been given the leadership role (Acker, 1994; Scraton, 1990).
As pointed out above physical education and sport are seen as ‘masculine’ pursuits (Flintoff, 1990; Woods, 1992) and as such, women who teach in the area are oppressed by assumptions about femininity that define men as more suited to the area. According to Bloot and Browne (1994) and Flintoff (1990), one outcome of this, is that female PE teachers must adhere to masculine values and leadership while at the same time risk being constructed as ‘not female’.

Socialist feminists in physical education are concerned with the historical aspect of physical education in identifying the ideologies of masculinity and femininity which, for feminists, are central to an understanding of gender and physical education. Socialist feminist reform in physical education would focus on strategies that address and challenge the notions of class in relation to femininity and masculinity. These areas need to be challenged and altered through physical education, or gender division and inequalities will continue. In doing this socialist feminists argue that reforms in physical education need to centre on class as a focal variable in women’s oppression. For example, how is girls’ education in physical education at a private school, where they pay an exorbitant salary for the girls’ rowing coach, different from girls experience of physical education at a state high school in Sydney West? There are enormous implications in terms of how these female students relate to their bodies and physical activity and associated issues such as confidence and self esteem. This in turn affects the way in which women teach physical education. Women teaching PE in private schools are less subject to competition with male teachers as at least school sport is often well received (Wright, 1999).

Many feminists operate predominantly from one theoretical perspective, yet they take on aspects of other perspectives. It is important to consider this when viewing feminist theory and education and its relationship to physical education teachers in this area. While all feminist perspectives have offered energetic critiques of education by placing women as central to their analysis and by attempting to address the oppression of women which is a part of education institutions for both students and teachers, liberal and social feminism are of most relevance to this study because of their emphasis on equality of opportunity and outcomes, and social / power relations in the workplace which oppress women.
2.3 CAREERS, WOMEN AND MEN AND SOCIETY

In researching career paths and promotional opportunities for female PDHPE teachers, it is necessary to place this in the context of the inequities in the more general literature on careers and work from both Australia and overseas.

Inequity between the sexes in its simplest form in relation to work consists of segregated fields of work, which in turn, result in differences in wealth, power and status. Kelly and Nihlen (1982) state that much of the inequity derives from the distinction between the value of work in private (or domestic) and public domains. While origins of this distinction are unknown, scholars have documented its intensification with the development of capitalism and industrialisation. The difference in value between domestic and public domains has also been shown in socialist nations, notably the Soviet Union and China, where the same distinctions between and the inequalities implicit in them are maintained (Croll, 1987; Lapidus, 1979; Rosaldo, 1974; Sacks, 1974; Weinbaum, 1976).

Kelly and Nihlen (1982) argue that with industrialisation the separation of household (unpaid labour) from income generation (paid labour) became more acute and so too did the need for wage labour. In most industrialised societies it is in the division of labour that we see most women becoming responsible for household and childbearing and dependent on income earned outside the home by men. Kelly and Nihlen (1982) claim that this is not a ‘natural’ phenomenon, and it is directly related to the wage structure for males. Employers can pay men less if unpaid women labour in the household to prepare food, clean, clothe, and rear the children.

Elizabeth Reid, who was appointed as advisor in women affairs to the Prime Minister in 1973, focused her concerns on changing the direction of pre school and child care programs. In 1974 Reid succeeded in committing the Whitlam government to a major change in direction in the provision of pre school and child care services and secured a considerable budget with which to fund it. (Ryan, 1990). Reid displayed a more ‘radical’ position and identified as a socialist feminist. This was a major turning point in feminist history in Australia in terms of the gendered division of labour.
The gendered division of labour does not only relate to the division of labour between public and private, but also to the division of labour within public life. Women have worked, and increasingly continue to work, outside the home while still bearing the majority of domestic responsibility. In doing so they often find themselves paid less than their male counterparts in what might be considered equivalent work (Wearing, 1996).

Workforce status inequality for women is a function both of discriminatory practices imposed by employers and the sex role division of labour that places prime responsibility of the family and child rearing on women ... Because of the structure of work and the family within society, women’s ‘double burden’, coupled with discrimination tends to produce both workforce status and wage inequities between men and women. (Kelly & Nihlen, 1982, p.165)

Women’s careers are affected by their participation and society’s expectations of their participation in unpaid work. As the House of Representatives Standing Committee in its report on the status of women in Australia points out:

Participation in paid work affects self esteem and status in society ... value and consequent status tend(ed) to be traditionally associated with monetary worth. As a result, those non marketed goods and services which are not given a financial cost are therefore perceived to be of less worth than those which exist in the market economy. Hence, voluntary work and unpaid work involved in caring for families, children or the elderly is perceived to have less value than paid work. (House of Representatives Standing Committee on Legal Constitutional Affairs, 1992)

Participation in the paid workforce has been increasing for Australian women since the 1960s. In 1996 women’s participation in the workforce stood at 36 percent, by the end of 1998 it had increased to 50 percent (ABS, 1999). However, the type of work women do varies from that done by men. In Australia in 1984, for example, 64 percent of women in work were employed in the areas of clerical, sales and services, while women were underrepresented in executive and managerial positions, even in occupations where women were predominant (Wearing, 1996). As Wearing (1996) points out:

Lower levels of wages are set for female occupations than would be expected to apply if the occupations and industries were male dominated.
The gaps in both earnings and awards have been narrowing in recent years, but they still remain in many areas to differentiate women’s employment (Blakers, 1990, p.212). The accepted view has been that women’s home roles take priority over their work roles and that type of work is generally an extension of family nurturing/caring activities. (p.103)

In Australia in 1991, 64 percent of women were employed as ‘professionals’, clerical, sales and services workers. In 1991, 64 percent of men were employed in the occupation of ‘professionals’, tradespersons and production and transport workers. Professionals are those in jobs such as medicine, law and teaching. For women the majority of professionals were teachers and nurses, while more male professionals were in the areas of law and medicine. Those ‘professions’ which were male dominated attracted a higher salary. A difference also, is that of those in managerial and administrative roles within their profession or organisation: 77 percent were men, and only 23 percent were women (Wearing, 1996).

While women’s and men’s work has changed somewhat over time, as indicated above, there are considerable differences in the value placed on the work women do and women’s chances of attaining higher positions in the workforce. It can be argued that a key factor in determining careers in our society for men and women are the messages women and men receive and experiences they have, in the context of work and education. Kenway (1992), for instance, argues that the production and circulation of hegemonic discourses serve to marginalise women in their experience of education and set limits in terms of their working lives. This in turn relegates them to subordinate positions both in educational outcomes and occupational choices. Sachs (1992) supports this in her belief that two sites in which dominant discourse function to marginalise women can be observed in schools and the labour market. In the labour market a selective tradition operates in terms of how jobs are defined and how notions of skill, in particular, are defined.

While over the years there has been a definite increase in the number of women in the workforce, women’s experience of work differs from that of men. O’Donnell and Hall (1988) argue that between 1975 and 1986 women’s share of paid hours increased from 33 percent to 41 percent, while their share of wages and salaries only increased from 25 percent to 31 percent. By 1990 women were still concentrated in only a few areas of the workforce. On average they earned less than their male
counterparts and were more likely to be in part-time or marginal employment (O'Donnell & Hall, 1988).

When looking at careers of men and women in Australia a major consideration is the likelihood of breaks in employment. Discontinuous paid employment may result in a loss of career impetus and also difficulties in upskilling (ABS, 1993; Wearing, 1996). A survey of work patterns of women conducted in Victoria in 1991 (ABS, 1993) showed that two thirds of women in Victoria who had been employed at some time between 1975 and 1991 had at least one break of three months or more of employment and women who had children under two years were more likely to have had a break than women without children. Among women in this category who took a break from employment 56 percent had taken the most recent break because of the birth of a child and 30 percent took a break to care for a child or another person (ABS, 1991). In 1993, an Australian Bureau of Statistics report on work and women showed that:

Those women whose children were less than 10 years old were more likely to be employed part time than full time; lone mothers whose youngest child was aged 10-14 years and married women without children were more likely to be employed full time than part time; and two thirds of lone mothers and just over half of married mothers with children aged 0-4 years were not in the labour force. (ABS, 1993, p.134)

It is important to recognise that because some occupations are generally more highly regarded by the community than others, occupation can be a significant indicator of the perceived relative status of women and men in employment. For example, if doctors are more highly regarded than teachers, and there are more women in teaching than there are female doctors, and the reverse is the case for men, it follows that women may be perceived as of lower status than men.

It is also of consequence that the official gatekeepers of our society, legislators and government agencies, have a critical role in not only shaping our society in general but also on shaping on issues around gender. It is not surprising to note that the 1993 ABS figures show that women held only 10 percent of legislators and government appointed officials, 11 percent of police and yet they accounted for 68 percent of school teachers, but not school executives.
If we look at legislation and its impact on the careers of women and men, various laws have been introduced in order to end discrimination against women in the workforce. Yet, as can be seen from the above ABS statistics women and men still display inequities in employment.

People in decision making positions exert their influence over a wide range of issues, including career paths for men and women. While women's participation in the process is crucial, few women in NSW are among significant decision makers (ABS, 1995). According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (1995) the proportion of women in selected government decision making positions in 1994 were as follows:

- House of Representative = 10%
- Senate = 30%
- Legislative Assembly = 11%
- Legislative Council = 36%
- Local Government = 20%
- Senior Executives = 14%
- Committees = 28%

In 1991, in order to address discrimination and inequities which existed as a result of family responsibilities, Australia ratified the International Labour Organisation (ILO156) on Workers with Family responsibilities. The ILO156 aimed to ensure that persons with family responsibilities who work or wish to work would not suffer either discrimination or conflict as a result of their responsibilities to their families. The intention of this convention was that flexible working hours, permanent part time work, rostered days off and extensions to parental leave provisions would go some way to easing the burden for those with family responsibilities. The reality however, is that the ILO156 was not effective because, for women with children, labour force status is still very dependent on the age of their children and the convention did not seek to negate the impact of career breaks (ABS, 1993).

As a consequence of this need for women caring for small children to be at home there has been an increasing number of women who are in paid employment at home (ABS, 1993). According to ABS figures (1993) the number of women employed at home was more than double the number of men employed at home. Although employment at home may seem to have a number of advantages, employees who work at home generally encounter unseen disadvantages in relation to employment conditions and benefits. Many employees working at home are employed on a casual
basis (ABS, 1993) and casual employees do not qualify for particular benefits and conditions.

According to the ABS (1991), in 1998-99 men worked on average 39.2 hours per week, while women worked on average 28.2 hours per week, with married women working slightly fewer hours. Of real significance is the fact that for women, part-time work accounted for 24 percent of aggregated weekly hours worked, but for men it accounted for just five percent. This is a critical factor to consider when examining the careers and possibilities for promotion for men and women in Australian society. As Heath (1999) points out:

> It is apparent that, where women are in a heterosexual relationship which involves children, they are financially better off leaving most of the breadwinning to their partner, who is likely to be better at negotiating an optimal wage. Therefore, most women will have a break in their careers, financially supported by a male partner. It follows that organisations need to change drastically in order for authentic parity to be achieved for those women who actually achieve positions of leadership. (p.6)

Work and family responsibilities are a major issue for women seeking promotion, but not for men. Walpole (1995) points out that in Australia:

> The relationship between work and family responsibilities is also a major concern for women workers. This is because women continue to carry a disproportionately high share of household and family work. According to Michael Bittman, women perform 70% of unpaid work in the home. When a woman marries, she increases her unpaid work by almost 60% and on average, a new mothers hours of unpaid work increases by 91% to nearly 56 hours a week. (p.7)

In looking at the situation in NSW it can be seen that generally NSW statistics concerning women and work parallel those across Australia. The following employment statistics on women in NSW reflect the situation across Australia:

- In August 1994 there were 1.1 million women employed in NSW and 1.5 million men.
- Women comprised 42% of all employed people and married women 26%. In 1966 women were 31% of all employed people.
The number of employed women had more than doubled from the 1966 figure of 545,000, while the number of employed men had increased by less than one quarter from 1.2 million.

Most women worked as employees, but a small proportion (3%) were employers and a slightly larger group (7%) worked for themselves.

In May 1994 one quarter (25%) of employed women worked in the public sector. This was only slightly less than the proportion of men (27%).

The proportion of women in NSW working part time increased between 1966 and 1994 from 23 percent to 39 percent and in 1992 in NSW, women spent twice as much time each day than men on household duties. (ABS, 1995, p.88)

This review of the literature provides us with an insight into the explicit and implicit barriers that exist for working women. Before looking specifically at promotion and women in teaching, it helps to examine the history and culture of teaching and how this has impacted on women’s careers. It is important then to view this information on careers, women and men in society and then reflect on how this impacts on the situation for women in teaching.

2.4 THE HISTORY OF TEACHING AND WOMENS’ PLACE IN THAT HISTORY

In order to understand the position of women in teaching today, it is helpful to look at the history of women in teaching. Women’s place as teachers in Australia has varied considerably over the years and has impacted on teaching and schooling (Kyle, 1986). However there have been some consistent patterns. Teaching has always been an area where women could find work. It is an area in which there are many more women than men. Teaching has also always been an occupation where there is clear hierarchy and where women have held positions of low power and influence in relation to men (Kyle, 1986; Murphy, 1984).

Blackmore (1993) argues that historically there has been a gendered division of labour in education. Those who hold the ‘real’ power, work in the areas of administration and policy making in education, and these positions have been, and largely remain, the charge of men despite the higher number of women in education. This has supported by figures from Milligan (1994) which show that in New South Wales in 1991 only 17 percent of principal positions were held by women across primary and secondary sectors. However, in primary and secondary sectors combined, 62 percent of women made up the teaching staff.
In reviewing the literature around the history of teaching and women’s place in that history, a chronological series of events and situations which have impacted on women in teaching and have led to the present situation can be seen. Kyle (1986) in her book ‘Her Natural Destiny: The Education of Women in New South Wales,’ provides a clear and valuable history of women in teaching in New South Wales, and discusses the major elements that have impacted on women throughout that history.

The use of convict men and women teachers, tutors and governess’ was common in the early years of the colony (Kyle, 1986). This situation largely arose because there was a lack of qualified teachers in the free population, and those who were free, chose what they considered to be more suitable and better paying employment. The theory is that by using convict men and women as teachers in the early years of the colony, the teaching profession was largely seen as much lower in status than many other professions, and as a result it was looked upon as a means of employment for women, rather than men.

Free women were also attracted to teaching in Australia when their only other choices were paid domestic service or unpaid domestic service to their family. Middle-class women who needed to earn a living often set up schools which catered for the daughters of the wealthy. By 1848 it was the state teaching service which provided the most opportunities for a professional career for women (Kyle, 1986). This system, however, differentiated between women and men teachers in terms of working teacher conditions, training and promotional opportunities.

This system laid the groundwork for a sexual division of labour within the State education system which remains to colour the working lives of female teachers in State schools today (p.131).

It was in this system however, that women felt some liberation from domestic servitude and there was some hope for the future liberation of Australian women. The system also endorsed and perpetuated inequities, some of which still exist today.

In examining the history of teaching and women’s place in it, the role of male teachers’ wives needs to be discussed. The male teachers wife contributed significantly to education in the early years, yet she was a source of unpaid labour. According to Kyle (1986), she was not seen as a teacher and she did not receive a wage, however, she played a vital role in the State education system.
The use of female labour both paid and unpaid was established very quickly in the State teaching service and it began with the male teacher’s wife. (Kyle, 1986, p.132)

In 1880 the Department of Public Instruction supported an earlier policy which required the wives of male teachers to be examined in needlework. For instance:

In schools containing female children but no female teacher, it will be the duty of the teacher’s wife to be present at the assembling and dismissal of the pupils, and to take charge of the female children. She is also required to teach needlework to the girls during at least four hours in each week. In forming an estimate of the efficiency of schools, the competency and usefulness of teachers’ wives will be taken into account. (Annual Report, 1880, p.169, quoted in Kyle, 1986, p.133)

Such women were exploited as they provided a form of unpaid labour. This situation appears to have been customary, particularly in country areas, where other forms of employment also assumed the use of wives as unpaid labour such as in post offices and gaols (Kyle, 1986). The use of women as an unpaid work force continued for many years with very little opposition. The current situation for many women today who dedicate their lives to unpaid domestic work can be seen as a continuation of this situation.

Pupil teachers were also an integral part of the NSW teaching service. They were visible workers, but received low wages and were used as a cheap method of providing instruction in the teaching service. It is not surprising therefore, that women were to be found in high numbers as pupil teachers. As Pike (1966) explains:

Lack of employment opportunities for women, and their willingness to accept the poor pay and conditions of teaching are seen as salient factors in the high predominance of female pupil teachers in the service. (p.41-42)

According to Hill (1967), respectable and ambitious working and middle-class pupil teachers made-up approximately one quarter of the total public teaching staff in NSW from 1880-1900. The first female pupil teachers in NSW were founders of a new profession for women and were placed in a system which imposed both social and structural obstructions. For instance, once they were married, women had to resign
from teaching and women were only permitted to teach in infants departments. These regulations made women’s participation in the service different from and a more difficult and restricted experience than that of their male counterparts.

In addition, because of the far wider choices of occupation available to men, women were unfairly exploited by the State teaching service. Female teachers were used to take on many of the remote outback posts in the early years, which provided little opportunity for promotion, low salaries and other problems associated with isolation.

In 1881 in the State teaching service 1057 males and 478 females were at the level of teacher-in-charge (Kyle, 1986). Given that the total number of female teachers in the teaching service was only 52 fewer than males, these promotion figures indicate a pointed inequity. By the 1900s the scenario had not improved for women in the teaching service. The Annual Report (1880) stated that in 1900 there were only 447 less females in the teaching service than males. However, 1967 males, but only 703 females held the position of teacher-in-charge (Kyle, 1986).

While women were not satisfied with remaining largely in low level positions (Pike, 1966) they lacked the economic, political and social power to bring about change. Change was unlikely or at best likely to be slow in a system where power remained in the hands of men. As Kyle (1986) pointed out:

The promotional system of the Department of Public Instruction was based on classification, examination, and seniority and the distribution of rewards within it was uneven and biased largely towards the home and work lifestyles of men. (p.142)

It is not simply a matter of stating that women’s lack of promotion in the early 1900s in the State teaching service can be explained by looking at the social constraints placed upon women. Obviously women’s marriage and childbearing role were significant barriers. However, the system also imposed a number of structural constraints.

The 1907 classification of public schools in NSW saw seven classes of schools. Men could be appointed to all of these schools, with the only exception being those positions specifically designated girls or infants departments. Women, however, could only be appointed as teachers-in-charge to girls or infants’ departments and mixed schools with
less than thirty students. This situation, although not directly set out in the
regulations, was however enforced as established practice. (Kyle, 1986,
p.144)

In 1912 regulations were amended to include a policy whereby women were not
placed in charge of schools above sixth class. There were also more boys and mixed
departments than girls, infants and mixed sex schools with enrolments less than
thirty, giving far more opportunity for promotion to male teachers. Another
impediment to the promotion of female teachers was the regulation that required a
teacher to give three years of country service before they could be appointed to a city
school. After 1900, preference for small country schools was given to male
applicants, making this difficult for women and almost impossible for married

It was not until the mid 1900s that legislation began to be introduced in an attempt to
address structural constraints and inequities. For example Porter (1986) described
how in the 1940s the issue of promotion, and in particular women as heads of
schools, began to be pushed in Western Australia. In 1968 accoutrement leave was
granted and equal pay came in stages by 1971. It was not until 1972 that married
women in Western Australia were allowed on permanent staff and this year also saw
the first women principal of a coeducational senior high school. In 1980 the Director
General’s policy statement on equal employment was issued and a Superintendent
was appointed and an Equal Employment Unit was established (Western Teacher,

In addition to promotion, salary was also an issue that provided evidence of inequity
in teaching for men and women and it was not until the mid 1900s again that some
form of parity began to emerge.

A lower salary also marked female teachers out as unequal in the
promotional race. At all levels except the lowly paid provisional or
unclassified teacher, men were paid more ... in all cases female salaries
were set at approximately 65 to 70 percent of the male rate. (Kyle, 1986,
p.144)

The Harvester Case of 1907, in which Justice Higgins professed in industrial law that
women were not breadwinners and as such could not be given the same pay as men,
set a precedent which would hinder women’s claims for wage justice for many years
to come. The emergence of a more active teachers association also saw a glimmer of a salary justice movement for women. However, the *Australian Journal of Education* (1912) reported that in NSW in 1912 a teacher by the name of Miss Thompson, from the Metropolitan district in NSW, moved a motion for equal pay and parity with that of single male teachers. The motion was not passed. It was not until 1971 that women and men were paid the same salaries (Kyle, 1986).

Throughout Australian history women in the teaching profession have been required to work within a state bureaucracy which has perpetuated the marginalisation of women generally and in relation to their educational work and ability, and of their roles as teachers. It is little wonder that promotion for women was and continues to be a source of inequity. As has been demonstrated to be the case in most large bureaucracies, the state education department has been shown to foster and perpetuate patriarchy.

The Education Department is a large bureaucratic organisation, with a disproportionate 71.6% of male executives (Blackmore, 1992, p.19) and large number of procedures, rules and practices firmly in place. By the very fact of their success those in executive positions will be less receptive to the need for change to accommodate the needs of women unable to gain a permanent position in the teaching service. The bureaucratic allegiance is to patriarchy (Telfer, 1993, p.190).

### 2.5 CAREER PATHS, PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES AND EXPLANATIONS ABOUT FEMALE TEACHERS’ CAREERS

#### 2.5.1 Careers and Promotional Opportunities

In examining the past career paths and promotional opportunities for women in teaching and the literature around the history of teaching and women’s place in that history a pattern of women’s marginalisation emerges. The difference between career paths and promotional opportunities of male and female teachers in more recent years, shows that women continue to be marginalised.

In 1991, women comprised 74% of teachers and specialist support staff in primary schools and 57% in secondary schools. ... In 1991 although
women represented 65% of all government school staff, they comprised only 22% of executive staff (ABS, 1993, p.106).

Trotman (1984) states that while it is evident that teaching has been and still is a largely feminised occupation, it has never been a profession in which women have had equal representation. They do not dominate at the executive level. As Sampson (1991) states:

In contrast to men, very few women in Australia have enjoyed a career in teaching through advancement to school principal or decision maker in administration. (p.123)

Given the similar numbers of men and women in government secondary schools and the significantly lower representation of women at executive level, it would seem that career paths and promotional opportunities vary for women and men. Telfer (1993) explains this situation in relation to patriarchy.

It is clearly evident that women have an unequal position in employment in the education sector. The concept of the male breadwinner, and of a female deference to males, both being aspects of patriarchy, are allowing a situation to exist where the desire and needs of women to work are denied. Instead, women are employed in the areas less popular with men, and to fill the unmet demand for teachers wherever it occurs. (p.189)

As with women in the wider workforce, female teachers have been forced to contend with cultural definitions of women and their place in the wider society. These definitions to a large extent on their workplace and careers. As Burton (1991) points out:

While women’s place is culturally defined as central within the family rather than the world of paid work, or while women are accepted at the workplace but only in places deemed appropriate for them, and these places are not where the power lies, progress has a fragile base. (p.xii)

It seems extraordinary that efforts over the years to increase the number and proportion of women in decision-making roles in schools has been unsuccessful (Milligan, 1994), despite equal access to all positions, equal pay, and in some states legislation for equal employment opportunity. In 1984 a study was conducted by the
Australian Schools Commission with the assistance of all state member unions of the Australian Teachers Federation. This study demonstrated that women’s family commitments clearly stood out as a major barrier to women seeking promotion. With the purported advances in EEO it is interesting to see if these findings are still relevant. Family commitments had secondary effects on such things as time required to seek and fulfill promotion requirements and the need and desire of women to engage in part-time work as opposed to full time work.

A review of literature on female teachers career paths indicate that the following factors have been influential in explaining their career paths:

2. part time work resulting from domestic/family responsibilities (DET EEO Annual Report, 1998; Walpole, 1995).
3. masculinisation of leadership (Blackmore, 1992; Hall, 1996; Sampson, 1987).
4. gender division of labour (Connell, 1995).
5. devolution of management (Milligan, 1994; Walpole, 1995).
6. legislation and policies (Burton, 1991; Milligan, 1994; Mills, 1997)

Men have largely been able to opt out of responsibility for the care of their own children, whereas women have not. As a result women’s careers have been interrupted by breaks to have and rear children, and as a result women, more so than men, have had to engage in part time work which in turn has effected their careers (ABS, 1992). As Sampson (1991) pointed out:

Many women still feel that the responsibility of providing care arrangements for children falls on them and that men still have the luxury of social acquiescence in their pursuit of a career for themselves ahead of family commitments. (p.132)

A related issue is that responsibility for domestic duties are still not equally shared between men and women (ABS, 1992). The inequitable division of unpaid labour impacts on women’s careers. It is less likely to have a negative impact on men’s careers because according to Bittman (ABS, 1992) they do less household chores.

Women’s domestic responsibilities have meant they experience factors which negatively affect their career. Returning to paid work after leave for child rearing
means often a return to part time work and also a loss of confidence after a long break. As Wearing (1996) points out:

Domestic responsibilities in the Australian situation results in women’s withdrawal from the workforce for periods of time during the early child rearing years, and re-entry frequently into part time positions which disadvantage their position and conditions in the workforce (p.147).

Women have been in this situation largely due to society’s expectations and ideas about women’s place in society. Sampson (1991) points out that the idea that children are deprived through the absence of their mothers which swept some Western countries after World War II, followed by significant input of women into the workforce in the 1960s, has meant that for decades women’s contribution both inside and outside the home has been controversial.

The effect of this debate (care of children versus career) has been oppressive for many women teachers whose expertise is focused on the well being of children and who have invested highly in years of study and professional qualifications (Sampson, 1991, p.132).

In line with women’s perceived responsibilities for children and the home is the high number of women in teaching engaged in part time-work. Within the NSW education system in 1998, women made up 90 percent of staff in part time work (DET EEO Annual Report, 1999). As one of the most significant areas of employment growth in recent years, this has had major implications for women’s teaching careers. Patterns of discriminatory treatment which impact severely on women due to the composition of the part time workforce include: “the problem of access to the same benefits as full timers on a pro rata basis, lack of career structures, limited training and development opportunities and limited access to superannuation benefits” (Walpole, 1995, p.7).

2.5.2 Women and leadership

The preceding section discussed the disparities in career patterns for men and women in teaching and considered some of the more obvious constraints on their chances of promotion to leadership positions. This next section specifically draws on management and leadership literature to further understand women’s underrepresentation in promotion positions.
While it is rare, at least in academic literature, to find an argument that women are not suitable on a biological level for leadership, resistance’s to women in leadership positions continues. Blackmore (1993) and Bacchi (1990) suggest that while a biological argument is no longer tenable with ‘the introduction of mechanisation and more sophisticated technology’ it has been replaced by arguments about “women’s socio-psychological ‘unsuitability’ for leadership” (p.44). Such an argument is possible in a context where a masculinist view of administration remains unchallenged.

This position however has been challenged by writing and research from a range of perspectives including those informed by a feminist perspective. One approach has been to ask whether women and men have a different style of leadership (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Ferguson, 1984; Fullan, 1997; Gilligam, 1993; Lyons, 1990). Eagly and Johnson (1990) in their study for instance found that women tended to adopt a more democratic or participative style and that men tended to adopt a more directive or autocratic style. An extension of this position is to argue that the style of leadership most likely to be associated with women is more desirable. Fullan (1997) believes that when the directions of the new leadership are more in line with women’s socialisation and leadership styles, all leaders need to develop these capacities. Webb (2001) also suggests that many ‘female qualities’, such as collaborative decision making and quality communication between colleagues, have a contribution to make to effective leadership.

Feminists such as Grogan (1996) and Weiner (1995) however warn against reinforcing stereotypes. According to Grogan (1996) feminist approaches to leadership allow a re-visioning of career models to include non-linear models that encourage leadership throughout the organisation. She suggests that until the perspective that managers have careers and workers have jobs is broken down, then leaders will still be operating under a domination and control paradigm. She argues that feminist theories have been vital in enabling us to value alternative approaches to leadership, challenging those which reinforce stereotypes associated with women i.e. women as nurturers and communicators. Weiner (1995) looks at the misconception that women have perhaps passive and soft approaches to leadership and argues that female managers have to address both ‘feminist’ and ‘feminine’ in their management styles and practices.
A feminist approach to research about leadership has been able to highlight the extent of the gender specific assumptions underlying the notion of leadership (Lyons, 1990; Marshall, 1994; Shakeshaft, 1989). In feminist literature, an inclusive non gender specific model emerged. This model did not see leadership as being associated with assertiveness, competitiveness, authoritarianism and hierarchies, but challenged the binaries of rationality versus emotionality, assertiveness versus passivity, dependence versus autonomy and public versus private (Blackmore, 1991).

Some feminists have also focused on examining the discourses of leadership which not only inform the study of the discipline but also create the knowledge in the field (Grogan, 1996). This perspective is influenced by a poststructuralist concern with the relationship between knowledge and power. Feminists in this area work to deconstruct the language which is used in a particular context, and to find and seek metaphors for management from those traditionally employed. They argue that female leaders and administrators can also be caught up in a career design which is inherently male and which reinforces those values which have served men best (Buzzanell and Goldwig, 1991; Calas & Smircich, 1992; Marshall, 1994).

2.5.3 Women, leadership and teaching

As has been the case with the women and leadership literature more generally, one of the preoccupations of the literature on leadership styles in relation to promotion and teaching has focused on the differences between women and men (Blackmore, 1992; Hall, 1996; Sampson, 1987). The argument has been that a traditional male model of leadership which values power rather than collaboration, has made promotion for women difficult. More recent work however examines the notion of leadership in the context of organisational change and the opportunities this provides for revisioning what it means to be a leader in education. Through the 1980s and 1990s there has been a progressive move towards restructuring schools in the UK, North America and Australia in the form of decentralisation and devolution of responsibility (Fullan, 1997). In this context, NSW schools have had to become increasingly self-managing.

Self management has been based on professional development planning, collaborative school reviews and participative decision making involving the school community (Webb, 2001). In relation to women in educational administration, these changes can be viewed as having effects that are beneficial as well as detrimental. Milligan (1994) suggests that the characteristics and qualities associated with women in educational administration such as collaboration, sharing power, participative
decision making and democratic approaches, are desirable in the context of restructured schools. However a number of very important negative factors emerge in this context. Firstly, there is a danger in assuming that women in education are a homogeneous group and in reinforcing a set of stereotypes about female behaviour. Second, restructuring and the resultant devolution of power has meant that the principals, deputy principals and heads of department have seen an increase in the work of educational administrators (Macdonald, 1995). The impact for women, is that the increase work load places further demands and therefore conflict with regards to their already problematic family responsibilities.

An interesting study by Hall (1996) involving six women heads or principals, showed how the ways in which women principals exhibited their leadership, had their origins in childhood and educational and career experiences that could not be disassociated from their gender identity as women. The women heads’ behaviour and values about schooling and leadership indicated a preference for a practical model in which ‘power for’ was preferred to ‘power over’, and developed goals were favoured over accountability.

A firmly held belief about women’s roles in society is the perception that women do not make good leaders (Sampson, 1987). When examining attitudes and perceptions about women and men in teaching, and their leadership abilities Sampson (1987) found that both male and female teachers believed that women in teaching were not perceived by men (the primary leaders of the school) to have the necessary leadership potential. This suggests that stereotypical ideas about leadership and its ‘masculinisation’ are at work in schools, making it more difficult for women to attain promotion positions.

2.5.4 Women, careers and teaching

Career paths for men and women in teaching differ in various ways. Hill and Ragland (1995) conducted a study of women leaders in education in the United States. They found no ‘typical’ career path for women. Findings by Dopp and Sloan (1986), Pauan and D’Angelo (1990), and Shakeshaft (1989) indicate that the most frequently held positions prior to superintendents was that of secondary school principal. The Hill and Ragland study (1995) showed the following sample of career paths of the women interviewees who had occupied the level of superintendent:

- teacher - counsellor - assistant principal - principal - superintendent
These examples indicate a different and varied career path between the women in the study as compared with a more direct path for the men who moved through the various step levels until they reach superintendent. They suggest that the women’s varied career paths were due to factors such as family responsibilities, breaks in careers and attitudes in regards to leadership.

In an Australian study, research by Milligan (1994) commissioned by the Australian National Board of Employment, Education and Training, on women in the teaching profession, shows that the school sector has been and remains highly gender segregated. Men continue to dominate in management and the teaching of older students and women continue to be predominate as teachers and teachers’ aides. All things considered, the report shows that women remain underrepresented in school leadership and promotional positions, and the improvement in their positions is very slow.

Schools are places where most of the junior staff are women, most of the senior staff are men, and even where this is not the case, the work is divided into ‘men’s work’ and ‘women’s work’. This makes gender a powerful factor in the daily lives of schools. Only an incomplete understanding of schooling is possible if gender dynamics are ignored. (Milligan, 1994, p.9)

The gendered division of labour which continues to exist in our society provides another explanation of women’s restricted careers in teaching. Gender relations within a school are interrelated with those in the wider society (Connell, 1987). Teaching as a feminised profession generally also divides many school roles along gendered lines. The male model of leadership which is perpetuated in society and predominant in teaching sees a hierarchy in which men are at the top and women are down the line.
The sexual division of labour is one of the major features of a school’s gender regime; and it is clear that the sexual division of labour ... conforms with larger social patterns. Women as secretaries and other support functions, men predominantly among administrators; women teaching home science and predominating in the ‘soft’ subjects, the humanities, while men teach carpentry and metalwork, and predominate in the ‘hard’ sciences, maths and technology. (Connell, 1987, p.139)

Predominant in executive positions and at the policy making level, men have been able to embed in the system values which may be deemed ‘masculine’. They accordingly largely benefits most men more so than most women. With men predominantly in leadership positions the male model of leadership is perpetuated.

2.5.5 EEO and merit in education

Leadership within NSW DET schools is linked to structural changes and recent changes in policy. An important factor which has influenced, and will continue to influence, female teacher’s career paths is the devolution of management, administration and control which has occurred in NSW schools. The introduction of merit selection in NSW schools first became part of the Department of School Education staffing operation in 1991-1992. This staffing operation stated that “all executive promotion would be by merit” (DSE staffing operation, 1991-92). An amendment to this was made in 1997 which state that “executive transfers will still exist” (DET memo: 97/206). The implications of this can be seen and will be discussed in interpreting the results of this study. Whilst there has been little research to show the direct effect which merit selection has had on women in general, Milligan (1994) suggests that:

Women will lose the tenuous hold they have on leadership and management positions. ‘Safety nets’ of control, public scrutiny and EEO policies are a feature, in principle at least, of central organisations, and these are thought to be threatened by the decline of central power. Concerns recently expressed strenuously at times, are that local selection will allow cronyism, sexism, racism and inefficiency to overwhelm merit as the dominant selection factor in some communities. (Milligan, 1994, p.32)
Merit selection was introduced to meet the requirements of the Sex Discrimination Act introduced in 1984 has impacted on education and women in education with the involvement of EEO and merit selection. The Act sets out its objectives as follows:

a) to give effect to certain provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; and

b) to eliminate, so far is as possible, discrimination against persons on the ground of sex, marital status, pregnancy or potential pregnancy in the areas of work, accommodation, education, the provision of goods, facilities and services, the disposal of land, the activities of clubs and the administration of commonwealth laws and programs; and

c) to eliminate, so far as possible, discrimination involving dismissal of employees on the ground of family responsibilities; and

d) to eliminate, so far as possible, discrimination involving sexual harassment in the workplace, in educational institutions and in other areas of public activity; and

e) to promote recognition and acceptance within the community of the principle of the equality of men and women (Attorney Generals Dept, 1999 p.11).

As this thesis will demonstrate, although the Sex Discrimination Act of 1984 sets out to eliminate discrimination through the dismissal of employees on the ground of family responsibilities, in reality it has not been successful. Whilst employees (women) may not be directly dismissed as a result of family responsibilities, their careers continue to be greatly affected (Evans, 1982; Sampson, 1991) by expectations about their roles in the family.

In response to promoting more positive policies in terms of anti discrimination, equal employment opportunity and affirmative action the ‘Guidelines for Employers: Equal Employment Opportunity for Women was published in 1981. These guidelines followed the design laid down by the Organisation for the Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (Milligan, 1994).

The Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) legislation in NSW was introduced in 1980, as an amendment to the Anti Discrimination Act of 1977. (Eisenstein, 1984) EEO in Australia has been a long time evolving. As Eisenstein (1984) points out:
The legislation in NSW was based on the US experience in the implementation of affirmative action, but with a distinctive Australian flavour. An elusive concept, this meant generally an avoidance of what were seen as the excesses of the American experience. Specifically, the legislation avoided any provision for what was termed ‘hard’ affirmative action in the form of quota hiring, that is, direct preferential hiring for members of the target group. (p.91)

The Affirmative Action (EEO for women) Act became legislation in 1986. This was the first legislative attempt to require the private sector companies to institute affirmative action programs for women. The final title of the Act, containing both affirmative action and EEO reflected a number of conflicts and compromises that occurred prior to its Parliamentary passage (Ronalds, 1990).

In principle it can be argued that EEO should be a positive influence on women’s career paths. However, according to Burton (1991) and Mills (1997), in practice EEOs concentration on inequalities within organisations with the aim of redistributing women in existing jobs, does little to change what may in fact be a more significant issue in women’s career paths, that of organisational process and distribution of tasks among jobs (Burton, 1991; Mills, 1997). According to Burton (1991) EEO plans are devised with the assumption that inequities are initiated or reinforced within work organisations rather than questioning the existing job categories and do nothing to “promote close investigation of daily practices which use gender as the basis for decision - making” (p.13).

Merit selection was introduced in NSW in 1991 to the public sector of the workforce in response to EEO legislation. It would seem that while merit was introduced to the NSW state school system as an EEO provision, it has not necessarily been successful (Milligan, 1994). In a study conducted by Mills (1997) regarding merit selection and the EEO process in Queensland, it was found that the number of women in promotion positions was less rather than more than it was 15 years prior to introduction.

Since EEO and the merit process have been introduced, the increase in women in classified positions since 1992 in bands 4 to 11 (4 being a small school, 11 being a large school) schools is only 1.47% ... The majority of these positions fall in the lower bandings ... Merit does not seem to have worked (Mills, 1997, p.17).
In NSW merit remains an “essential” criterion for public service appointments, even where statistical targets have been introduced. Merit selection, however, remains fraught with covert restrictions. Merit appointments within the NSW DET require applicants to have permanent status. For women taking breaks in their career to have and rear children and who then return on a casual basis, this is an inbuilt restriction. Milligan (1994) suggests that although merit selection is in theory helpful to women there are several factors which appear to work against women. She sees four main detractors:

the requirement for mobility, the precedence of transfer over promotion for appointments to vacant positions, the quality of job descriptions, selection criteria and selection process and structural impediments to the adoption of full merit promotion e.g. the need to be on permanent staff. (p.17)

2.6 CAREERS AND PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES FOR PE (PDHPE in NSW) TEACHERS

The career paths and promotional opportunities for teachers in the area of PE, and by extension PDHPE in NSW, have a distinct set of circumstances which distinguishes the teachers of this subject from teachers of other subject areas. When reviewing the literature a number of areas related to female PE teachers’ careers stand out. These include: the marginalisation of PE as a subject and of its teachers; sexism; isolation; work overload; the clash between the roles of teaching and coaching; PEs relationship to sport and the culture of sport; its poor status and communication with senior executive and administrators and policy makers; and the age of teachers and expectations associated with this (Birrell and Cole, 1994; Bloot and Browne, 1994; Macdonald, 1995; Templin, Sparkes, Grant & Schempp, 1994; Wright, 1991).

Teachers of PE work in a context where their subject is intimately linked to sport. In Australian society sport and masculinity are often connected with each other. (MacDonald, 1995). This has a significant impact on what is taught in PE and values and assumptions associated with its teaching. As Macdonald (1995) points out:

The link between sport and PE is significant for physical education teachers, as not only are teachers of PE influenced by the expectations and restrictions which society generates and perpetuates in educational administration and bureaucracies, but also by the inescapable influences of
working within a context which includes sport being intricately linked to PE. (p. 130)

The perceptions held by educators, students and the wider community in relation to sport and physical education have a significant influence on teachers in the subject area. It would appear that over the past 20 years little has changed. Numerous studies (such as Hendry, 1975; Kirk, Colquhoun & Gore, 1989) have pointed to the low status of PE in schools in the UK and USA, and the impact this has had on teachers. Hendry (1975) for instance conducted a study in the UK, which investigated the professional identity of physical education teachers. It was shown that the role of physical education in the school organisation was marginal. Sparkes (1990) supports this with his own study which indicated that: “all physical educators were concerned about the low status of their subject, since it had definite implications for their career prospects and it also reduces their feelings of self worth” (p.33).

Studies have indicated that the perception of the low status afforded physical education by teaching professionals, has also been perceived by students and members of the community (Hendry, 1975; Kirk et al 1989; Macdonald, Hutchins & Madden, 1994; Sparkes, 1990). Studies carried out in the United Kingdom by Measor (cited in Sikes, 1988) confirm that physical education has low status in the eyes of both staff and students and members of the community.

Marginalisation and the isolation that many PE teachers feel in relation to not feeling like a valued member of the whole school and overall education system, (Macdonald et al, 1994) seem to contribute to the low aspirations of the teachers themselves. For instance in relation to a cohort of Queensland PE teachers, Macdonald et al (1994) found that:

The most frequently mentioned career aspiration for both female and male HPE (health and physical education) teachers was to become a head of department (41.5%). Fewer respondents (13.8%) aspired to becoming a deputy principal and even fewer (4.6%) a school principal. Thus many men and women intended to remain at the teacher level (35.4%) or move to an advisory position (27.7%). (p.21)

Age is another factor which seems to be particularly relevant to teachers of PE in seeking promotion. The very nature of promotion calls for experience and, hence seniority. In a key learning area (KLA) which by its very nature is physical,
increasing age has an impact on the way teachers and others see their capacities to carry out their jobs and ultimately the appropriateness of promotion. As Sikes (1988) suggests, getting older and the physical consequences of ageing are of greater significance to physical education teachers than they are to teachers in other subjects. For instance when Bloot and Browne (1994) interviewed PE teachers in Western Australia, they found that 81 percent of respondents “indicated that age was an important consideration in determining the length of time spent on teaching the subject, and a contributing factor to the underrepresentation of females in leadership roles.” (p.9).

2.7 CAREERS AND PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES FOR FEMALE PDHPE TEACHERS

There are several characteristics particular to physical education which affect the careers of women who teach in this subject area. First, as demonstrated above, many perceive physical education to have a lower status than other subject areas (Templin et al, 1988). Second, the relationship between age and careers is pertinent to physical education (Sikes, 1988). Third, the connection between physical education and sport and sport and its association with male dominance and superiority is a key factor (Boutilier & San Giovanni, 1983; O'Rourke, 1991). These phenomena all have particular implications women’s careers and promotion in context of PE. Those outcomes are illustrated in the Queensland situation:

In the QED (Queensland Education Department) ... in terms of the total HPE teaching population in government schools women represent only 7.9% ... Of the 1826 HPE teachers, 58% are males and 42% are females ... Sampson (1991) reported that in 1986 there was only 38% of heads of department in all school subjects throughout Australian schools who were women. In HPE in the QED the figure is 19%. (Macdonald et al, 1994, p.20)

Bloot and Browne (1994)’s research into female physical educators teaching in Western Australian government secondary schools identified specific factors which may impact on women’s careers in the area of PE. The study involved in-depth interviews with three categories of female PE teachers. Category 1 was termed “inexperienced” (those teaching for 4 - 5 years), category 2 was termed “experienced” (those teaching for 15 years or more), and category 3 was termed head of department (those currently holding head of department positions). A number of factors were identified by respondents as contributing to the underrepresentation of
women at the head of department level in physical education. These included limited impact of policies (such as merit) on promotion, patriarchal structures within the education system, the preference for a male model of leadership, the image of physical education, family responsibilities, female teachers low promotional orientation, lack of encouragement and support for female teachers, lack of skills and experience, female teachers’ own perceptions in relation to age. (Bloot & Browne, 1994, p.5-9) These factors are discussed below.

Although the Bloot and Browne study (1994) indicated that each of these factors had some impact in relation to the underrepresentation of female heads of department in PE, various factors impacted differently on individual women in different school settings. Bloot and Browne found that as a result of changes in society and the establishment of EEO policies and their gradual impact, a number of problems were being addressed at the time of their study. However they stress that:

the extent of these factors appears to be a function of the personal experiences of female teachers. While in some schools stereotypic notions regarding appropriate female roles and associated sanctions are no longer an issue, other schools remain patriarchal, and PE departments continue to be chauvinistic. (p.9)

Another factor identified by Bloot and Brown’s respondents was the perception that men dominated, that is, that the patriarchal nature of the education system which was used to denote how female teachers identified the ways in which male dominance had been perceived as a potential deterrent to promotion. Among the examples cited was the perception of male leadership including superintendents and school administrators as “gatekeepers,” that is the perception that with many more men in leadership positions, a male model of leadership which clearly advantaged men was perpetuated. These perceptions deterred the respondents from seeking promotion, that is, many of the women believed they did not have a chance of gaining promotion and therefore did not apply.

Bloot and Brown’s respondents are not alone in the perception that HPE and specifically physical education and physical activity are tied in with notions of social practices around masculinity and that it is seen as a male domain is a pertinent factor. For example Flintoff (1990) states in relation to PE in the UK:
I am still pessimistic in terms of physical education and its scope for providing a positive educational experience for all children, for a closer look at this work reveals that equal opportunity issues have been largely ignored and the hegemony of male, middle-class and white values that underpin physical education have been left unchallenged. (p.91)

Physical education and physical activity is still seen to some extent as the domain of men and the curriculum is still, in many instances, dominated by male sports and male leadership (Wright, 1991). It is little wonder that women see the masculinisation of their subject as a barrier to promotion.

As is the case in the education literature generally (Milligan, 1994; Porter, 1995; Walpole, 1995), family responsibilities were identified as a major area of concern in relation to career paths and promotional opportunities by female physical education teachers in the Western Australian study. Three aspects were identified in respondents’ talk about family commitments. First, respondents talked about a traditional expectations that women assume the bulk of the responsibility for the family. Second, the additional responsibilities associated with a promotion position placed further demands on time. This was different for male respondents with a family. Thirdly, the loss of confidence resulting from breaks in service for child bearing and child rearing was also identified as an aspect. All these issues relate to family responsibilities for which women seem to bear the major responsibility and which have been identified as detrimental to career advancement (Bloot & Browne, 1994).

Bloot and Browne (1994) suggest that the lack of promotion interests reported by female teachers as a result of the combination of low career orientation, a reluctance to promote themselves, a lack of awareness and knowledge of promotion requirements, and the absence of mentors and role models to show the accessibility of the head of department position, all impacted on the low level of women in promotion.

According to the literature (Hutchinson, 1981; Sampson, 1987; Spender, 1982a), a lack of skills and experience is given by many women as a reason for not seeking promotion in education. In the Western Australia study (Bloot and Browne, 1994), concerns from female teachers tended to focus on the ways in which male staff and administrators, students and parents perceived the inadequacies of women in decision making roles. This is highlighted by the following comment from an experienced
female teacher in the study: “Males believe they are the best, and it doesn’t matter how bad they are, they’ve got an ego that tells them they’re all right. The guys I worked with always thought they were better than me” (Bloot & Browne, 1994, p.8). Women’s own perception of their careers, of head of department position, and of the expectations of both male and female significant others also deterred them from taking on leadership roles.

An aspect of career and promotion especially pertinent to physical education is age. In the study conducted by Bloot and Browne (1994), 81 percent of respondents indicated that age was an issue. The age factor was perceived by the respondents as far more crucial and relevant to women PE teachers than to men PE teachers. This was a possible reflection of stereotypic attitudes and expectations rather than any biological differences between men and women.

Studies in America (Cahn, 1994) and Britain (Ball, 1987) have shown the emergence of another possible factor affecting women in physical education. This is related to the association of ‘manliness’ with lesbianism. Cahn (1994) sums it up in the following passage:

Why has 30 years of concerted effort to dispel an image of mannishness failed so miserably ... The strong cultural association between sport and masculinity made women’s athletics ripe for emerging lesbian stereotypes ... In this context, physical educators found themselves in a particularly vulnerable position and encountered heavy pressure to prove their heterosexuality ... Whether lesbian or not, physical educators respond to homophobic pressure by formulating programs and philosophies that institutionalised heterosexism in physical education. (p. 335-336)

The implications here is that women may deny their ambitions, curb their goals, and be careful not to display competitiveness, as this threatens the way people may perceive them particularly in a context (sport and PE) where their ‘femininity’ is questioned already. Therefore in relation to promotion women may choose not to display these qualities and therefore experience difficulty gaining promotion.

According to Browne (1991), the underrepresentation of women in senior positions is of great concern. Because women are not seen to hold status positions, girls and other female teachers are not provided with positive female role models. The absence of women at the head of department level also ensures the perpetuation of the male
outlook on departmental policy, syllabi, and learning experiences. This not only serves to maintain the dominance of men in promotion positions, but has long term effects in shaping policy. This in turn may serve to hold back women. The combination of both an overt lack of role models and the implications of a male dominated curriculum may affect the syllabi content and therefore vicariously affect the perception young women may have of physical education.

It is in the context of the literature reviewed here that an investigation into the careers of women in teaching in PE within the NSW DET will be explored in the remainder of the thesis. An additional twist to the context is that in NSW PE teachers have been teaching health education for over 20 years and since the late 1980s the subject has broadened to included personal development, health and physical education. It remains to be seen whether or not this will make any difference to the results.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 OVERVIEW

The purpose of this research is to examine factors which influence career and promotional opportunities for female teachers in the KLA of PDHPE in NSW and the perceptions of PDHPE teachers in relation to such factors. As a first stage, it was judged necessary to establish whether there were inequities in promotional positions for women compared to the situation for male PDHPE teachers. Hence the major research questions which underpin the study reported in this thesis are as follows:

1. Are there disparities in promotion between female and male PDHPE teachers in the NSW DET?
2. How do female PDHPE teachers in the NSW DET view their situation in relation to promotion?
3. Are these perceptions the same or different from those of male teachers of PDHPE in the NSW DET?
4. What are the inequities and barriers to promotion for female PDHPE teachers in the NSW DET?

The research was conducted in New South Wales, drawing on teachers who work for the Department of Education and Training, and whose background was in the area of Personal Development, Health and Physical Education (PDHPE). The teachers involved in this research did so voluntarily and both men and women were participants.

The data collection and analysis drew mostly on a quantitative research approach. The first research question was answered through statistical information gathered from relevant sources (e.g. DET). DET data was collected with the help of the PDHPE personnel at the curriculum directorate who gathered the names and gender of each PDHPE head teacher in the NSW DET schools. For a comparison of PDHPE head teachers with mathematics head teachers the CEO for mathematics at the curriculum directorate collected this data from the mathematics consultants for the DET and passed this data onto the researcher. When examining the NSW situation for PDHPE teachers, numbers related to the head teacher level are only being
examined. The reason for this is that it was the only position for which the researcher could get data. Principals, deputy principals and leading teachers were not identified in terms of the KLA from which they came. PDHPE head teachers themselves were not systematically documented and it required appeals to various individuals within the NSW DET, namely the ex PDHPE consultants and the current mathematics CEO, and much gathering and collating on the part of the researcher to collect head teacher numbers (see Appendix E and Appendix F for DSE research approval and UOW ethics approval).

This information was used to establish if there was a disparity in promotion positions held by men and women with physical and health education backgrounds in NSW. The second and third questions were explored through a survey of 303 male and female teachers in the KLA of PDHPE working for the NSW DET. Questions yielded both quantitative and qualitative data.

The data has been analysed in order to identify the range of factors which may contribute to and perpetuate disparity in promotion between women and men in the area of PDHPE within the NSW DET. This chapter provides a detailed description of the research design and methods and procedures which were used to address the research questions.

3.2 METHODOLOGY

Broadly speaking research falls into two categories: quantitative and qualitative. Both paradigms, quantitative and qualitative, have a place in research and often a singular research project lends itself to a combination of the two. The strict dichotomy that appears to exist with regards to quantitative and qualitative research need not be the case, as in appropriate situations a hybrid variation is a viable option (Cohen & Manion, 1989). This study will draw on quantitative data and will use data collected in the survey to help with explanations which lends itself to some supportive qualitative data.

Quantitative research seeks to describe observation on a numerical scale. Characteristics often associated with quantitative research are those such as objectivity, theory driven, generalisation producing, numerical evidence and the like. Research methodology rests on a bottom line truth “... the nature of the data and the problem for research dictate the research methodology” (Leedy, 1993, p.139).
Given this we may generalise to a certain extent and say that if data is numerical then the methodology is quantitative. Similarly if the data are verbal or open then the methodology is usually qualitative.

This investigation also involves an additional further quantitative element. This is in the form of statistical analysis of data obtained from various Department of Education and Training sources.

Quantitative research can generate a variety of outcomes including description, interpretation, verification and evaluation. By combining this with qualitative data it can give the researcher an insight into how people construct meaning. This research will take the form of description of factors affecting promotion and interpretation. It should be recognised that different methods of research are appropriate for different situations. It is evident that survey research is only one possible method that is appropriate when investigating women in teaching and promotion. The survey is perhaps one of the most commonly used descriptive methods of research when the population is large. The design of the study is that of survey research utilising a questionnaire to collect the necessary data. The major component of this study is a quantitative type of survey designed to collect data relevant to answering the research questions. It has been used to produce both quantitative and qualitative information about the participants and the world in which they live and work. It will be used to describe the factors, explore and explain them. The questionnaire is designed to establish both statistical and open information about promotion and career paths of female PDHPE teachers in New South Wales, particularly in relation to comparisons to males' career pathways, promotion issues, experiences and aspirations.

Part A of the survey, which addresses demographic data and information is intended to yield mainly quantitative, statistical information. Part B, which addresses issues around promotion and career opportunities yields both statistical and some qualitative data. Part C involves participants answering open questions, largely designed to elicit responses which will yield quantitative based data with some scope for qualitative explanation.

Research is of little value unless it is accessible to an audience who is able to utilise the research in order to 'make the world a better place.' According to Peshkin (1993), the nature of research was often such that it was seen as valuable only if it gave 'watertight' truths. Apart from the inability of research - be it quantitative or qualitative - to deliver an absolute truth, surely it is important for research to provide
valid glimpses of reality that send us on a path towards understanding that reality - as opposed to truth.

No research paradigm has a monopoly on quality. None can deliver promising outcomes with certainty. None have the grounds for saying “this is it” about their designs, procedures, and anticipated outcomes (Peshkin, 1993, p.23).

3.3 THE SUBJECTS

This study was conducted in secondary and central schools, district and state offices, and other NSW DET related organisations. All participants were from the NSW DET. The study did not extend to the private sector as the researcher was interested in investigating a public institution with the broad view that some of these findings may be applicable to other government departments. The private school system is to some extent different to the public school system and promotional processes and barriers to promotion may take on a different meaning in the various institutions.

Schools, district offices and other related organisations in each of the forty Department of Education and Training districts within New South Wales were sent the questionnaire. Response was purely voluntary. The majority of questionnaires were sent to the schools. The DET publishes annually a book entitled ‘Organisation of Government Schools in New South Wales by District’. This book was used to send surveys to every second school (secondary and central) from every district in order to get a good cross section of NSW government schools. To send it to every school would have been beyond the scope of this thesis. It was also unnecessary as the survey still reached schools in every district in the state (a total of 245 secondary and central schools).

Surveys were sent out to 245 schools across 40 districts representing city, central and rural areas, district offices and other related organisations such as the Board of Studies, 134 schools, district offices and other related organisations responded to the survey, giving a response rate of 55 percent. There were 303 individual responses. Of the respondents 55 percent were women and 45 percent men. The participants in this study were teachers, consultants, education officers, superintendents and inspectors trained with backgrounds in the KLA of PDHPE who were employed by the NSW DET and Board of Studies in 1997. The participants in this study were teachers in secondary and central schools, at district offices, Curriculum Directorate and Board
of Studies. Both women and men were surveyed so that comparisons between the genders could be made.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION

The data for this study were drawn from a number of sources. To answer the first question the main sources of data collection included statistics in relation to women and men in teaching from the NSW DET. To answer the second and third questions a questionnaire was designed and distributed. (see Appendix A)

Establishing the case

The statistical data were gathered from the NSW DET reports and data bases and used to support the entire investigation to demonstrate the current situation and establish a case. This data was used as the first step in establishing if there was a disparity in promotion for men and women working for the DET, the extent of this disparity, and then more specifically whether this disparity was reflected in the area of PDHPE.

In order to collect this data, contact was made with the relevant departmental bodies. In relation to general data on women in the teaching profession the main source was that of commissioned reports conducted by the National Board of Employment, Education and Training. In relation to more specific data in the area of PDHPE, data was collected from the NSW DET Curriculum Directorate and by personally contacting PDHPE consultants. Statistical comparisons of male and female rates of promotion in general and in the area of PDHPE were obtained from data gained from the NSW DET. The information from the DET was gathered from two main sources. First, the curriculum directorate was able to supply the data related to number of head teachers in PDHPE and their gender for 1996. Second, a form was sent to each of the PDHPE consultants which they completed giving the numbers of male and female heads of department in PDHPE in their districts. The Australian Bureau of Statistics data also provided statistical data on women and work.

The Pilot Study

The first draft of the questionnaire was distributed to 15 teachers of PDHPE in a rural coastal town and in Sydney west, for review and discussion in an effort to establish the validity of the instrument. The teachers were asked to complete the survey and make a comment on each section in relation to format, presentation and content.
The second draft of the instrument was distributed to 10 teachers for a statistical test of reliability. They were asked to complete the questionnaire twice, and a correlation between the results was calculated.

**The questionnaire**

In order to gather valuable information from a large population, the main data collection tool was a questionnaire. The survey was developed through use of relevant literature (ABS 1993; Bloot and Browne 1994; Green and Lewis, 1986; Kenway and Willis, 1993; Limerick, 1991; Milligan, 1994; Sampson, 1987), 'expert' advice (lecturers from the UOW, the UOW statistics department and DET personnel), and it was piloted with NSW DET PDHPE teachers and head teachers, re evaluated using the information given from those teachers in the pilot study and revised in order to address the research issue.

The questionnaire was constructed in the following manner. (see appendix A). Section A: Context, Section B: Career and Promotion, and Section C: General Views and Thoughts on Promotion.

The content of the questionnaire was assessed by classroom teachers and head teachers in both city and country NSW. Expert opinions were sought and the questionnaire was then piloted, revised and piloted again (details of this are provided in 3.6).

Section A: Context, was designed to collect demographic data. Questions asked for information regarding the respondent's type of work place, location, his/her employment status, gender, age, marital status and family situation. Information about the length of time employed with the New South Wales Department of Education and training and the type of employment of the respondent was also gathered in this section. Section A also sought information about the participants own educational qualifications.

Data provided the means to match various aspects of each participant's demographic information to his/her career path and various promotion opportunities. For example, it provided the means to identify possible links between gender and promotion, between areas in which the respondent lived and taught and access to promotion, between gender, family status and promotion issues.
Section A also sought information which set the scene for the research project. It provided the means to gain a clearer picture of the people who responded to the survey and to note any possible limitations with the research in regards to the type of respondents. For example, slightly more females responded to the survey, more of the respondents worked in secondary schools rather than in the education bureaucracy and the majority of respondents were married.

Section B: Career and promotion was designed to elicit largely quantitative data with some qualitative data. It focused on issues in relation to career paths and promotion.

Section B was designed to collect data around the following areas:

- respondents' current position and how long they have been in that position
- whether or not respondents' were in promotion positions and if so how old they were when they achieved this position and any other prior promotion positions
- respondents' intentions in regards to going for promotion and the importance of career advancement to them
- postgraduate study and career advancement
- supporters and non supporters in relation to respondents' careers
- factors affecting the chances of promotion
- gender issues and promotion
- skills and attributes needed for leadership and promotion

The data collected in this section of the questionnaire were important for indepth analysis of the perceptions of NSW DET PDHPE personnel in relation to career advancement and promotion. Much of this data was collected for comparisons with other questions, particularly questions in the other two sections of the questionnaire. It was important that this section allowed respondents to not only circle an answer - thus enabling quantification - but also to elaborate on most of the questions and hence provide a greater understanding of how the respondents felt about various issues pertaining to career advancement and promotion.

Section C of the questionnaire - 'General Views and Thoughts on Promotion' - was designed to collect some qualitative types of data in support of the quantitative data. It allowed respondents to answer open ended questions on a number of issues around promotion as well as adding any other thoughts or raising any other concerns that they may not have had the opportunity to do elsewhere in the questionnaire.
Section C of the questionnaire allowed data to be collected in relation to:

- respondent's perceived barriers to promotion for both men and women and also specifically for teachers in relation to the key learning area of PDHPE
- qualities and characteristics respondents felt were necessary in gaining promotion within the New South Wales Department of Education and Training
- specific factors which may have affected individuals' chances of career advancement and general thoughts from respondents in relation to any aspects of promotion

Being optional open questions, obviously not everyone chose to answer these. Many of the respondents did (81%) and therefore the data collected in this section not only elaborates on the rest of the questionnaire, but greatly enriches the data already collected.

The questionnaire was designed keeping in mind Cohen and Manion's (1989) comment that:

> An ideal questionnaire possesses the same properties as a good law. It is clear, unambiguous and uniformly workable. Its design must minimise potential errors from respondents ... and coders. And since peoples participation in surveys is voluntary, a questionnaire has to help in engaging their interest, encouraging their cooperation and eliciting answers as close as possible to the truth. (p.103)

### 3.5 DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

This study involved analysing data which were quantitative in nature and these numbers were analysed using percentage comparisons and establishing significance by the use of chi square. Analysis was made of the statistical data gathered from the Department of Education and Training. The main source of data was the questionnaire which involved analysis of quantitative data and also provided useful insights from the qualitative information gathered in the form of comments and open questions.

The main methods of data analysis from both the DET data and the data from the questionnaire were percentage comparisons and chi square. A brief explanation is as follows:
Percentage Comparisons

Percentage comparisons involved looking at two or more possible answers and comparing the percentage of respondents who gave a particular response with those who gave another response. A simple yes or no question allowed for a comparison of respondents in regards to the two responses. In the case of the DET and the ABS statistics it also allowed for comparisons between men and women and men and women in various age groups and in different circumstances. Percentage comparisons were made on demographic data and on data obtained from the DET (e.g. the percentage of male head teachers compared with the percentage of female head teachers in PDHPE) and in the questions from the questionnaire (e.g. the percentage of females compared to males in promotion positions who had children).

Chi Square

Chi square was used as it is perhaps the most commonly used non parametric test (Leedy, 1993) and is almost invariably used in causal comparative studies. This study involved non parametric statistics because it involved nominal categorical data. Much of the data from the DET, ABS and the questionnaire showed the difference between women and men with numbered yes / no responses or a selection of numbered alternatives, and therefore chi square was used as a principal non parametric technique.

A summary of the type of analysis used for each section of the data collected is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITATIVE DATA</th>
<th>QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Statistical information obtained from DET</td>
<td>-percentage comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-chi square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Section A</td>
<td>-percentage comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Section B</td>
<td>-percentage comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Section C</td>
<td>-percentage comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-questions from section A with B and C</td>
<td>-percentage comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-chi square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUALITATIVE DATA
1. Questionnaire
-questions from sections B and C

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS
-building practical theory:
identifying themes and noting
trends, as these could be
interpreted in the context of
existing literature

Information from the DET
Thes data were tabulated to give essentially percentage comparisons, which forms the
basis or rather the initial groundwork for this research. They were used in the initial
stages of this research to develop some idea of the structure of the relationship
between gender and career advancement.

Chi square has been used to analyse this initial data obtained from the NSW DET in
order to establish if observed frequencies differ significantly from expected
frequencies. It allowed the researcher to classify initial data into discrete categories
and to observe significance. The data was nominal and therefore required the use of
chi square as a non parametric test.

Questionnaire
The analysis procedures for the questionnaire were that of percentage comparisons.
Chi square was used to establish significance. The main data in the questionnaire was
nominal categorical. Therefore data required chi square analysis as a non parametric
test.

The analysis of section A which mainly involved demographic data was largely
conducted on percentage comparisons. It was important to illustrate these results in
terms of figures and tables in order to build a picture of the respondents in terms of:

- place of work
- location of work
- employment status
- gender
- age
- ‘marital’ status
- relationships
- children
• employment with the DET
• schooling
• graduate qualifications
• pre service training
• post graduate study

These data were further analysed by comparing various issues and questions such as gender, with data collected in other sections of the questionnaire. For example, many of the responses from the other sections were studied in relation to question 4 from section A, which asked the respondent about their gender. It was therefore possible to analyse and compare males and females in relation to promotion and career opportunities. Most of these cross comparisons were analysed in terms of percentages and shown in figure and table form. Chi square was used to establish significance and the literature and policy used to interpret these results.

The analysis of section B of the questionnaire contained both quantitative and qualitative aspects. Once again each question was analysed on a percentage comparison basis. In so doing, the researcher was able to build an account of different groups of respondents’ careers and aspects of promotion. The percentage comparisons allowed observations and an overall image in relation to areas such as:
• current position
• years teaching
• age of attaining position
• promotion
• how many years before gaining promotion
• further promotion
• importance of career advancement
• factors which help in career advancement
• factors which hinder career advancement
• post graduate study and career advancement
• personnel important in career advancement
• personnel who hinder career advancement
• access to promotion
• men and women and promotion
• PDHPE and promotion
• qualities and skills for promotion
The data was then used to compare responses of men and women. Section B was also analysed with data from the other sections. Data was also used to make comparisons between multiple variables/questions. Figures and tables were used to analyse the main questions being asked by this research and analysed in terms of tabulated percentage comparisons on multiple variables.

Section C also involved collection of quantitative (and to some degree qualitative) data. Percentage comparisons within questions and between questions were made and figures and tables used to display these comparisons. Questions from section C were also used in analysis of multiple variables in order to answer and support the main research questions.

Section C involved a number of open questions which were coded into specific categories, which then allowed interpretation of meaning and themes relevant to the research questions. General and unique themes were able to be identified and analysed in relation to the overall research questions.

3.6 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Validity

The validity of an instrument represents the extent to which the instrument adequately measures the concepts under study. (Green and Lewis, 1986, p.101)

When addressing validity it is vitally important to address issues around both internal and external validity. Internal validity asks us if the instrument measures what it is intended to measure and external validity asks if you can generalise the information outside of the population you dealt with.

Internal validity is concerned with the question, does the instrument assess what it is supposed to assess? In order to enhance the validity and credibility of the results of this study, the researcher allowed for the questionnaire to be anonymous and confidential, randomly selected schools and hence respondents from all over the State, from both city and rural sectors, piloted the survey.

External validity describes the degree to which generalisations can be made from this particular study to other populations or settings. In order to enhance external validity respondents were randomly selected from all over the State (i.e. every second
secondary or central school in each of the 40 DET districts in NSW), from both city and rural areas, large and small schools, and from district and state offices. The questionnaire items were also based on a comprehensive review of the national and international literature. Generalisations can be made to some extent to other populations. Whilst the questionnaire focused specifically on NSW DET PDHPE teachers, the literature (Bloot & Browne, 1994; Sampson, 1987) shows that there are similarities between PDHPE teachers in NSW and HPE teachers in other states. Therefore results may be generalised to other Australian states to some extent. It is important to note however, that the research was specifically targeting NSW DET PDHPE teachers and therefore this could be seen as a limiting factor in relation to generalisability.

The questionnaire was also validated in early stages of development by the use of expert advice and review of the literature.

Content validity indicates the degree to which the instrument has adequately sampled the total possible meanings or substrata of a concept. Unlike the other operational forms of validity, you assess content validity during the scales early development, not after its completion. (Green and Lewis, 1986, p.104)

This questionnaire was informed largely by an extensive review of the literature, teachers’ comments and expert advice. The content of the questionnaire was assessed by classroom teachers and head teachers in both city and country New South Wales. Much personal reflection took place, along with dialogue with others, including ‘experts’ in the area. Experts included teachers and head teachers in the area of PDHPE, lecturers at the University of Wollongong (UOW) and the statistics department at the UOW.

By piloting the questionnaire validity was increased. Teachers answered the questionnaire and made comments on each of the section describing any difficulties or problems they encountered. They also made general comments which ultimately changed the nature of the questionnaire e.g. a number of ‘older’ men were very upset and quite derogatory about the fact that the initial draft asked mostly about women. As a result it was decided that the questionnaire would include questions about both women and men. This was completed not only so the researcher would be able to make comparisons between the genders, but also so as not to alienate male respondents. This process of pilot and review by experts also ensured the construct
validity of the instrument was increased and that it was suitable to the purpose of this study.

Reliability

A reliable instrument measures what you want to measure consistency “Reducing the amount of error in an instrument increases its reliability ... reliability reflects the consistency of a set of measurements.” (Green & Lewis, 1986, p. 83 - 85)

In its final draft format the questionnaire was distributed to ten PDHPE teachers for the purpose of testing the final instrument for reliability using the test retest principle. The instrument was distributed to two contacts who distributed the questionnaire to ten teachers in total who completed the questionnaire. The contacts collected them and returned them to the researcher. All were completed and returned.

After a period of two weeks another set of questionnaires were distributed to the two contacts, who in turn distributed them again to the same people. The contacts collected and returned them to the researcher. This time only eight were returned with two participants dropping out.

A Pearson - product correlation coefficient was calculated to indicate the level of reliability of the instrument. The Pearson product correlation coefficient was calculated to be 0.8 significant at the 0.05 level. This correlation coefficient indicated that the final instrument was reliable.

Within the questionnaire that was given to the ‘testing’ group, three questions were repeated with slightly different wording. The first, related to ‘current type of work place’ gave a correlation of 0.8 significant at the 0.01 level. The second, related to ‘partners’ gave a correlation of 0.07 significant at the 0.01 level, and the third related to ‘promotion positions,’ gave a correlation of 0.08 significant at the 0.01 level.

The ideal measurement is both valid and reliable. A valid instrument ... measures exactly what you want it to measure, a reliable one does it consistently ... Such a “perfect” instrument has not, does not, and never will exist. Measurement, like most things, has limitations. (Green and Lewis, 1986, p.82)

Having established the validity and reliability of the questionnaire it was then distributed as a major means of data collection.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION TO RESULTS

The focus of this study is the investigation of career and promotional opportunities in PDHPE, of women who work for the NSW DET. The initial task was to determine whether there was a disparity between promotion positions for women and men in NSW DET schools and if so, the degree of this disparity. Once this was established, the task was to identify barriers that exist for female PDHPE teachers in NSW and to understand why this is the case.

While the results often paralleled those of other recent documents and the literature, this study points particularly to teachers in the NSW DET key learning area of PDHPE. A number of unique findings, particularly in regards to age and to merit selection, have emerged, which have only been tentatively addressed, if at all, in other studies.

The survey results will be examined in light of current literature. This chapter will be organised into a number of main areas in order to introduce the material, establish the case and then pursue the reasons for difference in promotion between women and men.

The literature and current policy review has been drawn on to interpret the survey results. By examining the survey results in this context a more insightful understanding of what and why barriers have existed and continue to exist for women in education, and specifically women in the area of PDHPE can be seen.

When establishing statistical significance chi square was used because it involved non parametric statistics with nominal categorical data. The majority of the data from the DET and the questionnaire looked at the differences between male and females with a selection of numbered responses. Chi square enabled the researcher to analyse the data’s statistical significance in terms of an $\chi^2$ value and the degree of significance such as $p<0.01$ or $p<0.05$. 
One of the most important issues to come out of the research is that barriers that exist are not the same for all women. This research indicates it is important to not always treat women as one homogeneous group, but as individuals who fall into many different groups. Aspects such as age, marital status, children, work status and the like impact on all women, but on some more than others. For example for women in 'younger' age groups marital status may not have a significant impact on their promotional opportunities, while for women in 'older' age groups this has been a significant factor. It is in the context of this issue that the results will be examined alongside the literature and the various policies which impact on women in teaching and in PDHPE.

4.2 ESTABLISHING THE CASE

Information from the NSW DET 1998 EEO Annual Report supported the case for research into the area of women in teaching and promotion. It shows that in 1998, 87 percent of all female teachers in secondary schools were not promoted and only 73 percent of all males were not promoted. Almost twice as many male secondary teachers compared with female were at the head teacher or district guidance officer level and nearly three times as many men were at the deputy principal or leading teacher level in comparison to women. When it comes to principals, 391 of the 447 positions were held by men, leaving just 86 positions held by women. This becomes even more meaningful when this figure is looked at in terms of the total men and women at this level. Secondary principals class 2 (lower level) have men holding 77 percent of the total positions at this level and for the position of secondary principal class 1 (higher level), men hold 79 percent of the total positions at this level.

Table 4.1 provides current statistical information which establishes the problem and supports the need for further investigation. It shows the teaching profession as a whole in the NSW DET and first establishes that there are indeed inequities between the number of men and the number of women teachers who are promoted.
Table 4.1: DET secondary teachers: Gender by status level of full time teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>No. of female</th>
<th>% of total female</th>
<th>% of total at this level</th>
<th>No. of males</th>
<th>% of total male</th>
<th>% of total at this level</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>% of grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unpromoted</td>
<td>10 304</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>8 502</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>18 806</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher / District guidance officer</td>
<td>1 353</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>2 449</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>3 802</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy principal / Leading teacher</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary principal class 2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Principal class 1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 896</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>11 692</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>23 588</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Principals</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Promoted</td>
<td>1 592</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3 190</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>4 782</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Payroll file data 31 March 1998

Table 4.2 shows that 94 percent of part time teachers were women in secondary. In the NSW DET in order to apply for a promotion position one must be employed as a permanent teacher (see DET bulletins position criteria - Appendix D). Hence part time, casual or temporary workers will be at a disadvantage in terms of promotion. Given the position criteria for most NSW DET promotion positions and the large proportion of female part time workers, once again the case for investigation of women in teaching and promotion can be seen.
Table 4.2: Part time teachers: Gender by status level of part time (non casual) teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of women and % of total</th>
<th>No. of men and % of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary teachers</td>
<td>2,961</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary teachers</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>4,383</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Payroll file data 31 March 1998

Almost all part time teachers in the NSW DET are women. Yong’s thesis (cited in Tong, 1989, p.184) is that capitalism not only has, but needs, criteria for deciding who should belong to the primary permanent workforce and who shall be relegated to the secondary or underemployed workforce. Women, as Yong suggests, with their traditional responsibility for home duties are not as available for the primary workforce as are men. However women are able to be used when the need arises for part time work, returning to the home and family when they are no longer required.

In looking specifically at the NSW DET PDHPE teachers and promotion to the head teacher level, two major points need to be considered in relation to promotion. Firstly, we can see from Figure 4.1 and Figure 4.2 that the proportion of women in heads of department positions in the area of PDHPE is lower than that of men. In 1996, 27 percent of heads of department in PDHPE were female and 73 percent were male, making this a difference which is statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 21.2; p < 0.01$). The total number of men and women who were teaching in the area of PDHPE in NSW, however, was almost equal (Milligan, 1994). In 2000, 35 percent of PDHPE head teachers in NSW Government schools were female and 65 percent were male. This is a significant difference between these two groups ($\chi^2 = 9; p < 0.01$).

In 1996 27 percent of heads of department in PDHPE were female and 73 percent were male (see Figure 4.1); in 2000 35 percent of heads of department in PDHPE were female and 65 percent were male (see Figure 4.2). In other words, less than one third of the heads of department positions in NSW government secondary schools in PDHPE were held by women. These figures parallel the state overall secondary figure where women comprise 36 percent of the head of department positions (DET EEO Annual Report, 1999). Comparing the 2000 figures for female PDHPE heads of
department with another department, PDHPE appears more favourable to women. For instance compared with 35 percent female heads of department in PDHPE, only 23 percent of heads of department in mathematics were women (NSW DET mathematics consultants, 2000). Mathematics is, however, one of the most male dominated subject areas (Milligan, 1994). Figures for other departments were not available for 2000. Compared with NSW DET 1998 figure, however, it would seem that PDHPE teachers are about average in terms of percentage of women in heads of department positions. What is evident, however, is that currently significantly less women in PDHPE are in head teacher positions when compared to their male counterparts ($\chi^2 = 9; p<0.01$).
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**Figure 4.1:** Percent of male and female in HOD positions in PDHPE in NSW DET schools, 1996

**SOURCE:** DET Curriculum Directorate
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**Figure 4.2:** Percent of male and female in HOD positions in PDHPE in NSW DET schools, 2000

**SOURCE:** NSW DET PDHPE Consultants

Of importance and an encouraging sign is the trend that can be seen when comparing figures 4.1 and 4.2. There has been approximately an eight percent increase in the number of female PDHPE head of departments in NSW government schools since
1996. Further exploration of the factors affecting promotion shows that age is an important factor for women with more young women in promotion positions than young men in PDHPE in NSW DET schools. Yet it is important to still be aware that even in 2000 women are far fewer in head of department positions in PDHPE in NSW than are men.

The statistics collected from the survey / questionnaire responses also support the case for an investigation into women in promotion in PDHPE, as 17 percent of female and 37 percent of male respondents were in promotion positions. This further supports the case for this investigation. It is in this context that a case has been established for investigation into the disparity in promotion for men and women in education and in the area of PDHPE.

4.3 DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE STUDY

Having established the case for investigation, now it is possible to turn to the results of the survey for some insight into why the disparity and inequities existed and continue to occur. Exploring the demographics of the study allows a greater depth of understanding.

From the Tables 4.3 to 4.5 we can see the following demographic picture. The majority of respondents (87%) worked in secondary schools and were employed as permanent full time staff (82%). There were slightly less male (45%) compared to female (55%) respondents. Respondents were quite evenly represented in all age groups except for the 51 - 60 year age group (only 7%). The majority (55%) were currently married and at the time of the survey and there were relatively even numbers of respondents with children (52%) and without children (47%). The majority of respondents had been working with the NSW DET for 0 to 5 years (35%), with 26 percent working for the NSW DET for 6 to 15 years. The majority (65%) of respondents described themselves as being in continuous employment. Just over half of respondents had a Bachelor of Education degree as their graduate qualification (59%) and of all the institutions nominated in the survey, the majority of respondents gained their qualification at Wollongong CAE / University (30%). It is also evident that only 24 percent of respondents had undertaken or were undertaking post graduate study.
Table 4.3 Personal profile of respondents - age, gender, relationships, children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>R'ship</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep/div</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defacto</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Work profile of respondents - place of work, employment status, years working for the DET, continuous employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of work</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Employ status</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Years with DET</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Cont. employ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. sch</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>Perm. ft</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cent. sch</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curr. dir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job share</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis. off</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21+</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Sec. sch = secondary school; Cent. sch = central school; BOS = board of studies; Curr. dir = curriculum directorate; Dis. off = district office; Perm. ft = permanent full time; Cont. empley = continuous employment.
Table 4.5 Qualifications of respondents - graduate qualification, pre-service training, post graduate study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grad. qual</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Post grad study</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dip. ed</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (includes approx. 30 diff institutions)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also important to look at the demographic data in relation to gender in order to develop an understanding of the situation for women in this study. Of the respondents 165 (55%) were female and 137 (45%) were male. Whilst this is not an exactly even split, given the voluntary nature of the survey, there was a relatively even proportion of both men and women who responded to the survey.

Of both female and male respondents the majority were in the 22-30 year age bracket, 44 percent female and 31 percent male. There was, however, quite an even proportion of respondents from all age groups except the 51-60 age group. (See Table 4.6.) Half the female respondents and 61 percent of the male respondents were married, with 44 percent of female respondents and 62 percent of male respondents with children (See Table 4.6).
Table 4.6: Personal profile of respondents, by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>married</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>div/sep</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defacto</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest proportion of both female (37%) and male (34%) respondents had been working for the DET for 0 to 5 years. However, 27 percent of male respondents and only 17 percent of female respondents had been working for the DET for 21 or more years (see Table 4.7), despite there being a slightly greater percentage of women over 40 amongst the respondents.

A significant gender demographic ($\chi^2 = 9.2$, $p< 0.01$) is that while 75 percent of male respondents had been in continuous employment, only 58 percent of women had (see Table 4.7). This is perhaps indicative of the number of women taking breaks in their careers. Related to this is the proportion of women who have not been in continuous employment (Table 4.7). Sixty eight percent took leave to have children and no males taking this type of leave. This question asked respondents to indicate the purpose of their leave by checking on or more of the following lists: children, illness, travel, study or ‘other’ purposes. Of those indicating that their employment had not been continuous, 20 percent of women and 68 percent of men cited ‘other’ reasons for
leave and provided specifics. Women cited the following reasons (in order from most mentioned to least):

- other job / employment 64%
- family commitments / pregnancy complications 21.4%
- long service leave 14.3%
- compassionate 7.1%
- leave without pay 7.1%
- rest 7.1%

Men cited the following 'other' reasons for leave (in order from most mentioned to least):

- other job / employment 56.5%
- rest 13%
- no continuous work when casual 13%
- representative in sport 8.7%
- long service leave 8.7%
- resigned 4.3%
- house renovations 4.3%
- wanted a transfer 4.3%

The following (Table 4.7), gives an overview of the work profile of respondents. This shows a gender breakdown of years working with the DET, employment status and reasons for leave.
Table 4.7: Work profile of respondents, by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years with DET</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>permanent full time</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>casual</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job share</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous employment</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for leave</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>children</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that family commitments are a major issue for women, causing them to take leave. Whereas if men chose to take leave it was more for themselves as opposed to family commitments. It is important to note that women still cited family commitments in ‘other’ reasons even though they had the option of choosing children as a reason from the list provided. Clearly this is an important issue for women.
Table 4.8 Qualifications of respondents, by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate qual</th>
<th>%fm</th>
<th>%m</th>
<th>Post grad qual</th>
<th>%fm</th>
<th>%m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dip. ed</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Graduate qual = graduate qualification; Post grad qual = post graduate qualification; %fm = percent of females; %m = percent of males.

Another related gender statistic is that the majority of female (60%) held as their graduate qualifications a four year Bachelor of Education and male (60%) respondents held as their graduate qualification a three year Diploma of Education (see table 4.8), and similar numbers of female (23%) and male (26%) respondents had undertaken post graduate study.

4.4 PROMOTION POSITIONS

PROMOTION POSITIONS IN THE NSW DET

For the purpose of this survey promotion was defined as any position that was higher than that of classroom teacher or classroom teacher with advanced skills status. In the questionnaire respondents were given a choice of responses from ‘classroom teacher’ to ‘principal’ and they could also choose ‘other’ and specify another position. Of those 78 respondents who were in a promotion position 55 percent were head teachers of PDHPE, with the next most common promotion position being that described as ‘other’ (33%), followed by PDHPE consultant (14%). ‘Head teacher’ is the term used in the NSW DET schools for a teacher who is incharge of a faculty or specific key learning area(s) within the school. That is, they can be head of a particular key learning area, a number of smaller key learning areas, or have responsibility for an area such as welfare, administration or curriculum studies.

The next level of promotion above/beyond head teacher within the school is that of deputy principal or leading teacher. These two positions hold the same ‘rank’ and refer to teachers who are a level above head teacher. Deputy principal and leading
teacher are generally referred to as positions which assist the principal. The principal is the highest level within the school. The principal is ‘in charge’ of the whole school and within the position of principal there are levels based on the size of the school. A P1 for example is in charge of a large school whereas a P5 is in charge of a very small school. Within the secondary school the deputy principal, leading teacher and principal make up what is known as the senior executive. Head teachers, deputy principals, leading teachers and principals are collectively known as the executive.

Those teachers who are in roles outside the school such as consultants, senior education officers, principal education officer, chief education officers and superintendents make up what is known as non school based positions. When a non school based worker returns to the school, they return to the level they left at and not at the level they are at in their non school based position. For example, a person had been a head teacher and gained a position as a senior education officer level 2 (which is roughly the equivalent of deputy principal or leading teacher in the school), s/he returns to the school (other than by merit selection process) as a head teacher.

**WHO IS IN PROMOTION**

There were more than twice as many male respondents in promotion positions as female respondents (See Table 4.9).

Table 4.9: Respondents in promotion and not in promotion - by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoted</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in promotion</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not promoted</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the respondents from the survey 17% of females and 37% of males were in promotion (See Figure 4.3). Of all respondents in promotion positions 36 percent were female and 64 percent were male. This is similar to the DET figures which show that in PDHPE in NSW DET schools in 2000 of those who were head teachers 35% were female and 65% male (data collected from NSW DET PDHPE consultants).

FACTORS AFFECTING PROMOTION

The survey results indicated that there was a number of factors for the respondents which affected promotion. While most components seem to bear some relevance, some are more outstanding than others. There appears to be a number of factors which affected both the male and female teachers who responded to the survey in similar ways. The following are the most outstanding factors differentiating those in promotion from those not in promotion positions.

Employment status

Employment status was a strongly differentiating factor with regards to those in promotion positions and those who were not. When viewing the employment status of the female and male respondents generally and then examining women and men in promotion positions, the overwhelming majority of respondents were permanent full time employees. As a factor affecting promotion, employment status i.e. being in permanent full time employment was significant, with 95 percent of those in promotion being in full time employment \( \chi^2 = 31.4 \ p<0.01 \). The impact of this when looked at in conjunction with other related factors for women, will be discussed later in the chapter. For example, is it enough to say that now that women in total were more likely to be in part time positions than men?
Table 4.10: Type of employment, by promotional status and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of employment</th>
<th>% of females in promotion</th>
<th>% of males in promotion</th>
<th>% of females not in promotion</th>
<th>% of males not in promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job share</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm full time</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not surprising that those women and men who had gained promotion were predominantly permanent full time workers. As discussed earlier promotion within the NSW DET requires the applicant to be a permanent teacher. The promotion system continues to discriminate against teachers who are in job share or part time work as they are often seen by colleagues as having a particular orientation to work in which work is only secondary to their family or other commitments (Porter, 1995; Wearing, 1996).

Supportive partner

Another shared factor affecting promotion for women and men was that of having a supportive partner (for those who had a partner). Respondents were firstly asked if they had a partner and then later in the survey they were asked if their partner was supportive of their career. (See Question 35) Table 4.11 indicated a significant 91 percent of women and 93 percent of men in promotion positions said that they had a supportive partner ($\chi^2 = 70.5 \ p<0.01$). Table 4.11 also shows that less women (81%) and men (88%) not in promotion positions felt they had a supportive partner, compared with women in promotion (91%) and men in promotion (93%). Another section of the survey asked further about their partner’s support along with other people in their lives who were supportive of their careers. (See Question 30) The responses from this question did not discriminate between the support they received from their partners and the support they received from other people in their lives such as colleagues and family. However it did indicate once again that their partners were supportive of their careers.
Having a supportive partner appears to be a vital factor for those in a promotion position who have a partner. There were less women and men who were not in promotion positions who felt they have a supportive partner. Women, it would seem from the literature (ABS, 1993), are more likely to support their partners career than are men. Sampson (1991) found in her study of teachers that: Women significantly more often than men gave their partners career as an important reason for their unwillingness to seek promotion (p.133).

If one has a partner, having one that is supportive obviously provides a more positive environment for career advancement than if a partner is not particularly supportive.

**Post graduate study**

Of significance ($\chi^2 = 6.8, \ p<0.01$) is that nearly twice as many respondents in promotion positions (39%) as compared with those in non promotion positions (19%) had post graduate degrees. Of those in promotion positions, a similar percentage of women (39%) and men (39%) either had undertaken or were undertaking post graduate study.
This is interesting in that, although it is not essential to hold post graduate degrees within the NSW DET in order to gain promotion, nor is it even encouraged by policy, more of the respondents in promotion positions had post graduate degrees (39%) than those not in promotion positions (19%). Although the survey did not yield data which showed whether or not those respondents in promotion gained their post graduate degree before or after gaining promotion, over half the teachers both in promotion positions (60%) and not in promotion positions (54%) responded positively to the question ‘do you think that post graduate study is important for career advancement?’ In spite of NSW DET policies, it would seem that among respondents there was a widespread perception that post graduate degrees are important for career advancement.

**Not being as equally placed as other KLAs for promotion**

The respondents were asked whether they felt as equally placed for promotion compared with teachers in other KLAs? This question was posed as a result of the literature which indicated that PE is a marginalised subject area (Kirk, 1992) and that the marginal status of PE impacts on the career of those in the subject area (Templin, Bruce & Hart, 1988).

Figure 4.5 indicates that the majority of female and male respondents (70%) believed that educators in the PDHPE KLA were equally placed for promotion. However approximately one third (31%) of respondents believed they were not.
Figure 4.5: Educators in the PDHPE KLA are or are not equally placed for promotion as for other KLAs

Of the 94 respondents who said that they believed they were not equally placed for promotion in relation to other KLAs, 66 made comments. The three most common reasons, from most to least frequent, the ‘marginality’ of PDHPE as a subject and therefore of its teachers, the availability of fewer head teacher PDHPE positions, and the absence of a head teacher as a role model.

Both women and men gave similar reasons as to why they felt they were not equally placed, but put them in a slightly different order. The reasons men gave in order from most to least cited, with some typical quotes from the male teachers, were:

1. fewer head teacher PDHPE positions (55%)
e.g. “PDHPE are (sic) often smaller faculties and not all schools have PDHPE head teachers” or “Fewer head teacher positions”
2. ‘marginality’ of PDHPE as a subject and therefore of its teachers (38%)
e.g. “no, we are still not recognised by traditional subject areas as being as important as they are in many ways” or “Stereotype of PE teachers works against you”
3. not having a head teacher as a role model (7%)
e.g. “our area has been 16 years without a PDHPE head teacher - we have had a welfare head teacher” or “no head teacher role model”
The reasons women gave from most to least quoted, with some typical quotes from female teachers, were:

1. ‘marginality’ of PDHPE as a subject and therefore of it teachers (57%)
e.g. “Our current head teacher has applied for over 40 deputy principal jobs and not been promoted, deputy jobs seem to go to English head teachers” or “The KLA is still perceived as being run by sport and not brains”

2. fewer head teacher PDHPE positions (29%)
e.g. “Not as many head teacher positions as other faculties’ or “PDHPE faculties are often smaller with no head teacher”

3. not having a head teacher as a role model (7%)
e.g. “Because we don’t have a head teacher there is no role model for us” or “We haven’t even had the opportunity to be acting head teacher over our own KLA, people from other faculties have had that opportunity but not us, we have no PDHPE head teacher role models”

*other reasons quoted were single responses and not grouped (7%)
e.g. “PDHPE teachers hardly ever get deputy or principal positions”
e.g. “Broad knowledge of curriculum does not seem to be there.”

If we look at the reason respondents gave we can see the following support for these. In regards to fewer head teacher positions, whilst state wide figures have been difficult to obtain, a look at a number of districts would give some support to the teachers comments. In the Sutherland district for example at the beginning of 2000, there were 13 high schools with 8 head teachers of PDHPE and yet 13 head teachers in Mathematics and English. In St George district there were 12 high schools with 6 head teachers of PDHPE but 12 head teachers of Mathematics and English. If we look at a small rural district the case is no better for PDHPE. In Broken Hill district there were 2 head teachers of PDHPE. However for Mathematics there were 4 head teachers. In Bathurst district there were 4 PDHPE head teachers and 9 mathematics head teachers. Not only does this indicate that there are less head teacher positions than some other KLAs such as mathematics and English, it also follows that there would be a lack of head teacher PDHPE role models for PDHPE teachers.

The other reason often mentioned was the marginality of PDHPE and therefore its teachers. In support of this finding, a study conducted by Templin, with Bruce and Hart (1988) in the United States, found that of significance was the marginality of physical education as a subject and the consequence of this was marginality with regards to career direction.
Bloat and Browne’s study (1994) also supported respondents’ claim with regards to the marginal status of PE and its effect on career advancement. They explained that:

The historical reality of boys’ PE conducted by lazy and in many cases, poorly qualified males resulted in the “jock” image of PE, which has in the past been responsible for a range of negative perceptions about the subject’s status and credibility and this unfortunately still lingers. (p.6)

The fact that women put the marginality of PDHPE higher than men is also supported by Bloat and Browne (1994) who found that:

Being a female leader of a traditionally male dominated and lower status subject becomes a double disadvantage. The unfortunate aspect of the situation is that while there exists a lack of female leadership in PE, male dominance in the area is perpetuated and women continue to be deterred from striving for promotion. (p.7)

FACTORS AFFECTING PROMOTION: THOSE WHICH DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN FEMALE AND MALE RESPONDENTS

Associated with those findings which clearly differentiate between women and men in promotion, there were a number which were of importance. This will be expanded to develop a picture of those circumstances which are barriers to women in PDHPE and those factors which may in fact benefit women in relation to promotion. As such these figures need to be looked at in comparison to men and to unpromoted women.

Type of school

As a starting point, an unexpected result was the differences which the type of school attended seemed to make for male respondents. Examining Table 4.12 alongside Table 4.13 some pertinent factors in relation to schooling start to surface. It shows us that 30 percent of male respondents in promotion positions attended a single sex school, whereas for those males not in promotion positions only 16 percent attended a single sex school. This difference was not found among the female respondents. However, in contrast, women in promotion positions were more likely than men to have attended a coeducational school (79%). While this may not be statistically significant it is still worth some consideration.
It is possible that boys who attended single sex schools were brought up with a tradition where PE and sport were highly regarded and valued and therefore this has carried through in their drive and quest for promotion. This differentiating factor raises a number of questions in relation to the nature of the schools attended: were they private schools, Catholic or government schools and would this have made a difference? It may also be because of the greater age of male respondents and therefore the greater likelihood of attending single sex boys schools. This information is not available from the data but indicates that it may be worth further research and analysis.

Table 4.12: Respondents in promotion positions and school attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>% of females</th>
<th>% of males</th>
<th>% total</th>
<th>% total of overall respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of school attended</td>
<td>Single sex</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13: Respondents not in promotion positions and school attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>% of females</th>
<th>% of males</th>
<th>% total</th>
<th>% total of overall respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of school attended</td>
<td>Single sex</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualifications

In relation to graduate degrees more women (63%) than men (50%) in promotion positions hold as their graduate degree a four year Bachelor of Education. (See Table 4.14.) This is related to the age factor which shows that far more young women in promotion (21%) are in the 22 to 30 year age bracket than men (4%). More men hold three year degree in education, a degree which was superseded by a Bachelor degree
in most universities in the late 1970s. This will be discussed further, however, it is important to show this connection. Of significance ($\chi^2 = 6.8$, p<0.05) also is that nearly twice as many respondents in promotion positions, 39 percent, as compared to those not in promotion positions, 19 percent, held post graduate degrees (see tables 4.14 and 4.15).

Table 4.14: Degrees by gender and total, of those in promotion positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>% of females</th>
<th>% of males</th>
<th>% in promotion</th>
<th>% total of overall respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>Diploma of ed</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of ed</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate degree</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15: Degrees by gender and total, of those not in promotion positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>% of females not in promotion</th>
<th>% of males not in promotion</th>
<th>% not in promotion</th>
<th>% total of overall respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>Diploma of ed</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of ed</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate degree</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would seem that from the above statistics that having a post graduate degree is associated with enhancing a persons chance of promotion. However, merit selection within the NSW DET does not state the need, requirement or benefit of a post graduate degree when applying for promotion. It may be that having a post graduate degree is indicative of the drive or ambition of a person.

Examining the number of respondents who have post graduate degrees in relation to whether or not they have children it can clearly be seen as another related factor. Figure 4.6 shows that of female respondents with post graduate degrees only 43
percent had children, while of male respondents with a post graduate degree 82 percent had children. Using chi square once again we can see this is of statistical significance ($\chi^2 = 12.2$, $p<0.01$). Clearly once again this factor, having and rearing children, impacts on women's ability to pursue another factor which may help them gain promotion i.e. having a post graduate degree. This begins to point to a relationship between having children and promotion for women. This will be discussed further when reviewing the results with regards to relationships and children.

Figure 4.6: Respondents with post graduate degrees and children, by gender

Age, gender and promotion

With Figure 4.7 showing the overall majority of respondents in the 22 to 30 year age bracket for both women and men, but also with the broad middle range 31 - 50 years, accounting for 52 percent of female and 58 percent of male respondents, it is important to investigate this in light of a number of aspects. These aspects include the age of respondents who are in promotion positions, how long they had been working for the DET before gaining their first promotion position and seeking to understand the effect of the merit selection process on all of this.

Figure 4.7: Respondents by age and gender
Figure 4.8 shows us that of those respondents in promotion positions it is clear that for women, age is a notable factor. Women under 40 make up 64 percent of promoted women whereas for men the reverse is the case. Men over 40 make up 64 percent of promoted men.

![Graph showing respondents in promotion positions by age and gender.](image)

Figure 4.8: Respondents in promotion positions, by age and gender

Of those respondents in promotion positions more women than men fall into the younger age brackets. (see Figure 4.8.) 21 percent of women in promotion positions compared with 4 percent of men are in the 22 to 30 year age group. This is highly significant ($\chi^2 = 11.6, p<0.01$). In the 31 to 40 year age group, 43 percent of women in promotion positions fall into this age group and only 32 percent of men do. If this group is representative of the NSW PDHPE population it suggests that more young women in PDHPE are achieving promotion than young men.

At the other end of the scale of those respondents who were in promotion positions however, in the 41-60 age group more men (64%) than women (37%) in promotion are in this age bracket. In order to tease out the significance of age, there is a need to look at how long both women and men had been working for the DET before gaining their first promotion position alongside the age of female and male respondents.

In terms of the amount of time respondents were working for the NSW DET before gaining their first promotion position, just over half achieved it in the first 10 years. Over 80 percent of respondents in promotion had achieved their first promotion position in the first 15 years of teaching. Not statistically significant but still a differentiating factor that slightly more women (22%) than men (18%) had achieved promotion in under 5 years. As time working for the DET goes up so too does the number of men compared to the number of women achieving promotion.

The average age for women in teaching in the NSW DET is 41.8 years and for men it is 44.7 years, men being on average nearly three years older than women.
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becomes relevant when we see that young female respondents in this survey were
being promoted at a greater rate than young men, but then as women were older they
were not outdoing men in the promotion stakes but rather falling behind. It is worth
being reminded that female PDHPE teachers still only make up approximately one
third of head teachers (NSW DET, 2000), and when we look at principals in general
in secondary schools only 22 percent are women and 78 percent are men (Milligan,
1994).

Another indicative factor is the move from the list and seniority system of promotion
to the merit selection process. The introduction of merit selection has enabled men
and women apply for promotion at earlier ages. This maybe of benefit to women
who, as this study would indicate (see Table 4.16), are gaining promotion at an earlier
age, possibly before they take time out to have children.

Table 4.16: Respondents in promotion positions, age and years working for the DET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% of fm in promo</th>
<th>% of m in promo</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Yrs working for NSW DET before promo</th>
<th>% of fm in promo</th>
<th>% of m in promo</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This may indicate that for young people things are changing. It could mean that in the
1990s young women in NSW were achieving promotion in PDHPE, whereas women
many years ago were not. Women may now be choosing to have children later in life
and work towards achieving promotion earlier on in their careers. This interpretation
is supported by data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (1998) which shows that
women are starting child bearing later in life.

The median age at childbearing has increased from 26.1 years in 1977 to 29.4
years in 1997. In 1997, women aged 26 years had the most births ... By 1997
birth peak occurred in 29 year old women ... the proportion of women having children at the ages of 40 years and above has increased from 0.9% to 2.1% in the last twenty years as women have continued to have children later in life. (ABS, 1998, p.2)

Related to this is the number of children women are choosing to have. In 1998 there were 14600 less births registered than in 1992. Along with this, on current rates, 28 percent of women will not have children in their lifetime (ABS, 1998).

These figures would suggest that women are choosing to start families later in life and they are increasingly not having any children. This may in part account for the incidence of young women in this study achieving promotion.

Life trajectory polarisations between generations of women (Walby, 1997) may be seen in part to contribute to the growing emergence of successful young women.

This would also suggest that many years ago it was harder for women to gain promotion at a younger age, and it gets harder as they get older. Women as they get older may be a part of different social contexts. They may find different attitudes from their partners' and also have an added issue of childcare. It may also mean that times are changing i.e. the social context for women in schools.

**Promotion, relationships and children**

There are many aspects which impact on women and promotion. However, none more so than their relationships and children. Many of the following factors discussed, although not seeming to be direct questions about relationships and children, will be demonstrated by being linked to these factors.

The majority of respondents in promotion positions were married with the next most common status being single (see Figure 4.9). Figure 4.9 demonstrates that of the respondents in promotion positions 82 percent of males were married and only 57 percent of females were married. This is an indicator that marital status is a factor in promotion for women. When analysed further of those in promotion who were married 28 percent were women and 72 percent were men, this is a statistically significant difference between the groups ($\chi^2 = 33.8$, p<0.01). Of those in promotion positions, if married and defacto were combined, it would account for 86 percent of men in promotion positions and still only 68 percent of women (See Figure 4.10).
This is statistically significant \( (\chi^2 = 4.67, p<0.05) \) and it is a differentiating factor between the two groups. For women in promotion positions 25 percent reported as single, yet only 8 percent of males in promotion positions were single (see Figure 4.9). It would seem that for women being married and being able or willing to go for promotion are not necessarily compatible.

![Figure 4.9: Marital status of respondents in promotional positions](image)

When examining the data around promotion and relationships a number of interconnecting factors need to be examined. Of the respondents in promotion positions only women in PDHPE worked at the Curriculum Directorate and only men at the Board of Studies. (see Table 4.17). At the time of the survey while only one response came from the Board of Studies, there was in fact one man and one woman working there in the area of PDHPE, with the male respondent in the senior position. At the time of the survey the two senior positions at the curriculum directorate, chief education officer (CEO) and senior education officer grade 2 (SEO2), were held by
women who had not married and had no children. The male inspector at the Board of studies was married with children. While the numbers are not statistically significant they are suggestive of a pattern identified in the literature.

The work environment is designed for males who have a woman at home to care for their children, themselves and the relevant household chores. In fact, in the 1990 Australian Bureau of Statistics, data shows that fewer than 19% of Australian families are structured this way now. Nevertheless, there is an element of truth in employers’ assumptions because women do still take primary responsibility for child care and household tasks, even when in full time employment. (Wearing, 1996, p.144)

The Curriculum Directorate and Board of Studies requires its employees to work ‘administrative’ hours i.e. 9am to 5pm. Whilst they generally work above and beyond the required hours, employees must at least be available during these hours. Administrative hours are obviously more accessible to both women and men who are not the primary carers of children. The fact that the three women who hold positions in PDHPE at the Curriculum Directorate and Board of Studies do not have the responsibility of children says something about the possible limitations for women who would like promotion into these areas, but who also have children.

Table 4.17: Respondents place of employment, total and by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Employment</th>
<th>% of total females</th>
<th>% of total males</th>
<th>% of females in promotion</th>
<th>% of males in promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of studies</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central school</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum directorate</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District office</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Children

Of those respondents in promotion positions 90 percent of men had children yet only 47 percent of women had children (see Table 4.18). Clearly this is a significant factor which impacts on women and promotion ($\chi^2 = 14.93$, $p<0.01$). Of a most contradictory nature is the statistic related to the question which asked respondents if they were the primary carers of their children (if they had children), which indicates that whilst 57 percent of women believed they were the primary carers of their children, an astonishing 73 percent of men in promotion positions believed they were the primary carers of their children (see Table 4.18). Sampson's study (1987) does not support this statistic and nor does the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) records of time spent by women and men as carers of children and on domestic duties. The ABS (1993) states that a survey conducted in 1987 showed that married women with children spent more of their day on unpaid work compared to men. Overall women did approximately four times the amount of housework as men, about three times the amount on food preparation and cleaning up, and approximately eight times the amount of time on laundry. A survey conducted by the ABS in 1992 showed that women spent twice as much time each day on household duties as men and approximately three times as much time each day on child care/minding than men. (see Figure 4.11).

Figure 4.11: Average daily time spent on unpaid work, NSW, 1992
Source: 1992 Time Use Survey

Sampson (1987) with the assistance of all state member unions of the Australian Teachers Federation, conducted a study which sought to discover how aspirations and choices with regards to promotion were constructed within Australian government
schools. Her study points to the way women’s aspirations, choices and career priorities change because of family responsibilities.

More cogent reasons for the differences in men’s and women’s promotion seeking behaviour emerged when family related factors were investigated. Many more men had children living in the same household (62% male but only 38% female) but women were much more likely to be solely responsible for a child for more than four hours per day (65% of women who had children living in the household compared with 28% men). Although there were 62% of women who had no children living in the household, women teachers across all age groups did much more housework of various kinds than men (88% female and 65% male performed three or more tasks for others). (Sampson, 1987, p.30 - 31)

Why is it then that male respondents in this survey felt that they were the primary carers of children, when in fact it is far more likely to be women of whom 53 percent had taken leave (primarily for children) compared to 13 percent of men who had taken leave primarily for ‘other’ reasons? (see Table 4.18 and Figure 4.13). All this would seem to dispute the assertions of male respondents in promotion positions, that they are the primary carers of children.

The figures from this study parallel those of Sampson’s 1987 study, but more of this population had children. however, far more men in promotion positions (90%) than women (47%) had children indicating an important differentiating factor between female and male respondents. Having children has a number of possible consequences for women in relation to promotion. Of these continuous employment, employment status and shifts in career aspirations are of consequence.

**Continuous employment**

![Figure 4.12: Respondents in promotion positions and reasons for leave (if any taken), by gender](image)
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Tied in with women’s roles in family life is the notion of continuous employment. Table 4.18 shows that while 53 percent of women in promotion had taking leave only 13 percent of men did not have continuous employment. The importance of this is far reaching. Figure 4.12 shows us that the main reason for women taking leave was for children (80%), whereas for more of the male respondents travel and ‘other’ reasons were the case and children were not a reason at all. This is highly significant ($\chi^2 = 9$, $p<0.01$). A study conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics in 1991, indicated that the incidence of women withdrawing from the workforce during early child rearing years was not only noticeable, but also had important effects in terms of their confidence, on their returning to work and in turn promotion.

Table 4.18: Respondents in promotion and non promotion positions and factors affecting promotion, by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>% of females in promotion</th>
<th>% of males in promotion</th>
<th>% of females not in promotion</th>
<th>% of males not in promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary carers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous employment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An uninterrupted career influences career chances in a number of ways. There is the issue of seniority as well as continuity. Those persons who have not had breaks in their careers have more opportunity to, and are likely to be more confident in, keeping up with all the changes that constantly take place in the work force and in education. They have more opportunity for networking and keeping up with current trends.

The obvious effect on women’s career is the decreased chance and opportunity for promotion, when compared with men who are not taking on the role of primary carer or major household responsibilities and hence who do not have breaks in their career. Men do not appear to have the same need to be splitting time between work and family / household responsibilities as do women. Not only is the interrelated nature of women’s paid and unpaid work critical in determining the nature of women’s paid
work - hence the high proportion of women in teaching - but it also emerges as an inhibiting factor in women's opportunities for promotion. When they do come back to work it often means a change of employment status to that of part time, casual or job share.

**Employment Status**

The employment status of female and male respondents generally and of women and men in promotion positions, was overwhelmingly that of permanent full time employees (See Table 4.19). Of consequence, however, is that when women as a category are isolated, Table 4.19 indicates that while 78 percent of female respondents were permanent full time employees of those women in promotion positions 93 percent had the employment status of permanent full time. This is to be expected given the NSW DET job criteria for women and men includes the need to be permanent and also given the division if jobs in many schools along gender lines.

The most massive barrier to the application of the merit principles in bureaucracies is the division of labour. Those who fall outside the criteria of eligibility to apply are ineligible to apply despite their suitability for a position. (Martin, 1987, p.445)

We can see the importance of this when we view the New South Wales DET Personnel Bulletin (which advertises DET promotion positions). The NSW DET Personnel Bulletin states that:

Applications ... are invited from:
* **permanent** DET teachers for ...
* **permanent** DET teachers who ...
* **permanent** DET teachers and casual teachers with a **permanent** DET teaching approval ...
* casual teachers with a **permanent** DET teaching approval who ...
* **permanent** school administration and support staff ... (NSW DET Personnel Bulletin, 2000, p.1) (see Appendix D).
Table 4.19: Type of employment, total and by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of employment</th>
<th>% of total females</th>
<th>% of total males</th>
<th>% of females in promotion</th>
<th>% of males in promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job share</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm full time</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore women, who for many reasons, none the least of which is their child care and domestic responsibilities, make up the majority of part time employment within education, are starting from a negative position when it comes to promotion. Overall within the NSW DET, women comprise 90 percent of part time work, job sharing and part time leave without pay (EEO Annual Report, 1999).

During 1998, 9 719 staff in schools and state offices accessed part time work options including permanent and temporary part time work, job sharing and part time leave without pay. Women made up 8781 (90.3%) of staff accessing these options. Of the 20 878 staff who took short term absences for family and community responsibilities during 1998, 14 644 (70.1%) were women. (EEO Annual Report, 1999, p.9)

The EEO figures compare with those in this study. While less women in this study were in part time, casual or job share employment, they still comprised the majority (71%, n = 31) of those in part time, casual, or job share employment (see Figure 4.13).

Figure 4.13: Gender breakdown of respondents in part time, casual or job share employment
**Shift in career aspirations**

The results of the survey do not support the case that women may just not want to be in promotion positions but men do. Equal percentages of female and male respondents (52%) indicated that promotion was important to them however a greater percentage of women (45%) compared to men (32%) felt that they did not have equal access to promotion.

Table 4.20 shows that of those respondents already in promotion positions approximately 10 percent more females than males intend to go for further promotion. However, when we look at female PDHPE respondents who have children compared with those who do not, we see a relevant factor once again emerge. Children, for women, appear to be an inhibiting factor in relation to going for further promotion. While 64 percent of women in PDHPE overall said they intend to go for further promotion, only 43 percent of women in PDHPE with children intended to apply for further promotion.

When examining women and men overall (Table 4.20) a different pattern again can be seen. While overall 64 percent of women in promotion positions said that they intended to go for further promotion, only 54 percent of men said they do. While this is not statistically significant it raises a number of issues for further research. Are women more ambitious than men? Is it that more women in promotion who responded to the survey were young? Whatever the case, we can still clearly see that women with children are less likely (43%) than men with children (57%) to say that they intend to go for further promotion (see Table 4.20).

Table 4.20: Respondents in promotion positions intentioning to go for further promotion, total and those with children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intention to go for further promotion</th>
<th>% of total females in promotion</th>
<th>% of total males in promotion</th>
<th>% of females in promotion with children</th>
<th>% of males in promotion with children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.18 shows that female respondents in promotion positions are less likely than their male counterparts to have children. If they do have children they are more likely to have breaks in their career due to their children. With factors such as childcare and family commitments, household duties, breaks in career and being primary carers, impacting on women, it is little wonder that in 2000 there were only 35 percent of women and yet 65 percent of men, and in 1996 73 percent of men and only 27 percent of women in NSW DET held head of department positions in PDHPE.

The Sampson study of Australian teachers and promotion (1987) provides us with an insight into the results of the study. It supports and underpins many of the findings described in this thesis. In studying and discussing barriers to or factors affecting promotion for women in teaching in New South Wales Sampson (1987) stated that:

Findings from this study have provided evidence that female teachers' qualifications and self perceptions cannot be singled out as an overriding cause for their reluctance to apply more frequently for promotion. More pertinently there are data showing that many of them acknowledge a responsibility to their homes and families in terms of their non work time which most male teachers do not. This must be a powerful factor preventing many women from initiating the often troublesome and time consuming routines associated with applying for promotion. For men, however, family ties or not (and there is more evidence than formerly believed of men acknowledging these ties from this research) the demands of the promotion process seem worth it because, from the start of their teaching career, they have had their competence and suitability for organisational / administrative types of roles cultivated in numerous ways. (p.40)

Summary

Thus far we can see from the data that women in promotion in NSW DET schools teaching PDHPE are more likely to be young (40 and under) than are the men, and they are more likely than men to be single. They are more likely to have been in continuous employment than those women not in promotion positions and less likely to have children than women not in promotion positions or than men in promotion positions.

Table 4.21 summarises the important factors which have been identified in the study as impacting on PDHPE women's chances of promotion. Age is a factor, in that of those respondents in the 22-30 age group, 21% of women in promotion were in this
age group whereas only 4 percent of men were ($\chi^2 = 11.2$, $p<0.01$). Clearly if this study is representative, then younger women are gaining promotion in PDHPE. Table 4.21a gives a closer examination of this particular group of women.

Table 4.21a: Women aged 22-30 in promotion positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>% yes</th>
<th>%no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity leave</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate degree</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to go for further promo</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of skils for promo</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The entire 21 percent of women in the 22-30 age bracket who were in promotion did not have children and hence maternity leave did not impinge on their career paths or chances for promotion. Half of these women were married possibly indicating that it is not necessarily marriage which is a limiting factor for women in this age bracket as far as promotion goes but having children may be. The majority (83%) had a bachelor degree and 67 percent had completed a post graduate degree. Most of these women (67%) felt that they did lack any skills which would help them to gain promotion and 83 percent intended to go for further promotion.

Of the whole cohort of women respondents in promotion positions 93 percent were permanent full time, whereas 74 percent of women not in promotion were permanent full time. Similar numbers of women (48%) and men (49%) not in promotion were married. However, only 57 percent of women compared to 82 percent of men in promotion positions were married. Although the majority of women (71%) and men (76%) not in promotion had children, less than half of women in promotion (45%) had children and the vast majority of men in promotion (90%) had children ($\chi^2 = 13.5$, $p<0.01$). In relation to breaks in employment of those not in promotion 56 percent of women had breaks and 43 percent of men. But of those women in promotion 53 percent had gained promotion despite having breaks in employment, and yet only 13 percent of men had breaks in employment. The most common reason
for women in promotion having a break in employment (75%) was for children, whereas for men (86%) it is for ‘other’ reasons such as “I just needed a break”.

Table 4.21: Factors impacting on promotion, by promotional status and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>% of females in promotion</th>
<th>% of males in promotion</th>
<th>% of females not in promotion</th>
<th>% of males not in promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age i.e. 22-30 years</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status i.e. perm full time</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status i.e. married</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children i.e. yes</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaks in employment i.e. yes</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining results of this study alongside the literature we can see a number of factors emerge which affect women teachers’ chances of promotion. At this stage they do not seem to be specific to women in PDHPE. However, the case will be made later that from the point of view of respondents the ‘marginality’ of PDHPE does have an impact on promotion of both men and women. The interrelated nature of the factors already discussed will be seen when specific predisposing factors of women in teaching and PDHPE in promotion positions are examined.

At this stage the results provide evidence of the interplay of factors such as type of employment (the need to be permanent full time), age and marital status, children and child rearing, breaks in employment, reasons for these breaks and the far reaching effects these factors combined have on women and promotion.

Table 4.22 shows that of those respondents who have been promoted the majority go no further than the head teacher / consultant level, 71 percent of the female respondents and 73 percent of male respondents (when head teachers and consultants are summed). Of importance, however, is that of all those PDHPE teachers who responded to the survey only men were in deputy principal positions. Also only one district superintendent with a PDHPE background responded and he was male. While this research shows that in 1996 and presently 33 percent and 35 percent respectively
fewer women held PDHPE heads of department positions (see Figures 4.1 and 4.2), none of the female respondents went past this level within the school. That it is not to say that there are no female PDHPE teachers at the deputy principal or principal level, or no women at all in these positions as data from the 1994 commissioned report into women in the teaching profession shows us otherwise Milligan, 1994). It is likely that female PDHPE teachers follow trends similar to teachers in general, for example in 1992 when 50 percent of the teaching staff in Australian secondary schools were female, in NSW in that same year the ratio of male to female principals was 7:1 (Milligan, 1994, p.16 & 73).

Table 4.22: Respondents in promotion, level of promotion by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>% of females</th>
<th>Number of females</th>
<th>% of males</th>
<th>Number of males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy principal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not only in New South Wales where women’s roles and the family are intimately related and affect women’s chances of promotion. Support of the New South Wales situation can be seen, for example, in Western Australia. Trotman (1984) in her study of family ideology and its effects on women in education found that historically the family ideology affected the gender division within the teaching profession, and it continues to do so.

This study shows support for and highlights family roles and ideologies as a contributing factor to promotion, or lack of, for female PDHPE teachers in NSW. The research (Milligan, 1994; Sampson, 1987; Trotman, 1984) also indicates that these issues, particularly in relation to children, are factors in women’s careers in teaching not only in NSW but Australia wide.

From this study there exists within teaching and PDHPE a gender division which cannot really be fully understood without consideration given to the structure and beliefs that exist around family. Removing overt discrimination within career structures of the teaching profession generally, and within PDHPE, may certainly be
necessary changes for the betterment of women teachers. However, they are unlikely to be sufficient.

4.5 FACTORS INFLUENCING PROMOTION FROM RESPONDENTS’ VIEW POINTS

The survey provided opportunities for respondents to write down some of their own views and thought with regards to:

- skills and factors which may have helped or hindered them in gaining promotion
- child rearing, child care, maternity leave or ‘other’ factors affecting their chances of career advancement
- equality of access to promotion by gender and in regards to the PDHPE KLA.

While respondents may have felt that certain factors worked for or against their gaining promotion, these are not always necessarily reflected in who is gaining promotion. We now need to explore this more fully.

This section of the survey began with two questions requiring a yes/no response. The first asked respondents whether there were factors which have helped them gain promotion, the second, asked respondents whether there were factors which have worked against them gaining promotion. (see Table 4.23.) Of the female respondents 59 percent believed there were factors that contributed to or would contribute to their gaining promotion as compared with 62 percent of male respondents. Of those in promotion positions 89 percent of female respondents and 74 percent of male respondents said there were factors that helped them gain promotion. For all the female respondents 47 percent and for all the male respondents 53 percent saw that there were factors that worked against them in gaining promotion. Of those respondents in promotion positions 61 percent of women and 56 percent of men felt that there were factors that have or would work against them gaining promotion. Interestingly 14 percent more women in promotion positions wrote this, as opposed to the general opinion of female respondents. Women in promotion positions may have seen these factors more readily as they have worked their way through the promotion process.

There was not a great deal of difference between the percentage of female and male respondents who indicated that there were factors that helped them gain promotion and factors that worked against them gaining promotion (see Table 4.23). There were
89 percent of women and 74 percent of men in promotion who felt there were factors that helped them gain promotion.

Table 4.23: Respondents’ beliefs about factors which may work for and against gaining promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>% of females</th>
<th>% of males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors help gain promotion - total</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors help gain promotion - those in promotion positions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors working against gaining promotion - total</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors working against gaining promotion - those in promotion positions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors working against gaining promotion - total</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors working against gaining promotion - those in promotion positions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors working against gaining promotion - total</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors working against gaining promotion - those in promotion positions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors respondents felt would help them gain promotion

The comments (185 in total) of those teachers who responded to the question - are there any factors that you believe will help you gain promotion or have helped you in the past? were grouped into categories after the researcher had read every comment and was then able to see the emergence of general themes. For example, comments such as “wide experiences at school”, “involvement in whole school decision making”, and “various roles taken within current school”, were grouped together as ‘whole school involvement and experiences.’

A variety of comments were made, but on analysis, some common themes emerged. These fell into the following categories from most stated to least stated, and typical examples of the comments made indicate the meaning of the various categories.

Women’s overall responses
1. whole school involvement and experiences (25%, n = 36)
   e.g. “wide experiences at school and taking on many roles and extra curricula activities”
2. experience generally, including experience acting in promotion positions (20%, n = 29)
e.g. “experience acting in promotion positions”
3. extra qualifications (17%, n = 24)
e.g. “further educational qualifications”
4. interpersonal skills (13%, n = 18)
e.g. “good personal qualities”
5. knowing the right things to say at interview and on their CV / sucking up (12%, n = 17)
e.g. “knowing the right people and sucking up and ‘performing’ well at interviews”

**Men’s overall responses**
1. extra qualifications (21%, n = 28)
e.g. “post graduate studies”
2. experience generally including experience acting in promotion positions (17%, n = 23)
e.g. “experience and lucky enough to be acting in promotion position”
3. whole school involvement and experiences (15%, n = 20)
e.g. “involvement in whole school decision making and various roles taken within the school”
4. hard work / commitment / ambition (12%, n = 15)
e.g. “hard work and ambition”
4. knowing the right things to say at interview and on their CV / sucking up (12%, n = 15)
e.g. “sucking up to the right people, its not what you know its who you know.”

**Women in promotion positions**
1. whole school involvement and experiences (28%, n = 10)
2. extra qualifications (17%, n = 6)
2. experience generally and experience acting in promotion positions (17%, n = 6)
2. dedication to teaching (17%, n = 6)
5. interpersonal skills (14%, n = 5)

**Men in promotion positions**
1. experience generally including acting in promotion positions (17%, n = 10)
2. extra qualifications (15%, n = 9)
3. whole school involvement and experiences (12%, n = 7)
4. dedication to teaching (12%, n = 7)
5. right interview and CV /sucking up (11%, n = 6)
**Women not in promotion positions**

1. whole school involvement and experiences (25%, n = 26)
2. experience generally including experience in acting positions (22%, n = 23)
3. extra qualifications (17%, n = 18)
4. right interview and CV/sucking up (15%, n = 16)
5. interpersonal skills (12%, n = 13)

**Men not in promotion positions**

1. extra qualifications (24%, n = 19)
2. experience generally including in experience acting positions (16%, n = 13)
3. whole school involvement and experiences (15%, n = 12)
4. hard work/committed/ambition (13%, n = 10)
5. interpersonal skills (6%, n = 5)

Responses can be further divided into those where there seems to be an assumption about what the system values and those which improve the ability to take on a promotion position. It is important from the outset to note that apart from the first response of experience, participants responded to the issue with what they thought the system values and not necessarily what improves their capacity to do the job. Comments such as the ones mentioned above, show this. Comments such as “knowing the right people” and “networking”, indicate an answer to what they felt the system would value.

Generally when total responses from female and male respondents, overall women referred more often to factors that they called personal qualities such as empathy, communication and the like, as helping them gain promotion. Whereas men referred to these as such things as “ambition”, “commitment”, and “hard work.” A subtle but important difference which is referred to in the literature review and the research around men’s and women’s leadership styles (Connell, 1995; Sinclair, 1998). When we look at women and men who are in promotion, their top four responses (although in a slightly different order) are the same. However, for women the fifth most common factor they felt may help or has helped them gain promotion, was their interpersonal skills. For men it was different, with comments about being able to write a good CV and sucking up to the right people indicating that they felt this is what the system wanted. In relation to responses of those not in promotion a difference occurred between women’s and men’s responses in that in this case women made more comments about writing a ‘braggy CV’ and sucking up, whereas men believed factors such as hard work, commitment and ambition may work for them gaining promotion.
Factors respondents felt worked against them gaining promotion

When asked if they felt there were factors that worked against them gaining promotion, 50 percent (n = 152) of respondents answered “yes.” Of those, 47 percent were women and 53 percent were men. Very few made comments (this was optional). However, among the factors which respondents believed worked against them gaining promotion are some important issues. Both women and men stated that being too young was a disadvantage. This is somewhat surprising given that this research showed that young women in PDHPE were gaining promotion. Of the men who elaborated on factors they felt worked against them gaining promotion, the main reason (56 out of 81) was that they felt that the introduction of EEO had been disadvantageous to them for example one said that “the emphasis on creating equity between males and females in promotion positions limits males opportunities”.

While EEO policies cannot guarantee equity their purpose is to do so. The figures previously discussed in this chapter would suggest that although EEO has had some impact on improving womens’ conditions there is still a long way to go for women in teaching and in PDHPE teaching.

The men’s issues with EEO seemed to be connected to the belief that the merit selection process was disadvantageous to them. Some even went so far as to say that women were being selected over them simply in order to fulfil EEO quotas for example, “in some cases EEO dictates that a certain percentage of applicants for promotion must be women. This may well be at the expense of men who are suitably capable of attaining promotion”. This is not as surprising as one might believe if this were to be put into the context of a backlash against EEO and feminism (Thornton, 1982; Wearing, 1996). Women on the other hand quoted the ‘transfer’ system, which overrides the merit selection process, and favours those with seniority, as being disadvantageous to them e.g. “the new system where transfer overrides merit”. It is important here to recall the large study conducted by Batten, Griffen and Ainley (1991) where it was seen that teacher appraisal was considered to be a more positive experience by women teachers than men, suggesting perhaps that men are not as comfortable with a merit selection process as are women.

There appears to be an uncertainty in the population which encourages various forms of backlash against claims of group disadvantage and calls for redress through policies and targeted funding. As Lingard and Douglas (1999) point out:
In Australia, both conservative and far right wing politicians now seek the support of blue collar males - the battlers in Australian parlance - in the context of a new racism, anti feminism and insecurity ... the result is a situation of backlash and critiques of affirmative action programs and the like and sustained and vehement criticism of success of the progressive agenda across the previous decades, often framed within attacks of so called political correctness. (p.127)

Backlash policies and resentment in education have emerged. It seems as though that often these focus on policies which may seek to redress disadvantages experiences by women such as EEO and merit selection. These results support the emergence of backlash.

Although both women and men had issues with merit selection, they were very different issues. Men as a whole indicated that they preferred the old list system, where after ten years of teaching (including teacher training) you were eligible to be inspected then put on the eligibility list for promotion for example one man commented “I was on the list before the new merit selection came in now I’m disadvantaged.” Obviously this system required some form of seniority. Women on the other hand indicated that their problem with merit selection was the concession that was brought back, in that transfer (based on points) would override merit selection, showing to a certain extent a return to the seniority aspect of the old list system. This can be disadvantageous to women and if we look at the number of women compared to men in PDHPE who were on the promotion eligibility list having gained list 2, we find support for this. As an example in 1983, 58 male and only 18 female PDHPE teachers had list 2 and therefore were on the eligibility list for promotion to head teacher. Of those PDHPE teachers in head teacher positions in 1983 86 percent were male and only 14 percent were female.

However, a further question (question 43) which asked respondents about specific issues affecting their chance of career advancement such as “child rearing”, “child care”, “maternity leave”, and “other” issues, elicited some important and interesting responses. Questions around children were specifically asked as the literature (Porter, 1995; Randell, 1993) indicated that these were very relevant. The option to write down ‘other’ factors gave the researcher some valuable information.
In relation to the question asked of respondents, “Do you see any of the following factors affecting your chances of career advancement: child rearing, child care, maternity leave, and other?” - Table 4.24 shows support from the data for earlier findings that child rearing, child care and family commitments are major barriers to women and promotion and interrupts their careers.

Table 4.24: Factors affecting chances of career advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>% of fin overall</th>
<th>% of m overall</th>
<th>% of fm in promotion</th>
<th>% of m in promotion</th>
<th>% of fm not in promotion</th>
<th>% of m not in promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child rearing</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat leave</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of female and male respondents overall shows a significant difference ($\chi^2 = 11.96, p<0.01$) in relation to the respondents belief that child rearing, child care and maternity leave may work against their chances of career advancement. For women 62 percent of those who responded to the question believe that child rearing was a factor, but for men, this was only 29 percent. Fifty two percent of women believed that child care was a factor, but only 25 percent of men. In relation to maternity leave, 43 percent of women felt this might impede their chances of promotion but 8 percent of men felt that maternity leave might affect them.

In relation to those in promotion positions and child care 30 percent of women and 23 percent of men believed this was a factor working against their gaining promotion. These figures do not necessarily match the figures in studies previously discussed in this chapter. This may be due in part to the question regarding respondents’ perceptions. For example, the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 1995 reported study shows that on average childcare/ child minding time is approximately three times higher for women than for men. Another study which evaluated the 1998 Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Department of School Education (DET) in NSW strategies found that:
During 1998, 9,719 staff in schools and state office accessed part-time work options including permanent and temporary part-time work, job sharing and part-time leave without pay. Women made up 8,781 (90.3%) of staff accessing these options. Of the 20,878 staff who took short term absences for family and community responsibilities during 1998, 14,644 (70.1%) were women. (DET EEO Annual Report, 1999, p.9)

Whereas overall only 17 percent of women and 30 percent of men indicated ‘other’ factors in response to this question, of those in promotion positions 37 percent of women and 34 percent of men indicated ‘other’ factors. (see Table 4.24). The ‘other’ factors could be grouped as follows, from most cited to least cited:

**Women**
1. family obligations e.g. “broken service and not as much time to give to the job because of the family”
2. lack of mobility e.g. “as we are both settled we would have to move for one person to get promotion”
3. rural living e.g. “living in the country”
4. transfer system e.g. “the change of merit selection process - transfer overrides”

**Men**
1. lack of mobility e.g. “distance from schools”
2. lack of incentive e.g. “lack of incentive and possible loss of lifestyle”
3. age (too old) e.g. “age - I’m too old”
4. travel e.g. “going on holidays for a year”.

For women the main ‘other’ factors were family obligations, lack of mobility, rural placement and transfer system, and for men they were lack of mobility, lack of incentive, age (too old) and travel. Again for women family obligations were important factors affecting career advancement, but for men they were not featured at all.

**Importance of and access to career advancement**

While equal percentages of female and male respondents (52%) indicated that promotion was important to them, a greater percentage of women (45%) than men (32%) felt that they did not have adequate access to promotion. (See Table 4.25.)
Table 4.25: Respondents’ beliefs about access to promotion and importance of promotion, by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to promotion</th>
<th>% females</th>
<th>% males</th>
<th>Importance of promotion</th>
<th>% females</th>
<th>% males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities for promotion for females and males

Figure 4.14 shows that more females than males believed that women and men do not have the same opportunities for promotion, 33 percent of women believed they did not have the same opportunities for promotion as did men and 14 percent of men believed there was inequity. Respondents were asked to give reasons for their answers and with 56 out of 69 respondents of those who answered ‘no’, making comments, some insight into their perceptions of this issue can be gained.

Figure 4.14: Respondents beliefs as to whether women and men in education have the same opportunities for promotion, by gender

Of those male respondents who commented, the top three comments when grouped were:

1. gender inequity - EEO is disadvantageous to men (71%, n = 22)
   e.g. “positive discrimination for women of the past 15 years”
2. women are disadvantaged due to family commitments (24%, n = 7)
   e.g. “females with families are disadvantaged”
3. discrimination against the PDHPE KLA (6%, n = 2)
   e.g. “other teachers are being seen as higher than PDHPE teachers”.
The comments around EEO and its effect on men centred around a notion that there must be a certain number of women in promotion positions and therefore whether or not they deserve it, they are being promoted. Examples of quotes from the male respondents support this for example, “EEO and other factors show that a disproportionate number of females attain positions, disadvantaging men.” And “With EEO the playing field is biased towards women”; and “EEO has actually disadvantaged males unfairly”.

Of those female respondents who commented on why they said men and women do not have the same opportunities for promotion as each other, the top three comments grouped were:

1. family responsibilities (48%, n = 12)
   e.g. “females are disadvantaged by personal obligations such as family commitments”

2. males are already in the top jobs and they employ other males (perpetuates male dominance) (24%, n = 6)
   e.g. “I believe that male PE teachers due to their competitive sports background are averse to the influence a woman PE teacher may have on their ingrained attitude that males can only dominate”

3. women are perceived as lacking the ‘right’ leadership qualities (e.g., strong discipline, authority) (12%, n = 3)
   e.g. “women are generally not really encouraged to apply for promotion as leadership traditionally is dominated by men”

* other reasons quoted were single responses and were not grouped (17%, n = 4)
  e.g. “single females still have aspersions made about their sexuality”.

One of the main barriers quoted by women above, apart again from family responsibilities, was that they felt that they were perceived as not having the ‘right’ leadership qualities such as discipline and authority. Sampson (1987) shows support for this finding:

Throughout their lives, women do not receive the kind of social ‘message’ which men do, encouraging them to aspire to authority, in particular to managing or controlling other people, especially as leaders of men. Many images relating to outstanding women are negative or threatening ones for women (Horner, 1969, Leder, 1984). Even school children in Australia have been shown to have stereotyped perceptions of females and males in the principal role. (p. 37)
Barriers to promotion for female and male respondents in the PDHPE KLA

Respondents were asked to comment on barriers to promotion specifically for female or male teachers (questions 39a and 40a), and then barriers to promotion for each gender specifically in PDHPE (questions 39b and 40b). More respondents felt that they did not experience any barriers particular to their gender and KLA. Overall however, there was still 22 percent of respondents who did perceive barriers specific to either women or to men in the PDHPE KLA.

Table 4.26: Barriers to promotion for teachers generally and teachers of PDHPE, by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Barriers for male teachers generally</th>
<th>Barriers for male PDHPE teachers</th>
<th>Barriers for female teachers generally</th>
<th>Barriers for female PDHPE teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those men who perceived barriers particular to male teachers of PDHPE, only two main reasons could be categorised from the open responses.
1. they felt restricted to teaching and head teaching in male or coed schools (50%, n = 16)
2. they felt there was some pressure in that they were being watched e.g. “sexual harassment” (20%, n = 7)
* the rest of the comments were single responses and not grouped e.g. “need to be prepared to move the whole family” (30%, n = 10).

Women, on the other hand, who believed barriers existed to promotion which were specific to female PDHPE teachers wrote the following when categorised from the open responses.
1. physical education and physical activity is seen as a male domain / tied in with ‘masculinity’ e.g. “males are often still preferred in PE organisation and administration and sport roles, females face the barrier of a male dominated field” (40%, n = 13)
2. fitness and fatigue play a factor with age e.g. "physically demanding job affected by age" (17%, n = 7)
3. they felt restricted to teaching and head teaching in female and coed schools e.g. "not as many girls only schools and therefore less positions" (13%, n = 4)
*the rest of the comments were single responses and not grouped e.g. "male colleagues are worried that female PE teachers won't do as well if they have children" (30%, n = 10).

The notion of PDHPE and specifically physical education and physical activity being tied in with ideas around ‘masculinity’ and that it is seen as a male domain, has been discussed and supported in Chapter 2, the review of the literature. Given that physical education and physical activity is still seen to some extent as the domain of that of white, male and middle-class (Flintoff, 1990) and that the curriculum, whilst having undergone change in theory, is still in some instances taught with this underpinning, it is little wonder that women see the ‘masculinisation’ of their subject as a barrier to promotion.

When asked about their beliefs about barriers to promotion specific to either men or women in PDHPE many respondents (just over 50% of those who answered yes to whether there were barriers to promotion for men and women in PDHPE) made comments which they felt applied to both women and men. This was indicated by a response being given to the question which asked about male PDHPE teachers and then writing “as above” for a similar question on females. The main responses from most to least quoted were:
1. ‘marginality’ of PDHPE KLA and PDHPE teachers (60%)
2. fewer head teacher positions in PDHPE (20%)
3. stereotyping of PDHPE teachers as ‘jocks’ (15%)
* other comments were single responses and not grouped (50%)

Once again marginality of the KLA and hence PDHPE teachers was quoted, as was fewer head teacher positions in PDHPE. In addition a number of respondents (15% of those who answered “yes” to barriers specific to PDHPE teachers) believed that being stereotyped as ‘jocks’ was an issue particularly when seeking promotion at the senior executive level. This ties in with the marginality of PDHPE teachers.

4.6 CONCLUSION
This is a number of important factors related to female PDHPE teachers in the NSW DET, which are likely to influence their chances of gaining promotion and to
distinguish women in promotion from those not in promotion and which differentiate between women and men. From the survey data, Table 4.27 shows us that while many factors are perceived to affect women’s chance of career advancement and promotion, and many are interrelated, the most significant have to do with relationships and children.

Table 4.27: Summary table: Factors affecting promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predisposing factors</th>
<th>% of women in promotion</th>
<th>% of women not in promotion</th>
<th>% of men in promotion</th>
<th>% of men not in promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate study</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child rearing / family role</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are primary carers</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have taken mat leave</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not perm. full time</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe both women and men have the same chances at promotion</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age - 40 and under</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When taken together the factors summarised in Tables 4.27 can be seen to be mostly related to women’s roles within the family. Viewing the factors which differentiate the groups, from Table 4.27, it shows that 39 percent of women in promotion had undertaken post graduate study compared with only 20 percent of those women not in promotion. Another factor is that female respondents in promotion positions had less belief that they had the same chance for promotion as men. Only 56 percent of women in promotion, as opposed to 70 percent of those women not in promotion, believed they had the same chance for promotion as did men. This lack of belief of those women in promotion may have been a factor which urged them to work harder in their quest for promotion. In support, a female respondent in promotion reveals how these women felt: “women have to work twice as hard as men.” These two factors, post graduate study and lack of belief of equity in promotion - can also be related to five of the other factors, as seen in Table 4.27 (childcare, child
rearing/family role, primary carers, maternity leave and breaks in employment). All these relate to women’s actual tasks in relation to children and/or the family.

Of the female respondents already in promotion positions only 30 percent, compared with 56 percent of those not in promotion positions, found childcare to be an issue for them. Sixty percent of females in promotion positions compared with 79 percent in non promotion positions were the primary carers of children. Only 22 percent of those in promotion compared with 46 percent of those not in promotion believed maternity leave to be an issue for them. Another related factor is that, compared to 26 percent of women not in promotion, only seven percent of those in promotion were not in full time work.

Table 4.27 shows that 64 percent of women respondents in promotion were under 40, whereas only 36 percent of men in promotion were under 40. Thus showing age to be an important factor. So, too is marital status: as indicated in Table 4.27 only 57 percent of female respondents in promotion positions were married compared with 82 percent of male respondents who were married.

The study shows overall that the following are predisposing factors of those women who had gained promotion. They are:

- more likely to have undertaken post graduate study
- less likely to see child care as an issue for them
- less likely to see child rearing and family duties as an issue for them
- less likely to be the primary carers of children
- are predominantly permanent full time workers
- less likely than women who have not gained promotion and men overall to believe they have the same chance at promotion as men.
- less likely to be married than men
- more likely to gain promotion at a younger age than men

Analysis of data collected in this study show a clear barrier to promotion for women which is related to relationships and children. Significant factors of child care, child rearing, maternity leave, marital status and having children are all related to women’s roles in society which still primarily see them as the major careers of families and children.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.1 OVERVIEW

In this chapter the results will be discussed in relation to those findings which show a clear connection to the purpose of this study. The intention of the study was to establish if there were disparities and inequities in promotion for female PDHPE teachers in the New South Wales (NSW) Department of Education and Training (DET) and linked organisations, in relation to their male counterparts. Once the case was established, the main aim of the study was to discover and analyse these inequities and the predisposing factors for women in PDHPE who had gained promotion.

Hence, the purpose of the study was to examine the factors that influence career and promotional opportunities from the point of view of female teachers currently teaching PDHPE in NSW DET secondary schools and related organisations.

In order to complete this data collection and analysis the quantitative research approach was drawn on the most. The case was established through statistical information gathered from relevant sources (e.g. DET). PDHPE teachers' careers and promotional opportunities and teachers perceptions of the factors influencing teachers' careers and promotional opportunities were explored through a comprehensive survey of PDHPE teachers in the NSW DET. Existing literature was used to help understand the results of this survey.

5.2 THE ISSUES

The literature around women in teaching and promotion indicates a number of factors which can work against their gaining promotion. These include family relationships, a male model of leadership, the bureaucratic allegiance to patriarchy, policy, viewing women as one homogeneous group, the gendered division of labour, and issues around part time work and breaks in career (Blackmore and Kenway, 1993; Hall, 1996; Lather, 1991; Martin, 1987; Milligan, 1994; Mills, 1997; Porter, 1995; Sampson, 1987; Telfer, 1993). These are related to each other to some extent as will be shown.
In addition, the literature related to women teaching in PDHPE and promotion shows similar factors to those mentioned above. Whilst research specifically related to this area is limited in Australia, a study conducted by Bloot and Browne in Western Australia (1996) indicate that a number of factors contributed to the underrepresentation of female heads of department in physical education in Western Australia. As with other studies Bloot and Browne found that the male model of leadership, patriarchy within the education system, the perceived impact of policies on promotion, family responsibilities and lack of encouragement and support, were factors which can work against women gaining promotion. In looking specifically at physical education they also found that the image of physical education was a factor which worked against women gaining promotion. Bloot and Browne found that “being the female leader of a traditional male dominated and lower status subject becomes a double disadvantage” (1994, p.7). The above factors, along with the factors specifically related to PE which were found to be disadvantageous to women seeking promotion, were also factors that emerged in this study.

Bloot and Browne (1994) also found that low promotion orientation, lack of skills and female teachers’ own perceptions of their leadership ability were barriers to promotion. These were not so evident to the researcher in this current study. Interestingly in the Bloot and Browne study age was pointed to as a factor inhibiting promotion for women, but not in the same way as it emerged as a factor in this current study. Bloot and Browne found that women in their study generally saw PE as a short term career prospect and teachers made a clear distinction between men and women in that the age factor was perceived as far more crucial and relevant for females. In this current study, however, age emerged as a factor in a very different way. Young women were being promoted at a greater rate than young men in PDHPE, however, there were very few ‘older’ women among the respondents in promotion positions, as will be discussed further.

While female respondents in the current study mentioned many of the above factors in one way or another as impacting on their careers, it was quite clear that the following were the most important and had the greatest impact: childcare issues, child rearing and family duties, primary carers of children, employment status, relationship status, policy and age. While not indicated specifically as an issue, a ‘male’ model of leadership has relevance to specific areas that we addressed such as policy and merit selection as barriers to promotion for female respondents.
There is, however, a number of unique findings from this study which need to be highlighted and discussed, along with those findings which support the literature. The two major differences to come out of this study in comparison to other studies, were that while other studies pointed to family responsibilities, a male model of leadership, patriarchy within the education system, the gendered division of labour, breaks in career, and the image of and issues around PE, they did not see the emergence of different factors affecting various groups of women in diverse ways. In past studies women teachers have been treated as a homogeneous group, however, in this study it has been shown that women are not and should not be treated as a homogeneous group. The emerging trend which has seen the younger female respondents in promotion positions as compared to their male counterparts, is a new and important factor to come forth and further highlights the need not to always see all women as the same. Secondly, problems related to policy issues, particularly around merit selection and EEO, which may be seen as particular to the NSW DET situation, also arose as a new finding in this study.

The impact of family responsibilities
Like the general literature on female teachers and specific literature on female teachers in PE, when the differences between women in promotion and non promotion positions were examined the major distinguishing factors were that fewer women in promotion had children, had issues involving childcare, had issues involving child rearing and family responsibilities, were likely to be the primary carers of children and fewer felt that maternity leave would affect their chances of promotion.

For instance as the literature suggests the domestic responsibilities which fall to women in a patriarchal society such as Australia are significant in terms of their effect on promotion. Just why do domestic and family responsibilities fall to women? Wearing (1996) suggests that in Australian society family and work and public and private have been markedly separated. Historically women have been seen as ‘nurturers’ and men as ‘breadwinners’. As such this gender division of labour has seen men given priority to the workplace and women the home. In a society such as Australia where self worth is associated with paid work “domestic labour and childcare are under valued and responsibility for family maintenance is a hindrance to progression” (Wearing, 1996, p.147).

Employers are also implicated in the struggle women face in relation to family responsibilities and their careers. Employers still take the view that women
employees have the primary responsibility for finding solutions to family problems (Wearing, 1996). Not only are women having conflicts themselves regarding their family responsibilities but they are also battling employers and public perceptions of the role in society as the major trustees of the family. In a study conducted by the HRSCLCA in 1992 as quoted in Wearing (1996) it was found that “employers perceive women’s family responsibilities as a deterrent to their employment and their commitment to work once employed” (p.144).

Linked to this is society’s perception of what women do and what women should do. In Sampson’s 1987 study, she found that many more men had children living in the same household, however women were much more likely to be solely responsible for a child for more than four hours a day. Also, although there were 62 percent of women in the study who had no children living in the household, women teachers across all the age groups did much more housework than men. The current study supported this with more women than men stating that family responsibilities and home duties were a deterrent to their seeking and gaining promotion. More women not in promotion than those in promotion also felt they were hindered by family responsibilities.

With women bearing the major responsibility regarding the family and domestic duties, women who do work find themselves in a situation where they are split between their family roles and their work and professional responsibilities. In a paper presented to the South Coast Branch of Women Educators in NSW (1998) Groundwater-Smith and Furlong pointed out that the home school interface shows itself in regards to the perception that women will inevitably find themselves at odds with their domestic and professional responsibilities, which is seemingly not an issue for male teachers, principals and administrators who also have families, they also pointed out that many see this conflict of interest being resolved with the home winning out over professional duties. This is a great disadvantage in teaching and for those seeking promotion.

In this current study far more men than women in promotion had children. Female teachers not in promotion positions are more likely to have taken time out for children than those women in promotion positions. Women as opposed to men take time out of their career to have and raise children (ABS, 1991). When women with children do work they are more likely than men and women without children to be in part time work. This has major consequences for women’s promotional opportunities.
Related to children and domestic responsibilities is the issue of work status. When we look at women in this study in promotion positions as compared with those not in promotion positions, all but seven percent of women in promotion were employed as permanent full time workers, compared with 26 percent of those women not in promotion. In a study conducted the ABS (1991) it was found that heedless of age, employment, education, social background or income, women on average do approximately 36 hours of domestic work, while men on average do less than half that amount. It is argued by Wearing (1996) that women’s involvement in part time work is a result of their household and child rearing responsibilities and not that part time work for women is the cause of their greater domestic responsibilities. She asserts that the higher a person goes up the corporate ladder, the more that person is expected to separate family responsibilities from paid work. It follows then that women with more family responsibilities are less likely to be able to do this and more likely to have to engage in part time work, therefore less likely to be promoted.

Those respondents in the study in promotion positions had fewer breaks in employment than those not in promotion positions. Akin to this and of importance is that less men in promotion positions had breaks in employment compared to men not in promotion positions. When comparing women and men in promotion we can see that over half of the women in promotion had gained their position in spite of having breaks in their career, compared to a very small percent of men in promotion who had breaks in employment. The most common reason cited by women for a break in employment was for children whereas for men it was ‘other’ reasons and to travel.’ The type of leave men and women had taken may have a different impact with women taking leave such as maternity leave and this seems to have a less impact than leave taken by men such as leave for travelling. However as women take long breaks in their careers to rear children this has an impact on their chances of promotion and does not seem to impact on men’s careers. This shows us that yet another factor which impacts largely on women but not on men in relation to chances of promotion, is linked to children and family responsibilities.

We can clearly see that major factors impacting on the female respondents identified by the study are supported by the literature. Issues related to family responsibilities were significant in this study and supported by other studies. These ultimately all related to society’s perceived role for women and how women and men see women’s role in society at large, in careers, in teaching, and in teaching in PDHPE.
The issue of age

The literature on women in teaching and promotion has tended to talk about women as a homogeneous group (Blackmore and Kenway, 1993; Kelly and Nihlen, 1982; Marshall, 1985; Martin, 1987; Milligan, 1994; Mills, 1997; Partington, 1982; Porter, 1995; Rimmer and Davies, 1985; Sampson, 1987). However, this study points to very different patterns on the basis of age, and the link between age and children. Perhaps the most interesting factor to emerge from this study is that if this study is typical for female teachers of PDHPE in NSW, far more young women in PDHPE were being promoted than young men. This study shows that young women respondents were significantly more likely to be in promotion positions as compared to young men and they were also promoted earlier.

This may be seen in a number of ways. Firstly, from a positive perspective, we may say that the promotion situation for women teaching in PDHPE is changing for the better. Young female PDHPE teachers are achieving promotion. However, we need to be cautious and discuss the possible reasons for this, and see that young women have a number of associated characteristics which are advantages to them gaining promotion compared to older women.

Firstly, from this study and others (Bloot and Browne, 1986; Sampson, 1987) it can be seen that children and family responsibilities are barriers to promotion for women. Is it then that women are choosing to have children and take on domestic responsibilities later in life? While young women may celebrate their choice to do this, it does not negate the fact that women and not men are changing their set of circumstances in order to be able to compete for promotion. This situation does not show us that women are less responsible for children and family duties, but perhaps just delaying their responsibilities. The potential for promotion may not be fully realised because of factors such as those that have already been discussed.

There is support for this interpretation when issues, such as, part time work, married versus non married women in the workforce and women with children are examined. Women make up the majority of part time workers, with the most common reason being family responsibilities. The ABS (1999) indicates that the highest number of part time female workers fall into the 35 - 44 age group, supporting the notion that women are having families later and hence engaging in part time work later. Another supporting statistic from the ABS (1994) is that women who are not married and in the 25 - 34 age group have a higher (approx. 10% higher) participation in the workforce rate than married women. In support of this is the DET EEO Annual
Report (1999) which demonstrates that only 0.8 percent of women teachers in part time work are in promotion positions.

When examining the age at which women have children, it can see from the ABS (1998) that the median age of child bearing has increased from 26.1 years in 1977 to 29.4 years in 1997, and the proportion of women having children at the ages of 40 and above has increased over the last 20 years. In this study, of those female respondents in promotion in the 22 - 30 age group none had children, but of women in promotion in the 31 - 40 age group 43 percent and 41 - 50 age group 50 percent had children. More telling, is that of all the female respondents only one percent in the 22 - 30 age group had children and yet, in the 31 - 40 year age group it was 45 percent. For women in the 51 - 60 age group, their presence in promotion positions declined rapidly. By 51 they are in a dramatically smaller minority. In addition the majority (just under two thirds) of women in promotion positions are under 40. Of those women in promotion positions, women under the age of 40 make up 64 percent of this figure. The reverse is the case for men.

The importance of this finding is far reaching. Firstly we can say that perhaps things are changing for women and promotion, as young women in PDHPE in the NSW DET appear to be gaining promotion more readily than young men. Secondly however, we need to recognise that this statistic still tells us that those barriers women experience such as children, family roles, breaks in career, and part time work, are not necessarily being addressed in a ‘real’ way in DET policies such as merit selection as discussed earlier and structures such as permanent employment status and promotion as discussed earlier. Women are forced to make choices about these issues rather than solutions to these issues being addressed. Thirdly, this also tells us something else of importance. Women are not necessarily a homogeneous group and should not therefore be treated as one. The NSW DET and those involved in the development of EEO policies need to recognise and act on this. They need to recognise that particular groups of women, those in relationships with children and those in ‘older’ age groups are not being addressed as distinct groups in research and policy in relation to careers and promotion.

These issues need to be looked at in further longitudinal studies. We need to know what happens to these young women who gain promotion. Do they stay in these positions or are they further promoted? The question that also needs to be raised and addressed is that is it a different generation and a change in society and culture, or is it simply a process of age and life circumstances.
The issue of merit selection and EEO

In NSW merit selection was introduced in 1991 so that all executive positions would be determined by merit selection. It was amended in 1997 and it was stated that executive transfer would exist (DET Staffing Procedure, 1997). The responses of women and men in the study suggest that they regard DET policies, particularly around merit selection and EEO, quite differently. This study clearly indicated that while men believed that EEO policies worked against them gaining promotion in favour of women e.g. merit selection, women on the other hand felt the policies did not help them and were in some cases a hindrance to them. This is most evident in respondents comments about merit selection. Men’s responses indicate strong feelings and some misconceptions that the policy around merit selection involved the ‘rule’ that a certain percentage of women had to be promoted in schools to executive and senior executive positions (this is not the case). If we view this perception in light of the literature and research, we can see an emerging picture of the ‘failure’ of merit selection as an EEO policy intended to make promotion more accessible to women. Milligan (1994) in her research concludes that while merit selection was introduced in the NSW state school system as an EEO provision, it has not necessarily been successful. If we look interstate in support of this to a study conducted by Mills (1997) in Queensland, she found that the number of women in the promotion positions since the introduction of EEO and the merit process had actually decreased.

An interesting finding in this study is that while male PDHPE respondents in NSW state secondary schools believed that the merit process was disadvantageous to them and advantageous to women, and while some studies (Milligan, 1994; Mills, 1997) indicate that it does in fact not work for women as it was intended, women in this study did not see it as disadvantageous to them. What they did see however, was the ‘loophole’ which was set after merit selection was introduced into NSW DET schools, where essentially transfer overrides the merit panel process, worked against them. In other words, a promotion position in NSW state schools will only be advertised under merit selection if they have ‘special’ criteria and there are no suitable candidates on the transfer list (DET Staffing Procedures, 1997). In support of this Milligan (1994) found that in 1990 in NSW for promotion to principal, while women received only 39 percent of appointments to principal positions, they accounted for 48 percent of appointments in the merit based process and only 24 percent by transfer.
If transfer takes precedence over merit, then what would follow is that teachers who have not had breaks in their career for children or family commitments, who research shows are predominantly men (Milligan, 1994; Porter, 1995; Sampson, 1991), are likely to have an advantage over those who have had breaks (predominantly women). They will have more time and opportunity to ensure not only they meet the transfer criteria, but also will have amassed more transfer points. Therefore seniority covertly becomes a criteria.

It has been suggested that the predominance of transfer over merit has been bought in as a reaction to a backlash which developed when women started gaining promotion by merit (Milligan, 1994). In was a small window of opportunity that opened for women, between when merit selection was first introduced in 1991 and when transfer was put back on the agenda for promotion positions in 1997. Certainly the consequences of allowing for transfer has reduced the effects of merit selection in recognising women’s and men’s different situations, skills and experiences.

**PDHPE as a special case**
The study focused on teachers in the area of PDHPE. Respondents commented on aspects of promotion which directly related to teaching in the area of PDHPE. The marginalisation of PDHPE, the relationship of sport to PDHPE and therefore the ‘masculinisation’ of the subject area were all factors indicated by female respondents as being particular to women in PDHPE and their chances of promotion. This in turn has relevance and gives rise to the issue concerning a ‘male’ model of leadership. Thus for female respondents there was a factor of ‘double marginalisation’; i.e. being a woman in a ‘masculine’ and marginalised subject area.

Women in PDHPE may be better suited to working within the school structure as collaborative leaders. This is opposed to a ‘male’ model of leadership which is seen as a particularly effective method of leadership in a subject such as PE with it’s highly ‘masculinised’ nature and links to sport. Milligan (1994) found that women’s dispositions and personalities are seen to be more conducive to a style of management which involves the devolution of management to the schools and a more collaborative style of leadership. The problem with this for women in PE is that if in fact women are more suited to this style of leadership, and other studies (Bloot and Browne, 1994) indicate a predominance of a ‘male’ model of leadership in PE, then women in PE are disadvantaged. This is linked to the fact that in NSW schools, devolution of management has been occurring. On the surface this may appear to be a more congenial organisation style for women, however as Milligan (1994) points out:
There is a clear coincidence between women supposed dispositions and preferred working styles and the announced objectives of the restructuring agenda. What happens in practice is quite often a different story as a number of studies show. (p.34)

As Bloor and Browne (1994) suggest, the concept of the male model of leadership is closely linked to the stereotyping associated with gender roles and the patriarchal structure of the education system. In physical education where there is an association with sport and therefore a ‘masculinised’ subject area, the tendency to associate leadership with males may be all the more prominent. Bloor and Browne (1994) found that:

... the respondents comments repeatedly pointed to the male model of leadership as a deterrent to the promotional aspirations of female physical education teachers. (Bloor and Browne, 1994, p.6)

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the issues and results already discussed the recommendations to come out of this research are as follows:

1. NSW DET EEO policies need to be reviewed in relation to their effect on women and promotion.

Currently policies have been designed to ensure equal employment opportunities for women and to give women and men a more even ‘playing field’ when it comes to promotion. What the policies do not really consider is the enormous impact of family responsibilities for women in terms of promotion. This study shows family responsibilities to be a significant factor impacting on women’s chances of promotion. NSW DET EEO policies seem to reflect community ideologies regarding women’s and men’s place in society and work. This needs to be considered.

It is vital that NSW DET EEO policies consider women’s position in the promotion and recognise the considerable barriers they face, particularly in relation to family responsibilities, and ensure policies reflect this and help rather than hinder women’s progress.
2. NSW DET EEO policies need to be structured in a way that does not necessarily treat women as a homogeneous group.

NSW DET policies related to EEO, women and promotion need to be reviewed not only in terms of women in general, but in relation to various sub groups of women. When developing policy recognition needs to be given to the issue that women should not necessarily be approached as a homogeneous group. This study clearly shows that certain groups of women, those with children and those in the ‘older’ age groups are still very much disadvantaged, whereas young single women may do very well in relation to promotion.

The NSW DET needs to monitor these trends, identify particular groups of women who may be experiencing discrimination in relation to promotion, and look to design and implement EEO policies that address these groups.

3. More research needs to be done into job sharing and part time work options, and different ways of recognising work patterns and building these into career and promotion structures.

There needs to be more research into job sharing and similar choices for women that may have potential to help women in relation to careers and promotion. Presently those women who request and are fortunate enough to be allowed to job share are still regarded by many as casual workers. Those women already in promotion sometimes have difficulty with principals actually allowing them to job share.

Job share needs to be taken into the career structure and not viewed in the negative way that it currently is. This relates both to perception and policy. Research into how to make job share an integral part of the career structure needs to be undertaken.

It would appear that recommendations related to access to various forms of part time work have been raised and perhaps discussed by the NSW DET however, is this really the issue? It may not simply be a matter of having access to forms of part time work for women. More importantly these types of options need to have a more serious and valued profile within the NSW DET promotion structures.
4. Perceptions about what is and what should be women’s work needs to be addressed and issues around women’s family responsibilities needs to be taken up and addressed by those who develop NSW DET policies.

Whilst issues around women’s family responsibilities and their effect on promotion are not new findings, recommendations related to this need to be considered.

The NSW DET policy makers should firstly focus on looking at how we as a society and the NSW DET as a micron of society, can change perceptions around what is and should be women’s work. In order to do this a great deal more research is needed.

5. More research needs to be done into how to help model leaders other than simply following the current ‘male’ model of leadership which largely exists within the NSW DET and PDHPE.

The male model of leadership, particularly in physical education, which seems to pervade the NSW DET needs to be addressed. A report of a study conducted by Taylor (1992) of Victorian Promotion Practices suggested that even though selection panels expressed a preference for collaborative leadership styles, they in fact responded best to applicants who exhibited leadership styles involving forthrightness, aggressive, demanding and masculine behaviour.

Milligan (1994) suggests the same theme was found in a hearing into employment practices of the Ministry of Education in Western Australia. She cites a quote from an expert witness from the hearing which was conducted by the Western Australian Equal Opportunity Tribunal in 1993:

... senior persons could continue to move up the promotion ladder without having to change their thinking about gender and equal opportunity issues. This tended to create an attitude at school level which blocked equality of opportunity for women ... There had been no push by the Ministry to make principals accountable for their actions. (Rodway, quoted in EO Tribunal of WA 1993, cited in Milligan, 1994, p.35)

More research in NSW needs to be done into how to change criteria and procedures to make recognition of different models of leadership more effective. This in turn may encourage the NSW DET administrators to move away from a predominantly male model of leadership, to valuing varying and different, yet effective, models of leadership. The NSW DET needs to then provide training about leadership that varies from the predominant ‘male’ style and encourage participants to alter their expectations about training for leadership.
6. **Merit selection needs to be reviewed and changed.**

This study has shown that the merit selection process which was introduced into the NSW DET in 1991 and subsequently amended in 1997 has not been seen favourably by either women or men in PDHPE. The 1991-1992 staffing operation stated that all executive promotions would be by merit selection (DSE 1991-1992 Staffing Operations). While there were still problems for women inherent in this, such as the requirement of permanency, women felt this was an improvement over the transfer system, which among other things, relied on seniority. The backlash against EEO and women’s rights seemed partly to cause a rethink of the merit principle and in a memo sent out on the new staffing procedures by the NSW DET in 1997, a statement was made that “executive transfer will exist” (Memo:97/206 New Staffing Procedure, Staffing Operations, p.1). This was seen by women in the study as a backward step, as once again seniority became an issue.

It would appear that the merit selection process needs to be reviewed in light of these issues for women and changed so that seniority is not still at the forefront and that women who take time out for family responsibilities and return to a different form of employment status (e.g. job share, part time work) are not disadvantaged.

7. **Systems need to develop data bases which keep accurate data on various aspects related to teachers generally and teachers in PDHPE.**

When first undertaking this research there was enormous difficulty accessing records which showed the numbers of women in head teacher positions in PDHPE. The Curriculum Directorate was able to give me the 1996 figures, however there were no records for figures for 1996 - 2000. The only way this data could be collected for the study was through contacting all the district PDHPE consultants and prevailing upon them to gather the information in each of their districts. Other KLAS were approached and they also appeared not to have this information. The methods of data collection in other KLAS was similar to that of the PDHPE KLA. Trying to get any information related to age, marital status, children or even the faculties/departments of those women in senior executive positions was almost impossible.

The point being that in order to inform policy and decide on where further research should be done, it is important that the records are kept in order to look at and follow trends. If in fact this information does actually exist it needs to be centralised and far more easily accessible, for EEO purposes as much as anything else.
8. A longitudinal study related to young women in promotion in PDHPE in the NSW DET needs to be taken up.

In relation to the age issue, which appears to be a vital and unique finding of this research, it is important that we ask the question - If young women in PDHPE in the NSW DET are being promoted at a greater rate than young men, why is this so? And does this rate continue or decline?

In order to answer this question, an accurate data base needs to be set up and kept in PDHPE, and in fact in all key learning areas. This should include information related to gender, age and other demographic data for head teacher positions and other executive positions. This way we are able to track trends and undertake further research. This in turn would be a useful means of informing policy and developing EEO strategies.

This research indicated that further research needs to be done in the areas of looking at young women as they get older, research into older women and promotion and factors such as if they had children, if so when, and research into childcare access and facilities. This type of research can be used to inform policy around EEO, merit selection and issues involved in promotion for women.
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APPENDIX A

Questionnaire
SECTION A: CONTEXT

This information is strictly confidential and will be used for statistical purposes only. Please circle the number against your answer or write your answer in the space provided.

| QUESTION 1: Which of the following best describes your current work place? |
|---|---|
| secondary school | 1 |
| central school | 2 |
| board of studies | 3 |
| curriculum directorate | 4 |
| district office | 5 |
| other (please specify) | 6 |

| QUESTION 2: Please give the postcode of your school/ workplace. |
|---|---|
|   |   |

| QUESTION 3: What is your current employment status? |
|---|---|
| permanent full time | 1 |
| part time | 2 |
| casual | 3 |
| job share | 4 |
| other (please specify) | 5 |

| QUESTION 4: Are you male or female? |
|---|---|
| male | 1 |
| female | 2 |

| QUESTION 5: What is your age? |
|---|---|
|   (years) |

| QUESTION 6: Are you: |
|---|---|
| single | 1 |
| currently married | 2 |
| separated / divorced | 3 |
| defacto | 4 |

| QUESTION 8: |
|---|---|
| (a) Do you have children? |
| yes | 1 |
| no | 2 |
| (b) How many children do you have? |
|   |
| (c) How many children currently live with you? |
|   |
| (d) What are the ages of your children? |
|   |
| (e) Are you primarily responsible for the care of your children? |
| yes | 1 |
| no | 2 |

| QUESTION 9: |
|---|---|
| (a) How many years have you worked for Department of School Education? |
| 0-5 years | 1 |
| 6-10 years | 2 |
| 11-15 years | 3 |
| 16-20 years | 4 |
| 21+ years | 5 |
| (b) Has this been continuous employment? |
| yes | 1 (please go to Q10) |
| no | 2 (please continue) |
| (c) How much time have you taken off? |
| <1 year | 1 |
| 1-2 years | 2 |
| > 2 years | 3 |
| (d) Has this time off been in one continuous block? |
| yes | 1 |
| no | 2 |
| (e) For what reason(s) did you take time off? |
| to have children | 1 |
| due to prolonged illness | 2 |
| travel | 3 |
| study | 4 |
| other (please specify) | 5 |
SECTION B: CAREER AND PROMOTION

Please complete the following questions by writing your answer in the space provided or circling the number against your answer.

QUESTION 14: What is your current position?
- PD/H/PE teacher 1
- PD/H/PE acting head teacher 2
- PD/H/PE head teacher 3
- PD/H/PE consultant 4
- Deputy Principal 5
- Principal 6
- other (please specify) 7

QUESTION 15: How many years/months have you been in your current position?

QUESTION 16: At what age did you achieve your current position?

QUESTION 17: Are you currently in a promotion position?
- yes 1 (please continue)
- no 2 (please go to Q22)

QUESTION 18: How many years had you been teaching (or working for the Department of School Education) before you attained this position?
- 0-5 years 1
- 6-10 years 2
- 11-15 years 3
- 16-20 years 4
- >20 years 5

QUESTION 19: How many years had you been teaching (or working for the Department of School Education) before you gained your first promotion position?
- 0-5 years 1
- 6-10 years 2
- 11-15 years 3
- 16-20 years 4
- >20 years 5

QUESTION 20: Do you intend to go for further promotion?
- yes 1 (please continue)
- no 2 (please go to Q24)
QUESTION 21: In how many years/months do you intend to go for further promotion?

__________ (please go to Q24)

QUESTION 22: Do you intend to go for promotion?

yes 1 (please continue)
no 2 (please go to Q24)

QUESTION 23: In how many years do you intend to go for promotion?

__________ (please go to Q24)

QUESTION 24: Is career advancement important to you?

yes 1
no 2

QUESTION 25: Are there any factors that you believe will help you gain promotion or that have helped you in the past?

yes 1
no 2

If yes, please describe: ________________________________

__________________________

__________________________

QUESTION 26: Are there any factors that you believe work against you getting promotion or that have worked against you gaining promotion in the past?

yes 1
no 2

If yes, please describe: ________________________________

__________________________

__________________________

QUESTION 27: Do you think that post graduate study is important for career advancement?

yes 1
no 2

please comment: ________________________________

__________________________

__________________________

QUESTION 28: Have you wanted to take on post graduate study?

yes 1
no 2

QUESTION 29: For whom is it easier to undertake post graduate study?

men 1
women 2
neither 3

please explain: ________________________________

__________________________

__________________________

QUESTION 30: Of the following who has been most encouraging in terms of your career? (you may circle more than one)

female colleagues 1
male colleagues 2
school executive 3
partner 4
family 5
other (please specify) 6

(please explain)

QUESTION 31: Of the following who has been least encouraging in terms of your career? (you may circle more than one)

female colleagues 1
male colleagues 2
school executive 3
partner 4
family 5
other (please specify) 6

(please explain)

QUESTION 32: Do you feel you have adequate access to promotion?

yes 1
no 2

please comment: ________________________________

__________________________

__________________________
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QUESTION 33: Do you feel that both men and women in the field of education have the same opportunities for promotion as each other?

yes 1
no 2

please comment: ____________________________

______________________________

QUESTION 34: As an educator in the Key Learning Area of PD/H/PE, do you feel you are equally placed for promotion, in comparison to teachers from other Key Learning Areas?

yes 1
no 2

please comment: ____________________________

______________________________

QUESTION 35: Does your partner (if you have one) support your career as much as you would like?

yes 1
no 2
N/A 3

please comment: ____________________________

______________________________

QUESTION 36: Do you feel you have the necessary qualities to be the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>head teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deputy principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leading teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>board of studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum directorate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area sports organiser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUOTE 37:
(a) Do you feel you lack certain skills/attributes that may be necessary for the advancement of your career?

yes 1 (please continue)
no 2 (please go to Q39)

(b) What skills/attributes do you feel you need and may perhaps be lacking in?

______________________________

______________________________

QUESTION 38:
Do you feel you that you may be lacking certain experiences that may be necessary for the advancement of your career?

yes 1
no 2

If yes, what are these?

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________
SECTION C: YOUR GENERAL VIEWS AND THOUGHTS ON PROMOTION

Please answer the following open questions, giving as little or as much information as you choose.

**Question 39:**

(a) Do you believe there are barriers to promotion which are specific to male teachers or departmental personnel in education generally?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

please comment: ____________________________________________

(b) Do you believe that male teachers in the Key Learning Area of PD/H/PE face any barriers to promotion that male teachers in other Key Learning Areas may not face?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

please comment: ____________________________________________

**Question 40:**

(a) Do you believe there are barriers to promotion which are specific to female teachers or departmental personnel in education generally?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

please comment: ____________________________________________

(b) Do you believe that female teachers in the Key Learning Area of PD/H/PE face any barriers to promotion that female teachers in other Key Learning Areas may not face?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

please comment: ____________________________________________

**Question 41:** What qualities/characteristics do you feel are necessary to attain promotion within the NSW state education system?

__________________________________________
Question 42: Do you feel there is a highly competitive promotion environment within the NSW Department of School Education?

yes 1
no 2

please comment: ________________________________

______________________________

Question 43: Do you see any of the following factors affecting your chances of career advancement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) child rearing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) child care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) maternity leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 44: If you have achieved promotion, to what do you attribute your success?

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

Question 45: There are many aspects to promotion, please give any thoughts you choose to in relation to this matter.

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing the questionnaire.

If you are willing to participate further in this project by way of an interview, could you please provide your name and phone number:

Name: ________________________________

Phone: (Work) ____________________________ (Home) ____________________________
APPENDIX B

Letter to respondent
An investigation into the career paths and promotional opportunities of PD/H/PE teachers in the NSW state secondary education system.

For all teachers of PD/H/PE

Dear colleague

This study is being conducted by Lisa Newham and supervised by Dr. Jan Wright and Dr. Paul Webb at the University of Wollongong.

This questionnaire is part of a statewide study the purpose of which is to examine the career paths and promotional opportunities for teachers in the key learning area of Personal Development, Health and Physical education. Whilst the focus is primarily on women's careers it is anticipated that the study will also yield some relevant data in relation to promotion for male teachers of Personal Development, Health and Physical Education. This questionnaire is part of triangulation of data involving interviews, questionnaires and statistical evidence. It is important that both male and female personnel answer this questionnaire.

I would greatly appreciate your cooperation in completing and returning this questionnaire ASAP. Please understand you are free to withdraw from the research any time without penalty. Confidentiality with regards to this questionnaire will be observed.

If you have enquiries about this study please contact Lisa Newham on (02) 9531 3953. If you have any concerns regarding the conduct of this research please contact the Secretary of the University Research Ethics Committee on (042) 213 079.

Regards

Lisa Newham

Please return the completed questionnaire to:

Lisa Newham
Faculty of Education
University of Wollongong

in the reply paid envelope

by Friday 3rd October 1997
APPENDIX C

Letter to principal
ATTENTION: THE PRINCIPAL

Enclosed are a number of surveys which I would ask you to pass on to the PD/H/PE head teacher / co ordinator in order for them to be distributed to all teachers in the PD/H/PE faculty at your school as well as any other personnel in your school trained in the area of PE and health.

This study is being conducted as part of a Doctor of Education undertaken by Lisa Newham and supervised by Dr. Jan Wright and Dr. Paul Webb at the University of Wollongong.

This questionnaire is part of a statewide study the purpose of which is to examine the career paths and promotional opportunities for teachers in the subject area of Personal Development, Health and Physical Education. This questionnaire is part of triangulation of data involving interviews, questionnaires and statistical evidence. It is important that both male and female personnel answer this questionnaire.

Confidentiality with regards to this questionnaire will be observed.

If you have any enquiries regarding the conduct of this research please contact Lisa Newham on (02) 9531 3953 (work) or (02) 019 131 680 (home).

Regards

Lisa Newham
APPENDIX D

DET bulletin position criteria
Applications for positions which appear in the Personnel Bulletin are invited from:

- permanent Department of Education and Training teachers for non-school based teaching service positions;
- permanent Department of Education and Training teachers who have appropriate accreditation for promotions positions;
- permanent Department of Education and Training teachers and casual teachers with a permanent Department of Education and Training teaching approval who satisfy the position criteria for advertised classroom teacher positions which are not advertised as part of the Permanent Employment Program;
- casual teachers with a permanent Department of Education and Training teaching approval who satisfy the position criteria for advertised classroom teacher positions which are advertised as part of the Permanent Employment Program; and
- permanent school administrative and support staff for advertised senior school assistant positions.

N.B.: It is an offence for a person convicted of a serious sex offence to apply for these positions. Screening checks will be conducted on recommended applicants.

GENERAL SELECTION CRITERIA FOR EXECUTIVE POSITIONS (OTHER THAN PRINCIPAL)

The following six general selection criteria are deemed essential for all executive staff (other than principal) positions in schools. The general selection criteria are not listed in priority order. The degree to which applicants are expected to demonstrate their ability to fulfill each criterion and the relative importance of the criteria will vary depending upon the level of position sought.

Applicants for executive staff (other than principal) positions must demonstrate the capacity to provide successful educational leadership. This must be demonstrated through:

- Record of successful teaching experience and curriculum implementation.
- Capacity to initiate improvement and monitor high educational standards.
- Successful teamwork and ability to enhance staff performance and implement equal employment opportunity principles.
- Effective contribution to programs for child protection and student welfare.
- Effective communication and negotiation with students, teachers, parents and the community.
- Evidence of well-developed planning, organisational and resource management skills.

Additional criteria specific to the position will be included in advertisements for individual positions and should be addressed in the application.

GENERAL SELECTION CRITERIA FOR PRINCIPAL POSITIONS

The following seven general selection criteria are deemed essential for all principal positions in schools. The general selection criteria are not listed in priority order.

Applicants for principal positions need to show evidence of successful educational leadership. This must be demonstrated through:

- Provision of quality education for students and improvements in student outcomes.
- Effective management and implementation of programs for child protection and student welfare.
- Effective management and implementation of curriculum.
- Ability to establish effective decision-making and communication procedures within the school and the community.
- Ability to plan collaboratively on a whole-school basis and manage resources effectively and equitably.
- Ability to develop strategies to enhance the performance and welfare of staff, and implement equal employment opportunity principles.
- Capacity to promote the participation of the school community in developing and achieving the school’s goals and purposes.

Additional criteria specific to the position will be included in the advertisements for individual positions and should be addressed in the application.
APPENDIX E

DSE research approval
I refer to your application to conduct a project in Departmental schools entitled:

*Where have all the women gone? An investigation into the career paths and promotinal opportunities for female PD/H/PE teachers in the NSW state secondary education system.*

I am pleased to inform you that I have approved your application to conduct research in NSW government schools. I ask that you now contact the principals of the nominated schools to seek their participation. This approval remains valid until: 6/8/98

In conducting research, you should be aware of the following requirements:

- the principal must approve the methods of gathering information in the school and has the right to withdraw the school from the study at any time;
- the privacy of the school and the students is to be protected.

You are reminded that the participation of teachers and students must be voluntary and must be at the school's convenience. Note that in advising principals that approval has been given for you to seek their support in your study, you should include a copy of this letter with the documents you send to schools.

When your study is completed, please forward your report marked to my assistant, Annette Reidsema, at the Department of School Education, Locked Bag 7, Hamilton Mail Centre, Hamilton, 2303.

I wish you every success with your project.

Yours sincerely

Terry Palmer
Director, Research and Development
4 August 1998
APPENDIX F

UOW ethics approval
26 November 1997

Ms L. Newham
13 Elm Place
Cronulla NSW 2230

Dear Ms Newham,

I am pleased to advise that renewal of the following Human Research Ethics application has been approved:

Ethics Number: HE96/092
Project Title: Where have all the women gone?
Name of Researchers: Lisa Newham
Approval Date: 25 November 1997
Duration of Approval: 24 November 1998

This certificate relates to the research protocol submitted in your original application and the renewal application of 12 August 1997. It will be necessary to inform the Committee of any changes to the research protocol and seek clearance in such an event.

Please note that experiments of long duration must be reviewed annually by the Committee and it will be necessary for you to apply for renewal of this application if experimentation is to continue beyond one year.

Dr S. Dodds
Chairperson
Human Research Ethics Committee

cc. Dr J. Wright, Education