



The Promotion of Women in the Teaching Service

Women are under-represented in senior positions in both the primary and the secondary teaching services. But why? Judy Whitcombe has been conducting a research project in the Department of Education's Research and Statistics Division, stimulated by the Education and the Equality of the Sexes Conference in 1975 and requested by the Committee on Women in Education formed during that year. The project has been designed in four phases:

1. Case study interviews with an equal number of men and women, primary and secondary, school teachers, 48 in all.

2. An analysis of where women are in the secondary teaching service.
3. An examination of primary grading statistics.
4. A questionnaire survey of a five per cent sample of New Zealand teachers.

In this set item, based on papers by Judy Whitcombe, the findings of the second part of the project are briefly summarised, and the results of the third part given in greater detail.

Women in Secondary Teaching

The analysis has revealed that:

1. Women have the best chance of promotion from an internal appointment in a school where they are known;
2. Women have a high success rate when they do apply for promotions — but not enough are applying;
3. The opening up of senior positions has proved detrimental to women — which is the reverse of what was intended;
4. Men are moving into PRs and senior administration positions in girls' schools.

Men teachers are clearly pursuing a more active policy of applying for promotions. Men have carefully planned their careers and have clear ideas as to their future appointments. They apply for promotions and positions accordingly. But the main reason for women teachers changing positions is family-related.

Men appear to be more aware of the promotions gained by teaching in single sex schools and this has resulted in a male takeover with men occupying high PR and senior positions in girls' schools and maintaining control of senior and PR positions in boys' schools.

Maths and science are drawing men into PR and HOD positions in girls' schools and women with degrees covering these areas could find swift promotion if they taught in girls' schools.

In 1978, 101 men held positions of responsibility from PR1 upwards, even to acting principal in girls' schools, but only six women held PRs in boys' schools and they were at the lowly PR1 and 2 level.

There are three male principals of state girls' schools. Co-ed schools are providing the most heartening picture of women gaining promotion. There are now two women principals of large schools and 19 women deputy principals. There has also been a sustained growth in the percentage of women at PR levels in these schools.

But the research shows that women are simply not applying for promotions in proportion to their numbers in the profession. For example, in 1978/79 only 18 per cent of all applicants at co-ed schools were women, yet they make up 37 per cent of all teachers there.

In girls schools only 60 per cent of applicants were women yet they were 81 per cent of the teachers. In boys' schools, women are five per cent of the applicants and six per cent of the staff.

But, while they are not applying in the same proportions as men, women are achieving a far greater success rate. Overall, 54.2 per cent of the women who apply for positions are successful, compared with 30.6 per cent of men.

On current trends, it will take until next century for the proportion of women occupying senior positions in the secondary service to equate with the proportion of women teachers.

Women in the Primary Teaching Service

Although women make up 63 per cent of the primary teaching force they hold only 5 per cent of the principalships, only 12 per cent of the deputy principalships, and only 53 per cent of the Senior Teachers are women. On the other hand they do predominate as Senior Teachers of Junior Classes (STJC) holding 85 per cent of these positions. These figures are given in more detail, Education Board by Education Board, in Table 1.

It has often been said that women are under-represented because they do not apply for senior positions. This was thought to be an over-simplification of a complex situation and an investigation of women's career patterns was begun by the Education Department. The purpose of the following analysis is to discover the answers to the linked questions:

1. Why aren't more women appointed to senior positions?
2. Do women apply for these?
3. Do women hold a sufficiently high assessment to make an application worthwhile?
4. Do women apply for assessment?

In primary teaching, appointments to senior positions (in B and C Divisions) are made on the basis of the Personal Assessment Report. The higher the assessment held the greater the probability of appointment to the position sought.

Statistical material for this investigation was gathered in 1979. Assessment records held by District Senior Inspectors were examined at the 10 Education Board offices in New Zealand and applications for assessment and grades received were totalled for men and women. (This proved a time-consuming exercise on occasions for there is no standard form of recording the information and there were wide variations among boards.) In addition Board Staffing Officers were requested to record for 1979 the number of applicants for each level of position, their sex, and the assessment held, where applicable. This information had not previously been available and had to be specially recorded. Thanks are due to all Education

Table 1. *Distribution of Women Teachers in Education Board Districts — March 1979.*

Board	Principals		DPs		STJC		Senior Teachers		Teachers		Year 1		All Teachers	Total Teachers
	Women No.	%	Women No.	%	Women No.	%	Women No.	%	Women No.	%	Women No.	%	Women %	
Auckland	22	4.9	50	16.4	219	90.1	408	56.1	2365	80.0	447	79.5	67.0	5243
South Auckland	14	3.7	9	5.4	125	83.9	173	52.3	1423	78.4	272	83.4	63.7	3165
Taranaki	8	7.3	2	6.3	30	93.8	30	50.0	249	75.9	37	78.7	58.6	608
Hawke's Bay	8	4.1	7	9.7	55	83.3	59	46.8	486	72.5	84	75.0	56.4	1239
Wanganui	5	3.2	6	10.5	43	78.2	47	45.2	417	79.7	59	77.6	59.5	969
Wellington	26	10.5	30	19.6	135	94.4	194	63.6	1066	80.2	243	81.3	68.3	2479
Nelson	3	5.0	2	8.7	15	62.5	20	41.7	133	63.9	26	68.4	49.6	401
Canterbury	10	3.4	8	6.2	88	79.3	110	47.6	987	76.6	180	75.3	60.3	2295
Otago	4	2.5	7	13.2	44	75.9	42	40.4	459	79.3	90	75.0	60.2	1073
Southland	1	.9	5	12.5	35	83.3	22	50.0	241	77.0	46	70.8	56.5	620
														18092
Total Women	101		126		789		1105		7826		1484			11431
% Women		4.7		12.2		85.4		53.1		78.2		78.8	63.2	

Table 2. *Applications for Division B Reports.*

How the Education Boards received applications for grading in 1979.

	Women as a % of all applicants	Women as a % of all teachers
Auckland	62.0	67.0
South Auckland	54.6	63.7
Taranaki	47.6	58.6
Hawke's Bay	50.4	56.4
Wanganui	51.0	59.5
Wellington	62.9	68.3
Nelson	46.2	49.6
Canterbury	53.7	60.3
Otago	42.5	60.2
Southland	47.7	56.5

Table 3. *Applications for Division C Reports.*

How the Education Boards received applications for grading in 1979.

	Women as a % of all applicants	Women as a % of all teachers B1 and upwards
Auckland	32.6	40.6
South Auckland	18.9	31.3
Taranaki	23.5	30.0
Hawke's Bay	25.5	27.3
Wanganui	20.5	28.2
Wellington	35.1	45.3
Nelson	—	25.8
Canterbury	10.3	28.2
Otago	10.3	25.9
Southland	10.0	26.0

Table 4. *Division B Reports 1975 to 1979.*

How the Education Boards give grading marks: Men and Women compared.

Grading Mark	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		Total		Average Grading Mark	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Auckland																		
Actual number graded	107	73	334	115	351	175	280	198	139	133	113	153	45	52	1369	899	3.4	4.0
% getting this grade	8	8	24	13	26	20	21	22	10	15	8	17	3	6	100	100		
South Auckland																		
Actual number graded	72	48	162	81	205	133	142	141	80	114	52	124	17	61	730	702	3.3	4.2
% getting this grade	10	7	22	12	28	19	20	20	11	16	7	18	2	9	100	100		
Taranaki																		
Actual number graded	16	8	36	17	38	32	24	42	15	32	12	25	4	15	145	171	3.2	4.2
% getting this grade	11	5	25	10	26	19	17	24	10	19	8	14	3	9	100	100		
Hawke's Bay																		
Actual number graded	27	22	68	43	69	69	67	64	37	58	25	54	11	29	304	339	3.5	4.1
% getting this grade	9	7	22	13	23	20	22	19	12	17	8	16	4	9	100	100		
Wanganui																		
Actual number graded	27	17	65	33	73	49	52	69	12	52	7	53	5	25	241	298	3.0	4.2
% getting this grade	11	6	27	11	30	16	22	23	5	17	3	18	2	8	100	100		
Wellington																		
Actual number graded	55	39	172	49	188	84	153	95	65	47	52	83	24	37	709	434	3.4	4.1
% getting this grade	8	9	24	11	27	19	22	22	9	11	7	19	3	9	100	100		
Nelson																		
Actual number graded	10	7	29	12	20	31	16	32	15	15	2	27	2	9	94	133	3.1	4.2
% getting this grade	11	5	31	9	21	23	17	24	16	11	2	20	2	7	100	100		
Canterbury																		
Actual number graded	70	39	176	77	163	155	148	159	70	93	50	103	16	54	693	680	3.3	4.1
% getting this grade	10	6	25	11	24	23	21	23	10	14	7	15	2	8	100	100		
Otago																		
Actual number graded	18	20	57	32	72	43	46	53	21	37	14	40	5	19	233	244	3.2	4.0
% getting this grade	8	8	24	13	31	18	20	22	9	15	6	16	2	8	100	100		
Southland																		
Actual number graded	17	11	31	30	36	48	22	45	13	33	4	35	4	14	127	216	3.1	4.0
% getting this grade	13	5	24	14	28	22	17	21	10	15	3	16	3	6	100	100		

Boards for their co-operation in providing the returns

The requirements for eligibility for assessment are outlined each year in the Education Gazette so that all teachers have access to the necessary information.

1. A teacher may apply in his or her 5th year for a Division B report.

2. Teachers with 13 years service, at least three in Division B, may apply for a Division C report.

3. Division D positions do not require assessment reports.

The assessment procedure is generally known as 'grading'.

Table 5. *Division C Reports 1975 to 1979.*

How the Education Boards give grading marks: Men and Women compared.

Grading Mark	1		2		3		4		5		Total		Average Grading Mark	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Auckland														
Actual number graded	36	87	73	135	76	177	42	130	4	78	231	607	2.6	3.0
% getting this grade	16	14	32	22	33	29	18	21	2	13	100	100		
South Auckland														
Actual number graded	18	56	36	98	28	132	16	102	7	44	105	432	2.6	3.0
% getting this grade	17	13	34	23	27	31	15	24	7	10	100	100		
Taranaki														
Actual number graded	3	14	11	23	5	32	5	26	1	12	25	107	2.6	3.0
% getting this grade	12	13	44	21	20	30	20	24	4	11	100	100		
Hawke's Bay														
Actual number graded	10	25	21	47	21	61	6	45	—	25	58	203	2.4	3.0
% getting this grade	17	12	36	23	36	30	10	22	—	12	100	100		
Wanganui														
Actual number graded	13	21	12	46	10	59	8	39	2	20	45	185	2.4	3.0
% getting this grade	29	11	27	25	22	32	18	21	4	11	100	100		
Wellington														
Actual number graded	28	36	44	65	43	87	12	72	2	44	129	304	2.3	3.1
% getting this grade	22	12	34	21	33	29	9	24	2	14	100	100		
Nelson														
Actual number graded	2	10	3	14	3	19	2	12	—	9	10	64	2.5	2.9
% getting this grade	20	16	30	22	30	30	20	19	—	14	100	100		
Canterbury														
Actual number graded	26	59	44	100	30	142	16	100	8	51	124	452	2.5	3.0
% getting this grade	21	13	35	22	24	31	13	22	7	11	100	100		
Otago														
Actual number graded	7	16	11	36	6	47	4	36	—	21	28	156	2.3	3.1
% getting this grade	25	10	39	23	21	30	14	23	—	13	100	100		
Southland														
Actual number graded	5	20	4	38	9	39	4	33	—	18	22	148	2.6	2.9
% getting this grade	23	14	18	26	41	26	18	22	—	12	100	100		

Applications for Assessment

The percentage of women applying for grading has been calculated (see Tables 2 and 3). It is not possible to calculate the number of teachers entitled to apply for grading but not applying.

It is important to note that ceilings operate in the assessment system. An applicant applying for a Division B report in the minimum qualifying time is limited to a ceiling assessment of 4 (on a 1–7 scale) while a minimum qualifying time applicant for a Division C report has a ceiling of 3 (on a 1–5 scale). Those qualifying in the minimum time (that is, those teachers who have a ceiling operating) were not separated in the statistics for two reasons. First, both sexes are equally affected by ceilings and, second, the information was difficult to obtain.

Women are applying for grading and in sufficient numbers and proportions to refute the often heard assertion, 'Women don't apply for grading'.

Overall there is a slight increase in the proportion of women applying from 1975 to 1979. Some fluctuations not shown by the tables here are hard to explain. For example, a huge increase in Otago women applying for 'B' reports in 1978 was referred to the Inspectorate for comment but no significant event or in-service course could be linked to the upsurge, which was not maintained in subsequent years. Canterbury also

showed an increase for 1978 'B' reports but in some other areas this year produced a decline. The number of women applying in Wellington has dropped since a 1975 peak.

Wellington still has the highest proportion of women applying in both B and C Divisions. This may be related to the fact that the highest proportion of women teachers are in that Board area. Auckland comes second in both divisions. Nelson Board with the lowest proportion of women teachers has among the lowest proportion of women applicants in both B and C divisions. Southland has a very low application rate for both B and C reports but the numbers of women seeking B reports have more than doubled over the period. Otago also has a low proportion of women applying for assessment.

The percentage of women applicants in Division B shows that women are taking the first step (Table 2). Division C has a lower proportion of applicants but then the pool of women with sufficient service entitled to apply for C reports is proportionately lower too (Table 3). It is not possible to see whether the increasing number of women applying for B reports is reflected in Division C as there is a further 7 year service requirement after first application for a Division B report and statistics collection over a longer period would be required before trends could be assessed.

When the percentage of women applicants over the period is studied it is clear that women are applying for assessment and in proportions great enough to ensure that they could move into senior positions providing their assessment grade was sufficiently high.

Assessments Received

The next step in the investigation was to compare the assessment received by men and women teachers. Tables 4 and 5 show the allocation of grades for B and C divisions. The average for women over the 5 year period is always lower than that for men.

Differences between Board areas was slight overall, but this is to be expected. The allocation of assessment is expected to conform to the normal distribution curve. A meeting of a national assessment group (usually held in May) reviews the applicants for assessment from all Boards and sets distribution quotas for each Board area. District Boards of Inspectors subsequently meet, in September or October of each year, to distribute the assessments within the prescribed allocation. The regulations state that, 'The Director-General shall take steps as he considers necessary to maintain reasonably uniform standards of assessment among the various District Boards of Inspectors'. A system of inter-district cross-checking is carried out by inspectors to ensure consistency.

There are annual fluctuations within Board areas not shown in these tables. For example, women in Hawke's Bay had a very successful year in 1977 in Division B with the mean for women exceeding the male mean, and men and women had equal means in Auckland in 1976. Apart from these two examples women are always lower in Division B although they make up approximately half of those assessed.

In Division C the smaller number of teachers being assessed results in greater fluctuations. In some years the female mean has exceeded the male mean; e.g., in 1975 in Taranaki and Southland, in 1976 in Nelson (where 1 woman received a4), in 1977 in Southland (only 3 women applicants), and 1978 in South Auckland. The very low number of women applicants in these areas has contributed to the occasional higher average scores which run against the general trend.

It is accepted that women will predominate among the first-timers in Division B anyway. To correct for 'first-timers' a further analysis was carried out and again the proportion of women is far below that of men.

A Division B report assesses seven aspects of the teacher's work: personal, professional qualities; relationships with children; planning preparation and records; class or school atmosphere and management; content and quality of the class or school programme in action; methods of teaching; capacity to conduct a small school or carry out the duties of a senior teacher in a large school. These apply equally to men and women teachers so it is theoretically possible for both sexes to score equally well. However, some inspectors have stated that they place emphasis on point 7 — which deals with organisation and administrative performance — which gives men a greater chance since more men have had these experiences. In Division C six areas are focussed on and three of these are concerned with organisation and management. As many more men hold positions (e.g., Principal or Deputy Principal), where they are demonstrating their capacity in these areas, so they are more likely to score better than women. Thus women,

unless they hold high administrative positions, are unlikely to receive comparable grades to men in Division C.

The allocation of assessment is a key area in the search for reasons why more women are not in senior positions. This analysis has shown that women continue to receive lower assessments than men and there was little sign of any change in the pattern over the years.

Research by J. Ussher on year 1 and 2 teachers in New Zealand has shown that women teachers consistently demonstrate a better teaching performance than men and a teachers' college report shows that in the second year of teaching men teachers seemed to have a reduced level of competency.

It would appear then that women start off well as teachers yet by the time they are graded their performance is judged to have fallen. However, assessment is not just a measure of teaching ability and so it must be presumed that women are seen by inspectors as showing less leadership potential if their consistently lower assessment grades are to be explained, certainly at B report level.

This analysis cannot answer the question 'In what aspects are women achieving lower than men?' but it does show that the assessment process is not favourable to women. The effect of receiving lower assessments is that women are, generally, at a disadvantage when applying for positions.

Applications for Senior Positions

Education Boards were asked to record, for 1979, the number of applicants for each senior position by sex and assessment held. Returns were sent in at the end of each term.

The 1979 totals of applicants for B1 positions upwards are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. *Number of Applicants for Senior Primary Positions, 1979.*

	Women	Men	% Women
B1 (all NZ except Auckland)	362	522	
B2 (all NZ except Auckland)	617	1952	
B3 (all NZ except Auckland)	184	671	
B4 (all NZ except Auckland)	35	1088	
All B Positions (including Auckland)	2043	6078	25.16
C1 (all NZ except Auckland)	40	613	
C2 (all NZ except Auckland)	56	1273	
C3 (all NZ except Auckland)	17	333	
All C Positions (including Auckland)	281	3404	7.63
D1 (all NZ except Auckland)	30	204	
D2 (all NZ except Auckland)	6	172	
All D Positions (including Auckland)	47	497	8.64
All Senior Positions	2371	9979	19.2

Once again regional differences occurred with the greatest proportion of women applicants for B positions coming from Wellington and Auckland Board areas. Auckland has the highest proportion of women applicants for C positions while Taranaki and Southland did not have any women applying for these positions. Very few D positions were advertised.

Boards were also asked to record the assessment held by the applicants. These figures reflect exactly the same pattern as in Tables 4 and 5 with the women's average below men's.

The analysis of applicants for senior positions upholds the often expressed view that women are under-represented in senior positions because they don't apply. The proportion of women applicants was indeed low (only 19 per cent overall). Assessment could be one explanatory factor in this situation for any teacher who applies for a senior position with a low assessment has little chance of success, certainly in the closely sought after schools in urban areas. Other factors which influence women to apply or not apply for senior positions are to be investigated in the questionnaire survey.

Conclusion

The investigation has revealed that:

1. Women are applying for assessment (at B report level) in proportions close to the proportion of men teachers.
2. The assessments received by women are consistently lower than that allocated to men.
3. The number of women applying for senior positions is lower than the number who are able to do so.

The key question to be answered is, therefore, 'Why do women receive lower assessment grades than men?' If the assessment procedure is to treat both sexes equally, teachers need to be fully aware of what is assessed when inspection occurs. Inspection is carried out by one of a team of inspectors. (At the time of writing the Inspectorate comprised 92 men and 4 women.) The present guide *The Appointment and Promotion of Primary School Teachers in New Zealand* was published in 1975. It states that 'Inspectors are responsible for making their judgements throughout the whole range of agreed criteria' (page 32). If more emphasis is placed on certain criteria this should be indicated officially so that teachers (particularly women) who do aspire to leadership positions can pay attention to these aspects. The assessment of teaching ability is only part of the personal assessment, 'the primary function of the personal report is to give appointments committees a full and fair picture of a teacher's professional abilities, and his relative claims for appointment to a particular

position as a senior teacher'. (*Appointment and Promotion of Primary School Teachers in New Zealand*, page 11.)

A further question requiring answer is, 'Why don't more women apply for senior positions?' Low assessments is one important consideration. It is reasonable to assume that while they continue to receive lower assessment women will not apply for senior positions in any great numbers.

The outcomes of the present system of assessment would seem to indicate that 'the relative claims for appointment' are stronger for men teachers than for women. If women, who are 65 per cent of the primary teaching force, are to fare better under the present system (or its possible replacement) the assessment procedure will need a closer investigation.

Notes

The analysis in this survey was unable to compare men and women by age and length of service. But these and many other factors are being investigated in the fourth part of the project — the questionnaire survey of a five per cent sample of all New Zealand teachers. The results will be published by the Department of Education, probably in 1981.

Bibliography

The two pieces of research which show women as teaching better than men can be found in:

Ussher, J. *The Occupational Socialisation of the Beginning Teacher in New Zealand: Administrative Implications*. Master of Educational Administration, University of New England, New South Wales, 1977.

Wellington Teachers' College. *Evaluation in a Teachers' College: a Report of the Year One and Year Two Teacher Study*. Wellington, Wellington Teachers' College, 1976.

The *Teacher Career and Promotion Study* papers, on which this item has been based, are:

Whitcombe, J. *The Present Position of Women in Secondary Teaching*. A paper to the Women's Studies Association Conference, August 1979. (Available from the author or the Department of Education.)

Whitcombe, J. *A Comparison of Career Patterns of Men and Women Teachers*. A paper presented to the New Zealand Association for Educational Research Conference, December 1979. (Available from the author and the Department of Education.)

Whitcombe, J. *The Promotion of Women in the Primary Teaching Service*. Wellington, Department of Education, 1980. (Available from the Department of Education.)

