WINNING A VOICE IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

A study of women working in middle management

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Educational Administration

Marian R. Court

Department of Education
Massey University
1989

Abstract

This study examines a group of women working in educational middle management in both primary and secondary schools in a provincial area of New Zealand. The focus is the inequalities of power in gender relations within the women's home and school situations. It examines the ways these relations contribute to theories explaining the persisting low status of women in educational management. The theoretical framework draws on critical theory and cultural studies, along with feminist critiques of androcentric administration theories and practices. These critiques call for a reconstruction of theories of leadership to take account of women's perspectives and values.

A questionnaire survey was used to document the teaching service of 30 women who took part in a 'self-help' management training strategy. Alongside the career constraint of time out of full-time service for child rearing, the women identified discriminatory attitudes and practices that relate to perceptions that women should have primary responsibility for caring and nurturing within both their home and paid work situations. These attitudes are woven into the structures, policies and practices of educational institutions in ways that can limit the opportunities of all women teachers.

Six of these women participated in case study interviews which investigated the sexual division of labour at work and in the home. As a consequence of the sexual division of labour and a hegemonic linking between 'masculinity' and authority, they were involved in struggles to 'win' their authority and establish the right to lead as educational administrators. The study also investigated the place of anger in the women's development of a sense of autonomy. It concludes that the caring and nurturing responsibilities of women in the home reinforced an affiliative style of educational management in the workplace, which emphasised shared decision making and equal power relations.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the 30 women who participated in the original questionnaire survey. Their thoughtful and full answers provided the basis for this research. A special thanks is due to the six women who gave much of their personal time to think and talk about their experience in educational management.

My supervisors, John Codd and Liz Gordon, gave me continued interest and support throughout the project, Liz especially keeping me going when at times the task seemed too large. To both I also owe thanks for careful editing and for helping me with the structuring of this thesis.

Shona Wright (Urenui) typed the transcripts of the interviews. Her painstaking unscrambling of those conversations is gratefully acknowledged.

Helen Watson (Women's Officer, PPTA), Sue Middleton (Waikato University) and Wendy Craig (Massey University) discussed ideas with me as I began this research. Jenny Neale (Victoria University) provided valuable comment on the first draft of the questionnaire. My thanks to other women who sent me papers and other material.

Throughout the whole process of thinking and writing about the issues surrounding the inequalities of power in gender relations, my husband both responded to challenges and in turn challenged my thinking (and cooked the meals!).

Table of contents

List of tables: Survey results

Introduction

There seems to be a popular view that the position of women in gender relations has vastly improved and that there have been considerable gains in the struggle for women's emancipation. A recent profile of Marcia Russell in Metro Magazine quoted her as saying:

> It pleases me that (young) women...don't consider the sex war...That you accept that you'll get on with your lives with a sense of self worth that everyone is entitled to. That seems to me to be a victory. If you don't have to use your energy for those fights and can put it to other things, that's excellent (Corbett 1988 p92).

However, despite equal opportunity legislation, women working in educational management in New Zealand and overseas are still clustered in the lower ranks of positions of responsibility (Sampson 1987, TEACAPS 1987, 1988, 1989). Rather than improving, the position of women seems to be deteriorating in some areas. In primary schools, although 75 percent of primary teachers are women, in 1988 they held only 10 percent of the G4 and G5 principals' positions. This representation has shown a decline over the last three years - from 18.8 percent in 1986, to 15.3 percent in 1987 and 10 percent in 1988. In secondary schools, although there is a better representation of women in middle management, still only 17 percent of principals are women, despite the fact that women make up 51 percent of the secondary teaching force. Why do such gender inequalities persist?

In looking at historical reasons for male dominance in educational administration, Shakeshaft cites a telling section of the Quincy School Committee notes in the 1870s:

> One man could be placed in charge of an entire graded school of 500 students. Under his direction could be placed a number of female assistants. Females "are not only adapted, but carefully trained, to fill such positions as well or better than men, excepting the master's place, which sometimes requires a man's force; and the competition is so great, that their services command less than half the wages of male teachers" (1987 p31).

Today, although women have won equal pay for teaching, as a group women are still earning proportionally less than men because of their poor representation at the top, administrative, levels of the teaching service. Further, ideologies that see women's

`natural place' as being in the home carrying primary responsibility for nurturing and childcare while men hold decision making power in the public sphere, still shape dominant cultural expectations about leadership and management. There is evidence that these expectations continue to be reproduced. Studies such as that undertaken by Gill (1986) have shown that children continue to internalise sex-stereotyped expectations that school principals should be male.

Such ideologies underpin the workings of a dominant male hegemony that maintains the present gender inequalities in educational administration. This hegemony is reflected in the focus of administration research: women do not appear in the bulk of it, neither identified as subjects, nor as a group which needs specific analysis in the writing up of results. Although recent writings have been considering gender as an important factor influencing both teachers' work and students' learning (for example Deem 1978, Spender and Sarah 1980, Apple 1983, Connell 1985, Arnot and Weiner 1987) gender has been largely ignored in the development of educational administration theory. A reading of texts used in New Zealand (eg. Hoy and Miskel 1982, Handy 1976, 1986) supports the observation made by Shakeshaft (1987) and Blackmore (1989) that educational administration theory and research have been largely androcentric. The result of this male centred focus is that the absence of women has remained unproblematic.

Smith (1974) called for women-centred studies to redress the imbalance in the development of traditional fields of knowledge. Such a changed research focus on women's personal accounts and experience (a paradigm shift of the kind described by Kuhn, 1962) is needed to turn around a perspective that has defined women as deviant or deficient as a result of measuring them against male norms (Acker 1983). Neville argues that the publishing of this kind of research can help to:

> ...demolish the `mystique' surrounding management, shown to be particularly inhibiting to women who are not traditionally seen as management material (1988 p125).

In New Zealand, Malcolm's (1978) study of women's aspirations and promotion questions the stereotyping that traps many into what she argues are conflicting roles between home and school. She identifies discrimination in structures and social attitudes as a result of male domination as among the main causes of women's disadvantage. Moreover, she argues that if women are to take their place equally alongside men and be able to contribute from "a virtually untapped resource of intelligence, education, sensitivity and talent" (1978 p3) which could be said to be needed at the upper levels of administration, then this discrimination must end. "It

seems reasonable to assume that a profession is harmed if the talents and abilities of a large proportion of its members are not effectively utilised" (1978 p3). At the conclusion of her research she recommends that studies of women administrators should ask:

What characteristics of leadership style do they display?
What limitations, or constraints, if any, are placed on them, as women, in the performance of their executive function?

Mollie Neville's study of 16 women administrators who had "proven competence" (1988 p9) in top management positions in education demonstrates that if women are to gain this kind of success they need to:

> ...remain single, childless, re-enter the workforce after childbearing, or have very supportive husbands...Only a few very exceptional women have access to power in a man's world (1988 p151).

To help change this situation, she calls for research into women's "negotiating of the problems" surrounding gender discrimination, reporting that the women in her study reacted in a variety of ways to the situation of being women and administrators. They showed:

> ...a range of responses from a painful awareness of gender issues to unawareness of gender as a consideration at all, and this is a remarkable contrast in such a small group of women in one employment group in one region of a small country. It validates the need for qualitative feminist research, especially if Marshall (1984 p153) is correct in asserting "The presence of a few tokens does not pave the way for others" (1988 p100).

This present study sets out to add to Malcolm's and Neville's studies a picture of women involved in educational middle management. It focusses on investigating inequalities of power in gender relations, aiming to contribute to the development of what Acker (1983 p35) calls `implementary theories' that will explain how the subordination of women is perpetuated. Although gendered power differences exist and have been analysed within both educational curriculum and structures, the nature and the functioning of these differentials within the interpersonal relationships of men and women is not always easy to identify or analyse. The terrains of ideology and culture are important here and the existence of resistance and struggle need to be highlighted in an analysis that looks also at the links between home and school. Therefore this study aims to examine the hegemonic connections and contradictions between the so-called `private' and `public' spheres, examining the women's gender relations in both their home and school situations.

Chapter 1 develops the theoretical background to gender inequalities in society as a whole, showing ways in which the economic, political and social/cultural spheres interact to impact on women's social relations. This chapter is followed by and linked to a critical review of the literature on women in educational administration. This literature has largely focussed on examining the blocks to women's promotion, seeing these as the result of women's so-called `deficiencies', rather than examining the proposition that many studies have been measuring women against male norms. Women's management styles have also been investigated in comparison with those of men and these perspectives are reappraised. Then, in the light of the theories and processes examined in Chapters 1 and 2, educational administration theories of authority and leadership are critiqued in Chapter 3. The concept of affiliation is re-examined here as part of a reconstruction of a woman's view of administration.

In Chapter 4 the methodology for this study is described. A questionnaire survey of 30 women was used to document their teaching experience and their perceptions of constraints on their careers. This was followed by indepth interviews with six of those women to examine their perceptions of their gender relations. The results and discussion of the questionnaire survey are given in Chapter 5, providing some background for the case histories which make up the main part of this research.

The case history investigation is introduced in Chapter 6, which also analyses the women's aspirations and perceptions of the sexual division of labour. This chapter reports the dilemmas they were facing as a result of expectations of women's dual responsibilities in the home and the workplace. Chapter 7 then focusses on the women's perceptions of their experiences as they were establishing themselves in their positions of responsibility. Winning authority and the `right' to lead emerged as an important factor for this group, some of whom have been involved in related gender power struggles in their homes as well as in their schools. Chapter 8 identifies the place of anger in the women's varying recognition of gender discrimination. Anger has also played a part in their developing autonomy; for some of them it has become an empowering emotion, motivating them to resist and challenge dominant cultural expectations of them as women, as well as spurring the development of their own styles of leadership. Chapter 9 then describes the group's management philosophies, which reflect the emphases identified by Shakeshaft (1987) and discussed in Chapter 3. These women were combining what has been termed `private' caring/nurturing roles and skills with the `public' roles of managing/leading. In their emphasis on the

qualities associated with affiliation, their management philosophies have transformative potential for androcentric definitions of authority and leadership.

As a result of using what was an opportunistic sample (a group of women who came together in 1987 for a series of management training seminars) the focus of this piece of research is on Pakeha women: no Maori women attended that management training course. That situation underlines the present highly disadvantaged position of Maori women in education. In reading the results of this study then, and considering the position of women in educational management, it is important to remember that Maori women and women of other ethnic minorities experience the compounding constraints of sexism and racism. Their situation needs to be addressed in studies that investigate their viewpoints and needs.

Chapter one

The theoretical background to gender inequalities in society

To develop an analysis of the gender relations of women educational managers in both their home and school situations, it is necessary first of all to briefly outline theories that offer explanations of gender inequalities in society as a whole. This chapter provides an overview of a range of feminist theories. These will later be used in a critique of administration theory and practice to show how male domination in society is reflected in androcentric theories of leadership, authority and control that endorse `commonsense' beliefs that men are more suited to leadership than women.

Although feminist theories represent a range of political viewpoints[1], they hold to:

> ...a basic tenet that women are oppressed by men... Explanations of this differ, being attributed to biological, cultural, economic, political or institutional factors, depending on the theoretical approach being used (Gordon 1988 p3).

Liberal and radical feminist analyses expose ideologies associated with sex- role stereotyping and point to a pattern of male domination in social relations and structures: these explanations see gender inequalities resulting from the one system of *patriarchy*. Marxist and socialist feminist theories which show how the patriarchal and the capitalist systems interlock in social relations that exploit women's labour in varying ways are then discussed. The notion of the public/private split is significant here in the development of a sexual division of labour and of the idea of the family wage, both of which disadvantage women while benefitting men. The discussion then turns to the concept of hegemony, to help develop an understanding of the contradictory nature of the processes involved in male domination. The related concepts of resistance and struggle are discussed in the final part of the chapter which turns the focus onto the agency of women as a subordinated group and opens up the possibility of transformation within systems of domination.

---

[1]Middleton (1988a pp 174-198) provides a useful overview of both the nineteenth century and the 'second wave' of feminist theories of gender relations and she analyses their influence on the sociology of women's education in New Zealand.

Patriarchy as ideology

Patriarchy is the term given to the system of domination of men over women. Radical feminists[2] argue that the variety of forms of oppression suffered by women are sufficiently inter-connected to be part of a single autonomous system of gender inequality. Their theories developed out of liberal feminist critiques of sex role theory such as that of Friedan (1963).

In her book, `The Feminine Mystique', Friedan investigates the `problem with no name', describing how many women of her generation were suffering from symptoms of ill health that were explained by doctors as being the result of poor adjustment to their `natural' feminine roles. Friedan argues that what was being described as `suburban neurosis' was for many the result of their trying to fit the male defined `normal' feminine roles of full-time housewife and caregiver. Her conclusion states that women need to change their expectations and develop their full potential through equal participation with men in the public world rather than being confined solely to the private world of the home.

The social theories available at the time of the development of these ideas essentially worked within functionalist frameworks (Middleton 1989 p17). As a result, liberal feminist accounts such as that of Friedan tend to remain descriptive, and do not adequately challenge the underlying power differences in the *systems* producing the inequalities. Middleton states that:

> The emancipatory reforms of liberals will enable only a small number to compete with men in a fundamentally oppressive social order... Radical feminists argue that women are a structurally oppressed group and revolutionary changes are needed for their liberation (Middleton 1988a pp184-85).

Radical feminist theories provide a more structurally-based analysis of women's oppression, arguing that the power differential of the domination of men over women, especially in sexual relations, is the basis of sex inequalities. Millett's (1970) analysis of Freudian psychology and of sexuality in literature takes Friedan's ideas further, describing a set of rigid expectations created around the functionalist concept of sex roles which are revealed as particularly oppressive towards women. Drawing on

---

[2]As Middleton (1988a pp 184-5) points out, there are a set of perspectives and many political positions contained within the term 'radical feminist', and although analysing the dominant ideologies of patriarchy, especially in relation to the control of women's sexuality, is the main thrust of their work, some have also made studies of the way patriarchal power is exercised physically in, for example, rape. This aspect of patriarchy is discussed later in this chapter.

earlier sociological and social psychological research into gender formation, Millet distinguishes conceptually between sex (ie. the biological anatomy of a child) and gender (ie. the culturally and socially developed set of attitudes, beliefs and expectations that are assigned to the category of male or female and produced largely within the environment of the family). It is this social nature of the construction of gender that needs to be stressed, as much of what is important in the gender relations of men and women is obscured by a emphasis on the experience of gender distinctions as `natural'. Game and Pringle (1983 p15) point out that "in no other social relations are references to the `natural' biological world so constant and persistent".

Millet argues that women are conditioned to accept a subordinate status by being socialised to see their position as `natural' and `normal'. This conditioning has been reinforced by functionalist theories such as those of Parsons (1951, 1956) in which `normal' traits for the female gender are seen as passive and expressive while for males, `normal' means active and instrumental qualities. However, Janeway (1971) calls such trait theory classifications a `social mythology', arguing that expectations are being prescribed rather than described. Connell (1983 p75) argues that to maintain the system of male power there has to be a "continuing effort to sustain the social definition of gender" because the biological facts "cannot sustain the gender categories." Thus there are masculinising practices for boys, such as in rugby, and feminising practices for girls. This is not a case of the social being added to the biological, but rather the social practices must often run counter to biological facts. Connell gives an example here:

> Girls in early adolescence, though usually bigger and stronger than boys in their school classes, must be made passive and fearful in relation to males (1983 p75).

Sex roles then, are not `value free' scientific explanations, but rather cultural directives (Eisenstein 1984 p11) that are supported by ideology.

In the broad sense of the word, an ideology is a "system of thought that cannot be demonstrated to be true which has the effect of maintaining relations of domination and exploitation" (Codd et al 1985 p16). It works at both the level of `commonsense' ideas, that develop as a result of particular historical and social circumstances, and at the institutional level where dominant and subordinate groups are involved in a struggle over the maintenance of the ascendancy of ruling groups. Along with Codd et al, I accept that the meaning has slipped to that of "any politically contested idea" and I

use `ideology' in this sense[3]; however, most of the early radical feminists use the word in the sense of an `untrue system of thought' that maintains the domination of men who benefit from exploitation of women. An example is the work of Firestone (1972) who argues that love is "the pivot of women's oppression" (p121): she states, "That women live for love and men for work is a truism" (p121). She analyses romantic love as a crucial part of the ideological structure that both disguises and perpetuates male power over women in heterosexual relationships and she argues that it conditions women into accepting their subordinate status through the process of sex-role stereotyping: women are `trained' into accepting a system divided into male and female spheres which gives public power to the male sphere and confines women to the reproduction of the species[4].

A different area of analysis came from the `cultural reproduction' theories in which schools are seen to function alongside the family to reproduce the ascendency of the culture of the dominant group. These theories came together with feminist critiques of sex-role theory and analyses of patriarchal ideologies in a multitude of investigations into the part schools play in male domination. Study after study revealed the sexist nature of the curriculum, organisational structures and policies and interpersonal relationships in schools; some showed the parts played by each of these in reinforcing and producing particularly conservative sex-role stereotypes (an influential collection is that of Spender and Sarah 1980; see also Deem 1978, Delamont 1983). In New Zealand, Sue Middleton's analysis of the Thomas Report shows that:

> Sex-differentiation was an explicit assumption of the report... intending the `homemaker' part to apply only to girls...who were to receive (compulsory) instruction in Home craft "with topics selected from.. mothercraft, housewifery, houseplanning, dress design and pattern making, clothing, laundry work, cooking and meal planning" (Thomas Report p46) ... The Report contained specific recommendations for the `domestic training' of girls in other subjects of the core (1988b p78).

Thus educational policy in New Zealand from the 40s through to recent years has been firmly based on differentiated sex roles[5].

---

[3]The concept of hegemony (discussed separately in part three of this chapter) has taken over some of the original meaning of 'ideology'.

[4]Firestone called for reproductive technology to take over this function and thus liberate women, but as Middleton points out (1988a p185) other radical feminists have disagreed with this idea, seeing in women's mothering and nurturing capacities a source of power strength.

[5]Although the statements on sexism in the Curriculum Review (1987) challenge and negate such assumptions, stereotyped attitudes and practices may take a long time to change. In the perceptions of women's place in teaching rather than management, and the common allocation of 'female' tasks such as hostessing, flowers and girls welfare to women administrators, there can be seen the influence of ideologies of such sexually differentiated roles.

The fact that functionalist theories of differentiated sex roles are not describing `natural' differences but concealing a power differential, becomes clear when we think about the fact that sociologists do not talk about `race roles' (Eichler 1980 p13). As Connell points out:

> With `sex roles', the underlying biological dichotomy seems to have persuaded many theorists that there is no power relationship here at all. The political effect of sex role theory is to highlight the pressures that create an artificially rigid distinction between women and men, and to play down the economic, domestic and political power that men exercise over women (1987 p59).

He goes on to show how when what is `normative' is distinguished from what is common, the `normative' can be seen as what the holders of social power wish to have accepted. Whose interests are embedded in the myth that `woman's natural place is in the home'? Millett states that our society:

> ...like all other historical civilisations,is a patriarchy. The fact is evident at once if one recalls that the military, industry, technology, universities, science, political office, and finance - in short, every avenue of power within society, including the coercive violence of the police, is entirely within male hands (1970 p25).

Valuing women's experience in a women-centred perspective was seen as a way of redressing the imbalance (Smith 1974). However, in a reaction to an emphasis that developed out of liberal feminism on what was wrong with women and how they needed `re-socialising' to compete equally with men, some radical feminists moved to a celebration of female difference that goes further than valuing women's experience. In some versions of what has become termed cultural feminism (Cox 1987), the idea of the social construction of gender is replaced by the idea that women are intrinsically different, if not superior, to men. However, although it is a comforting thought for women that we may have qualities such as nurturance that place us in a plane above men, Eisenstein (1984) and Segal (1987) among others point out that arguments claiming the innate difference of women's values end logically in essentialism and this lays open the `biological differences' dead end. Such arguments develop once more into the ideology that women are `naturally fitted' for the mothering role, an argument that has long been used to justify women's isolation in the home away from positions of public power (Burton 1987, Eichler 1980)[6].

---

[6]This ideology is also called into service to explain why women are not 'suited' to the technical tasks of managing in schools and should stay in the pastoral care and 'home-making' areas, carrying out the 'tea and tampax' tasks for which they are 'better suited' by reason of their 'nature'. A focus on analysing gender difference, then, has snags that need careful examination when research is undertaken into male and female differences in management.

Eisenstein wrote in the conclusion to her discussion of contemporary feminist thought:

> Much feminist theory in the United States during the 1970s did not focus upon the sexual division of labour as it functioned in the workplace and in the home, but instead analysed the powerlessness of women chiefly in psychological terms (1984 p143).

In spite of what she calls the radical feminists' "brilliant dissection of the mythology surrounding gender" (1984 p130), she warns that an emphasis on the psychological (such as that in cultural feminist writing) may lead women to think that all they have to do to improve or to transform their situation is to change the way they think about the world. An example of the limits of such an emphasis in the field of educational administration can be seen in the liberal equal opportunity interventions. These place the changing of women's attitudes high on the list of strategies, without accompanying this with the need to examine the normative, institutional and structural bases of male power[7]. Although some women may gain promotion into administrative positions, and although some of the structural impediments to women's advancement may be removed (eg. the suggested removal under education administration reforms of the service requirements for promotion) it is necessary to go further than this if we are to progress beyond having some `token' women in educational administration: the very nature of educational administration needs to be examined[8].

There is then, a need to consider the interaction of other power systems with that of patriarchy to develop more adequate explanations of gender inequalities. Walby considers Millett's work, for example, to be descriptive only, in that it "does not analyse the systematic interrelationships between the structures ...of the family, the economy, force, socialism, religion, sexuality and psychology" (1986 p23) and Eisenstein points out that it is important to see the powerlessness of women (in psychological terms) as dialectically inter-related with the sexual division of labour, to examine how one affects the other (1984 p143). This is the focus of Marxist and socialist feminist theories that examine both patriarchy and capitalism as interacting systems which create and maintain gender inequalities.

---

[7]The Taranaki Women in Educational management seminars is such a case (Court 1989) yet, despite the criticism that such interventions do not go far enough, it is important to continue to work on this front, to use the liberal discourse to pressure policy makers to remove discriminatory practices (Middleton 1984).

[8]Chapters 2 and 3 do this.

The sexual division of labour

The position of women as unpaid workers and primary caregivers in the home is an important factor when their history in educational administration is considered[9]. However, the situation of women in the home is overlooked in many of the mainstream sociological writings investigating social inequality because the family is used as the unit of analysis:

> ...despite the ample evidence of substantial inequality between men and women in the household. So it is remarkable that theorists of social inequality deliberately treat as a unity that which many regard as the main site of gender inequality...thus conceptually eradicating the inequality that exists between men and women in that unit (Walby 1986 p12).

When most married women were not employed in public production but worked full-time in their homes, analysing the class position of women had posed problems for Marxist theorists, who usually solved the difficulty by assigning women to the same class as their husbands or fathers (Novitz 1982). Arising in the early 70s, the `domestic-labour debate' was:

> ...the attempt to conceptualise the material position of housewives...to specify the place that housework, or rather domestic labour, has within capitalism (Walby 1986 p16).

An early argument is that of Benston (1969), who states that the sexual division of labour defines women's work as outside of the money economy and though they can move into paid work and men can become involved in domestic labour, these reversals are seen as transitory. The Marxist concept of the reserve army of labour is important here. Drawing on this, some feminist theorists argue that the sexual division of labour persists because it benefits capitalist employers: women's dependency on men through their unpaid work in the home curbs male workers' ability to strike, as well as creating in women a reserve pool of labour which can be called upon in times of need, then encouraged back into the home when no longer required (Novitz 1982 p304). Thus it was established within Marxist feminist thought that domestic labour is productive work, unpaid but socially necessary for capitalism to produce the labour power of men by cooking, cleaning and providing emotional support. Domestic labour is also reproduction, involving the bearing and rearing of the next generation of workers. Thus women's labour is "identified as a form of commodity production vital to the capitalist economy" (Kuhn 1978 p57).

---

[9]This aspect is illustrated in Chapter 5, which documents constraints experienced by the women in this study, and in later chapters which examine ways in which six women were negotiating their dual roles in their homes and their schools.

There is a flaw in much of the `domestic labour debate' however; in its focus on the family and the home, it overlooks or underplays the sexual division of labour in the workplace, the public sphere. Barrett (1980) argues that an analysis of the connections between these two spheres is essential for an understanding of women's oppression. She points out that it is:

> ...men who benefit from the material advantage of having women to undertake various servicing roles, care of relatives and so on (1980 p216).

Hartmann (1981) develops these points in her argument that both job segregation by sex and the family wage work together to benefit both capital and patriarchal interests. She argues that men saw women in paid work as being in competition with them for jobs and that this lowered wages overall, with men losing bargaining power because of the quantity of workers available. As well as this, men realised that women who were working in the paid workforce were not able to serve them as well as if they were working only in the home. So men organised together in unions, partly through the device of job segregation by sex, to exclude women from much paid work (see also Cockburn 1985). The jobs that were left were accorded low status and were poorly paid, so this was a disincentive to women who were thus encouraged to stay in the home and engage in unpaid domestic labour. Men demanded a `family wage' to support their families, and this, as well as increasing the pay for `male' jobs, further pushed women away from paid work and into unpaid domestic work[10]. Thus women became economically dependent on men who could earn better wages, and individual men benefitted from women's service in the home and from the lack of competition in the workforce. On the other side of the coin, with women in the home, capitalists could depress wages in the sense that the true value of labour power produced by women's unpaid work in the home is not fully rewarded.

Hartmann shows an historical development of patriarchal and capitalist interests working in partnership to exploit women's labour. This situation has reinforced the ideologies of `appropriate' places for each along with the notion that `women's natural place is in the home'. Work has become allocated in both in the home and the workplace on the basis of gender, and as well as this division, there is the further one between home and the workplace, that is, the separation of public and private worlds. As such, Game and Pringle (1983) argue that the sexual division of labour is important in constructing and maintaining masculinity and femininity and the particular forms these take at different times and in different places. Although there is nothing

---

[10]The 'family wage' was also used as an argument to deny women equal pay.

inherently different in the work done by men and women, the distinctions, and the perceptions of the lesser value of women's work, remain[11], despite changing assumptions of what is `suitable' male work or female work. It is within these changing definitions that the influence of power can be detected (Game and Pringle 1983 p16).

Walby argues that if theories of gender inequality are to propose an adequate explanation, it is the different "modes of exploitation" within distinctive social relations that need analysis:

> The patriarchal system is marked by the social relations which enable men to exploit women; in the racist system (those) which enable one ethnic group to dominate another; in capitalism (those) which enable capital to expropriate labour. These social relations exist at all levels of the social formation, whether this is characterised as economic, political and ideological, or as the economy, civil society and the state or whatever (1986 p47).

However using the term `patriarchy' to describe the nature of the social relations of men and women has some limitations. Sheila Rowbotham points out that patriarchy "suggests a fatalistic submission which allows no space for the complexities of women's defiance" (quoted by Apple 1983 p30). As a term it has connotations of an established and fixed order, rather than emphasizing the on-going nature of struggle which is inherent in the social relations of domination and exploitation. Neither does it adequately allow for the analysis of the response of individual men who do not wish to exploit the privilege which male domination as a system offers them (though it does encompass the idea of the domination of older, more powerful `fathers' over younger and weaker men).

In the absence of a concept which embodies the ideas of patriarchal domination and the contradictory nature of resistance in one term, I turn now to a discussion of hegemony, to marry the understandings developed as a result of Gramsci's analysis of class relations with those developed in radical and Marxist feminist theories of patriarchy.

Hegemonic masculinity

Boggs defines the concept of hegemony, derived from the writings of Gramsci, in a way that sounds remarkably like Millett's description of the processes of patriarchy:

---

[11] Within education, until recently these distinctions have been strongly endorsed by educational policy (Middleton 1988b), and the gender division between teaching and management can also be seen to have reflected and reproduced that ideology of sexually differentiated roles within education.

> By hegemony Gramsci meant the permeation throughout civil society - including a whole range of structures and activities like trade unions, schools, the churches and the family - of an entire system of values, attitudes and beliefs, morality, etc, that is in one way or another supportive of the established order and the class interests that dominate it. Hegemony ...is diffused by agencies of ideological control and socialisation into every area of social life (Boggs 1976 p39).

Gramsci's concept was developed to explain the political processes involved in the structuring of class; Millett's analysis is of the patriarchal relations that placed men as elites. As elites, it can be seen that men need to:

> ...perpetrate their power, wealth and status - they necessarily attempt to popularise their own philosophy, culture, morality and render them unchallengeable as part of the natural order of things (Boggs 1976 p39).

The term male hegemony to describe the political processes involved in male domination is not new, as Sheila Rowbotham points out (1973 p38). She and Hancock Bensemann (1978) trace the history of this concept back to 1911, when the German sociologist Georg Simmel proposed it to suggest that:

> ...all culture is male defined and based on a male ideology... Simmel argued that: "Man's position of power...assures that his standards become generated as generically human standards that are to govern the behaviour of men and women alike. If one sees the relations between the sexes in a somewhat crass manner as that between masters and slaves, then it will be realised that it is the master's privilege not to have to think continuously about the fact that he is the master. In contrast the position of the slave is such that it never allows the latter to forget it. There is no doubt that women much more rarely lose their sense of being women than men lose their sense of being men. Very frequently it seems as if men think in purely factual categories without their sense of maleness coming into play; by contrast it seems as if women never lose the sense, be it clearly felt, or only subjacent, that they are in fact women" (Simmel 1911, translated by Coser 1977) ... In male dominated culture, Simmel argues, male forms of behaviour successfully claim superpersonal validity and normative value...and women are judged in terms of criteria that were formed for the male sex... Simmel concludes that there is a denial by male culture of female identity (Hancock Benseman 1978 p44).

Karen Horney developed Simmel's ideas to explain how:

> At any given time, the more powerful side will create an ideology suitable to help maintain its position and make this position acceptable to the weaker one. In this ideology the differentness of the weaker one will be interpreted as inferiority and it will be proven that these differences are unchangeable, basic or God's will. It is the function of such an ideology to deny or conceal the existence of a struggle (Horney 1926 p116, cited by Hancock Benseman 1978 p45).

That this `creation of an ideology' is not done at the conscious level of a plot, but results from "a way of seeing the world" becoming dominant is argued by Rowbotham

(1973 p39). She goes on to state that for a woman to understand a concept like male hegemony she needs to experience what is in effect a series of `culture shocks' that will allow her to realise how the dominance of male viewpoints has affected her[12]. For example, she may recognise that what she has accepted as `real' inferiority of females has been in fact a male perception of women and not the true situation at all. A series of such experiences will need to be communicated to others to result in a total process of female self-recognition and resistance to the dominant ideas.

Although the concept of male hegemony does encompass the ideas of resistance and struggle, there are however, some difficulties in its use to explain the processes involved in the constructing of patriarchy. In that the word `male' suggests anatomical sex definitions, there is a link to sex role theory and functional sex role stereotypes, rather than the emphasis being placed on the social and cultural nature of gender construction. That is, `male hegemony' suggests that all men exploit women as part of their inherent qualities of `maleness'.

Connell (1987) suggests instead the term hegemonic masculinity, arguing that this emphasises the social nature of a culturally produced and contested dominant system of values and beliefs[13]. It also incorporates the idea of the character of gender domination varying across time and place; in Connell's analysis, hegemonic masculinity is not a fixed image but like all culturally produced stereotypes, alters its nuances according to the social conditions and expectations of the time. The present dominant image, he argues, is a masculinity organised around "technical rationality and calculation" (p131) with its power sustained by a "hypermasculine ideal of toughness, power and strength" (p80), motivated to compete, strong in confidence in its own abilities and "able to dominate others and face down opponents in situations of conflict" (Connell et al 1982 p73).

The changing nature of hegemonic masculinity as it has been experienced in New Zealand is vividly illustrated by Jock Phillip's "A Man's Country?" (1987). In his book he traces historical changes in dominant male stereotypes and the place that changing values and beliefs have played in the construction of a Pakeha male culture[14]. Over the years different emphases have been created, but Phillips shows how this culture has been grounded in contradictory combinations of the sportsman soldier and

---

[12]This is the process of consciousness raising.

[13]This means that women can also behave 'like men', if they accept and use the characteristic values, beliefs and patterns of behaviour endorsed by the dominant value system. This is illustrated in the case studies.

[14]I use the word 'culture' in Deal's (1985 p105) sense i.e. "the way we do things around here" - the values, beliefs, language, stories and ways of behaving that become characteristic of a group of people.

the tough beer-drinking bloke, who, though hard, was a respectable and (underneath it all) loving family man. Using data from Gray's (1983) research, Phillips argues that despite changes in women's situations won as a result of the women's movement during the 70s, in the 1980s:

> ...the older stereotypes have hung on ...men as resourceful and practical, able to overcome class barriers... There are the symbols of rugby, racing and beer... Work was still thought of as `the man's job'; looking after the home was the women's sphere... and there is the pervasive fear of being thought effeminate - of not living up to the manly image (pp275-278).

A result of the narrow definitions of the male stereotypes which also "defined the national identity in male terms" meant that many New Zealand women:

> ...found themselves living with a man who resented domestic responsibilities, yearned for good times with the mates, and felt that to be emotionally sensitive was to be weak...and who believed that earning money was a male prerogative (p278).

Phillips also points out that men themselves were hurt by the stereotypes, especially homosexual men, artists and intellectuals, but also all the others who did not fit the dominant images. This illustrates the complex nature of hegemony which cannot be thought of as a consistent or singular force working for domination: hegemonic masculinity is an image that divides men among themselves, as well as dividing men and women. Connell argues that:

> Hegemony does not mean total cultural dominance, the obliteration of alternatives. It means ascendancy achieved within a balance of forces, that is, a state of play. Other patterns and groups are subordinated, not eliminated...(Connell 1987 p182)

However, it is the practices of men as a group that are important in creating and recreating women's subordination. This is pointed out by Millet in her analysis of patriarchy. Connell calls it "a collective project of oppression" (1987 p185) that may be realised at the individual level at times (for example, in the actions of an individual male to protect men's privileges by blocking a woman's promotion) as well as at the collective level (by men organising to keep women out of positions of power in the state)[15]. He argues then that:

> ...hegemonic masculinity is not necessarily what powerful men are, but what sustains their power, and what large numbers of men are motivated to support...(because) most men benefit from the subordination of women...It

---

[15]Examples of these kinds of actions occurring within education are discussed in Chapter 2 and in the later analyses of the women's experiences.

> implies the maintenance of the practices that institutionalize men's dominance over women (1987 p182-183).

He sees hegemonic masculinity as the force behind the patriarchal state, which is a centre of power relations and processes wherein patriarchy is both constructed and contested in an on-going process of change and contradiction. For example, the state may legislate for equal opportunity while at the same time it refuses to fund childcare adequately enough to make equal opportunity a reality, and while "much of the bureaucracy, which is, of course, run by men, quietly resists the legislation" (1987 p130). The connection of authority to masculinity is an important ideology in the maintenance of this power.

Connell's argument explains how individual men are not necessarily responsible for what he calls the `collective project of oppression', and is an important addition to theorising the nature of the working of patriarchy. The term hegemonic masculinity is useful in stressing the cultural nature of oppression, thus identifying a point of intervention wherein change may occur. However, in its `distancing' quality it also gives individual men a way `out' when considering their own part in the oppression of women. It can obscure the fact that whether they fit the stereotype or not, each boy and man benefits (at the expense of girls and women) from the systematic nature of what Simmel called male hegemony.

All of these ideas are important in any discussion of male domination. However, as there is no one term that conveys adequately all the emphases just discussed, in this study I will use each of them, patriarchy, hegemonic masculinity and male hegemony, depending on which seems more appropriate in the context.

In his analysis of hegemony, Connell (along with others, like Hearn 1987, Daly 1979) makes a further important point: although hegemony does not refer to ascendancy by force, it is not incompatible with force and the two commonly go hand in hand. Simmel wrote:

> Domination based on subjective unilateral power has from time immemorial had the tendency to cloak itself in a mantle of objective justification: might is transformed into right (cited in Hancock Benseman 1987 p44).

Physical power is an aspect of hegemonic masculinity that has important consequences throughout society and within education, where it has been reflected in a perceived need for principals to be `strong' men `to control disruptive students'. It also affects perceptions of the suitability of women as educational managers: an associated ideology is that women should not get angry, nor express anger in public. Such an

ideology as `nice girls don't shout' acts to keep women silent in the `public' world, as well as in their place (subordinate) when the accompanying male value is that men who are angry should be listened to and obeyed. The underlying threat of potential violence in male anger is unspoken but ever present and tacitly expected[16].

In the creation and maintenance of ideologies that support male power and domination the control of language is a most important factor. The processes involved here have been powerfully analysed by Miller and Swift (1977) and Spender (1980); they show how the ability to define situations and set the terms in which events are understood have been captured by male interests. For example, the history of the generic use of `he' and `man' to encompass women reveals that this practice was unknown in the fifteenth century but developed through a long (hegemonic) process of argument. The debasing of terms associated with women (witness, for example, the change and difference in meanings between `an old master' and `an old mistress') is another example of how forms of language are continually being altered and shaped by men to exclude and devalue female meanings. The suppressing of women's experience from the language can be illustrated by the lack of a word to describe a woman's experience of being raped. The word `rape' names that act from the point of view of the perpetrator; there is no word to name the trauma of the victim. Rowbotham points out that: "We are continually translating our own immediate fragmented sense of what we feel into a framework that is constructed by men" (1973 p35). These are powerful strategies to `keep women in their place', invisible, or if acknowledged at all, inferior to men.

It is generally accepted now that language is inextricably connected to culture, not merely reflecting `the way things are' but working at largely unconscious and symbolic levels, shaping thinking about social problems and processes (Deal 1985). That male control of language can materially affect women's position is evident in the hegemonic definition of work as meaning paid employment. This has had far-reaching implications for women, marginalising and rendering invisible their unpaid work in the home. It has also cemented a link between capitalism and patriarchy that has resulted in any work that is associated with that done by women in the home being ascribed low status and rewards and not being recognised as providing any worthwhile skills or experience to fit people for positions of decision-making responsibility in the `public' world of paid employment.

---

[16]This is discussed in Chapter 8.

Resistance and struggle

However, all this does not mean that men acquire and maintain their dominant positions without a struggle: hegemony must be won. Thus, the associated concept of struggle is important in any consideration of the changing nature of gender relations. The practice of resistance is always a possibility, by both individual men and women who can choose to challenge or maintain the relations of power. Despite the power of male capture of language to shape the consciousness and behaviours of all those who use it, the work of feminist writers such as Spender (1980) and Mary Daly (1979) shows how women can resist such hegemonic forces. Daly has worked on redefining terms to remove their androcentric and negative qualities and restore the original positive meanings (eg. restoring ideas of `wisdom' to `witch' and `crone'). She also argues that women need to `spin' new concepts so that their suppressed experience and viewpoints can be exposed and included in language. Naming from the viewpoint of the oppressed is a powerful way of surfacing and challenging exploitation and enabling action to be taken against forms of domination. For example, the concept of `sexual harrassment' was developed in America in 1978 and its use spread rapidly; it reached New Zealand in 1980 and became included here in labour awards in 1982.

Consciousness raising is an example of a resistance strategy first employed by radical feminists. They aim to demonstrate through analyses of particular instances how the institutions of patriarchy form "an interlocking grid within which women are trapped" (Jaggar 1983 p366). In combination their accounts can reveal the breadth and range of male hegemonic ascendancy and this consciousness raising process aims to challenge that ascendancy. A women- centred focus raises the possibility of a spiralling development of the revaluing of women's own knowledge and experience in which the personal becomes political, opening up the possibility of transformation.

This, however, could give the impression of a kind of `all women against all men' struggle. It is necessary to come back to the point that hegemony implies contradictions and conflicting interests. Socialist feminists, building on the insights of radical and Marxist feminism, analyse the contradictions and varying experiences of women that are a consequence of their position in the labour market and in the unpaid labour of the home within capitalist, patriarchal and racist social structures, seeking to understand the intersections between class, race and gender.

The concept of gender is further refined in these writings. Stanley and Wise describe it as:

> ...the cluster of norms, attributes and so on that are referred to as `gender' and are related to as stereotypes - as simplistic stereotypic representations which people relate to in a myriad of ways. These are not in themselves `reality' as people experience it: they are but one facet of what people construe as this... Many people experience a difference between `themselves' and their `femininity' or `masculinity'...and do not willingly use sex-role stereotyped items when describing themselves (Stanley and Wise 1983 pp103-104).

Thus gender is not a fixed, unchanging, innate quality in someone, but should be seen as varying from individual to individual with each person relating to their `femininity' or `masculinity' (to `commonsense' understandings of what it means to be a woman or a man, a girl or a boy) with "varying degrees of acceptance, ambivalence, tension, conflict and antagonism" (Segal 1987 ppix- x). Thus, despite the existence of a dominant form of hegemonic masculinity, there are other expressions of masculinity as well varying expressions of femininity which are contradictory and changing. Both women and men will also vary in their degree of acceptance, accommodation and resistance to male domination in gender relations.

Although it is important to remember that there is always this variety of experience and reactions, it is also important to understand that women's experiences as a subordinate group have resulted in their different life styles and career patterns in comparison with those of men. Consequently women do often behave differently and emphasise different values to those of men. There is increasing empirical evidence that shows that women conceive the world differently from men and have different attitudes towards it. Levinson (1978) pointed to men displaying a sense of distance between themselves and others, and Gilligan (1982) documents the existence of `the different voices' of her male and female subjects, with males:

> ...stressing the importance of the role of separation as it defines and empowers the self and females of the ongoing process of attachment that creates and sustains the human community (1982 p156).

Gilligan demonstrates that the categories describing the moral development of children only fit that of boys; girls' moral development can take a different course, showing how categories such as rationality, autonomy and justice are derived from male views of the world and do not always fit the experience or values of women.

Ideas such as these have important implications for the study of educational administration. Feminist critiques (eg. Shakeshaft 1987, Blackmore 1989) show how male domination in society is reflected in androcentric theories of leadership, authority and control that ignore the experience of women and the gendered structuring of

schools. Such theories have endorsed `commonsense' beliefs that men are more suited to leadership than women, beliefs that have been contributing to the limiting of women's representation in management positions. However, as Walker and Barton point out, "certain practices are not inevitable, processes are changeable" (1983 p16). They argue that if gender inequalities in society are to be altered, points of intervention need to be identified.

Feminist theories provide a framework here for looking at changes in the practices of educational administration. Although some would argue that women need only equal opportunity to compete alongside men for positions of decision-making power, others point out that equal employment opportunity legislation has been introduced, yet the position of women is not improving as rapidly as could be expected. What is the existing situation? Chapter 2 provides a brief survey of past studies and examines the present situation using literature from New Zealand, Australia, America and England. Recent studies are also used to describe the existence of discrimination and prejudice about the suitability of women for management, as important factors which are working against women's promotion.

Chapter two

Women in educational management: A literature review

In the past, studies which have investigated the position of women in educational management have focussed on the constraints on their careers. These studies have tended to `blame the victim', by emphasising that women need to change themselves if they are to gain promotion. However, in the recent literature, the focus has shifted towards an analysis of factors of discrimination and prejudice against women in management. This chapter will review this material, arguing that much of that prejudice is founded in ideologies that see women's nurturing and childbearing as their `natural' roles. Investigations of women's management styles are also reviewed and the chapter ends with a discussion of power that identifies the need for a reconstruction of the present dominant theories of educational administration.

The position of women in education

The New Zealand and overseas studies of women in education reveal a similar story; women outnumber men in the elementary teaching ranks but are increasingly eclipsed by men who rise to the status positions in schools, universities and training colleges, as well as in the bodies which govern and make policy for these institutions (McIntosh 1974, Malcolm 1978, Whitcombe 1979, 1980, Sarros 1984, Wilson 1986, Sampson 1987, Donn 1987, Sheehan, Kerslake and Slyfield 1988).

These inequalities are a major cause of concern and the situation is not generally improving: in fact, it is deteriorating in some areas. In a recent Australian report, Sampson undertook a questionnaire survey of 2,380 Australian teachers in each State and Territory, which showed only 24 percent of women had sought promotion in the last five years compared to 46 percent of men, and appointments of women to primary school principals' positions had declined from 41 percent in 1970 to 18 percent in 1984 (1987 p2). In New Zealand, the TEACAPS papers (Donn 1987, Sheehan, Kerslake and Slyfield 1988, Westwood and Slyfield 1989) have shown that fewer

women than expected are applying for higher positions, though the rates of application and appointment have improved slightly at the lower levels.

In the primary system in 1987 women made up 47 percent of the applications for Senior Teacher (with some subject and staff responsibility) and G1 and G2 positions (teaching principals of one to two teacher schools), an increase on 1986 when women made 41 percent of these applications. In 1988 this percentage rose again to 51 percent. The proportion of women appointed to these positions, (58 percent in 1987, 63 percent in 1988) also sounds encouraging, but it is important to remember that these are the `first step' management positions. The percentage of applications for G3 principals' positions was much lower at 21 percent in 1987 and 26 percent in 1988; appointments were 33 percent in 1988. Thus, although both the application and appointment rates at the lower levels have shown a slight increase, when the higher status G4 and G5 positions (non- teaching principals of large schools with 11 or more teachers) are examined, these show a similar picture to that reported by Sampson in Australia. Applications for G4 and G5 principals' positions dropped from 16 percent in 1987 to 15 percent in 1988. Appointments have shown an even bigger drop: from 19 percent in 1986 to 15 percent in 1987 to 10 percent in 1988. It is important to remember that this is in a teaching service where 75 percent of the teachers are women. As Dixon (1988 p145) points out, if equality existed, women would hold 75 percent of all these positions.

In the secondary system women made up 36 percent of the applications for senior positions in 1987 and 37 percent in 1988, still lower than their proportion in the teaching service (51 percent). This reflects a gradual improvement since 1981 when the figure was 30 percent, but there is still a great deal of progress to be made in the position of women overall. Moreover, the appointments were more often in positions for English, counselling, language and home economics, the traditional areas for women. Although recent articles in the PPTA Journal (Term 2, 1989) suggest how the Promotion of Women Review has been instrumental in improving the position for women in the secondary system over the last three years, in 1988 women still held only 46 percent of PR1 positions, 33 percent of PR2, 20 percent of PR3, 18 percent of PR4, 22 percent of deputy principal positions and 17 percent of principals' positions. Only in the traditionally female position of senior mistress were they well represented, holding 61 percent of these positions (Watson 1989). A recent unpublished Promotion of Women Review done in a Taranaki high school (Court and Smith 1988) also shows women under-represented in middle management in a way that is typical in New Zealand high schools. There were 19 full time men and 14 full time women on the

staff in 1988, and of the available 27 PR units, 19 units were held by men while only 8 units were held by women. The women were also clustered at the lower levels: the three available PR3 positions were held by men, while the few women who held PRs were in PR1 or 2 positions.

It is clear that in both the primary and the secondary systems women remain on the bottom rungs of an educational hierarchy that is dominated by men: despite the fact that there are actually fewer men in the teaching service, men are still being promoted to the top positions ahead of women. This situation is of concern for several reasons. When equality of rewards is considered, although it seems that women teachers now get equal pay with male teachers, their under-representation in middle and senior management means that overall women are earning considerably less than men. It is perhaps more worrying to consider the prospects for their future promotion in a system where the politics of resource allocation:

> ...effectively preclude consideration of the interests of women, and systematically deny, or distort, developments which would promote their social and economic independence, while at the same time positively endorsing those policies and programmes which actually limit power...The allocation of resources is determined by priorities which are not, principally, intended to equalize the social and economic power of the sexes (Aitken and Noonan 1981 p124).

Although under administrative reforms gender equity is required, at the time of writing there were large shortfalls being reported in the funding of schools and amounts allocated to establishing gender equity were being seen as too large (Dominion Sunday Times; Education Times 24/9/1989).

Within this situation, the position of Maori women is a particularly disadvantaged one. Their absence from management positions is generally not commented upon; I could find no figures showing their representation in PR or senior management positions. The TEACAPS papers, for example, distinguish only between women and men, and do not yet document the compounded disadvantage faced by Maori women and women of ethnic minorities. Last year however, Te Ohu Whakatupu published "Maori Women in the Economy", reporting that only:

> ...about 5% of women teachers throughout the education system are Maori. The education system as a whole is unsympathetic to Maori women. The language and culture are not recognised and valued and the barriers against moving on to tertiary education are high...There are very few Maori women managers; only one holds a job in the top 400 positions of the Public Service... and overall Maori women get only about 80% of the incomes which non-Maori women receive (Ministry of Women's Affairs Newsletter 1988 p7).

If only five percent of women teachers are Maori, the likelihood of finding them represented in the management structures is slight indeed. The effects of a Pakeha mono-cultural educational system on both Maori culture and on the lack of equity for Maori people are being increasingly documented (Stokes 1985, provides an excellent summary of the recent research) and the constraints of ideologies of assimilation, integration, cultural deficiency and cultural difference have been identified by many studies (for example, Simon, 1986). Such figures as are available on the position of Maori women in education make it clear that if Pakeha women face disadvantage as a result of their gender, Maori and ethnic minority women are further constrained by factors relating to race.

Apart from the need for improved equity for all women however, there are two further points that must be considered. The real skills and abilities that women offer are presently being under utilised in the management of schools where they are sorely needed. Further, for schools to provide equal educational opportunity for girls, there is a need for models of effective female administrators within the school environment to encourage girls to develop their own leadership potential and career horizons.

For all these reasons then, the causes of the present inequalities in educational administration must continue to be addressed. However, women still do not appear in the bulk of educational administration research, neither identified as subjects, nor as a group which needs specific analysis in the writing up of results. James Hough has recently investigated gender bias in the British journal, `Educational Management and Administration', using questions formulated by Shakeshaft (1987). He reports that from an analysis of all the research articles over the last five years, although there is relatively little explicit sexist bias:

> ...There are, however, strong indications of a lack of awareness of gender as a relevant issue in connection with many topics and a failure to pay due regard to gender when formulating a research problem and/or when writing up the results. If gender-related issues are to receive the attention they deserve, a change in attitudes by researchers in this field seems called for (Hough 1988 p73).

In his recent review of management research in general in New Zealand, Inkson commented that although:

> ...a great deal has been published in recent years concerning issues directly affecting women in the workplace, unfortunately much of this material, while valuable, is published in mainly journalistic form (Inkson 1987 p21).

The research on women is covered in one small paragraph in his review and he states that "a thorough examination, preferably by a woman, is overdue" (p21). My search of the Index to New Zealand Periodicals 1984 to 1986 uncovered a few articles in magazines such as The Listener, Metro, Broadsheet and New Zealand Women's Weekly on feminist issues such as pay equity, but only two on women in management. Management journals published three articles on women managers last year, documenting their low numbers (Edwards 1988) and arguing that women managers need "a new deal" (Pearson 1988), finding that they are "different, not deficient" (Clarke 1988). But in all, I could find only two journal articles relating to women in educational management: "Female primary principals: How they arrived and their advice to prospective primary principals" (Simpson 1984) and "Top jobs - inequality persists" (Dixon 1988).

A DDOC search of the last ten years done for me by N.Z.C.E.R. revealed only three dissertations done in New Zealand on the topic of women in educational management, those of Malcolm (1977), Steele (1981) and Neville (1988). Neville's ERIC database search done in 1986 found 47 articles from the later 1960s up to 1986. An ERIC database search for this study showed only a small increase in the number of studies during the last three years: the search revealed 64 articles, and many of the new articles were reviews of the existing literature rather than reports of new research.

Spender (1981) argues that the gatekeeping practices of academic publishing have kept women's writing about the issues that concern them out of the mainstream academic journals. Feminist publications have provided an avenue (for example, Simpson's paper (1984) was published in a Women's Studies Conference Papers Report) but the effect of this alternative is that the research becomes marginalised. Even if a researcher or writer publishing in mainstream journals does acknowledge that women are not specifically focussed upon or mentioned in a study, these attempts to be non-sexist can seem half- hearted. Colgate (1976 p109) for example, demurs in the introduction to his study of the role of the secondary head: "I trust my lady colleagues will understand that, throughout, `man' means man or woman". From there on, women drop out of the picture. In his paper, as in most academic educational administration papers and research, women are considered to be the same as their male counterparts and are referred to as `he'[1].

---

[1]Research has shown that the use of the generic pronoun results in women and girls not seeing themselves as included in such statements (Spender 1980, Miller and Swift 1977).

Gender inequality as theoretically insignificant or non-existent

Feminist researchers argue that issues of gender inequality have been largely ignored in the creation of traditional fields of knowledge. Smith (1978) argues that such knowledge has been created over many centuries by "a circle of men", philosophers, politicians, poets and policy-makers, who have been writing and talking to each other about the issues that are of significance to them. Their theories give only a partial view of the world as in them, women's views are absent. Shakeshaft (1987) shows how this is true in the field of educational administration where, she argues, both theory and practice entail the assumption that male and female experience is the same and following from this, that generalising from research on males is an adequate base for developing theories to explain administration for both sexes. This androcentric or male biased viewpoint (Novitz 1982) limits most educational administration theories. They leave out the experience and perceptions of women.

> To label a piece of research or a theory, concept, or model "androcentric" is merely to identify the framework within which the thinking and work occurred. It is an attempt to establish for the consumer a set of parameters to be used in accepting, internalising and applying the results of such research, as well as addressing what is missing, what has been overlooked, what has not been stated (Shakeshaft 1987 p151).

From the early theories of scientific management, bureaucratic organisation and the human relations school, through to the systems theories developed during the 1970s, women's perspectives are noticeably absent in the literature of educational administration. Cohen and March (1974) and Weick (1976), for example, look at the loosely coupled nature of educational institutions, trying to understand the special qualities of schools and their associated problems of autonomy and control - the disjunction between management and classroom. However, their theories do not consider the gendered nature of educational workplaces that consist of mainly female teachers and male administrators.

During the 1970s school effects studies were beginning to examine the multitude of variables, apart from leadership, that might make a school `effective'. Although this concept is in itself problematic (`effective' for what and whom?) factors such as promptness and efficiency, fewer disciplinary actions, frequent immediate praise, well cared for buildings, staff joint decision making and open student-teacher communication are identified by Rutter et al (1979) as important in the development of schools they see as successful. Reynolds (1982) isolates an emphasis on academic learning, a cohesive and democratic classroom environment, teacher expectations and the presence of rewards as the important factors making a `good' school, while the

further factors of attention to the school's public image by involving the community, building on success and emphasis on student pastoral care are added by Renihan and Renihan (1984). In none of these studies though, is gender considered as a factor that may be influencing the `effectiveness' of schools for the greater benefit of males over females. A recent study in New Zealand also overlooks the importance of gender factors. In their report on the factors making for successful schools in Auckland, Ramsay et al (1987) report similar findings to earlier studies in relation to organisational/managerial and interpersonal factors: the importance of a clear pattern of communication, of team spirit in the involvement of both teachers and students in decision- making under the leadership of the principal. They also identify the pedagogical factors of clear goals and positive review and teaching strategies and add multiculturalism as an important variable in their analysis of curriculum factors. But they do not consider how girls are differentially disadvantaged or helped in the schools in relation to boys. Neither do they discuss the gendered nature of the administrator/teacher work relationships and the part these might be playing in what is seen as the `success' of a `good' school.

This sexual division of labour has also been overlooked in most of the instructional leadership research (see for example Bush 1970, Lipham and Hoeh 1974) which argues that much of what the school does to promote achievement is within the principal's power to control. In his review of the literature, Cohen (1981 p466) states that "strong administrative leadership by the school principal, especially in regard to instructional matters" is an important variable in the making of an effective school. Smyth's review (1982 p32) comments on "the compelling nature of the evidence we have so far on the value of the principal's enactment of an instructional leadership role". However, Erickson writes that the past tendency of education administration research to focus not on "the phenomenon known as instruction", but rather on organisational factors, is a "puzzling parochialism" (1979 p10).

This "puzzling parochialism" is not so curious if one remembers that the theorists and researchers in this field have traditionally been male, looking at institutions where management has been traditionally dominated by, and seen as suited to, men, whereas instruction in the classrooms has been traditionally a job `suited to' women. This sexual division of labour plus the androcentric viewpoint of male researchers and academics are reflected in the failure to consider the importance of instructional factors in educational leadership. However, even when Smyth's (1982) paper focusses attention on the need for instructional leadership:

> As a community of scholars we can ill-afford the luxury of assuming that while instruction is something that goes on inside classrooms, administration is something that transpires beyond the classroom walls. We need a more robust conceptualisation (1982 p30),

attention is not given to the gender divisions between administration and teaching. Smyth comments only on the need for a research focus on "the precise methods by which effective principals are able to successfully cross the boundary of the classroom", a `difficulty' that is seen as "a delicate boundary-spanning function" in the enactment of the principal's instructional leadership role. The possibility that gender hierarchy factors are complicating this situation is overlooked[2].

In a more recent paper on critical pedagogy, Smyth (1988) again examines the divisions between administrators and teachers, though the division this time is between teachers and political and bureaucratic technocrats outside schools who are imposing control on those inside schools. He argues that in recent administrative reforms in Australia and New Zealand, "the language of schooling resoundingly becomes that of accountancy and business management" (p5), and that the struggle "...is really about who should have the authority to control schools" (p4). But once again he does not consider the gender of those who have authority and control.

Although other recent studies consider gender as an important factor influencing both teachers' work and students' learning (for example, Apple 1983, Connell 1983 and 1985, Arnot and Weiner 1987, Newton 1988), gender has been largely ignored in the development of educational administration theory and practice:

> If men and women were the same, if they behaved in similar ways,then leaving (women) out of the formulation of theory wouldn't be a problem (Shakeshaft 1987 p163).

But the history of women administrators and their career paths vary in important ways from those of men, who are consistently dominant in all administrative positions, and this requires a focus on the lives and work of women to aid an understanding of their subordinated situations. Such a focus has been provided by feminist writers who develop the basis of an understanding of the structures and processes involved in explanations of the gender inequalities experienced by women in educational management.

---

[2]Other studies (e.g. Pitner 1981) investigating women's management styles do not find this difficulty. In fact, supervising teachers' work in the classroom is emphasised by women and their building of co-operative interpersonal relationships is regarded as one of their strengths (Charters and Jovick 1981). These points are discussed further later in this chapter.

Women's Career Constraints

Most of the research on women in education up to the end of the 1970s focussed on the reasons for their `failure' to apply for promotion. Malcolm (1978) set out to re-examine that question in her study of a group of women primary teachers in a "medium-sized city" in New Zealand. The great majority of women in her survey were young and married, many of them teaching "only until they started a family". The other group were older women who had returned to teaching after having a family. Among their three most common reasons for not seeking promotion was the fact that:

> ..marriage and home took precedence over any career aspirations, and it was considered *natural* that women teachers of child-bearing age would not be interested in promotion or career opportunities. (1978 p2) (My emphasis).

It seems at the beginning that her study reflects what Acker, in her review of the literature on the sociology of teaching careers during the 70s, describes as an "obsession with the married woman teacher" (1983 p126). This stance resulted in much of the research discussing women almost entirely in relation to their family roles without considering other factors of career patterns, which resulted in a `blaming of the victim'. Comer comments:

> The demands of a career are commonly supposed to conflict with those of a family...the woman, who happens, like a man, to be committed to her work as well as to her private relationships, has to bend over backwards to prove to the world that she is first and foremost not herself, but her husband's wife and her children's mother (Comer 1974 p46-47).

These assumptions are difficult to shake off[3]. The ideologies of women's `natural place' can be seen at work in the comments reported by the women Malcolm studied. She reports that they were strongly influenced by traditional sex-role stereotypes, being "happy to work under a man", seeing their main role as wife and mother, or seeing women as "particularly suited to the teaching of young children" (1978 p2). Here is the `commonsense' idea of teaching as a good job for a woman until she has her own children, but not as a career which she will continue to pursue (Buchan 1980). Malcolm does not treat women as the problem though; she identifies social expectations of their roles in the home as the block to their career advancement and she points out that marriage can be "a career deterrent" for women, whereas it "is seen in

---

[3]Ten years later Neville (1988 p56) states that she expected the 'successful' women in her study to be single, but she found that several women were married. However, in comparison with women teachers overall, the proportion of single and no longer married women in her sample is higher. She hypothesises that some women choose not to marry to overcome this block to their careers, a suggestion that is supported by the higher proportion of single women than single men in Wilson's (1986) study of academic staff in universities.

general as a career asset to a man" (1978 p2). In a separate paper, Deem comments on the irony in the situation that women's involvement in marriage and childrearing has been:

> ...evidenced as a reason why women make unreliable teachers, are thus not promoted and are paid less. The contribution made by men to this unreliability is seldom recognised by those who thus criticise women teachers (1978 p115).

The findings that women are constrained by their childcare responsibilities have been challenged in several studies. Whitcombe (1980) shows that less than 30 percent of women teachers in the original TEACAPS study had children of primary age or younger. Sarros (1984) also found that there were far fewer married women teachers with dependent children than commonly believed. Sampson's (1987) results have only 38 percent of women teachers with children at home, compared with 62 percent of men. The men as well as the women in her study were less prepared to put in the extra time necessary for increased job responsibilities and were less willing to move for promotion than was previously thought; they were giving greater priority to their home and family responsibilities. Such research results suggest that there is a shift underway in the patterns of relationships in the homes of traditional families. Marriage and family seem not to be a deterrent for all women: for example, McIntosh's (1974) study comparing the lives of women who do and who do not seek promotion, reports that women who were successful had supportive husbands, were less `houseproud' and were placing less emphasis on being at home for their children after school than women not seeking promotion. That is, they were not primarily traditional housewives and mothers, but were giving more emphasis to the development of their careers.

It is easy to overlook though, the fact that conflict between what is seen as the divided roles of women teachers still lies beneath these findings. The conflict between the perceived roles of wife and mother and career teacher had been faced by the married women in McIntosh's study who were seeking promotion, and they were emphasising their careers. What is not discussed is the question of `at what cost?' Paddock points out that for women, the divided role of professional and homemaker is:

> ... generally seen as her own personal problem. She must choose between pre-packaged options. One woman described a primary barrier to her career as, "my own feeling that I needed to give primary attention to my family until the youngest was in school" while another wrote "We are not being fair to young women by telling them that they can do what homemakers do and have a career besides. It is a physical impossibility" (Paddock 1981 p191).

It is significant that over two thirds of the women in Sampson's (1987) study who did have children at home had sole responsibilty for child care and they had significantly more housework responsibilities than the men. In Clarricoates' 1980 study of primary teachers, the male teachers saw the conflict between home and school as primarily a professional one rather than a domestic conflict: they had difficulty `turning off' the teacher role at home, rather than facing what Clarricoates calls the "double workload" (p80) of responsibilities at home added to the school demands carried by many women.

Clarricoates argues that it is this double workload of home and school responsibilities that results in women judging themselves as inadequate when they cannot meet all the demands placed upon them. Women are saddled with two obstacles to advancement: lack of time to fulfil extra responsibilities and the using of this fact, both by others and by themselves, as evidence that they are personally lacking in the ability to carry responsibility. It has been shown that when they fail at a task, "women attribute failure to lack of ability and men attribute it to bad luck" (Russell 1986 p41), and Malcolm reports that the women in her study reflected this lack of self-esteem, being "reluctant to apply for promotion because of feelings of inadequacy...needing more support and encouragement to apply for promotion than do men" (1978 p2). There are many studies agreeing with this finding (for example, TEACAPS 1982 p102). However the original summary and conclusion of the TEACAPS study also states that women achieve what they aspire to and they aspire to "what they know is attainable", possibly scaling down their expectations as a result of their prior commitment to their families.

What was being overlooked then in the early studies on women's promotion was the difference between choice and constraint. Neville's profile of a successful woman administrator suggests that to reach the top of education hierarchies, women:

> ... have to remain single, childless, re-enter the workforce after childbearing, or have very supportive husbands (1988 p151).

As Acker points out it is too simple to think that just family responsibilities plus a lack of ambition produce a lack of interest in promotion:

> Writers get tangled up trying to equate `commitment' with what men do. `Lack of commitment' turns out to mean interruptions for childrearing; `commitment' to mean furthering one's own career, especially by moving out of classroom teaching (1983 pp127-129).

Both Shakeshaft (1987) and Acker (1983) argue that many studies have used a `deficit model' of women, measuring them against male norms of behaviour, motivation and

success. But, in comparison with men, women have different life styles and career patterns as a result of their subordinated position in the public sphere where social structures and institutions are male dominated, and in the private sphere of the home where they are ascribed the primary responsibility for childcare (Macdonald 1976, Novitz 1982, Berk 1985). These two spheres interact to constrain women's career choices and development.

Discrimination and sex-role stereotyping are identified by Malcolm as important reasons why women do not apply for management positions. She argues that there is a sex role conflict faced by women, who:

> ...are supposed to be subservient, nurturant and maintain effective relationships, yet as administrators are supposed to be independent, assume leadership and be task oriented (p2).

Given the expectations such stereotypes generate and the fact of male domination of management, she argues that women's socialisation and experiences confirm for them the feelings that they are not suited for such work. These feelings can be reinforced by the meeting of prejudice and discrimination based in `commonsense' understandings about the `naturalness'of women's nurturing role in childcare. Malcolm writes though that:

> Discrimination is a loaded word and tends to arouse antagonism. Many women as well as men refuse to recognise the possibility that it might occur (1978 p3).

She reports that none of the women in her case studies considered they had been discriminated against in their careers, but she uses extensive statistical data to show how men dominate all positions of administration in education. Thus, although she seems to be writing within a liberal feminist `equal opportunity' framework, Malcolm also identifies the underlying working of power differentials in discriminatory practices.

In management training areas discrimination has been identified as restricting women's chances to gain the experience seen as necessary for promotion. The data from Webster's report (1975) on in-service training shows that although women are very motivated to attend such training, `gatekeeping' has occurred here in that management training has been offered mainly to men as a result, and reinforcement, of cultural expectations that men are more `naturally suited' to leadership than women. Webster's call for a greater number of places for women on such courses and more encouragement of women who are qualified for administrative positions, is still

relevant 15 years later. Married women can be seen to be particularly discriminated against in the assumptions about which women are likely to want management training. In the 1978 -1980 national management training courses for women, whilst:

> ...many women teachers left early in their careers for childbearing and rearing and perhaps returned later to the classroom, it was felt nonetheless that amongst the pool of women who remained in teaching or who wished to pursue a full-time career in teaching there was a large untapped potential source of administrators (Steele 1981 p11).

Married women were thus not seen as potential participants. In a separate paper (Court 1989) I have shown how a group of married women who had taken time out for childcare did want management training.

Sarros's (1984) investigation of male and female teachers' aspirations supports the case that discrimination can prevent women gaining management training experience. She found that:

> ... females are neither given encouragement nor incentive to achieve promotion success to the same extent as males...There is a lack of role models and few, if any opportunities to develop confidence in administrative tasks such as the timetable or sports day organisation (Sarros 1984 p15).

Discrimination also surfaced as a factor in Sampson's study (1987). Forty- five percent of the 1430 women surveyed said a lack of experience stopped them from applying for jobs; only 28 percent of the 950 men surveyed gave this as a reason. Sampson points to government systems and the selective cultivation of young men over the years in apprenticeship tasks in schools as a cause of this difference. Significantly, the men were allocated these tasks, while women were given "child management or library tasks" (p3). Judith Manchester's (1984) unpublished study, exploring differences in the ways male and female DPs and SMs in the Central Region did their jobs also shows that women were involved in different tasks. Few female SMs had responsibility for the traditional areas of school administration such as timetables, buildings, grounds and staff relief. Their jobs were more oriented to welfare, guidance and relationships than those of the mainly male DPs. Sixty percent of all SMs and DPs in her sample had received their training from the principal on the job. This would suggest that principals are training neither male nor female staff for promotion to administration.

However, the processes of administration training which are very informal in schools (Thompson 1988), have been shown to benefit men over women (Sampson 1987, Edson 1981). The dominance of men in senior PR positions in high schools for

example, shows that women are missing out in this important area of administration apprenticeship. Secondary principals appoint staff to these positions and as Malcolm points out, "sex-role stereotypes have ensured that men are the gatekeepers to positions of school management" (1978 p3). Lynn Scott places the blame for the failure of women to attain management positions "squarely on the shoulders of principals...who are responsible for the professional development of their staff; many are failing to encourage women to apply for positions for which they are qualified" (Scott 1985 p34). Principals are only part of the problem though. Buchan's (1980) autobiographical account clearly describes wider discriminatory practices which came from her colleagues as well (she also shows how Australian government policies were discriminatory in their effects).

In New Zealand when it comes to actually getting hired, Boards of Trustees will now have the final say for all women aspiring to management positions. Overseas research provides a gloomy picture here too. In Edson's American study, women aspirants report being repeatedly told at interviews they could not be hired because they lacked experience and they felt that "Inexperienced men were hired on their potential, whereas women were required to have already demonstrated their competence" (Edson 1981 p177). The women's comments on their search for reasons why they had failed to get hired despite having the necessary credentials and motivation makes salutary reading. Although they cited factors of age, race and experience, Edson points to gender as being the `paramount' factor.

> When they sought experience, their sex became a factor; when they sought jobs, the lack of experience was brought up (p179).

She summed it up by quoting one man's comment after an interview: "Gee, you had all of the qualifications, but I'll be honest with you: I couldn't go with a woman" (p178). The ascendancy of a male hegemony can be seen here and the result, as Neville points out, is that:

> Only a few very exceptional women have access to power in a man's world (1988 p151).

Neville argues that rather than studying the constraints on women's careers, there is a need to celebrate women's success as a way of turning around the focus on women as subordinated (Burton 1985) or powerless, to provide women with inspiration and role models.

Women's management styles

In the past, studies investigating whether men and women work differently as educational managers have shown conflicting results. Shakeshaft (1987 p165) argues that many of those which reported `no difference' have been looking at the question from within a male paradigm, often measuring the job on Mintzberg- type task models which define management as an integration of ten roles grouped into interpersonal, informational and decisional tasks (Mintzberg 1975). When they found that women managers were (not surprisingly) involved in similar management tasks to men, the studies went no further to ask whether women were doing anything else, or using a different style, or emphasizing different aspects of their work to men. Shakeshaft also reports that the early studies had:

> ...an odd reporting history. When women surpassed men on the measures used, these differences were often not reported in the conclusions. For instance, a study by Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederickson (1962) ended with the conclusion that men should "probably not be favoured over women for positions of school administration."

And this was despite their own conclusions that:

> As a class men are not overwhelmingly superior to women as elementary school principals. The evidence appears to favour women if the job of the principal is conceived in a way that values working with teachers and outsiders, being concerned with the objectives of teaching, pupil participation and the evaluation of learning, having knowledge of teaching methods and gaining positive reactions from teachers and superiors (Hemphill, Griffiths and Frederickson 1962 p334, cited by Shakeshaft 1987 p168).

This illustrates the difficulties researchers have come up against when confronting results that deny their own expectations that are grounded in possibly stereotyped views of what is, or should be, `male' and `female' behaviour[4].

However, recent studies do describe differences between male and female educational managers (Stockard and Johnson 1981, Charters and Jovick 1981, Gilbertson 1981, Pitner 1981). These show that women managers were more democratic, had schools with more positive teacher, pupil and parent attitudes towards education and their schools demonstrated superior pupil performance. In Gross and Trask's (1964) study of male and female career paths, most women decided as early as high school that they wanted to be teachers and they specialized in education with this aim, whereas more

---

[4]It also suggests a reluctance to confront the fact that if women are not less competent than men, there could be other discriminatory factors working against them being more equally represented in management.

men planned to move out of teaching into other jobs at some stage in their working lives. It would seem logical that if women do move from teaching into management positions, they will take with them a strong emphasis on instruction as part of their leadership role. Although most investigations of instructional leadership do not consider the significance of gender factors, in studies comparing male and female administrators, women have been shown to spend more time discussing the academic content of the school with teachers, to assist beginning teachers more, to give more attention to students' individual differences and to be more concerned about the social and emotional development of the child. They are also more likely to emphasise teachers' instructional skills and their total responsibility to the school, deriving more satisfaction from supervising teachers in their work than do men, who derive greater satisfaction from administrative tasks. (Fishel and Pottker 1977, Fauth 1984, Gilbertson 1981, Gross and Task 1964).

Pitner carried out two studies which observed behaviours of male and female superintendants in almost all types of work situations. She found that although the time and energy of both male and female administrators is mostly filled by the routine aspects of their jobs, there were several differences in the aspects they emphasised. For example, the women spent less time in desk work (11 percent of the women's time was spent on this whereas men spent 20 percent of their time at their desks) and women gave more time to people and instructionally oriented activities. During their observation tours, women spent more time:

> ...visiting classrooms, keeping abreast of the instructional programme, while males used the time to walk the halls with the principals and the head custodians, requesting that they follow up on particular concerns...While women were able to articulate the specific ideology and activities that dominated the district's curricular program, men appeared to speak of aspects of organization structure, such as the construction of a new school building, approval of a tax levy and the graduation of a senior class (1981 p288).

The women in Neville's study described the technical tasks of management as the `paperwork' and they used support staff to move this quickly and efficiently, recognising that this aspect of administration had to be completed (1988 p41). But they gave the educative functions a higher importance than the technical tasks of management; and saw the motive in their management work as: "to improve education for children" (p140). When Neville asked the women if they saw any links between classroom teaching and management:

> All agreed without hesitation that the classroom skills they used were as applicable in running an institution. They valued people skills, the ability to plan, facilitating learning, analysing, evaluating (1988 p142).

They were doing something more in their administrative work, though, than just using the technical skills that they described as having been developed during their work as classroom teachers. They were stressing affiliative skills as the basis of their ways of working. In Karen Sewell's words:

> All the things that were important to me in my classroom like being non-confrontary, being supportive and caring about individuals - they are the basis of me as an administrator as I was a classroom teacher (Neville 1988 p142).

Such skills are an important part of a co-operative management style. In Johnson and Snyder's investigation into administrators' perceived instructional leadership training needs, they report that principals "want to know how to involve others in co-operative planning and action successfully" (1985 p115). Studies have shown that women have special skills in communication, which is recognised as the main work of educational administrators: talk *is* the work and it *does* the work (Mintzberg 1973, Gronn 1982). Shakeshaft suggests that more research needs to be done on how women's different communication styles from men may, in fact, be the very styles collaborative management needs. She discusses, for example, women's tentative phrasings that shy away from generalisation and their use of questions to express opinions, as styles that invite participation from others (1987 p181). She also reports studies with both perceptual and behavioural evidence that women listen more, interrupt less, use greater eye contact and hear the emotional and personal issues in conversations whereas men listen for 'facts' (1987 pp179-186). Pitner (1981) reports that the women she observed did not dominate discussions and used meetings as a forum for considering possibilities. When it is added that women managers have been shown to give more information to workers (Baird and Bradley 1979) as well as showing them more consideration (Hyman 1980) it is not surprising that Scott (1980) found that female communication characteristics were considered more effective than those of males. Shakeshaft concludes:

> It seems we should advise men to watch how women speak and listen and try to make those styles their own, if they want to be effective school administrators (1987 p186).

Women's communication styles as reported in these studies go a long way towards creating consensual and participative atmospheres for decision making, and help explain why studies on women administrators identify their styles as democratic and collegial. Charters and Jovick report that:

> More decisions than expected were of the collegial variety under female principals, while more decisions were made by the principal alone under male principals (1981 p316).

Shared decision making is part of the sharing of power. Karen Sewell wrote in a recent article, "Widening the Power Base":

> I think the balance of power in this school has altered... Our aim has been to develop a spirit of mutual responsibility and a commitment to collaborative action... that values self-examination, non-defensiveness, working together, continued evaluation of where we are going and what we are doing, determination to work through problems together, and acceptance that real leadership should not derive from one person alone (1989 p14).

It is fair to argue that this more co-operative style is not just exhibited by women, and Sewell specifically denies that the change of management style in her school has come about "just because" she is a woman. She comments that its effective operation depends upon the "commitment, support, honesty and open minds" of her male colleagues as much as on her own beliefs. This is, of course, true, but what must not be overlooked here is that she is enabling and facilitating the change, 'leading from the centre of the group', in Hartsock's (1983) words.

To sum up and conclude this survey of the literature, from what is currently known about the female world, and work behaviour in schools, Shakeshaft (1987 pp 195-198) suggests that five factors might conceptualise the work of women administrators: *relationships (affiliation)* with others are central; *building community* is an essential part of their style; *teaching and learning* are their major foci; the line separating the *public and private world blurs* for them and *marginality* overlays their daily work as a result of their token status and sexist attitudes towards them. All these ideas have emerged in the first two chapters of this thesis.

However, if women's perspectives and values are to be adequately represented in educational administration theory and practice, there needs to be more than just a description of the ways that women who do 'make it' into management positions are working; there needs to be a *reconstruction* (Blackmore 1989) of the present dominant paradigms. This is especially so in the area of leadership and authority. The next chapter therefore reviews feminist critiques of these concepts and examines further the idea that affiliation is central to a woman's style of management.

Chapter three

A feminist reconstruction of educational leadership

In administration theories and practice the domination of androcentric viewpoints have been influential in the development of definitions of authority and leadership, with a particular concept of leadership persisting despite recent challenges from critical theorists. Jill Blackmore (1989 p107-119) argues that a continuing association of `masculine' characteristics with leadership is problematic in education, where women constitute over half the population. She traces the social and historical construction of this connection from the present broad definitions of management equated with notions of efficiency, skill, hierarchy and control back through trait theory definitions of leadership to what she argues is their base in a combination of liberal political theory with positivist scientific theory which informed the bureaucratic structuring of schools. The first part of this chapter summarises her critique of theories of leadership before discussing the concept of affiliation. It is argued that this concept should be an important part of a new theory of administration that would better reflect the concerns and values of women.

Authority, individuality and rationality in educational leadership.

Blackmore (1988) argues that women's invisibility in organisational theory stems from processes which made them invisible in social and political theory generally. In liberal political theories (such as those of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau) the idea of the `universal man' is important. Blackmore argues that this notion has had important consequences for women as a result of its development through abstraction and the creating of dualisms. In order to make generalisations or universal statements there is a "decontextualisation, or abstraction, of real events and people from their situation" (p108): the `individual' becomes disembodied and each person, regardless of their gender, is treated as having similar status and experience. However, the public individual is termed universal man and is modelled upon men's experience. Thus, individuality and masculinity are linked, while women become invisible.

The creation of dualisms between "culture/nature, public /private, mind/body, rational/emotional" (Blackmore 1989 p108) involved the definitions of rationality separating concrete and affective experience from what was seen as the higher plane of the mind[1]. Further, women were "cast into the private sphere of emotionality and men into the public, civic sphere of political and economic activity" (1989 p108)[2]. The development of distinctions of gender power as a result of such dualist separations is reflected in Jean Jacques Rousseau's comment on the education of women:

> The whole education of women ought to be relative to men. To please them, to be useful to them,to make themselves honoured by them, to educate them when young, to care for them when grown, to counsel them, to consider them and to make life sweet and agreeable to them - these are the duties of women at all times and what should be taught to them from their infancy (cited by Ritchie 1987 p49).

Alongside these ideas developed the bureaucratic form of organisations, with the specialising and rationalising of work being supported by positivistic theories of knowledge. A distinction is made between facts and values in this paradigm: knowledge can be scientifically explained through a process of systematic study of natural phenomena[3]. Within this framework, schools have been considered value-free contexts with consensus as the norm and organisational control legitimately vested in formal institutionalised roles.

> Administration in schools came to be conceived as a neutral practice carried out by experts in a scientific and rational manner and decision making seen as a rationale linear procedure, not a matter of values and subjective opinions (Blackmore 1989 p112).

The effect on women of the combination of these paradigms is argued by Young:

> As a consequence of the opposition between reason and desire, moral decisions grounded in considerations of sympathy, caring, and an assessment of differentiated need are defined as not rational, not `objective', merely sentimental. To the extent that women exemplify or are identified with such styles of moral decision-making, then women are excluded from moral rationality (Young 1987 p630).

---

[1]As Hochschild (1975) points out, rationality becames "emotionlessness" in this paradigm and the implication is made that emotions and feelings are not positively required in the rational action of individuals and the smooth functioning of institutions.

[2]These ideas have filtered through to New Zealand educational policies: for example, in the Thomas Report's statements about the curriculum all girls were seen to need "...studies and activities directly related to the home" (p. 46) and in the fifth form homecraft option, home-making was conceived as "...an art that calls not only for efficiency but also for taste and an understanding of non-material needs" (Thomas Report p70, cited in Middleton 1988b pp78-79).

[3]A split is also being made here between logic and intuition, where intuition is classed as 'non-rational' rather than logic and intuition being equally valid ends of a spectrum of rationality, as Radcliffe Richards argues (1980). Intuitive knowledge can arise from "a leap of the imagination and the person who has come to the conclusion cannot say how it was reached" (1980 p22).

Harding (1983 pp40-50) also criticises the view of rationality that requires a transcendental view of morality, with abstract judgements being arrived at through abstract principles and an impartiality that stands apart from interests and desires. Such a rationality requires that all situations need to be treated, in effect, according to a set of rules that leaves out the particular and ignores feelings. It is this kind of thinking though, that lies behind the development of the bureaucratic leadership paradigm and style that is typically authoritarian, claiming to be impartial in the interests of the organisation as a whole (Blackmore 1989). Despite critical theorist's attacks on its narrow scientism (Codd 1988), this paradigm has persisted: "Leadership is justified on the grounds of rational necessity, individual behaviours and opportunities" in the school organisation which is hierarchically structured as a `technical necessity' for the co-ordination of subdivided tasks (Blackmore 1989 p118).

The problems for women have been further compounded by trait theory descriptions of leadership. In Western societies, trait theories equated particular interpretations of rationality, morality, organisation and individualism with characteristics more frequently depicted as masculine than feminine, characterisics such as aggressiveness, forcefulness, independence and competitiveness. This association resulted, Blackmore argues, from empirical studies of those already in leadership positions:

> Historical accounts of `great men' merely substantiate what is already seen to be self-evident. The behaviours, traits and characteristics displayed by men in formal positions of authority have become the `givens' of leadership (1989 p100).

Definitions and perceptions of leadership have thus become gender stereotyped. A woman who behaves according to a culturally defined `femininity' (being emotional, dependent, nurturing or intuitive) will not be seen as a `good' leader, but if she behaves in an aggressive, forceful, competitive or coldly logical manner, she will be seen as `hard' or `unfeminine' (Blackmore 1989 p100). Although trait theories have been criticised for not being able to distinguish between `effective' and `ineffective' leaders, the `masculinist' model of leadership persists in other paradigms, such as the behaviourist and the situational/contingency models.

Situational/contingency models argue that leaders need to develop a range of skills and strategies, from which they can choose the most appropriate to suit a particular situation. An example can be seen in Vroom's `decision-making tree' (discussed in Prebble and Stewart 1984 pp93-97) where the leader chooses from a range of strategies that can help define the problem and who should be involved in the decision-

making process. Women can be seen to be disadvantaged here by the traditional view of `femininity': under classical liberal theories, "women were perceived as irrational creatures of passion" (Middleton 1989 p3). Such notions persist, making it difficult for women to be seen as possessing decision-making skills within the dominant frameworks. Blackmore argues that women in management positions are required to reject and submerge their definitions of self as a woman[4].

The behaviorist models of leadership accept that behaviours which are gender stereotypic are learned, rather than the result of innate differences; the dominant theory explaining the lack of women in administration as sex-role stereotyping and socialisation is an example. But the political effect of this theory is the same as that of trait theory: it `blames the victim' by taking a perspective that sees women as deficient (Acker 1983). When judged against male norms of behaviour, motivation and success, women don't `fit' and the solution is seen as women needing to change themselves, rather than the problem being a consequence of the fact that the norms and structures of leadership have been male defined. When viewed from within the male perspective women are seen as inferior rather than different.

Blackmore concludes that the combination of liberal political theories of individuality, trait theories of masculinity and femininity and the processes of bureaucratic structuring have resulted in a gendered hierarchy of authority in schools and a sexual division of labour between teaching and administration which have been based on ideas of expertise and notions of bureaucratic rationality. Rather, teaching and administration should be seen as:

> ...inextricably dependent and within the same field of practice... Such hierarchies reinforce existing power relations and the ways in which femininity and masculinity are socially constructed and reproduced in schools. The emphasis on authority as being legitimately and rationally imparted through neutral organisational or bureaucratic means renders the gender relationships which co-exist in bureaucratic life non-problematic (Blackmore 1989 p109).

Chapter 2 of this study reported the position of women within these hierarchies; the large majority have become located on the bottom rungs. As argued in Chapter 1, the domination of men's viewpoints and values in society as a whole has resulted in a cultural devaluation of that which is most characteristic of women's lives and

---

[4]Liberal interventionist ideas argue that women can 'cross over' into the public (masculine) world: through the notions of individual 'merit' and success and those of the autonomous individual freely making rational choices she can 'work hard' and gain promotion. As pointed out in Chapter 2, such ideas emphasise 'choice' but neglect the structural and ideological constraints that are placed around women's ability to make such 'choices'. It also ignores the need for women to fit the male paradigms of leadership.

experience. Within educational administration, such a devaluation can be seen to have resulted in the view that women are not `suited' to leadership which `requires' qualities of forcefulness, impartiality and rationality more commonly seen as `masculine'.

In this situation, Neville argues that there is a need to celebrate women's success as a way of turning around the focus on women as subordinated (Burton 1985) or powerless and to provide women with role models and inspiration. Although it is important to recognise and validate women's achievements, there are problems in this approach if the presence of unequal power in gender relations is not adequately recognised or analysed and there are some contradictions in Neville's study which can be traced back to this factor. A discussion of the concepts of affiliation, career and success will illustrate some of the difficulties.

Affiliation: women's need or chosen strategy?

Neville refers back to Malcolm's study in her suggestion that affiliation is a woman's need that may be hindering her promotion chances (1988 p101-102). Malcolm, in turn, refers to research findings that women are more often motivated by affiliation, ie. social or group needs, than men, and she hypothesises that:

> Since these needs are possibly more easily met through teaching than through administration, some women therefore prefer to stay in the classroom (1978 p2).

Such ideas are based in Maslow's (1970) model of motivation which conceptualizes levels of needs through which all people pass on a journey to autonomy and fulfillment. This model is criticised by Shakeshaft (1987 p156- 160) who argues that it is androcentric and therefore does not take sufficient account of women's different values. She questions his hierarchy that places affiliation needs below those of self-esteem, and self-actualization higher again:

> This prepotency configuration matches traditional male values. Whereas some females embrace this value system as well, one must question its applicability to female experience...A woman's sense of self and fulfillment have historically been tied to her needs for affiliation and intimacy (1987 p156).

As she points out, Maslow does not explore the differences between the public worlds of men and the private worlds of women. His research sample of women was drawn from those who had succeeded in the public world: consequently he does not develop an adequate picture of women's values and experience. That he views women's nurturing roles in the home as being of lesser value than roles in the world of paid

employment is clear in his introduction, where he devalues female intelligence and experience:

> It is possible for a female to have all the specifically female fulfillments (being loved, having the home, having the baby) and then, without giving up any of the satisfactions already achieved, go on *beyond femaleness to the full humanness she shares with males,* for example, the full development of her intelligence, of any talents she may have, and of her own particular idiosyncratic genius (Maslow 1970 pxiv, cited by Shakeshaft 1987 p158). My emphasis.

In Maslow's view, excellence is equated with masculinity, not with femininity nor with the world of the home. In contrast, Shakeshaft shows through her analysis of over 200 dissertations and 600 research articles and her own research on women in administration that women emphasise the importance of relationships and of intimacy in their own different definitions of excellence and fulfillment.

The working of male hegemony can be seen in the arguments that trace women's lack of promotion to a `need' for affiliation that keeps them in the classroom rather than moving into management. These arguments ideologically re-define qualities that are a woman's strength, an emphasis on intimacy, relationships and nurturance, as her `weakness', a sign of her being overly dependent, or `unable to stand on her own' and thus `unsuitable' for management. To take this argument to its logical conclusion, by implication management does not require affiliative skills and as an occupation, cannot fill those (human) needs[5]. The hypothesis that affiliation needs keep women teachers in the classroom must also be criticised on the grounds that such an argument demeans women, intellectually and socially. It assumes that adult women are less than adult, seeking to be satisfied by relationships with children and teenagers and not by relationships with their adult colleagues.

If we were to change the emphasis and acknowledge affiliation as a quality needed by both women and men in management to build the teamwork identified as important in the development of effective schools, a very different picture would emerge. Ironically, that is the very thing that is happening in the emphasis on participatory and facilitative models of management. Alongside the current revised `Taylorist' educational management discourse with its emphasis on technical systems of control, cost-effectiveness, staff rationalisation, performance and outcomes, there is an awareness of the significance of team-building in educational management, in the processes of decision-making, of motivation and in job satisfaction for example. Such team work

---

[5]Neville refers to the 'relative isolation' of administration, but in my experience of classroom teaching and adminstration, administrative work in a people-oriented style of management involved daily contact with a much wider range of adults than did teaching.

requires the skills of affiliation, the ability to build and maintain relationships, those very skills that have traditionally been seen as the ones valued and practised by women. However, the models for consultative and participatory management (for example, that of Prebble and Stewart 1984) do not argue this link; rather, androcentric research perspectives see only a need for those kinds of skills to be taught in management training programmes (see, for example, Johnson and Snyder 1985, Wadsworth 1988). It would not be surprising if men were not strong in such skills as a result of their socialising into competitive individualism and an authoritarian `masculinity', but the `mainstream' administration research does not identify such a possibility. This is hegemonically `overlooked', as is the associated suggestion that women administrators may already possess such skills as a result of their socialising into nurturing, affiliative `femininity'.

An awareness of, and emphasis on, relating to other people was not a constraint on the women in Neville's (1988) study, revealing their need for other's approval and attachment. Instead, affiliation was expressed as strong positive values of concern for people and the wish to work through co- operation rather than competition. These values were also seen as part of their identities as women: they were "emphatic about the necessity to retain their sense of gender and to take their love and care of people into their managerial roles" (Neville 1988 p144). For most of the women in that study, sharing power through collaborative decision-making, thus empowering others in a facilitative way, was important. This facilitative quality is one many writers see as a particularly `female' strength, different from the more commonly authoritarian style of men (Schaef 1980, Gilligan 1982).

In her summing up of the recent literature on women in management, Neville writes that this literature:

> ... shows quite clearly that women have a style that is not the norm but has proven highly successful for students and teachers alike... a `feminine' style that is, in part, a product of being in the minority with low opportunity status, so being forced to be negotiatory and placatory (1988 p144).

In Neville's reporting of her women's management styles there is however, an underlying inconsistency due to her vacillating views of affiliation. She writes that the women had:

> ...*broken through* what Malcolm calls `affiliative needs' to take roles which other women do not see as traditional and *beyond where* so many women are content to operate (1988 p102). My emphases.

Her wording gives a low status to qualities of affiliation, despite the fact that she also reports this quality of caring for people as one of the strengths of her women managers styles (pp142-144). She writes these further comments about the `successful' woman:

> Her major achievement has been to avoid the `stuck' female roles in institutions, the nurturing caring roles that do not lead to promotion (p149).

The inconsistency in what Neville reports as successful women's ways of working ("taking their love and care of people into their managerial roles" p144) and the ways they actually achieved their positions (by avoiding the `stuck' nurturing roles), can be understood when it is remembered that most of the women in her study rose to the top of a male dominated institution by following what could be described as a male career pattern. They had gained experience in the technical tasks seen as important for promotion (Manchester 1984) and if married, they did not take time off for having children, having a supportive partner who was willing to move for their job promotions. Single or married, they often `bought' home help to help them keep on top of the inevitable housework (Neville 1988 pp147-151). It seems from Neville's study that this is the way women are required to behave if they wish to attain management positions, but if women only do this, the male-defined requirements for `success' and the hierarchical patterns in management that keep men in positions of power over women will not be challenged nor changed for a long time yet. Neville herself points to this fact on the last page of her study where she states that only a "radical social change will alter... the deeply held antipathy to women in management positions" (p152).

This antipathy can be traced back to the underlying male hegemonic forces which work at `commonsense' and cultural levels, shaping understandings about the nature of authority and leadership, career and success. In a male paradigm of work in the `public' sphere, a career means a patterned sequence of jobs, each increasing in responsibility and rewards (administrators thus have careers - they have moved up through a vertical sequence of jobs). This paradigm though does not take account of women's patterns of paid work, often broken by periods of unpaid voluntary work or work in the home, different patterns which affect women in significant ways[6]. The notion of talking about women's career paths has some anomolies for women teachers: as a result of the ideological private/public split, women who work in the `public' world have been seen as having jobs rather than careers (Biklin 1985). In the ideology of women's `nature' their primary role has been seen as nurturing and childcare in the

---

[6]For example, Paddock's 1981 study showed that most women enter administration later than men, as over half have broken their careers for child rearing.

`private' world of the home and therefore, paid work in the public sphere has been seen as having secondary importance. If they are married, women's paid `jobs' in the `public' sphere have been devalued by judgements that they are `only second income earners' (this is discussed further in Chapter 5).

Success within the `male' career paradigm is also synonymous with moving `up' into management positions, and promotion is justified by calling on the `meritocracy' ideology - the rhetoric of `fair and equal opportunity' that `rewards individual effort and competition'. Thus, it can be argued, women can `choose' to try to move into management by hard work and effort, or they can `opt' out. It is easy in such a paradigm to overlook the different constraints on women's so-called `choices'. Different ways of achieving success also have no place in this viewpoint, though Carlson and Schmuck reported a woman's definition of success as:

> Success is not measured in moving from job to job in a vertical continuum - it is measured by the quality of any job held (1981 pp122-123).

Within the ideologies of success there is also the notion that management positions which are placed higher on a bureaucratic hierarchy require more `ability' than positions that are `lower' and thus, those who don't move up are somehow `deficient' in important skills. In Neville's use of the word `content' to describe the feelings of women who stay as teachers rather than `moving up' to become managers there is an implication that they are passively accepting a lesser role. This ignores the possibility of resistance by these women, an active choice not to conform to male patterns of success that require them to work in the technical areas of management (such as timetabling) which could be perceived as taking them away from people. In Neville's comments that the `successful' woman "was always involved in relief, buildings, staff development, finances and departmental returns" (p149), a reason why many women choose not to seek promotion into administration seems clear. The possibility that women may be deliberately choosing not to move into management for reasons that have nothing to do with their needs, but more to do with what is seen as the needs of others, their families and the children they teach, for example, is also overlooked here. Although Neville recommends that women need to "change themselves and challenge the stereotypes in their own homes and in their classroom practice" (p152), the nurturing caring roles are the ones many women value highly; the staff `relief', buildings, finances and departmental returns side of management could be viewed as only the `paperwork' behind the more important work of helping children learn and develop, the reason they went into teaching in the first place.

Neville set out to find out why her women had achieved success, and though she was trying to change the focus away from looking at women as subordinated (1988 p9), through her documentation of her women's careers paths what becomes clear is that if a woman is to succeed in educational administration, she must be exceptional. Neville explains this as being "outstandingly able" (p32) but such a woman needs also to be exceptional in the sense of being atypical in comparison with other women; she needs to behave like a man and follow male- defined career patterns. Paradoxically, by tracing the reasons for the success of these women, Neville's study reveals that women are subordinated: they cannot easily achieve top management positions on their own terms.

That women are not seen as `appropriate' people for management is clear from the results of Sampson's study. Her open-ended questions asking for the causes of women's lack of promotion had unanimous answers: women were not seen as having administrative potential, men were seen to be running the schools and males were prejudiced against women as administrators. The present reality for most women teachers is:

> ... a cumulative record of legitimation for authority to be linked with masculinity...Men learn that they are the next generation of leaders, and women too learn just that, and that they themselves are NOT. It is a two way process (1987 p3).

This two way process is reinforced through "a hierarchy of gender relations" that permeates not just management but school life as a whole (Cocklin and Battersby 1987). It has already been argued that this hierachical structuring reinforces existing gender power relations, but as well as that, it poses a further dilemma for women:

> The dominance of a science of administration has legitimated power relations in schools and maintained a myth of bureaucratic rationality and individualism...hierarchy is technically rational and domination legitimate (Blackmore 1989 p118).

Those who value collegial relationships face having to work within a management model and school structures that require the exercise of power over others[7]. If they choose not to be put in this situation by opting out of management, they lose the chance to influence decision and policy making procedures. If however, they enter management positions and change these into people-focussed, collegial and nurturing jobs, they can be seen as not 'real' managers at all, but as pseudo mothers or hostesses (Kanter 1977, Marshall 1984) who can't 'take the lead'. Johnston's (1986) study of

---

[7]Male managers working in this style can also meet this situation if staff members expect and want a manager to work in hierarchical ways: "You make the decisions, that is what you are paid to do".

primary teachers' preferences for leadership shows that they tend to want men to be directive and women to have "time to listen and to see things from the other person's point of view before making a decision" (p224), that is, those teachers wanted women to behave in traditionally `feminine' nurturing ways rather than assertively taking the lead[8].

All this seems very depressing and rather hopeless. However, the picture thus far does not pay adequate attention to the fact of women's agency in a struggle against hegemonic forces that define and judge their aspirations, values and beliefs as `deficient'. Women are achieving management positions and once there, they are developing a style that is reflecting values which they hold as teachers and as women. As was argued in the last part of Chapter 2, there is transformative potential in non-hierarchical and faciliative ways of working.

In the traditional conceptualisations of leadership what is missing is the recognition of the part played by community (I use this word to mean the shared involvement of a group of people) in the making of moral judgements. Individuals' needs for social collective action are denied in the liberal theory emphasis on the individual (Blackmore 1989 p112). Gould (1983) argues that in human society where one must live with others, the rational person, rather than valuing independence and separation, values empathising and connecting with particular others through a recognition of social interdependence. These are the areas of women's particular interests and where they have much to offer educational administration. Drawing on what has been seen as the `feminine' skills and strengths of nurturing and commitment to others (socially developed as a result of women's centrality in the family and as principal childrearers), a new view of management would emphasise a relational morality and attachments and responsibilities to others as well as to oneself. Young argues that in this view:

> ...Consensus and sharing may not always be the goal, but the recognition and appreciation of difference, in the context of confrontation with power (1987 p76).

In her study of women managers, Marshall also states that women's interests need to confront and transform power, rewriting a traditional notion of power over others to one of power for and power through others (1984 p108). Leadership in this definition would be described primarily as the ability to act with others, a form of empowerment,

---

[8]However, it must be noted here that the answer to any research question can be shaped by the way that the question is asked. Sex role stereotypes have quite probably been triggered here by the question which asked for the behaviour preferred from the "ideal female leader". Eichler (1980) has pointed out that sex differentiated research designs can, in this way, reinforce the notion of inherent differences between the sexes.

where collective processes confront traditional notions of authority, efficiency and organisational rationality and offer ways of building community (in the sense of `group belonging'). In this paradigm, there would be a recognition and appreciation of difference (Blackmore 1989 p122) and the zero sum idea of power is challenged, echoing Lickert's idea of `the influence pie': if you want more influence, bake a bigger pie.

Karen Sewell's article, referred to in Chapter 2, illustrates how power can be widened to include the members of the school community in decision making. As a principal, Sewell is sharing power with the staff of Green Bay High by not not retaining the right to veto the decisions they had made together. This is a flattening of the hierarchical model of leadership that can be seen to hold risks for those at the top who have traditionally held this power in their own hands. But it also shares responsibility in a way that compensates for that loss of power: it is a model that values a more equal participation in both decision making and taking of responsibility, and thus can empower others in a way that can develop their potential.

However, Sewell's statements about the processes involved in the `widening of the power base' reveal that once again a fundamental gender power imbalance exists, even in her school. It is significant that she refers to her male colleagues support as necessary for that process, but she does not make the same comment about her female colleagues. In her earlier interview with Neville, Sewell had said she eventually realised:

> "I shouldn't have to put a lot more energy into the men than the women I work with." She admits she used to spend a lot of time "trying to make them feel better about the fact that I was a woman", but now sees that it is not her problem. But "for some people who observe me - they still have a problem" (Neville 1988 p96).

In the later article her comments reveal that women who wish to be influential have to be careful not to offend the men they work with and to always maintain a `reasonable, unbiased' stance that does not threaten the status quo in the unequal gender relations that exist within the patriarchal culture of educational institutions. In 1983, Sandra Acker wrote:

> In my years of teaching experienced teachers on advanced course, I have heard many stories of incompetent men given scale posts within primary schools; women teachers who continue to work after maternity leave believing they are under constant scrutiny from disapproving heads to prove no loss of competence; unsuccessful women applicants for senior posts told in confidence that a man was preferred in order to discipline older children or satisfy village prejudices. I also hear complaints from men teachers about the lack of

> commitment and interest shown by women teachers in their schools. None of these stories has any but anecdotal weight, but where is the research to show what gender relations are really like in schools, and how they influence women's choices?... They will not tell us 'why' sexual divisions occur, but they could do us immense service in telling us how they are perpetuated (1983 p134).

The next chapter introduces and explains the methodology of this present exploratory study of a group of women working in educational middle management. It attempts to explain some of the processes involved in the construction and maintaining of the inequalities identified in Acker's statement and in the preceding chapters.

Chapter four

The research process

As argued in the first three chapters, the androcentrism identified in educational administration theory and practice means that women need to engage in a struggle against being defined as deviant (Shakeshaft 1987), deficient (Acker 1983) or invisible (Spender 1982) by using a women-centred approach to research that focusses on women's own perspectives, values and personal accounts of their experiences. An obvious criticism of such within-group analysis could be that it appears to be as biased as androcentric studies. However, until women's own views are fully described and analysed alongside those of men, there can be no balanced picture of the work of educational managers.

This study focusses on a small group of women who were working in middle management positions in both primary and secondary schools and who came together for a management training course. A questionnaire survey of the whole group was used to gather data on their teaching experience and their perceptions of constraints on their careers and this was followed up by case history analyses of interviews with six of the women.

Before describing in greater detail the methods used for the study however, it is necessary to briefly discuss some of the issues related to the place of personal experience in the research process.

Subjectivity and objectivity in the research process

The relationship between the researcher and the researched is important in any kind of research, particularly so in life history styles of investigation. Positivism suggested that the researcher can `stand back' from the `object' of study and be neutral and dispassionate in analysing its `facts', but writers such as Roberts (1981), Oakley (1981) and Stanley and Wise (1983) criticise such research paradigms that place a premium on `neutral and objective' methodologies. An early feminist critique of the sexism in research argued that feminism could only influence the first stage of

choosing a topic and the last stage of interpreting the results. Kelly (1978) saw research methods as objective, not being susceptible to bias or influence.
However there is no such thing as `neutral objectivity'; such a claim merely hides subjectivity behind a `scientific' facade.

As argued in Chapter 3, positivistic views of knowledge separate objectivity from subjectivity, fact from value, logic from feelings and ascribe superior status in each case to the former. Research based on such dichotomies, while making a claim to `neutral objectivity', can work to maintain gender inequalities because logic and objectivity have been culturally defined in Western societies as qualities that are `masculine', while "women are viewed as irrational creatures of passion" (Middleton 1989 p3). In this way, women's knowledge and viewpoints are removed from consideration (Smith 1974).

Objectivity within logical positivism (ie. neutral detachment between observer and observed) as a frame of reference for research has been powerfully challenged. Oakley criticises the methodology that treats:

> ...the researcher and the researched as objective instruments of data production. (This should be) replaced by the recognition that personal involvement is more than dangerous bias - it is the condition under which people come to know each other and to admit others into their lives (Oakley 1981 p58).

The `myth' of `hygenic research' is misleading in that it suggests that a researcher: "... can be `there' without having any greater involvement than simple presence" (Stanley and Wise 1983 p110). The background, experience and personality of a researcher will affect each stage of the research process, from the choosing of which questions to ask to the writing up and analysis of data collected.

> ... The kind of person that we are and how we experience the research have a crucial impact on what we see, what we do and how we interpret and construct what is going on (Stanley and Wise 1983 p50).

That sociology needed a methodological reorganisation that would place the researcher within her own experience which thus become the "ground of her knowledge" was pointed out by Smith (1974 p11), and Roberts wrote that there must be "a reflexive sociology in which the sociologist takes her own experiences seriously and incorporates them into her work" (1981 p16). A useful example of this personal approach is Judi Marshall's description and reflection upon her own personal experience (1984 pp5-8). She wrote that this experience was:

> ...a powerful sense-making apparatus..in a world of being bombarded by different messages about the place of women...struggling to make personal sense of it all, and remain viable as people in their day- to-day work and home relationships...Development of my intellectual understanding... has been paralled by the emergence of a new sense of myself as a woman in a public world structured largely by men (1984 pp5-8).

A piece of advice to potential researchers that made good sense to me was: "Mine your experience, there's potential gold there!" (Strauss 1987 p11)[1]. This study therefore places an emphasis on the importance of including personal experience and of acknowledging the subjectivity of both the women participants in the project and of myself as researcher.

My stance is that of an 'insider'. This is in several senses: I was a participant member of the course from which the sample of women administrators was drawn (registering after the brochure was sent to my school, a co-ed secondary where I was Senior Mistress), I am married and the mother of two teenagers, and I am Pakeha. I was thus a fairly `typical' member of the group who attended the course. However, although I may have shared some experiences which could open insights into what some of the women wrote I am aware that:

> ...feminism shouldn't be taken as a password misleading us into a false notion of 'oneness' with all women on the grounds of gender. No matter how much our past personal experience figures and feeds into the research programme, we can't possibly assume it neccessarily corresponds in any way to that of the research `subjects' (McRobbie 1982 p52).

Historical and cultural variations in women's experiences make it necessary for me, as for all researchers, to be as aware as possible of my own values and assumptions, to interrogate these and to try to put them on one side as I listen, read and reflect. As a participant observer it is also necessary to try to hold in balance two stances: to "treat the familiar as strange" and to treat what both the respondents and myself took for granted "as a topic worthy of examination" (Barton 1988 p112), while trying to stand off far enough from my own personal involvement with the issues the women discussed to `hear' their experience yet also maintain the empathy that would open understanding of their stories.

Although this stance can be seen to cohere with feminist methodology, as Shipley has pointed out:

---

[1]Within educational administration, Mollie Neville has described her personal "anger and pain" at her realisation that gender was "almost certainly the main reason for not being appointed" to administrative positions and she set out to take the positive step of documenting the reasons why women succeed, as a way of doing something positive about gender inequalities (1988 p10).

> ...the various sociological research methods are neither inherently feminist, nor, on the other hand, sexist. The statistical survey is no more a masculine research method than the in-depth case study is a feminine one, although there may be good historical reasons why feminists find the latter more productive sociologically. Feminism informs the research process from start to finish, but it does not constitute the sociological approach (1983 p11).

She argued that feminist research is done for women in general, for and with the women we are studying and for ourselves as feminists, aiming at "women's social and political advancement or the liberation of women from patriarchal social relations" (p11). It is done with the aim of making women's lives visible (Spender 1982). Such aims inform this research which tries to build understanding of aspects of male hegemony as it is experienced by women in their schools and homes, exposing some of the "...mechanisms, the experiences, the behaviours, the looks, conversations which are involved" (Stanley and Wise 1983 p167).

The participants

The group chosen for study was an opportunistic sample: they came together for a series of ten evening seminars for management training in 1987, and I was a member of the group. When the four women who initiated this `self-help' strategy invited women interested in educational management to attend, about thirty did so, paying the small fee themselves. I decided that this `self selected' group would be an appropriate one to use for this study for the following reasons.

The women came from a variety of schools, both primary and secondary, rural and city, integrated and state, while three worked in the Psychological Services. By joining the course they showed that they were conscious of having an identity as women managers or were interested in, or aspiring to, management. Most of them were not principals at this time, though some were already working in middle management, holding a range of positions such as senior teacher, visiting teacher, HOD and assistant principal. Although some were working in what are considered to be the `lower' rungs of `senior' management such as senior mistress and G1-3 primary principals, for example, they were not "successful" in the sense that Neville's (1988) sample were, as they had not reached top management positions[2].

As indicated in the Introduction, the choice of this particular group meant that the effects of race factors compounding with those of gender could not be studied: no

---

[2]The concept of 'success' in discussed in Chapter 3.

Maori women attended the course. Differences of sexuality and class did not emerge from this group either: it could be described as middle class, Pakeha and probably heterosexual[3].

Contacting the participants and the questionnaire survey

A letter inviting participation in a questionnaire survey of the whole group and an interview study of about six women was sent out to all of the women who had attended the course[4].

The questionnaire had two main sections; the first investigated the groups' teaching service and backgrounds and the second section was used in the separate evaluation study (Court 1989). The questions in the first section were not planned to provide data that could be generalised to a description of all women educational managers, but rather to provide data which would give some context and sense of setting for both the thesis study and the course evaluation when put alongside the material from the TEACAPS yearly surveys and Mollie Neville's (1988) study of the group of 16 successful women. To further this aim I modelled some questions on those used in the TEACAPS and Neville studies. Thus data in Chapter 5 does not delineate a `typical' group of women, but merely describes the backgrounds of a small group of women working in a provincial area in New Zealand. It is also important to point out that:

> ...the sample known as `women in management' are a tiny part of the normal distribution curve of life...The obstacles women face in getting managerial jobs and then over-coming sex-role conflicts all possibly channel a specific type of woman into managerial positions... As such, care should be taken in generalising comments or experiences from this group to `women-in-general' in the wider population (Pringle 1987 p101).

Open-ended questions were used to investigate the women's perceptions of the constraints they had experienced during their careers and their evaluations of the seminars. Labau (1980 p133) argues that open-ended questions are the only way respondents can `have their say', being able to tell the researcher what they mean, not vice-versa. However, although this style of question does not seem to force the respondent into the researcher's frame of reference, there are factors that are not immediately obvious at work in the wording of questions. For example, interpretations of the word `constraints' may vary, and the influence of gender stereotypes is not easy to assess in responses to the word `career'[5] .

---

[3]None of the women in this study identified themselves as lesbian.

[4]The letters and sections of the questionnaire used for this study are attached as Appendices 1 and 2.

[5]This was discussed in Chapter 3.

Thirty-six questionnaires were sent out, one to each woman who registered for the course. (Some women had attended only two or three sessions.) I also filled in a questionnaire, as a participant member of the course. Six were not completed: three women had gone overseas - two were travelling and one had gone to teach in the Falkland Islands; one woman was on leave from her school, nursing her mother who was very ill; two other women apologised for not completing their questionnaires - one said she had no time or energy at the end of term, and the other felt she "could not help" because she had not attended enough sessions and was not working in management even though she would like to be.

The 30 completed questionnaires were collated and analysed. The discussion of the results is given in Chapter 5.

Case histories

Selecting a sample group for in-depth case studies required careful consideration. It was necessary to avoid simply choosing women whom I knew well to interview: this could have introduced the bias of my choosing people I felt comfortable with and who would be likely to think the same way as I did. Therefore I included at the end of the questionnaire a section asking for the descriptive biographical data needed to find women in a variety of home and work situations. From this information, I selected six women to interview in depth, checking my selection with my supervisors.

The life history method interprets individual biography within the wider socio-historical situation. It has been discussed by Sedgewick (1980) who argues that the method is a most useful one for the sociological analysis of the interaction of history, social structures and the individual where:

> ... we use the individual to come to grips with the complex interrelationship of all three variables, not perceiving the individual as a problem or a type but as the core of a complex matrix. The individual is not the lone reactor to structural conditions nor to a social milieu but constantly exists within a dynamic system (1980 p54).

Middleton describes the method as a:

> ...focusing on both individuals and their socio-historical context...to study people as creative strategists who devise means of resisting and resolving the contradictions they experience (1988c p128).

She points out though, that rather than `using' the individual as a `subject' for the recording of biographical data for analysis, within feminist methodology, "research is viewed as a collaboration between the researcher and the researched" with the interviews through which the individual tells her life story being seen as "a means of generating theory collectively" (1988 p132). Thus, for this study, I used an interview method modelled on that which she describes, designed to:

> ...elicit respondents own analyses of their lives (and) also designed to test my developing and changing analyses of both the lives of individual women and the events and structures of the wider socio-historical context in which they planned and lived them (1988c p133).

The term `life history' suggests that all aspects of a person's life are explored equally. This research was focussed more narrowly on what the women perceived to be of significance in their gender relations in the two settings of their homes and their schools; thus these studies could be more aptly called case histories (Hakim 1987). The aim was to illustrate and explore the perceptions, experiences and situations of this small group of women in a way that would help reveal some of the influences on "the personal decisions that come into play in any series of events" (Hakim 1987 pp65-66).

There were six women in the sample, three working in full primary schools and three in secondary schools. Nichola Adams[6] whose children were grown up and living away from home, was a Grade 1 principal of a two teacher country primary school. Susan Baker's two teenage children were attending high school and still living at home; she had been recently appointed to a Grade 3 primary principal's position in a five teacher school in a small town. Pauline Chapman was single and worked as an assistant principal (junior classes) in another small rural town's primary school. She had responsibility for five teachers. Robyn Hunt was married but had no children and was working as an HOD in a co-educational secondary school in a small rural town. There were six staff in her department and while this research was in progress she was promoted to PR3. Only one of Dorothy Anselm's four children was still living at home: Dorothy was an assistant HOD in a department of eleven staff in a girls' secondary school in the city. Mary Ross was single and an HOD (with two staff in her department) in a city boys' high school.

---

[6]Pseudonyms have been used to protect the identities of the women participants in this study.

Interviewing

The interviews investigated the women's perceptions about and attitudes toward their gender relations. As Best points out:

> It is difficult to describe and measure attitude. The researcher must depend on what the individual says are his (sic) beliefs and feelings (1979 p173).

The six women may, of course, have concealed their true opinions, or reflected what they thought were acceptable perceptions. There was no need for them to do this though, as the emphasis was on their own interpretations of their jobs and their gender relations. I accepted their responses as true accounts of how they saw themselves functioning. Whether they were actually behaving in the ways they describe is a different question, and one which needs a different kind of investigation.

Many writers point out the importance of language in the process of defining the research interview process; for example, Wolff (1971) describes the researcher's stance as "surrender" to whatever the `subject' offers and Reinharz (1983) suggests taking the attitude of student rather than expert. I was concerned to try to understand the worlds of the women as they constructed them, "grounding" any theory in their concepts and theorising (Glaser and Strauss 1967). Thus the interviews did not adhere to a set of structured questions but largely followed the women's own concerns within the broad focus of the research. After explaining that I was interested in their experience as women in management positions and the connections between their gender relations at home and at school, I took the stance that the aim was to produce dialogue about the women's experiences. This is not to say that the interviews were in the interchange/interruption style of everday conversations. At first, I was modelling my approach on the non-directive counselling style (Middleton 1988c), trying to maintain some `distance' to help develop that recognition of the familiar as `strange' (Barton 1988). I found this stance very difficult to maintain however: when listening to the first tapes I was dismayed to hear myself `taking over' on occasions as I responded to an experience or idea. However, as I did more interviews and analysed my feedback and contributions, I found that what I first interpreted as `takeovers' were closer to what several writers have identified as `shared construction of meaning' (Mischler 1986).

Mischler reports studies using three re-definitions of the researcher/subject roles:

1) interviewees as informants and interviewers as reporters;
2) research collaborators

3) learner/actors and advocates.

I found the informant/reporter stance a most useful one for the first interview with each woman: it clarified my role in a way that enabled me to step back from the conversation sufficiently to allow the other person's ideas and perceptions to dominate. When I was tempted to interrupt or respond with a personal experience, the image of reporter was a useful check on these impulses. Taking the stance of reporter also meant that mis-cueing or jumping to conclusions which can lead the conversation down a false alley, were also checked. However, I learned that if there is a feeling of trust and equality, such interruptions (and there were some!) need not mean the researcher's bias will take over. I found that the women were quick to correct me, interrupting me to carry on with their stories, or coming back to the point they wanted to make later. Such `mistaken' interpretations by a listener can also be an important part of the sharing and clarifying of meanings; as such they are part of what Oakley (1981) describes as the personal involvement through which people "come to know each other". The `feedback' stage of the second interview also provided an opportunity for the women to correct or add to any of their first statements that may have been misinterpreted by me because of an interruption.

Accepting the interviewees as collaborators, full participants in the development of the study including the framing of the question and the analysis and interpretation of the data, is advocated by some writers. Mischler (1986 p127) cites Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule who returned copies of transcripts to their interviewees and reviewed them together, jointly planning the next stages of the research. Although during the second and third contacts with the women I explained the developing analysis with them, it did not become full collaboration in this sense. Middleton's model was useful here. She describes her stance in the following way:

> It was important to ...enable the women being interviewed to assist in the analysis of their own tape- recorded life histories... I also recognised though that I had done more reading on the nature of the contradictions experienced by postwar educated New Zealand women than had the women in the study. I wished to avoid both `conceptual imperialism' and a naive relativism. I attempted to do this by being as open as possible with the women about my theoretical orientation and the model I was developing in the course of analysing their life histories (Middleton 1988c p132-133).

There was also the need to be aware of how the interviews themselves would alter and shape both my own perspective as well as those of the women with whom I was working. They each expressed their own expectations of this process, and said they enjoyed not only the chance to talk about their lives, but also the chance to use it to

reflect on their careers and ideas. Robyn said, "I hope you're going to analyse me for me, make my life clear!"

The process of analysing the interview transcripts was helped by my academic background in English. Through my study of literature I have learned to extrapolate universal themes from the lives of fictional characters and consequently for me there is no problem in accepting that the individual experience of one woman living in a certain time and place can and will contain many elements of the experience of others, especially of those living and working within similar situations. Although results cannot be generalised to the universe of all women from such a small and select group as that in this study, the feminist strategy of consciousness-raising aims to share:

> ...the personal and unique experiences of women...in such a way that a pattern of common experience emerges. It runs counter to a conception of sociology as an objective discipline; that is, maintaining a distance between the observer and the observed (Novitz 1982 p298-299).

Novitz argues that this stance originates in Weber's concept of `verstehen', the understanding of the world from the point of view of the actor.

I modelled my method of coding on those described by Strauss (1987) and Middleton (1988c pp132-136). After the taped interviews had been transcribed (I used a research grant-in-aid to pay a typist to do this for me) I colour coded the transcripts into categories. I did not have pre-selected categories into which to slot the data: the categories `arose' from my reading and thinking about the women's `stories' in relation to the research literature I had been reading earlier and in relation to my own experience. I consciously used a method of coding that was similar to reading a short story or novel's plot, setting and characterisation for its underlying themes, allowing these to `surface' and crystallise through a process of checking a `main idea' across a number of incidents and comments. This kind of interpretation was also occurring during the actual interviews themselves; as Strauss points out, the interpretation and refining of data is on-going, with the researcher working back and forwards during the whole research process, during data collection right through to the final drafts of the report (Strauss 1987 p26-27).

A range of themes/categories emerged, which I refined and coded as follows.

* gold - male hegemony: area of male power and/or domination and stereotypes of aggressive, competitive masculinity
* lemon - other forms of masculinity: eg. caring, nurturing men

* pink - exaggerated femininity: traditional feminine stereotypes, ideologies of romantic love and women as sex objects
* purple - affiliation and nurturing: both as an area of women's strength and transformative potential and also its contradictory aspects in ideological definitions of mothering
* blue - sexual division of labour: both at home and at school
* green - own resistance, challenge and struggle against male hegemony: included contradictions and tensions
* orange - upbringing and background: its contribution to the developing of a sense of personal identity as both a woman and a teacher/manager
* red - anger: levels of awareness of, reactions to, place in personal growth and gender relations
* bright orange - winning authority: problems of, successes in, feelings about
* brown - aspirations and definitions of success
* black - feminism

I took the colour-coded transcripts back to the women for them to check both the accuracy of the interview transcriptions and my interpretations of their comments. At that stage I explained the categories to them - the concept of male hegemony always needed discussion. About a week or two later, after they had had time to think about the coded transcripts, I arranged a second interview, when I asked whether they wished to alter any of their statements and checked that they were happy for me to use all of what they had told me. During this interview I also sought their further ideas, exploring the area of authority with them in particular as this was not explicitly covered in the first interviews but had emerged as an important theme in my coding of the transcripts.

Although most of the first interviews had been done during the first week of the May holidays and the second interviews three months later in the August holidays, the women altered few of their first comments - in fact, they often repeated the same ideas almost word for word during the second interview. This acted as a verification for me of the first interviews; each woman was very consistent in her opinions and statements.

After completing the second interviews, I followed Middleton's method of cutting up one copy of each interview, putting the sections on the same topic together so that the larger patterns would become clearer. All the way through the coding process I had followed Strauss's advice (1987) to write memos as ideas and questions occurred to

me, and these formed the basis of the developing analysis. In doing this, I was of course selecting and conceptualising the themes I considered to be significant. This illustrates how a researcher is necessarily personally involved in both the processes of perception and of explanation of the phenomena being studied: as argued earlier, complete objectivity in research is impossible.

Ethical concerns

The research process became an increasingly enriching experience for me as a result of the women's own interest and response to the analysis of their experiences and their gender relations. These were often very personal, and related of course to specific incidents at home and their schools, both past and present. There were ethical problems here: the need to protect others from potential harm meant that some of the data could not be used in its original form. I discussed with the women which sections we could use and which needed identifying details such as names and places and superficial details to be altered. We decided that all personal and place names should be changed to protect identities and preserve their own anonymity.

The interactive nature of interviewing in the style described here means that the research process becomes, as Middleton (1988c p132) pointed out, intervention in people's lives, giving rise to further ethical problems. Even though interviewees will not tell an interviewer things they don't want the interviewer to know, sometimes circumstances may inadvertently take people beyond a point where they are comfortable before they are aware that this has in fact happened. I tried to guard against this during the interviews, and the returning of transcripts and the first drafts of the analysis to the women for vetting was to make sure that they had the opportunity to withdraw any information they felt uncomfortable about me using. None of the original material from the interviews was vetoed when the women read the draft analyses, though my interpretations of the meaning of two incidents were challenged by two of the women. Those sections were re-written.

During the research process I considered gathering the women I had interviewed together for a group discussion of the issues raised in the research as a way of verifying and extending the data. However, apart from destroying the anonymity we had decided upon, this would have involved us all in a much larger study, of the kind Mischler describes in his third definition of research interviewing, that of the learner/actor and advocate type. This envisages the learning about and solving of problems through reflecting on them with the researcher as facilitator, a form of

consciousness raising (Novitz 1982) or critical enquiry (Retallick 1983) which was beyond the limits of this thesis. It would make an interesting future study.

Conclusion

From my own attendance at the manangement training seminars, I became aware that many of the dilemmas I had faced when first moving into an educational management position, such as the heavy demands made by dual responsibilities at home and at school and the experiencing of feelings of inadequacy at times as I tried to meet these, were being experienced by other women. At that time I was also becoming aware of gender inequalities within educational management. The motivation for this present research was spurred by memories of the discussions with other women at the seminars of the dilemmas which were a result of ways in which our gender was impacting on our situations.

The following chapters aim to provide first of all the general data on the group of women who participated in the seminars and then to move to a closer in-depth focus on the ways in which six of these women middle managers were experiencing their home and work gender relations. That analysis makes extensive use of quotations from the interview transcripts: to reflect the flavour of their individual experiences, the women's own descriptions of their thoughts, feelings and opinions were used as much as possible to tell their stories.

Chapter five

Constraints on women's careers: Survey results

This chapter describes the group of 30 women who attended a management training course (a series of 10 evening seminars) in 1987[1]. The aim of the questionnaire survey, as explained earlier, was not to gather data that could be generalised to all women, or even to all women in educational management, but rather to provide some context and sense of setting for the case history studies of the gender relations of six of these women, which are reported in the next four chapters.

The questionnaire results and their discussion are interwoven in a blend of quantitative and qualitative analysis. The chapter is divided into two parts: firstly the women's teaching backgrounds and experience are reported; then the second section analyses their reports of factors that had constrained their careers. This analysis reveals that beliefs and expectations surrounding the dual roles of mothering and teaching, combined with their breaks from full-time teaching to raise their families, have been significant constraints for the majority of the married women in this group.

Part 1: Teaching service

Schools The group was fairly evenly split between primary and secondary women teaching in a range of rural and city schools. (See Table 1 on the following page). Three women, attached to the Psychological Services, who planned the seminars with a Grade 1 primary principal, also attended the seminars. These three women held the positions of seconded teacher, special needs (equivalent to senior teacher); visiting teacher (equivalent to Grade 3 principal) and psychologist, Grade 1. Although they worked with both primary and secondary students, staff and parents, for the remainder of the analysis they are included in the primary group as none of them has held a full-time secondary position and each has taught, for over 20 years in two cases, in primary schools.

---

[1]The course aimed to build women teachers' confidence and skills to improve their chances of promotion. It is gratifying to note that 50 percent did achieve promotion after the course (Court 1989). The data discussed here relates to the positions they held two years after the course, in May 1989.

Table 1. Distribution of the Schools

Present institution		State	Integrated
Primary	Contributing	6	1
	Full Primary	6	1
	Intermediate		1
		12	3 total:15
Secondary	Co-ed	5	
	Girls	2	4
	Boys	1	
		8	7 total: 12
Psychological Services total: 3			

Ages and present positions At the time of this study, the women ranged in age from 25 to 55 years, with the majority of the primary women aged between 40 and 55, while most of the secondary women were in their 30s and early 40s (See Tables 2 and 3, and also Table 10 which includes each woman's age alongside other data). There was an age split in each of the groups, between those aged 25-35 and those over 40 years. This was an interesting split and it is discussed further in the section on constraints beginning on page 78.

Like their national counterparts[2], the women in this study who had gained management positions were mainly clustered in middle management, which combines teaching with administrative responsibilities. For the primary women these were positions of senior teacher, assistant principal (junior classes), (the old STJC position) and Grade 1-3 (teaching) principals.

[2]The TEACAPS (1988) study reports that in 1987 women made up 74 percent of primary teachers and 51 percent of secondary teachers, but they held far fewer of the management positions.

Table 2: Distribution of present ages and positions of the primary women

Age	Position				Totals
	Assistant teacher	Senior teacher	Assistant principal	Principal G.1-3	
25-35*	1	2	1		4
40-55	2	3	1	8	14
					18

* The women divided into two age groups: younger than 35 or 40 and over. To show this I have divided the table in two. The table includes the Psychological Services women.

The primary women had reached their positions of responsibility later than the secondary women in this study, most of whom held positions of HOD (mostly PR2) and/or dean, although three were senior mistress (all in co-eds) and one was a deputy principal (in an integrated girls' school). Table 3 shows this distribution. Although for the sake of consistency I have kept the 25-35 and 40-55 divisions, none of the secondary women was aged over 47. However, they reflected a similar pattern to that of the primary women and to their national secondary counterparts in that they were also clusterered in middle management positions. These were in English, counselling and guidance and health, similar to the dominant areas for women reported in the 1987 and 1988 TEACAPS studies.

Table 3: Distribution of present ages and positions of the secondary women

Age	Position				Totals
	Assistant	Dean, PR.1-3	Senior mistress	Deputy principal	
25-35*	1	4	1		6
40-55		3	2	1	6
					12

Early intentions These women chose teaching as their career early in their lives, the primary women making their decision younger than the secondary women, though the majority of both groups had decided by their late teens.

Table 4: Distribution of ages when the women first decided to become teachers

Age	Primary	Secondary	Totals
5-10	5	2	7
11-15	3	3	6
16-20	9	5	14
21-	1	2	3
Totals:	18	12	30

About half of the women planned to stay in teaching as their career (see Table 5). Two of the women who responded that they did not know initially how long they would stay, commented that they were expecting breaks for having children. None of the women indicated in the later sections of the questionnaire that they had early plans of moving into management. Rather, most of them indicated that they had attended the seminars to gain the confidence and skills to apply for promotion. It could also be that some of those planning not to stay were considering careers other than teaching.

Table 5: Intentions when first entered teaching

	Planned to Stay	Undecided	Intended Leaving	Total
Primary	8	5	5	18
Secondary	6	3	3	12

Qualifications The women's qualifications on entry into teaching reflected different patterns to the national TEACAPS survey (1982 pp23, 52-53) which showed that over half of all primary women had no university qualifications, and about half of secondary women had a bachelor's or master's degree. None of the primary women in this group had university qualifications when they entered teaching; that is their

qualifications were poorer in comparison with the national average for primary teachers surveyed in 1982. Conversely, the secondary women were better qualified: ten of the 12 women held a bachelor's degree or higher qualification when they entered teaching (two women held two qualifications).

Table 6: Qualifications on entering teaching

	None	Teaching diploma	Bachelor's degree	Honours/ Dip. Ed	Other
Primary	3	15	1		1 Art Specialist 1 Speech Therapy
Secondary	2	10	8	3	1 part of MSc 1 ATCL

The higher qualification level of the secondary women is not suprising when it is remembered that appropriate subject qualifications are an important part of the structure in the secondary system. One secondary teacher said[3] that she decided to complete her bachelor's degree after she began teaching: to be properly qualified for teaching - *although I had Group 3 qualifications*[4], *I felt second class*. Although PPTA's `trained and qualified' policy attempts to ensure that no secondary teacher can be employed without tertiary qualifications (or their equivalent in subjects such as Maori), shortages of suitably trained and qualified teachers have meant that this policy is as yet an ideal. However, to be considered eligible to teach senior forms and thence be seen as a potential HOD, a degree is generally seen as necessary.

When asked what qualifications had been gained since they commenced teaching, eight of the primary women had no further qualifications. However, the increasing emphasis on university level qualifications for primary teacher trainees can perhaps be seen reflected in the number of primary women who had done further study since entering teaching. Seven had gained university credits, three had gained diplomas in teaching or education, one had completed a bachelor's degree and one had gained a higher degree to qualify her for her move into educational psychology (some women had gained more than one qualification).

[3]Italics in this chapter indicate quotes from the women's answers in the questionnaire.
[4]Group three qualifications are equivalent to holding a degree for salary purposes.

Only two of the secondary women had not added to their qualifications, though 9 of the 12 women had added a Diploma of Teaching (awarded when List B status is gained after two years of supervised teaching practice. No further formal study is required to gain this qualification if a degree is already held). Six women had completed or were working on further degrees or diplomas: two had completed bachelor's degrees, one had completed her M.Sc. and two had gained Dip. Ed., while two others were working towards further qualifications in management - a Business Diploma and an M.Ed.Admin. (one woman had added two qualifications).

Paddock reported that American male administrators begin their advanced studies as a kind of preservice preparatory training, while women seek advanced training as in-service training after moving into an administrative position: it was enabling them to "both retain their position and to improve their performance in a position already attained" (1981 p192). The reasons given by the women in this present research for undertaking further study covered both kinds of motivation. Significantly, for 7 of the 10 primary women who have continued to study, improving their knowledge for teaching was the most commonly cited reason. This high priority given to their own professional development within the teaching/learning situation supports research findings that women educational administrators are focussed on instructional learning (Shakeshaft 1987).

Table 7: Reasons given by the women for improving their qualifications

Reason	Primary*	Secondary*
improve knowledge for teaching	7	1
enhance chance of promotion	5	3
own interest and enjoyment	3	1
improve management skills	2	3
build self-esteem	1	1
to complete degree	-	1

*Number:primary = 10
secondary = 6

(Some of the 16 women who answered this question had two reasons)

Years of teaching service The number of years the women had been involved in full-time teaching ranged from two to 33.

Table 8: Years of full-time teaching service

Number of years	Primary	Secondary
1-5	-	1
6-10	5	8
11-15	2	3
16-20	6	-
21-25	2	-
26 +	3	-

Breaks from full-time service Three of the primary and four of the secondary women had not taken any breaks from full-time teaching; 23 women had had time out.

Table 9a: Distribution of full-time and broken service

Period	Primary	Secondary
unbroken service	3	4
broken service	15	8

Thus a majority of these women had taken a number of years out of teaching. This is a distinct contrast with Neville's group of `successful' women, all of whom she reports as having "chosen" permanent and full-time tenure. She also acknowledges that many women "do not have this option" (1988 p120). This is discussed further in the section covering constraints.

Table 9b: Distribution of the length of absence from teaching

Period	Primary	Secondary
unbroken service	3	4
breaks		
0-2 yrs	4	1
2-5 yrs	4	3
6-10 yrs	6	4
10 + yrs	1	-
Total:	18	12

This time out was not just `rest and recreation' breaks for all of these women: when asked why they had time out, 17 of the 23 had been raising children. Seven had taken time out for travel and it was interesting to note that six of these were under 35 years of age and had no children. Only one older woman had taken time out for travel; she had also had time out for childcare. These were the only two reasons given for their breaks.

Table 9c: Distribution of reasons for absence from teaching

Reason for break	Primary	Secondary
child rearing	12	5
travel	4	3

Thus, the majority of the women who had spent time out of teaching had been raising children and their breaks were between three and 15 years, with most spending between six to nine years out.

Table 10 on the following page provides a `spread sheet' summary of the group's teaching service, their breaks and the constraints they identified.

Table 10: Summary of service and constraints experienced by the women

	Age	Children at home @ ages	Yrsof full-time service	Years out of service	Constraints Experienced: Family factors	School	Being a woman	Other	No Constraints
PRIMARY									
Assistant	32		11	0	-	-	-	-	#
	44	15	20	7	/	-	-	not RC	
	54	*	25	5	/	/	/	-	
S.T.	28		8.5	0	-	-	-	-	#
	30		10	.5	-	/	/	travel, timing	
	46	19	12	9	/	/	/	-	
	54	*	12	15	/	-	-	-	
A.P.(Jnr)	30		9	.5	/	-	/	-	
	40		19	1	-	/	/	union work	
Principal	42	19	16	6	/	/	/	-	
G1	42	11.5	17	3	/	/	/	-	
	46	17	15	0	-	-	-	-	#
	48	*	18	10	-	/	-	-	
G2	49	16,12	30	.9	/	/	not overtly	-	
G3	51	*	25	5	-	/	/	-	
PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES									
Seconded T.	55	*	33	2	/	-	/	-	
Visiting T.	55	*	28	8	/	-	/not in varsity town		
Psychologist G1	43	16	6	6	/	-	/	-	
TOTALS:	**18**				**11**	**9**	**12**	**3**	
SECONDARY									
Assistant	30		6	2.5	-	-	-	-	#
HOD,PR1	42	18,16	8	0	-	-	-	-	#
PR2	25		1+2p	1	-	-	-	-	#
	28		7	0	-	-	-	-	#
	42	15,13	5+5p	6	/	-	/	-	
	47	17	11	10	/	/	/	-	
PR3	34		11	1.5	-	/	-	-	
	35		8+2p	1	-	-	-	own attitude	
SM	32		8	.1	/	-	-	-	
	40	14	9	8	/	-	-	-	
	44	17	11+2p	6	/	-	/	-	
DP	42	7,15	11+2p	10	/	-	/		
TOTALS:	**12**	**6**			**6**	**2**	**4**	**1**	**7**

Note: Some secondary women had also taught in primary schools (p). Other symbols used are:
* children grown & left home;
/ constraint identified;
- this factor not a constraint;
no constraints.

Part 2: Constraints

The second section of the questionnaire asked the women whether they thought they had been constrained in their careers by any of the following: family circumstances, school factors, being a woman, or any other factors. When their comments were placed alongside the data on their teaching service, reasons for breaks and their own and their children's ages, the results threw some interesting light on the research explanations for women's lack of promotion. This data has been put together in Table 10 on the preceding page. The information was organised by the grouping of the women into similar positions, beginning with assistant teachers through to principals in the primary service, then the women from the psychological services, and then assistant through to deputy principal in the secondary group.

As shown in Table 10, seven women stated that they had experienced no constraints. It could be noted that five were under 35 years of age and had no children, and the two older women, aged 42 and 46, had both entered teaching late, at 34 and 31 years of age, when their children were older. None of these women then, had had breaks out of teaching for childcare. This is an important fact to remember when questions are asked about the perceived constraints of family responsibilities. Although several of these women had taken short periods of up to one year out which they spent travelling, only one identified this as a constraint on her career.

Twenty-two of the women, 15 primary and 7 secondary, felt their careers had been constrained by one or more of the factors asked about in the questionnaire.

Table 11: Distribution of constraints

Constraint	Primary	Secondary
family	11	6
school factors	9	2
being a woman	12	4
other	3	1

Kinds of Constraints As the constraints related to family responsibilities, school factors and being a woman were inter-related in the women's comments and need to be discussed together, I will discuss the responses given in the in *other constraints* category first. Perceptions of competition for the few PR positions available in the primary service were mentioned by two women, the result in one case being that: *an*

over-qualified person (STJC) won the senior teacher position I had applied for. The other wrote that timing was a constraint for her (one of the few positions became available when this woman was away travelling for three months). Thompson (1988) also reported this factor in her investigation of the things that limited women's careers. Being in the right place at the right time is a factor that affects both men and women of course, but when related to other factors constraining women, such as immobility because of their spouses' jobs for example, it possibly seems more important to a woman such as this one who missed out on one of the few jobs available to her. The two remaining *other constraints* were that one woman felt disadvantaged by *not being in a university town*, and another was heavily involved in union work which, she felt had affected her own promotion, in that she had not had the time or energy to put into that aspect of her career.

These constraints were reported by only one person in each case, but there were a cluster of other factors relating to family responsibilites that many of the women wrote about. Thirteen of the women (nearly half) had children still at home, and a further six had grown up families. Their experiences would seem to contradict some of the research into the constraints women teachers have reported.

Family Responsibilities Of the six secondary women who identified family constraints, one said it was only her spouse's job which had limited her mobility and constrained her career, but the other five women wrote that it was time out for rearing a family that had limited them. In the words of one, this meant that: *my promotions have been acquired at a later age (10 years later) than men who started teaching at the same time as me.* The one secondary woman who had children and who did not identify this as having been a constraint had entered full-time teaching at age 34 when her children were aged 10 and 8; she had thus reached the stage when her children could be seen as needing less of her time.

Eleven primary women wrote that family responsibilities had constrained them: again, one identified her spouse's job as the sole factor here, but the other ten said it was breaks for childcare that had affected their careers. Two other women had had time out for childcare but they had not decided to try for promotion until their children were older; one wrote: *I chose to have five years off when the children were born.* She did not initially plan to become a principal: *I was happy and successful at junior school level* (the implications of these expectations are discussed later). One other woman who had children did not think that family responsibilities had constrained her; she also had entered teaching late, at age 31, when her children were older. Thus, of the 30

women in this study 19 had had children, 17 took time out of full-time teaching for childcare, and 15 of those 17 women wrote that the breaks had constrained their careers.

Research into the perceived constraints of family responsibilities has often asked the question from the point of view of how many women teachers have children at home (Whitcombe 1979, Sarros 1984, Sampson 1987). The results have led researchers to conclude that this is not a disadvantage for many women; in fact, they point out that men also name family responsibilities as a constraint on their mobility and promotion. Sampson for example, reported that "only 38 percent of women teachers had children at home, compared to 62 percent of men" and came to the conclusion that family responsibilites "may NOT be such deterrents for women teachers as they once were" (1987 p3). Sampson, though, had sent a survey questionnaire "to a 3 percent sample of union members[5] in schools in each State and Territory" (1987 p2, my emphasis) and her study did not report the ages of the teachers who responded, nor whether every age group was fully represented in her sample. Such research seems to overlook a very obvious fact hidden in the figures - the fact that many women teachers with young children are at home looking after them, in the break stage of their fulltime teaching careers; many also teach part-time at this stage of their lives. Such women are unlikely to have been included in the research sample, which helps to explain why there is such a discrepancy in Sampson's results between the numbers of men and women teachers who are working and have children at home. One common constraint was verified by Sampson's study, when she noted that: "of these teachers (who do have young children at home) nearly two thirds of the women were solely responsible for a child or children for more than four hours daily compared to only 28 percent of the men... and women did significantly more housework than men" (1987 p3). Despite this finding, she still concludes that family responsibilities may not be such a deterrent for women as they were.

In this present study of a group of women who nominated themselves for management training, there is a noticeable split into two age groups between those (without children) aged 25 - 35 years, and those aged 40-55 years (who have teenage or grown-up children)[6]. I suggest that this split and the gap between the two groups is significant. Participants selected for management training courses have usually been men (Webster 1975). However, in 1978 a group of women were invited to attend a series of three national training courses for women in New Zealand. These invitations

---

[5]In New Zealand part-time teachers have, in the past, often not been fully involved in union activity as a consequence of their staggered hours and peripheral status.

[6]Two years ago, when the course took place, the women were aged 23-33 and 38-53.

were offered to women who had remained in teaching full-time, and were therefore seen as being in teaching as a `career' and likely to want promotion (Steele 1981 pp10-11). When childcare breaks, women's common life patterns (Department of Labour 1984) and workforce participation rates are taken into consideration though, a different picture of women's aspirations and willingness to gain training and take on the extra responsibilities of administration emerges. Shipley, in her study of women's employment and unemployment, reports:

> ...females full-time participation (in the paid work-force) shows the expected `M' curve, with an initial rise to 50% at age 20-24, a sharp fall to 32% at age 30-34, and a subsequent rise to 50% again at age 40-44 (1982 p46).

She also points out that between ages 24-34 women's part-time participation peaks, dropping off again after this as women returned to full-time work, suggesting a strong inverse relationship between women's full and part-time workforce status and stages in the family life cycle. Women teachers who have children are likely to have time out of full-time teaching; they may also relieve or teach part-time while their children are young. In 1981 a common pattern for New Zealand women was to return to full-time work after the youngest child started school, when a woman was aged about 32 (Dept of Labour, Common Life Patterns of New Zealand Women, 1984).

There were no women at the Taranaki course in 1987 between the ages of 33 and 38. This is a stage when many women are coping with heavy dual reponsibilities of home and paid work. These kinds of factors can be seen to influence which women will feel sufficiently motivated to invest a considerable amount of their personal time and energy into a training course such as the Taranaki Women in Educational Management Seminars. Further research is needed to uncover the complexity of the ways family responsibilities inhibit women's opportunities in the teaching services and affect the timing of their seeking promotion into management.

Some points can be suggested though. There are a cluster of constraints associated with the time taken out for childcare. It is during the ages 25-35 that important steps up the promotion ladder can be taken (TEACAPS 1982 pp13-22), as shown by the number of younger course participants in this study who had gained positions of responsibilty (see Tables 2 and 3). If women achieve these first steps and then break their service for child bearing and rearing, (like two of these women, senior teachers aged 28 and 30, who were pregnant and about to take maternity leave), their careers lose momentum: they are disadvantaged in several ways by the time out.

* It disrupts the `expected' (male norm) career pattern, raising questions of `You're past this, surely?'

* Teachers who have no breaks (commonly men) are promoted in their absence.
* The women get `out of touch' and need to `catch up' when they return, and this can affect their confidence and aspirations.
* When they do become eligible for promotion, many have teenagers at home. This is a time of high stress for many families and added responsibilities at work have to be weighed up against the need for energy at home where most women carry the nurturing responsibilities.

In this study, some of the women who stayed at home while their children were young, realised only later how this: *hindered the time available for my career and was detrimental to my aspirations,* in the words of one woman. Another's rather wistful comments sum up lost opportunities: *Sadly, now I come to write this, I didn't have a group (to support me) - wish I'd had "women in Ed" group 25 years ago!* Factors such as these emerged also in the women's written comments about constraints that they saw as *school factors,* as well as those related to their perceptions of how *being a women* had limited their opportunities.

The links between family responsibilities and associated constraints on career development for women are at deeper levels than those that just ask how many children are still at home. This is not the problem for women in education that it is for women in other areas of work, because obviously the hours when children need supervision before and after school are the hours when a teacher parent can be free to be with them. This `advantage' is one of the things that attract women into teaching as a career: they can `easily' combine the roles of parent and professional. It is an advantage with hooks though, which make this dual role of mother and teacher a difficult one for women who wish to take on the extra challenge and responsibilities of educational management.

Ideology is an important factor here. Ideologies such as, `women teach and men manage', and `women are naturally suited to being the primary child carers' influence attitudes towards women moving from teaching into management, and women themselves are influenced these ideas. An example can be seen in the following comment explaining one woman's second break from teaching: *I took another year when my eldest child was imminently off to University. I realised she'd <u>always</u> had a ' working mother ' and I felt guilty about this!* The ideology of `Good mothers are at home for their children' is still a powerful one and some women, like this one, end up suffering from guilt if they don't fulfill their so-called `natural' roles. The power of hegemony to convince the disadvantaged that their position is `natural' is difficult to

combat, but awareness of the pressures that particular ideology puts on women does seem to be growing as reflected in this other comment: *I had no children, and that had made it easy - no guilt feelings.*

Difficulties associated with conception and birth are only now being recognised as a source of stress for many people. For working women, there are the physical problems to cope with as well as the emotional and economic. Susan Baker[7], who was the main bread-winner for her family, experienced these stresses, and wrote that she had had a two month break that was due to a culmination of the stress of a miscarriage after the earlier loss of her first baby boy in a cot death: *There was no counselling available then, and anyway, my situation was not recognised as needing help.* The ideology of women's `natural' role being that of childbearer could be seen behind such attitudes towards miscarriage: if one occurs, there is nothing to worry about as it is a `natural' event and women should be able to cope with it as part of their qualities of being women. Five years later, Susan had another stress related break. By then she was: *holding down a responsible position, running the home and looking after two children.* Clarricoates' (1980) point that it is women's double workload that is the main constraint on their careers is supported by such cases, but the added underlying force of ideology needs to be recognised.

Ideology becomes embedded in cultural beliefs about `the way things are'. Those kinds of `commonsense' beliefs also inform what becomes social structures. In this group of 30 women, 21 identified family responsibilities and the fact of being a woman as constraints on their careers. The two go hand in hand in the following examples of socio-structural constraints (Kanter 1977). Neville describes some of these structural constraints as among the "numerous complicating factors" (1988 p113) in teaching career patterns that affect mainly women because of their childbearing and caring roles.

`Broken service'

> *I had one year out at the birth of our second child - then returned to teaching as it was impossible to obtain a replacement teacher for a small country school in 1963-64.*

The use of women as a reserve pool of labour has had important effects on the balance between teaching and child-rearing over the years. Aitken and Noonan (1981 pp134-

[7]Susan is one of the case study women.

137) trace the history of changing policies designed to maintain a steady labour force in education. After the war women had been encouraged back into the homes to free up jobs for the returning soldiers. Then, in the mid 60s, motherhood increments were offered to women to attract them back into teaching during the severe teacher shortages at the time when the `baby boom' had swelled school rolls. The revoking of these increments and the introduction of the `broken service' clause in 1975 was a response to the surplus of bonded teachers by that time. The `broken service' clause was opposed by NZEI, who proposed a re-training scheme, but this was implementedin such a way:

> ...that there could be no guarantee that it would be available to all those who wished to avail themselves of it. The scheme was then presented publicly as a positive step towards the development of higher professional standards... Department of Education officials denied any discriminatory intention or effect ..."If there were men who stayed home, it would apply to them as well" (Aitken and Noonan 1981 p136).

This was a policy which affected several women in this study. In the words of one of them: *This particularly discriminated against women whose breaks in service were for child rearing reasons, and it directly affected length of service.* In fact, according to one Education Board officer, during these years when teachers with broken service applied for jobs where there were applications from teachers with continuous service, Education Boards were "required to put to one side the applications from teachers who had not had continuous service" (Phillips, New Plymouth Education Board, personal communication, June 1989).

Although this policy has now been revoked, the ideologies of `women's natural role' being in the home are not so easy to alter in a society dominated by male hegemony, as shown in the next section.

Part-timers and `second income earners' Attitudes and values that are sex role stereotyped can undermine policies that have been planned to protect teachers who may be unfairly disadvantaged. This can be illustrated by looking at 'staff terminations' during the present 'falling rolls situation' in the secondary system. Many part-time teachers, the majority of whom are women, are the ones who lose their jobs, despite elaborate formulae to ensure `fair' identification of the school's curriculum area that is overstaffed. As a senior mistress, I attended in 1988 an in-service course giving training in the use of these formulae in the 'management of falling rolls', where a principal seconded to help run the course argued that part-time women were, "after all, the second income earners, and the jobs of young men as the breadwinners for their families should have priority".

Several women mentioned this attitude as a discriminatory factor they had had to contend with during their careers: *...male teachers rubbishing women teachers as second income earners, saying things like, `It's only your pocket money' or `It just means another trip overseas'. They never class their own jobs as the second income.* When such attitudes and values are held by those who hold decision-making power, it is hardly surprising that policies and practices "protecting those those who will seldom be required to break their teaching careers, or to take part-time teaching positions - namely, men" (Aitken and Noonan 1981 p138), are common. There is a very fine line here between conspiracy to disadvantage women (through a refusal to think about and acknowledge one's own advantage), and hegemony, a cultural form of domination. The effects of hegemony though have become apparent to this woman: *I NEVER even considered applying for principal or DP positions - always STJC or senior teacher positions.* And this one, who did `make it': *The outlying districts still do not accept women principals readily. It is hard work. You must forever prove your worth, with no mistakes.*

Knowledge and experience The problem of women not having sufficient knowledge of how the promotion system works has been well documented. These problems are also reported by the women in this study, many of whom laid the blame largely at the feet of the men in the system. One woman wrote about the: *Poor management skills of some principals - poor communication, lack of professional guidance, etc. Being a woman was a disadvantage in that young male teachers were given more opportunity for responsibility.* Only one woman identified another woman as having been a constraint in this sense, writing that a woman principal had *brick-walled* her.

But even having good experience can work against women it seems. Three women commented on training for, and experience in junior classes as a limiting factor. *When I trained for junior classes, the expectation that I would stay there didn't concern me - I had success in this area. But when I applied for principal's positions, I wasn't considered because of my lack of senior school experience, even though men got these jobs despite their only having had two junior kids in their sole charge school. At this stage I was running a successful junior department of seven teachers and I had a very good grading mark.*

Edson's (1981) analysis of similar factors in her study of female aspirants makes the point that what is at issue here is gender. Male applicants with limited experience in the junior school are preferred over the female applicants, even when in a case like this

one, the woman has had superior experience in supervising a number of staff. Another woman wrote, with not a small touch of cynicism, *I had an incomplete degree at the time of application, and lack of experience in the particular field was the reason given to me. The position was re-advertised, and the person who was accepted I don't consider as well qualified.* A woman now teaching in the secondary system wrote: *I was trained in the one year graduate course for primary teaching, specialising in intermediate levels. However, I was placed in a J1 class, an area for which I had no preparation! We shifted, and I was again not placed in an intermediate, but in a composite Std 1 and 2 class. I could only put this down to the fact that I was a woman, as the men on my course who also trained for intermediates were placed in intermediates for their first jobs.* Intermediate positions are perceived as being status jobs and the `higher level, fewer women' syndrome is at work here (Deem 1978): intermediates commonly have more male staff members than contributing schools which are predominantly staffed by women.

Gradings In the primary system, gaining a good grading report has been an important step in seeking promotion. It has been a difficult step for many women, however, as illustrated by this comment: *When I applied for my first green (B) report[8], I was inspected by a seconded intermediate school principal who had had nothing to do with infants. I was an innovative teacher of junior classes and an advisor, but I didn't get a good grading. I wasn't happy with it, but I didn't know I could appeal, nor that the grades were `negotiated' by the inspectors afterwards. I looked at others who had `made it' (mainly men) and was cheesed off with the whole system. I decided that I didn't need all that and did not apply any more - I didn't know enough to talk about it with others.*

Sheehan, Kerslake and Slyfield (1988) also report the disadvantage primary women faced in their gradings. They show how there has been little change in the mean assessment for women and men's B reports over the last 10 years, from 3.3 women and 4.1 men in 1975 through to 1987, when the figures were 3.5 women, 4.0 men and in 1988 3.5 and 4.2. Also, in 1988,

> There was little difference between women and men minimum time applicants for B reports (2.4 for women, 2.5 for men). However, `other' women applicants for B reports received lower assessment than men (3.7, 4.2) on average, as in 1985 and 1986 (p5).

[8]In the primary system this grading could be applied for after about six years of teaching. Gaining a good grade on this first Division B report made one eligible to apply for senior teacher positions. After about 12 years of service, the Division C report and position could be applied for.

This would suggest that although attitudes towards younger women, those who have had no breaks in their service, may have been altering, `other' women were still being given lower assessments than men. Bryne (1978 p212) showed that "The average woman teacher student was more able than the average male teacher student", so women should have been able to gain good gradings. It is not a case of poorer ability.

Discrimination and prejudice This is difficult to come to terms with, and even women often refuse to see or acknowledge such attitudes (Malcolm 1978). Sometimes discrimination is as blatant as this report: *A year ago a job as DP at the school I taught in while I was assistant principal, was written to ensure a male got the job and the (male) principal said in the staffroom, `We need a man'.*

Prejudiced attitudes and discriminatory behaviours are often more subtle though, and although some women are becoming more aware of the effects of `put down' comments for example, many still tend to brush these aside, excusing those who make them. One respondent felt that such women give men the power by never speaking up. She wrote about the negative effects of remarks made about older women who are still teaching, remarks such as: *"She should have given up ages ago". But I don't see many middle-aged men in the classroom - most of them have made all the right moves and have gone up.* Her comment is supported by the data in the original TEACAPS national survey, which showed that while only ten percent of the women in the primary service held senior administraive positions by their late thirties, "over half the men" held senior positions by that age (TEACAPS 1982 p100).

The secondary women did not comment on as many examples of male discrimination. Margaret Wilson's report (1986) on the status of tertiary academic women shows however that even highly qualified women face discrimination within universities, and prejudice certainly still exists in secondary schools as shown by the following examples from two secondary women. When they applied for HOD positions, one was told that she could only be made an acting HOD until she `proved' herself, because: *The Board are not foolish men - they know you are a married woman with a family.* The other woman was not interviewed for the position of HOD, although she had several years experience teaching through to form 7 and held a degree in the subject area. *The man appointed over me had less experience than me (he had only recently returned to teaching after a break taken because of stress caused by teaching) and he did not hold a degree in the subject. There were no women HODs in the school.* One woman, when being interviewed for a responsible position, encountered discriminatory questioning from a senior inspector who: *implied that my loyalties*

would be split because my husband held a responsible job in another school. A primary woman summed up this kind of situation as: *oppression and prejudice from males in positions of power.* The different and discriminatory criteria used to judge the suitability of women applicants for senior positions act here to disadvantage women applicants against men.

Spouse's job There is the other often quoted constraint of immobility because of partner's jobs: in this study twelve women mentioned this as a factor that had affected them. As pointed out earlier, men also often cite not being able to shift because of family responsibilities as a constraint. However, there is an interesting difference here, in that the research does not mention men citing their partner's jobs as the constraint, but rather their children's educational needs (Sarros 1984). These twelve women made comments such as this though: *It would have been good to have been able to move schools, but with my husband committed to a vet partnership, this is not a real possibility and: We shifted frequently as he gained promotion to larger schools.* In their partnerships, the man's job still has priority and the woman still follows his interests rather than vice versa.

However, in two cases this has been made to work for the women, such as this one: *I've moved frequently to follow my husband, but this has been an advantage. I think, in retrospect, the broad experience gained has been an advantage.* Another wrote: *My husband teaches too and this has been an advantage - we often discuss things.*

There was a sense of change beginning in the home relationships of two other women in this study, as reflected in their statements that these have assisted them. One wrote: *When I first became an HOD, my husband took over most of the running of the house.* The other said: *I have very few commitments in my home and personal life eg. housework, partner's demands.* The telling point in the second woman's case is that at 30, she has no children. She has not had the child care role to negotiate, and how many women have been able to transform that socially defined responsibility within their relationships?

To sum up and conclude this chapter, although recent research has questioned the impact of family responsibilities on women's opportunities, the results of this survey of 30 women middle managers would suggest that there is a need to think again. Until it becomes both `appropriate' and expected that a man with children will need to take some time out of his career for childrearing responsibilities, this crippling constraint on women's career advancement will not change. Even the provision of childcare creches

will probably not alter the attitude blocks: women will still be expected to do the arranging of the care, the delivering and collecting of the children and so on. This is still seen as part of a `natural' sexual division of labour.

This part of the study then partially supports Neville's contention that:

> ...all the `barriers' or `blocks' to women's promotion can be traced to the single factor... that society allocates to (women) the primary responsibility for child rearing (Neville 1987 p8).

But alongside the physical constraints this places on women, discriminatory attitudes and values surrounding the role are woven into the structures, policies and practices of educational institutions, limiting women's opportunities. These can be seen to be a large part of what TEACAPS called the "jigsaw pieces" (1982 p99) of variables explaining women's relative absence from decision-making positions in both the primary and the secondary systems.

`Jigsaw pieces' is a good way to describe the various workings of a dominant male hegemony. It links to feminist descriptions of the patterns of patriarchy where "every avenue of power within society ...is entirely within male hands' (Millet 1970 p25). It is this situation of unequal power in gender relations that is the focus of this thesis, which turns now to the analysis of the perceptions of six of the women from the group described in this chapter.

Chapter six

Aspirations: Dichotomies and dilemmas

This chapter, and the three which follow, focus on the in-depth case studies of the six women selected from the initial questionnaire. The methodology of this part of the study was described in Chapter 4. The interviews did not follow a structured set of questions, but took the form of a series of `focussed' conversations about gender relations. It was important to work from the women's own experience, so the topic of unequal power in gender relations was not raised unless a woman described a situation where that was an issue. When this happened though, as it did in each case, their feelings about those situations were explored in some depth.

Because of the complex nature of the workings of hegemonic forces the analysis of the women's perceptions cannot develop a linear type of argument that will finally explain the continuing gender inequalities in educational administration. Rather, the discussion tends to weave back and forth across the chapters, exploring the links and contradictions that emerged from the women's comments. For example, the concept of the sexual division of labour appears in every chapter: it constrains women's opportunities to gain experience for promotion into management (Chapter 5) and at the same time shapes their aspirations, directing them to marriage and motherhood (Chapter 6); it has also resulted in men being the ones who have held positions of leadership (Chapters 1 and 2), and consequently this has reinforced perceptions of `masculinity' being authoritative (Chapter 7) whilst `femininity' is associated with nurturing (Chapters 5 and 9). Thus the discussion needs to be read with the image of a mosaic in mind: both within and across the chapters, segments of the discussion link to one another to create a picture that reveals some of the complexity of the interlocking `jigsaw pieces' (TEACAPs 1982) of hegemonic forces working within society as a whole to advantage men and boys as a group over women and girls.

As in a mosaic, where a pattern is not complete until all the pieces are in place, an explanation of gender inequalities needs to consider the structural, political and economic forces behind individual stories of gender inequalities. This thesis cannot achieve the huge task of completing the picture though; it aims rather to develop a micro analysis of the experiences of a small group of women. They are introduced in

this chapter with a brief description of their home and school situations, which is followed by an analysis of their aspirations and the dilemmas that have confronted them as either mothers who were also managers, or as women facing `choices', of marriage and children, or careers. Although the emphasis tends to fall on the women's `private' aspirations and experience, links to their school situations begin to be made here.

In Chapters 7 and 8 the focus is turned onto the women's struggles to establish their authority in their schools in the face of cultural expectations that associate authority with `masculinity' rather than `femininity'. The women's recognition and expression of their right to be angry, especially in response to discrimination and prejudice, is shown to be an important part of their developing autonomy.

Chapter 9 describes the ways in which the women were perceiving their work as managers. Here their philosophies can be seen to be combining their so-called `private' nurturing roles and skills with their `public' authority roles in school management. This chapter shows ways in which the women were experiencing their `two worlds' as continuous, yet were maintaining some of the distinctions between their private and public selves. These distinctions were to some extent reflecting the presence of unequal power in their gender relations, inequalities which can be seen to be placing `superwoman' demands on the time and energy of some of the women.

Home and work situations

In their paid work situations, the women were at various stages of establishing themselves in their management positions in their schools or communities or teaching organisations. They worked in head of department positions at the levels of PR2 and 3 in both co-ed and single sex secondary schools, and as Grade 1 and 3 teaching principals and an assistant principal in primary schools. They were carrying responsibility for between three and six other teaching staff and administering yearly budgets of between $3000 and $60,000. Two of the women also held responsible positions (at a national level) in NZEI and PPTA. During the time they had been in their management positions, periods ranging from nine months to three years, each woman had met resistance to her authority; although they were handling this in different ways, some common patterns emerged with the women using similar strategies to deal with this resistance and establish her own styles of working.

The six women were living in a variety of home situations and were at different stages in the negotiating of their positions and roles there. Two were single, Pauline Chapman[1] having definitely decided not to live with a male partner while Mary Ross was still undecided about whether she would marry or not. Mary wanted to have children at some stage in her life, but she was painfully aware of the dilemmas of marriage versus career. Of the four married women, Robyn Hunt had chosen not to have children, while Susan Baker, who had children, had faced considerable stress and difficulties as a result of having to be the main breadwinner for her family throughout her teaching career. The other two women, Dorothy Anselm and Nichola Adams, had married and taken time out of full-time teaching to raise their children before returning to school and taking up increased management responsibilities. Each of the women's stories touched at some stage on the sexual division of labour, those living with male partners showing that they were, to varying degrees, still embedded in the traditional gender patterns, while both the single women indicated that issues surrounding the expected division of labour and the dilemmas surrounding the dual roles of career and marriage were factors influencing their choice to remain single.

Before moving into the analysis of the women's perceptions of these dilemmas though, it is necessary to briefly discuss the concepts of nurturing and of the sexual division of labour.

The sexual division of labour

There has been a common acceptance of the idea of a division of experience into public and private spheres although the lives of men and women span both worlds (Novitz 1987 p23). Further, within these spheres men and women do different things in each of these spheres. There is an:

> ...allocation of work on the basis of sex, within both the home and the workplace, as well as that division between home and workplace which has been characteristic of capitalism (Game and Pringle 1983 p14).

It was argued in Chapter 1 that these divisions are historical and social constructions[2] that are not only a part of capitalism, but also part of the pervasive working of a male hegemony that maintains gender inequalities[3]. Game and Pringle argue that:

---

[1]To protect the identity of the women in this part of the study, I have used pseudonyms.

[2]The experience of the divisions changes over time and place (Cox and James 1987 p9).

[3]Marxist feminist theory has shown how the split is linked to the needs of capitalism as well as patriarchy, while within educational administration theory, Blackmore (1989) has traced the dichotomies back through trait theory to the influences of liberal political theory. She argues that this has worked alongside positivistic theories of knowledge and the development of the bureaucratic

> One of the ways in which men's power and control is maintained is through the sexual division of labour in the home which connects with a sexual division of labour in the workplace: and this division does not have to be imposed: it is experienced as natural in both spheres (Game and Pringle 1983 p23).

Thus, in the allocation of `tasks', while men's place is seen as being in the public workplace, women are seen as best `suited' by reason of their `natural' qualities of femininity to the nurturing and caring work associated with childrearing in the private world of the home. Nurturing has become seen as `women's work' in the wider world as well. It can be defined as the range of activities that:

> ...women engage in to service the basis life-maintaining needs of society generally and of their families in particular. This covers all archetypical women's work: child-bearing, care of home, husband and children and the sick; food preparation; provision of clothing and emotional support...It has both instrumental goals concerned with achieving identifiable goals and emotional aspects expressing the maintenance of relationships...In the notion of nurturing, the relational facets of women's identities become particularly clear (Marshall 1984 p80).

However, it is not just that men and women do different things that is damaging to women: it is the judging of women's work and worth as inferior that is harmful (Shakeshaft 1987). The private world has been seen as a sphere of human experience that has "secondary importance" (Cox and James 1987 p2) and women's nurturing work there is taken for granted as part of their `natural role' and interests, therefore not needing any special recognition or reward. Significantly, this work is unpaid. Like Eisenstein (1984) and others, Marshall argues that women are "particularly vulnerable in their nurturing roles to exploitation". One example she gives of how this can happen is in the perception of women's carrying out of tasks such as cooking a meal as "expressive of their relationships with others": women are seen to do this `for love', while the recipients can see it merely as "an instrumental means to an end" (1984 p80).

Millett (1970) argued that `sexual politics' provides one of the most fundamental concepts of power. It can be argued, for example, that men also do work in the private sphere `for love', such as painting the house or fixing the car. It is the value judgement nature of the distinctions that can be easily overlooked here. Some examples are needed to illustrate this. A man's private world is generally seen as legitimately separate from his work in the public sphere, and his work in the private world is viewed from the perspective of his `superior' position and status in the public world. Thus a male principal who does tapestry at home is viewed as having an

---

structuring of schools to create and maintain gender inequalities in educational hierarchies that endorse male control and influence.

interesting hobby; if he has strong practical skills (such as those needed in building or farming for example) which he uses in the private sphere, he gains status in both private and public worlds - he can run a school and do those other things. He is thus seen as being a `well-rounded', talented person. However, judgements of women are not generally made in the same ways. A woman's work in the private sphere of the home has been devalued as a consequence of it being seen as part of her ascribed `natural' skills and interests (this judgement has also been part of the justification for such work remaining unpaid). When she moves into a position in the public world, such as school management, a woman can be viewed sceptically: because her `roles' in the private world are devalued, this judgement can carry over into perceptions of her activity and viewpoints in her public work. At often unconscious levels, there is likely to be a feeling that such a woman is not in her `proper place' and that her ways of working in administration for example, are `not as good' as those of men who are `rightfully' there. Ideological beliefs such as these can maintain the ascendancy of a male hegemony.

The ideologically `sensitive' nature of research involving the marriage relationship is also linked to the sexual politics of gender inequalities in the way that hegemonic forces place curbs on the `appropriateness' of investigating this `intimate' area of people's lives. The private world has had a "veiled and relatively, inaccessible" nature (Cox and James 1987 p2): here, patriarchal ideologies such as `A man's home is his castle' maintain the public/private split and the notion that home relationships `should not be discussed' with outsiders. Restraints are thus erected around the possibility of speaking about or analysing areas of male control within this private sphere: the researcher does not wish to intrude into another's private and intimate relationships, and a woman who loves a man does not wish to hurt him by criticising him; he, after all loves her too. Such cultural `rules' can work to isolate women from one another within marriage `walls' that maintain a hegemonic `pact of silence' on this area of gender relations.

However, in the case history interviews which make up the major part of this present research, the women talked quite freely about their home relationships and private aspirations. As they did so some of the complexities of gender power relations were revealed: some of the women discussed areas of male power that had disadvantaged them in their own relationships, yet showed that they knew that they were accommodating and reproducing some of their disadvantage by their own actions. I turn now to a discussion of some of their dilemmas as they were working within

contradictory situations as women managers whose aspirations are also commonly seen to be linked to marriage and motherhood.

Aspirations: Dichotomies and dilemmas

Middleton has shown how in New Zealand women born after the war were brought up to think that they would have equal opportunity, both educationally and vocationally, on the grounds of `merit'; but at the same time "they were socialised as women to choose only occupations seen as `feminine'(such as teaching, nursing and secretarial work)" (1985 p6). Within education, it was teaching, not educational management, that was their expected area of work.

In Gross and Trask's (1964) study of male and female career paths, most of the women decided as early as high school that they wanted to be teachers and they specialized in education with this aim. It would seem logical that they would progress to become educational leaders, but the contradictory expectations identified by Middleton have been a strong influence on women's aspirations. Robyn Hunt, who grew up in the sixties, summed up a common experience for this group of women:

> *I was expected to go into a traditional female career and I wanted to teach. I took a Sunday School class while I was still at school to see if I'd like it, and I loved it. Management wasn't then my goal.*

Both Nichola Adam's and Dorothy Anselm's comments about their education in girls' schools agreed with Susan Baker's judgements about girls' schooling in the fifties. Susan said:

> *During my time at school in the middle fifties everything was prescribed about what you did and didn't learn, and in girls' schools it was never anything really exciting or challenging. It was nice little packages of `suitable' knowledge.*

Middleton's (1988b) analysis of the Thomas Report shows how training for domestic skills was given emphasis within the school curriculum for girls during the years when these three women were growing up. The forces of cultural expectations that marriage and family would be a girl's first interest and career second are shown here to be supported by State policy (David, 1980, has traced a similar pattern in Britain).

However, it seemed that when this group went to Training College, as Susan said:

> *Suddenly it was open slather. It was a time of the golden lecturers and I was like a sponge - opening up and realising that there was all this knowledge I could learn. I just read and read - I couldn't read enough.*

Nichola also talked about her time at college as "wonderful." It has been argued though that training colleges reinforce the conservative attitudes of the dominant ideologies (Ramsay 1985). In Britain, Deem pointed out that the spatial and educational isolation of teacher training from other forms of higher education has "reinforced - or even to some extent created - the ideology that teaching young children is a feminine vocation" (1978 p120). She argued that the isolation allowed training colleges to "function effectively as social controllers of the skills and behaviours of their mostly female students" (p119), and limited young women's horizons. Ramsay (1985) cites studies showing that in New Zealand training colleges:

> ...liberal, challenging and academically successful students were singled out for special attention by the college teaching staff. These students were `channelled' (or socialised) into acceptable patterns of behaviour (1985 p111).

Susan described an incident that illustrates this. She had a poem accepted for publication in the college magazine but it was censured and publicly commented upon in assembly by one of the lecturers:

> *It had a line in it that compared people to `shit on a dung heap' and that was terrible...you didn't say things like that, especially if you were a woman. It was the most embarrassing moment of my life. I was trying to make myself as small as possible...I had really bared my soul in this verse and I felt just so exposed.*

It was also interesting to note that while she was at training college, Nichola had:

> *... done a lot of work for one of the lecturers. It was a survey of land use on the West Coast and I did a lot of map work and things for him... He was going to publish a book about that area.*

This illustrates the existence of an academic sexual division of labour within tertiary institutions where it has been, and still is, common for male academics to have women research assistants (Roberts 1981). Although Susan and Nichola both felt their intellectual horizons were stretched at training college, these examples show some of the ways in which limits were placed on women in relation to men. The sexual

hierarchy still operates in the staffing of training colleges as in other educational institutions[4], giving young women there few models of women in positions of responsibility and status. The message given to women teacher trainees by such a situation is that their goals should not include such positions, but rather they should remain in teaching and, as taught earlier during their schooling, carry domestic responsibilities in the home.

Nichola said that when she went to training college she was getting interested in men and she met her future husband, Peter, at this time:

> *He was a second year, and much more mature than the other guys in my group. My parents commented that he had `an old head on young shoulders'. He was intelligent and we could talk about lots of things.*

Susan said this about her husband:

> *Jim and I just clicked. He was a lot older than me and in lots of ways I've wondered whether I transferred the relationship I never had with my father to him. We were such good friends and had such a lot to talk about....There were lots of blokes my own age that I got bored with and I was just too much for them.*

And Robyn said:

> *I met Matthew when I went to varsity...He was gentle - honest and genuine. He was sincere - and I think I was looking for a father figure - someone to love me and cherish me and look after me in the style to which I wished to become accustomed! (Laughs)...I wanted security I think, because I had always had it up to then.*

The similarities are interesting here. Although no generalisations can be made about such a small group of women, it is worth considering the effects of the ways in which women and men choose their partners. It is culturally accepted that the man `should' be older than the woman but not vice versa, echoing the father/daughter relationship,

---

[4]Most senior lecturer and administration positions in training colleges are still held by men; only 19 percent of principal lecturer positions, and 24 percent of senior lecturer positions, were held by women in 1987. There were no female principals or deputy associate principals and only 17 percent of vice-principals were women. This was in a year when women made up 74 percent of the primary teaching service (TEACAPS 1988).

and the stage is set for a `natural' deferring of the woman to her `more mature and wise' husband. However, the `sexual politics' (Millet 1970) at work here are hegemonically hidden in assumptions about what are `natural' and `appropriate' love relationships. Such assumptions can shape the consciousness of both men and women, working perhaps to persuade women that they `need protection' and men that they are suitably qualified to give such protection to partners who are generally younger (and smaller) than themselves.

In Robyn's comment that she was wanting security (*this was only at the beginning of the relationship,* she added) there can be seen the effects of the socialising of girls and young women to look to men for leadership and protection. Such socialising was identified in Malcolm's research into women teachers' aspirations and she found that the women she studied reflected a lack of self-esteem, being "reluctant to apply for promotion because of feelings of inadequacy...needing more support and encouragement... than do men" (1978 p2). Dorothy Anselm illustrated this kind of lack of confidence, in spite of the fact that while she was growing up she was encouraged to aim for `success'.

> *I was terribly lucky - had strong opportunities. Father insisted, even to the point of holding down two jobs himself, that we all had a good education. My grandmother and her sister had both gone to university in spite of a real hard struggle and I'd gone through girls' schools too, so I knew about role models.*

In spite of the fact that she did gain promotion into management and in spite of her competent handling of union work and the support of her husband (who was encouraging her to seek further promotion), she still lacked confidence in her ability to hold more responsible positions.

> *Sam is always telling me, `Of course you can do it ...whatever makes you think you can't?' It is still a bone of contention between us.*

Past studies have blamed the women for `deficiencies' such as this kind of lack of confidence. However, Dorothy said later that she had watched her mother filling traditional `housewife' and nurturing roles:

> *... probably it was social pressures through the church, which was a big part in my life, that influenced me to see myself as the scone maker and the afternoon tea provider. Mother had done all that too.*

Thus she had been exposed to the contradictory messages about careers and independence within expectations of equal but different roles described by Middleton (1988b) and May, a woman who, like Dorothy grew up in the 50s and who wrote:

> We may have `rejected' some of our mothers' values, but despite our personal and collective revolutions, we have found the inheritance difficult to resolve as we `manage' and/or balance the various dimensions of our own lives...Women gave a priority to being a good wife and mother during the 1950s that may no longer be fashionable. Their impact on my generation has been one of ambivalence, as we have plunged into the fulfillment of ourselves while still trying to be `good mothers' (1988 pp57, 60).

Dorothy saw her lack of confidence in `public' roles as growing out of her socialising into an acceptance that her `real' place was in the home: along with her mother's example, that had been a stronger influence on her than the encouragement of her father to seek success in the `public' world or the models of her grandmother and schoolteachers.

Early research into womens' lack of promotion did not adequately consider the fact that for women brought up in the post-war years, cultural expectations of their nurturing roles within marriage and family placed them in several binds. If women with children sought promotion into positions that required more time and responsibility, they risked being judged as `failing' to fill adequately their nurturing roles in the family. And although:

> ...both men and women were expected to marry and raise children, men were expected to have both family and career, while women were expected to choose one or the other, or, if they continued to teach, their careers would be subordinate to their husbands. While the ideology of liberalism valued intellectual, professional and emotional autonomy, that of `femininity' portrayed women and girls as financially and emotionally dependent on men (Middleton 1985 p6).

Dorothy responded to the contradictory expectations by building her own `expertise' within the culturally sanctioned role of `mother':

> *I realise now that being a mother, to do it successfully, was important to me - to do it, as I termed it, properly - was part of a success thing for me. There has been reward in the self-satisfaction of having achieved what I set out to do; a good job well done.*

Here, her values and definition of success also echo those of the woman quoted by Carlson and Schmuck (1981 pp122-123): "Success is not measured in moving from

job to job in a vertical continuum...it is measured by the quality of any job held." Dorothy added: *The reward has also been a good relationship with the children,* and she was happy that she was continuing to carry that responsibility. Apple (1983) argues that women carve out areas of power within their subordinate positions and Dorothy illustrates this:

> *Sam will say to me, `Paul didn't tell me about so and so when he was home.' But you see, I'm here - I'm not off at golf; I'm in the kitchen making tea and playing cards, and that's when you talk, that's when you get the good stuff with your kids. Sam's missing out on that.*

Although there is resistance to the dominant definitions of success in Dorothy's recognition of the worth and importance of what she was doing as a mother, her resistance can also be seen to be contradictory. Her achieving of self-fulfillment and success through mothering also reinforces the ideology that ultimate success for women lies in their `natural' roles of mothering. Such ideologies can persuade women to stay in the home carrying the main responsibility for childcare which can disadvantage their teaching careers: at the same time, men are advantaged by their freedom from full-time childcare. Dorothy's teaching career was put `on hold' for ten years while she was bringing up her family[5]. She said:

> *It's now that they're gone that I have the time to pick up these other things. Earlier I couldn't have done them.*

It was Robyn's recognition that mothering could entail a kind of `loss of self' that influenced her decision not to have any children. She said:

> *With mothers, their children come first. I mean, they as people disappear just about. Their needs and desires in life disappear until the children are off their hands again. Everything revolves around them.*

In comparison with Dorothy, Robyn was at the opposite end of a continuum of `being maternal'. She said: *I didn't relate to young children - never saw myself in that role.* She held very different values to those implied in stereotypes of self-sacrificing nurturant femininity and she thought that some of her own assertiveness and her strong sense of herself as a person was related to the fact that:

---

[5]In Chapter 5 it was argued that the careers of men and those who do not take time out for childcare are advantaged by the numbers of women who are out of the teaching service, and therefore the 'promotion stakes', for childcare reasons,

I've never been out of the workforce - I've never been in that, `Oh she's just a mother' sort of situation.

Dorothy had enjoyed her mothering though, as had Nichola, who had also filled the traditional expectations, taking ten years out of teaching while she looked after her children. Neither Nichola nor Dorothy viewed this time as being `just a mother' - both of them gained great satisfactions from it. Nichola said:

When you have two or three children I think they need someone there all the time. Other people can leave their children and go off teaching and that is fine, but I was very satisfied doing what I was doing - working away, going to kindergarten, all the other kids around - and I enjoyed sewing for them.

Nichola also illustrated how personal career aspirations can be limited by the mothering role though:

Marian: So the whole mothering thing was quite satisfying?
Nichola: *For a time, yes. And then it wore off. I grew out of those satisfactions. I think I began to need something more stimulating - people contact, commitment, deadlines, that sort of thing.*

It was the stretching of her own mind and skills in the meeting of challenges outside the home that she was missing and she was feeling the isolation that can occur for women involved in childcare in the home.

Mary Ross was a generation younger than Dorothy, Nichola and Susan, but she was still caught in the dilemmas resulting from the contradictory expectations surrounding women's so-called equality of career opportunity and their ascribed nurturing roles:

If I had a husband and a family I wouldn't `go for the top' because I believe that they should come first. I'm really old-fashioned about that. I probably wouldn't be like I am if I was married. That's why marriage freaks me out a bit. What I see for marriage, and what I see for me as a single person are actually a long, long way from each other...

This dilemma has been linked to the ways in which a patriarchal culture has constructed `mothering':

> The idea of female virtue and the image of the mother tends to work against our capacity to achieve, or even aspire to, professional `success'. As mothers we are expected to nurture; as professionals, we are expected to compete (Culley, Diamond, Edwards, Lennox and Portuges 1985 p12)

Although Mary had experienced economic independence and success in her teaching and had been encouraged by both friends and her principal to aim for a principal's position, she was not sure whether that kind of success was what she really wanted.

> *I swing desperately. I am a really maternal person, though whether I have children or not doesn't really bother me. And yet... I don't know. I really don't know. I went through a process of redefining it all a couple of years ago when I was going out with a guy I really loved and we were going to get married. It looked like I could do what I wanted to do... But I think if I had children, they would come first. They would have all my energy, which doesn't mean I would stop doing other things, but they would be my focus, because I would want them to be in an environment where they were loved and secure. I don't want my children to be messes - I want them to grow up in the same kind of secure environment that I had.*

Although May (1988 p67) suggests that by the 1970s the potency of the myth that women are `bad mothers' if they worked outside the home, had waned, Mary shows how this idea is still influencing young women. On the one hand she believed in `the family' in the way it is described by May:

> ...as a traditional middle class Pakeha paradigm, which assumed that:
> - the family was a haven of comfort and love:
> - mothers should always be with their children:
> - men could earn a breadwinners wage and they too were willing to assume a benevolent fathering role (May 1988 p65).

She said: *Family is important to me - I had a really stable, loving family background,* and this would take all her energy. Yet on the other hand, her idea of family was one which included an equal status for her alongside her partner, rather than what she called the:

> *...stereotype of being tied down, looking after little kids and with husband coming home for his dinner and that sort of thing. I think it can be something really stimulating and creative and a whole extension and discovery for me...*

Her beliefs about the place of a mother in the family have resulted though in her perception that she would need to give up her aspirations (she said: *If I'm really honest, I want to be a principal)* if she married and had children.

As shown already by Dorothy's seeking of success within her mothering, the women in this study did not all define success in the `traditional' male paradigm of moving up through a continuum of public and paid jobs, with each increasing in responsibility and reward. Mary had a myriad of aspirations, and reaching the `top' would not necessarily mean success for her:

> *To excel is important to me but what frightens me is that I'll end up stuck in one thing. There is this dilemma - do I commit myself to one thing only - or do I go and do lots of things over the rest of my life, and enjoy all of them and grow in a more rounded sort of way...It's a decision I haven't made yet, because it's one I'm frightened of.*

Although she had been brought up to be competitive (all her family have `done well' academically), Mary also wanted to develop sides of herself that would be limited if she specialised in only one job so that she could gain promotion. As a result of ideologies surrounding the meanings of `success' though, she was caught in a dilemma, confronted by what seemed to be a choice between reaching the `top' (by becoming a principal) or, as she said: *growing in a more rounded way by doing lots of different things in my life and enjoying each them,* or having a family.

Pauline Chapman had decided that if she married (and she doubted that she would) there would have to be an equal sharing of the work and the decision making involved in homemaking. She had watched her mother:

> *...giving Dad a suggestion and two weeks later it comes back as his idea. And I swore never to let myself get in the position that I would be under some man's power. I'm not prepared to put up with a marriage where the woman is not the man's equal. I was not going to look after someone else all the time - and that's what it would be like, with New Zealand men. I know only three or four men who do equal amounts of housework and even then, they're still looked after by their wives.*

The married women in this group suggest that her assumptions here were fairly accurate. Dorothy said:

> *I can remember Sam watching me one time - answering the phone, stepping over the baby, making the dinner and folding the washing - and him saying, `How do you do it all?' He finds it difficult to put a meal on and get it timed to the right time. And it's just practice. It's not being clever. It's just long practice at sharing yourself.*

Although it was clear from her statements that she thought anybody could learn such skills, Dorothy did not make the connection that her husband could learn the skills if he chose to do those things often enough, even though she acknowledged that:

> *Sam is better at taking time for himself than me - I tend to work all the time. Achieving things comes at a cost of things done for me. That will have to come later.*

There was no acrimony here at an imbalance in the division of labour. In fact she stated that:

> *...he tends to look after the garden and cars and keeps the finances straight and I don't have to do any of that at all - it is a reasonably balanced division of labour.*

However, when she was interviewed (on the first morning of the school holidays) her husband was out playing golf, and although she had been away all weekend on school business, she had also been up early to get the car in to be checked so it would be available for her to take her daughter to the dentist to have a wisdom tooth out. There seemed to be a difference between her description of: *a fairly equal division of work,* and what was actually happening. Although her husband was extremely supportive of her in her teaching career (he had earlier given up his job to shift for her promotion and was encouraging her to think about moving up again: *Damn his eyes! I've only just got settled in here!* she said) their respective roles in the home had not altered a great deal since she took on increased responsibilities. For Dorothy these had been fitted in around the wife and mother tasks and expectations.

> *Sam accepts now -though he doesn't like doing it - he accepts that if I'm late home from school or have to be off out to a meeting, then obviously he's going to have to do it - get the meal ready and clean up again afterwards. But he's always glad to see me home again afterwards.*

The `superwoman syndrome' was operating in Dorothy's case as she carried a triple workload - in her home, her teaching/managing job and her union responsibilities. Game and Pringle make some pertinent comments about perceptions of the contributions made by men and women to housework:

> Although college students frequently tell us that `women aren't oppressed any more, men do housework too', when pressed it usually turns out that this amounts to putting food in the microwave or Saturday morning shopping...Husbands now like to think they do more in the house and wives would like to believe it is true. But the reality is different. The husbands of wage-earning wives only appear to be doing more and it would seem that they are kidding themselves. A recent American study showed that on tasks in which they claimed to `participate' they contributed about 10 percent, on average, of the time and effort (1983 p136).

Nichola said several times that her husband was really supportive but when she talked about who did what in their home, she said:

> *Sometimes when I'm home late he'll say, "I'll cook tea". I go and get the groceries - Peter sometimes says he will, but he never ever gets around to it. But then he's always in the background, washing up the dishes that are left on the sink, or putting the washing out.*

Nichola was thus the planner and the main worker in the areas of cooking, cleaning and laundering in her home and at school these kinds of tasks were still carried out by her, despite the fact that she was principal:

> *I rush around when they have a working bee and I make the cups of tea and they leave the cups there and go out again.*

Susan Baker had always been the breadwinner in her family, yet even she had had many arguments with her husband over who did the housework:

> *I have never been a traditional wife. Because of the financial position I had to keep working and I expected him to do the things he'd never been used to doing. He used to get very shirty with me and I'd get short with him too.*
> Marian: So you changed his expectations?
> Susan: *Yes I did. It caused a lot of arguments then, and still does.*

Horsfield (1988 pp32-33) reports that there have been no studies on the amount of time women in New Zealand spend on unwaged work in the home since that done by

Fletcher in 1978, but that that study confirmed that household work associated with young children is principally undertaken by women and that women on average spent the most time working.

Game and Pringle argue that: "The idea that husbands should help has become popular though" (1983 pp136-37). The three younger women in this study, Mary, Robyn and Pauline all reflected this idea. Robyn was adamant that `playing the good wife' has never been a part of her relationship:

> *I think Matthew learnt that when he first took me out on a date and three days later he turned up with a pair of trousers which he asked me to take up. I did it, but he realised that he shouldn't ask me again!*

She said there was never any suggestion that her husband should not share the housework equally:

> *When I was at university 13 years ago, all my group expected that husbands should do that... I think looking back that my expectation probably came from my mother. She was a strong woman in a quiet way and she gave a lot of double messages. She'd not come out with the ideas, but if I did, she'd certainly not contradict them. It's almost as if she was saying, "I'm not of the generation that can do that dear - but I think it's the right idea."*

May's observation is relevant here:

> The new feminist consciousness of the 1970s was seeded by our mothers, who may have enjoyed motherhood but who also felt that they had missed out on something somewhere (1988 p60).

Robyn had developed a feminist consciousness (she had kept her own name after she married, for example) but her experience supports Game and Pringle's argument. When talking about disagreements she has had with her husband, she said that she probably gives in to Matthew over things that are not important:

> *...to save an argument. If it's not going to affect me, I can't be bothered making an issue over it.*
> Marian: Can you think of anything you have made an issue over?
> Robyn: *Yes - until three years ago, getting Matthew to do an equal share of the housework. I did get him to help though - and now he probably does more than an equal share - five sevenths of the cooking and two thirds of the shopping...*

Marian: How did you get him to do that?
Robyn: *Constant nagging!*

Although she went into marriage expecting her husband to do half the housework *(We all thought that way at varsity)* she said it took ten years of nagging *(I went on and on and on!)* to achieve that (ironically Robyn and Matthew now employ a cleaning lady, so a woman is still doing the work).

However, this sexual division of labour in the women's homes has many contradictory aspects. Although the women's comments suggested that the men were keeping this division (often by default: by not initiating or not carrying through the doing of housework tasks themselves, by not cooking until they had to, or by being a `helper' rather than doing the organising and planning), conversely, both Nichola and Dorothy were also maintaining this situation, and they showed a certain acceptance of their lot.

Despite Dorothy's heavy commitment to union work outside of school time, she was still happy taking most of the responsibility for housework and being the primary caregiver in her family. She took some pride in the fact that she was:

> *...ever so much more efficient than Sam is, ever so much more efficient. And I don't actually mind doing the washing. I don't like doing housework much, but I do like things being washed and tidied to my standards. And I like when the washing is nice and clean and blowing on the line.*

There were rewards for her here in an area of acknowledged skill in her home responsibilities. Nichola also found rewards in her housework. She said she found:

> *...a sort of security and peace in doing things like wiping round the benches when I get home from school. And I don't know whether I could relax and let it go. That's to do with my upbringing in that my mother is a perfectionist about the house and that is at the back of my mind...*

She said she did not want to alter her home situation, despite the fact that she carried the main responsibilities of housework, because:

> *Peter has really been behind most things that I do - he encourages me and he actually gives me strength.*

Nichola was not seeing the inequalities in her home division of labour as unfair, but was emphasising the support that Peter was giving her. There was an unconscious kind of `repaying' of his support. Dorothy illustrated this influence in her thinking when she said:

> *Sam shifted for me to get this job. He's pushed me...That's why I've never been in that angry place where women can get to if they've had to fight for everything.*

Connell's comments on the particular kind of teacher feminism that had been observed in his study of teachers at work are relevant here:

> To a significant extent it is the feminism of married women. Many are wives and mothers as well as employed teachers...The reasonably good relations many of them sustain with their husbands no doubt inform their thinking (1985 p190).

When one is aware of *what other women have to put up with,* as Dorothy put it, doing the housework can seem a small thing. However, the effect of this is that the privilege of the men in the home and in the workplace seems to be not disturbed too much by women's careers. Although Dorothy and Nichola both said their husbands were starting to do more in the house, this was only happening in response to the women's heavier school workloads; when the pressure came off, the old patterns reasserted themselves. Both Peter's and Sam's support was being expressed more in the form of encouragement of their wives in their public roles, than in a truly equal sharing of household tasks.

In Nichola's and Dorothy's relative acceptance of this situation, Firestone's argument has some explanatory force. She argued that romantic love is the pivot of women's oppression - women fall in love with their `oppressors'. Certainly love relationships can modify the power relations between men and women, but they can also cloud the underlying inequalities. Zillah Eisenstein has written that:

> The more feminists study patriarchy the more we understand that much of its power lies in the ability to mystify the reality of women's oppression... Woman's oppression, although a part of (capitalism's) processes is also part of the more complicated patriarchal arrangements of family, motherhood and the sexual division of labour (1981 p341).

The complicated nature of women's situations was further illustrated when Nichola talked about the way she saw her two roles of (public) principal and (private) wife and mother. Although she was combining the caring nurturing sides of her roles in the

family with the leading and administrative tasks of her work as a school manager[6], she was in some other ways deliberately keeping a distinction between these two sides of her life. Both she and Peter were aware that she was doing this. She described an occasion when she and Peter were *having words* in the car on the way to work one day:

> *...and he said to me, "You will have to change roles now - You're being the wife, and you'll have to change to the principal". And I did.*

She explained that:

> *Home is to relax in - school is not a relaxing place. The decisions at school just don't come easily. I change my role at home - as a principal you have a certain sound to your voice, you have to keep up the facade... At home I don't have to do that. There is a security thing about home.*

She was having to work hard at school to establish her authority and keeping the distinctions between her private and public worlds clear was important for the maintenance of her sense of `self'. She also needed to have a place to `let go'. That home as `a place of rest and refuge' was not totally true for her (she was still carrying a fairly traditional load of `women's work' there), was not seen as a problem. Game and Pringle point out that:

> Men have the power to define what is acceptable (in the public and the private worlds of work)...and women are placed on the defensive. They are the ones who have to negotiate the two power structures. And ironically they often do this by making an even sharper distinction between them. This makes each area easier to handle (1983 p139).

That Nichola was in fact having to negotiate from a defensive position became clear when she talked about the processes of decision making about such things as getting new things for the home. Those processes, and her developing awareness of anger at Peter's stance in those situations, are discussed in Chapter 8.

Before that though, Chapter 7 will analyse the women's reports of their struggles to establish themselves in their positions of responsibility in their schools. Those struggles can be seen to be linked in some ways to expectations and beliefs about what is a woman's `proper place' and what are appropriate tasks for women to undertake. Some of the dilemmas this group had, and still were encountering as a result of the

---

[6]This is discussed in Chapter 9.

sexual division of labour have been examined in this chapter: the next chapter focusses on ideas relating to authority and leadership, qualities that are more commonly associated (most of the time unconsciously) with masculinity than femininity. Such an association can place women who move into management positions in some difficult situations as they seek to establish their own credibility and ways of working as leaders.

Chapter seven

Authority: Women winning the right to lead.

Chapter 3 argued that what is seen to be authoritative in schools has been historically defined by those who already hold authority and power - leaders and theorists who have been male. Although there may be different levels and strategies of control existing within a conflict of interests in schools (Child 1984), the hierarchy of gender power relations (Cocklin and Battersby 1987) has been largely obscured by the processes of bureaucracy which (on the surface) make it possible for a few women to reach positions of authority alongside men, through promotion `on merit'. However, the bureaucratic structure is still very much a male power structure:

> We can call this `Patriarchy without the Father' to signify that it comes from an apparently neutral system. In some ways it is harder to fight, for it operates on denial of the authoritory relations, it is impersonal and no one can be held personally responsible. Men can be let off the hook or claim that they too are victims (Game and Pringle 1983 p22).

The fact that a particularly conservative patriarchal order of authority and control manifests itself in schools is only now becoming accepted (Apple 1983, Connell 1985). Although it can be seen to differ from school to school and will be in a process of change over the years, in education there is a:

> ...pattern of authority and consent, alliance and co-operation, resistance and opposition that characterises the institution as a whole... The association our society makes between authority and masculinity is a significant underpinning of the power structure of a school system where most administrators, principals and subject heads are men. It can create difficulty when women are exercising authority...to assert it is to undermine one's femininity (Connell 1985 p138, 153).

In her conclusion to her study of women in educational administration Shakeshaft suggests this is an area that needs investigation, asking:

> Do men carry with them, by nature of their sex, legitimate authority - authority that women must earn in other ways? (1987 p204).

This chapter focusses on the ways in which the six women middle managers were negotiating these difficulties. It illustrates the nature of a hegemonic masculinity of a hierarchical, technical, legalistic, paternal and sometimes aggressive kind which has ascribed authority (with its accompanying control) in schools to older males, while females are ascribed subordinate servicing roles under the direction of men. Some suggest that there is a modernisation of hegemonic masculinity in a new rhetoric of tolerance and equality, but in schools and in homes, many of the old divisions of labour and definitions of gender persist (Connell 1985 p186). Although an (ideal) image of the principal as the kindly, wise 'father' has largely supplanted earlier images of the tough, stern disciplinarian[1], women, along with children, are still seen as under the control, guidance, and `protection' of these men, with younger men being groomed to take older men's places in the hierarchies.

The analysis in this chapter will also illustrate how hegemonic processes work within this patriarchal authority structure to socialise women into endorsing male supremacy and defining their own aspirations in terms of male goals. Hegemony acts to continually construct and maintain the dominant group's values and beliefs about who has and who should have authority so that the ideology that men should lead and women should follow becomes the belief of the subordinated group as well. Such processes can shape the consciousness of women to the extent that they can fail to recognise contradictions between their own interests and the interests of those exercising power. Contradictions become submerged and difficult to identify or discuss because to do this requires a departure from the taken-for-granted world of `commonsense' ideas about what is `natural' or `right and proper'.

This does not mean that the oppressed are the unthinking dupes of ideology: women resist hegemonic male authority and are involved in on-going struggles (which can nevertheless be contradictory in their effects). But for women who wish to become involved in the influential decision-making positions of management, the hegemonic association of authority with masculinity creates dilemmas and problems of identity and validity that are different to the problems faced by male teachers moving into administration[2].

---

[1]Under the administrative reforms of 'Tomorrow's Schools', this seems likely to give way to a new image of 'corporate manager'.

[2]Stanford Friedman (1985) explores similar issues faced by feminist teachers who confront a trivialising of their intellect and authority as women working within patriarchal pedagogical practices and structures.

Men moving into administration possess a measure of cultural capital that advantages them: their gender has resulted in them having received `training' for the job, in the sense that cultural expectations build in them a `commonsense' belief in their ability and `right' to lead while others are also `trained' to accept that men are the ones most `suited' for administration. Although individual men may not personally use techniques of domination nor discriminate against women in schools, they still benefit from cultural definitions and perceptions of so-called `masculine' qualities as `authoritative'. Thus, individual men enter administration already `clothed' in the mantle of traditional status and authority that patriarchy weaves for them: they do not have to win this acceptance, but are expected only to maintain it by their bearing, behaviour and attitudes.

For a woman entering administration however, cultural definitions and expectations of her are not merely different: so-called `femininity' clothes her with (perceived) qualities that are judged to be inferior in comparison to those that `fit' men for this job. She has to win acceptance of her authority, by persuading others that she has not only the ability to administer, but that she has the right to do so. And she has to learn how to anticipate, negotiate and overcome the obstacles that an ascribed inferior status (based merely in the fact of her gender) constantly puts in her way. Neville points out that successful women were likely to experience resistance in the early stages of taking up an administrative position (1988 p149) and Marshall (1984) reports that once a woman won acceptance in a firm, she was reluctant to move and go through that process all over again. This present study shows that each woman faced resistance or challenge as she was establishing herself in her position of responsibility[3].

As has been shown in Chapter 6, it is not only in their public working lives that women have to negotiate problems of authority and gender power relations. In families and social interactions these issues are also present (though the inequalities here are based in the economic and emotional relationships more than the social one as in schools). Here the power differentials are obscured, softened and mediated by the ideologies of `romantic love': the oppressed falls in love with the oppressor, lives with him and has children with him (Firestone 1972). If one wishes to research the gender relations of women in the spheres of the home as well as the school, ideas about what is `right' and `proper' overlay those about what is `natural' and here one is venturing into the `sensitive' area of the `private' life and sexual relations of women and men. The perception of this area of research as `sensitive' is itself ideological, maintaining

[3]Suggestions that it is women's affiliative need that make them reluctant to move schools or apply for promotion (Neville 1988 p119, Malcolm 1978) need to be questioned in light of their experiences.

existing power relations. The hegemonic division of experience into public and private (a result of the working of both capitalism and patriarchy, as argued in Chapter 1) has been an added powerful constraint placed on women. The association of women with the `private' world of the home works against them in the `public' world where they are seen as having no experience or training for holding authority, while it also works to maintain male authority in the home.

Therefore any woman, moving out of a culturally defined `woman's place' (the home and the traditionally `female' position of teacher) into a position of authority as a school administrator, has to face and negotiate many dilemmas. She may become involved to a greater or lesser extent in gender power struggles, though her awareness of and involvement in such struggles will vary, depending on factors of personality, political awareness, aspirations and interests. Both Marshall (1984) and Neville (1988) found some women managers who said their gender had not constrained them at all; however, Marshall points out that the women in her study who said this were coping with being tokens (Kanter 1977) by controlling their awareness of themselves as women, describing themselves rather as people (1984 pp150-155). In her summing up profile of the successful woman administrator in education in New Zealand, Neville wrote that:

> After a while the men on the staff accept her, especially the younger men, but at first there is likely to be resistance...She is always aware that she must work twice as hard as a man and try not to make a mistake because it would be attributed to the fact that she is a woman rather than to her as a person. She would like to be perceived as a person, not as a token woman (1988 p149).

I turn now to the analysis of these aspects of the women's perceptions of their gender relations.

Dilemmas and power struggles

The women's accounts of their gender relations in their schools and communities were often about their interactions with individual men who had used a paternalistic `power of the fathers' to try to `keep them in their place'. This kind of authority was a common component of the hegemonic masculinity against which they were struggling. Despite the fact that each of the women worked with men who were in positions senior to them, however, they did not accept unquestioningly having to `do what they were told'. In varying ways they were challenging this aspect of the patriarchal order.

Nichola Adams is principal of a two teacher country school which sends its Form 2 students to a secondary school that uses an IQ test as part of its assessment of new students at enrolment time, prior to placing them in classes. Nichola's description of an incident with Sid Jones, the secondary principal, when she refused to allow this testing of her students at her school, reveals some of the pressures women face when they challenge established male authority.

Firstly, she faced the issue of whether she actually had the authority to make this decision; she found it in the power of her position, ie. in formal authority:

> *I had to think, `Now I'm in charge of this school. If I want things to happen or not happen, I'm the one who has to make the decision.' I decided, that no - I wouldn't allow the testing for my students...and fortunately Peter was away for a fortnight and so they couldn't say, `She's been talking to him!' It was entirely on my own.*

Her comments here reveal some of the interlocking of the `public' and `private' lives of women; she thinks other people judge her husband Peter as having quite a lot of influence over her work. My own experience would support this perception that married women in positions of authority are often seen as being `helped' or influenced by their husbands - a way of accounting for a woman making sound decisions maybe, is to assume that there is a man (ie. a `rational authority') helping her to make them[4]. This assumption is not often spoken; it is a semi-conscious `feeling', suggesting the presence of hegemonic forces, where challenges to the possible falsehood of the assumption are avoided by not speaking it aloud. In the reverse situation, when it is either obvious or possible that the woman in a partnership is really the one making a decision, jokes (often snide) are commonly made: `Who wears the pants in that family?' or `She's the power behind the throne'. Gender stereotypes are often used to belittle or poke fun at such situations. What is obscured here is the possibility that what is being suggested in the `joke' may in fact be true and although gender power dynamics are surfaced and verbalised, the bantering `put down' tone of the interactions have the effect of trivialising or denying a reversal of what is held to be `right and proper' in gender relations.

The differences in these two situations are subtle, but they reveal the presence of what Eichler has termed "the double standard", which can be defined as "all norms, rules and practices which evaluate, reward and punish identical behaviour of women and

---

[4]There are also perhaps overtones of husbands keeping a 'fatherly' eye on their wives' work.

men differentially" (Eichler 1980 p16). Such double standards work subtly to maintain hegemonic control which functions at the almost unconscious level of culture:

> ...the forgotten or hidden connections between the basic perceptions and ideas available and the shared conventions between people through which these perceptions and ideas acquire mutual significance (Codd 1985 p25).

To expose the underlying nuances of meaning and assumption in gender relations then, requires a careful unravelling of threads that are `commonsense' and taken for granted. Nichola was pleased that the fact of her husband absence meant that others would have to acknowledge that she had the ability and sufficient expertise to make her own decisions about an issue such as IQ testing, without having to refer to her husband.

A related point that arises from the next part of Nichola's story is that she considered it important to research and document her facts carefully if her opinions were to gain acceptance. She did not see these as having the weight of culturally defined authority behind them as of `right', but that they needed to be backed up by some `expertise'.

> *I searched out all the data from my university work and I wrote a letter saying why I wouldn't have the testing in my school... Sid wrote back and said, `I'm sorry about that - I'd like you to reconsider it.' But I said no. I see every child as an individual and try to have them learning as individuals and to IQ test them didn't seem right to me. Those tests have certain limitations - they are seen to be culturally biased, and I was particularly worried about Maori children. Sid didn't challenge me about the reasons though.... I guess I was relieved about that because of this whole thing about not wanting to get into confrontations.*

The importance placed on academic qualifications as a way of gaining authority based in expertise is illustrated by Nichola's next comments:

> *I could never have been so strong about it if I hadn't done university work. Academic qualifications have been really significant in giving me confidence.*

Although gaining qualifications can give a woman added confidence, they also can make her strong in the sense of giving her power, a power based on achievement and academic expertise which she can use to challenge the culturally ascribed power of men. It was noticeable that Sid Jones did not challenge her on her arguments against the use of the IQ test; he avoided that issue and turned to using emotional pressure to try to win his case. This did create pressure on Nichola and despite feeling

intellectually sure of her arguments against the IQ test, she did not continue to press Sid to reconsider his use of it once she had had her refusal to allow her students to be tested heard.

> Marian: Did you challenge his school's use of the test?
> Nichola: *I did in the letter. But he didn't respond to any of those challenges.*

Sid's ignoring of her comments and the power of his senior position (a traditional authority base) combined to contain her challenging of him any further. But Nichola was also choosing her issue here. She had put a great deal of energy into what she described as: *protecting my own territory,* and she said: *I didn't venture into his any more at that stage.* The main issue for her was winning her right to make a decision and have it honoured[5].

Another important part of this incident for Nichola was her recognition that Sid was using a form of paternalistic pressure in the use of the words, "I'm very disappointed", that he was implying, `disappointed in you'. Later in the interview she referred back to this and said:

Nichola: *I just felt I was a `very naughty girl'.*
Marian: Why was that? Was it - like, the `father' growling at the little girl...
Nichola: *Yes. It was - definitely. I felt that quite strongly. You see, he's very senior to me and he has a lot of status in the community.*

She was pleased with herself that she had penetrated Sid's use of this kind of power and had successfully resisted it.

Other women talked about the use of `paternal' control, their being made to feel like `naughty girls' by older men. Susan Baker spoke about a powerful man who treated her with scant respect when she first took up her position as a new principal:

> *After being introduced all round we took our seats and there was dead silence, till one man burst out and said, "Now what's all this about? We want to know whether you are here to teach or whether politics is going to take the uppermost thought in your mind?" I was really furious, but I just said - My priority is my job for which I am paid.*

---

[5]This lack of emphasis by women educational managers on pushing for change in the curriculum for girls, as shown in an evaluation of the management training seminars (Court 1989) can be partially explained by these kinds of factors.

This incident shows a man acting in a role of `father' in the sense of `guardian' of the school `family', questioning a woman's right to a position of authority if she didn't obey the unspoken (cultural) `rules', in this case, rules about involvement in outside interests. Here an individual man assumed the right to challenge a woman principal and demand that she affirm her total loyalty to the school. Constraints placed around women's conditions of service are not new; in the past, repressive measures have been enshrined in law. For example, women's right to become involved in full-time teaching has been legislated against in times of economic downturn: a Bill was passed in 1929 to allow secondary school boards to refuse to employ a woman on the grounds that she was married and this power was extended in 1934, when boards were allowed to sack a woman if she was married (Travers 1989 p34).

Susan's story illustrates another aspect of hegemonic masculinity though. Some men challenge women's authority in a particularly aggressive way. Kanter (1977) refers to this kind of aggression in her analysis of women as tokens in a dominant group[6]. She showed that in the presence of token women, men would often exaggerate aggressive behaviour, displaying their power and thus accentuating the differences between themselves and the woman. This effected a polarising of the two groups, the dominant group acting to separate themselves from the token, thus isolating her and reducing her threat. The staff at Susan's school behaved like this after she was appointed.

> *The staff were quite antagonistic to me. No-one would tell me anything voluntarily. If I asked, they would answer politely, but they never informed me voluntarily. And when you don't know things, you don't know what to ask. So I made a mistake one day over the timing of two school events and this man bawled me out in front of everyone. That's when I said my piece - I wasn't going to have him treating me like a naughty child and I let him know that under no circumstances would I tolerate that sort of behaviour. Later I went back and said I would always be ready to discuss things with him that concerned him - and I apologised for the mistake that had been made; but I said I would never be spoken to like that again. He was very apologetic...and since then we've worked well together.*

Although some women will `go along with' male domination, not challenging this kind of inappropriate behaviour (in fact, not even seeing it as inappropriate as a result of

---

[6]Women in educational management are 'tokens' because of their relative scarcity at this level as well as for reasons of the different cultural expectations and values that surround them.

their socialised acceptance of male supremacy), Susan shows that not all women conform to the feminine stereotypes of passivity and obedience in the face of such male power. She controlled her anger at first, but when this man's aggressive and patronising behaviour continued, she challenged it and made it clear she was not going to accept it. The polarising effects of the staff's reactions were difficult for her to overcome though. She said that she finally traced the lack of help from the rest of the staff to one man who had been passed over when she had been appointed. She said: *He was the lynch pin of their resistance to me... When he finally left, they crumbled, and things were much happier.*

Although she found it easier once that man had gone, she still did not feel at the time of her second interview, a year and a half after her appointment, that her authority was accepted by all of her staff. And it was one woman in particular who was difficult then. What must be acknowledged here is that although men were the people who featured in most of the examples the women gave of challenges to their authority, some women also hold negative attitudes towards another woman's exercising of authority. That other women, as well as men, can make it difficult for a woman manager to establish herself as a person doing a job, is illustrated by Susan's story: three of the staff who were antagonistic to her were women.

As a result of their gender, women in management positions are not only highly visible, but they are also expected to behave differently from male managers. Johnston's study (1986) shows that women are expected to be more nurturing and men are expected to show greater authority in their working relationships, not a surprising result under current gender stereotypes. In Susan's case, although her interest in politics was challenged because it seemed to threaten her commitment to the school, it was perhaps also seen as threatening her fulfilment of nurturing roles. The reactions of her staff could also be seen to reflect their antagonism to her behaving in `inappropriate' ways for a woman.

Studies have shown that women are generally far more accepting of other women in positions of authority than men (eg.TEACAPS 1982) but the fact that some do challenge others who step outside acceptable `norms' of `feminine' behaviour and aspirations can be seen to illustrate the power of hegemony to persuade the subordinated to believe and hold the dominant male values in relation to who should be the leaders. Nichola described an incident which illustrates this more clearly:

> *When I put up the notice about the Women in Management training seminars, one woman said that women were going too far and this was just another feminist thing and I had no right to try to get women to seek higher positions.*

The woman who challenged Nichola can be seen to be believing in and acting out of the ideology of authority being based in traditionally sanctioned male leadership. In such an ideology women do not have a `legal' nor a normative right to seek higher positions: such aspirations are not `proper'.

Women managers themselves also have to confront and `unlearn' such socialised attitudes and behaviours - in themselves. For example, Nichola said that she usually felt uncomfortable about negotiating, especially if there was likely to be conflict: *I find I get very up-tight inside - it takes a lot of courage to do it.* Personality factors could be playing a part here of course, but this kind of response in a woman is not surprising when cultural values and beliefs endorse conciliatory, nurturing and passive roles for women. Although Nichola found negotiating conflict often difficult however, she was actively confronting the problem and was in the process of developing strategies to overcome her feelings of anxiety and powerlessness.

Negotiating over the phone was particularly difficult for her (something that many men as well as women would sympathise with!) and she told a story which gives some of the flavour of her feelings about dealing with the possiblity of conflict. She had received an account for the refilling of the photocopying ink cassette (the School Committee usually paid this bill but something had gone wrong):

> *The note said we couldn't collect the cassette until the bill was paid. I knew I had to do something about that, but my heart goes `bang, bang, bang' and I didn't want to be in the negotiating situation. So I just pretended I hadn't had the account. I put it under the phone book where I couldn't see it and I just rang up and said, `Oh it hasn't turned up and I wondered if something had gone wrong with it, that you had taken longer to do it or perhaps the courier had forgotten to deliver it?' I just pretended I hadn't had this other letter. And she said, `I'll put it in the post.' The cassette came the next day. But it took me a great deal of courage to do that.*

This episode could be interpreted as a most unassertive way to solve the problem, or a clever way of avoiding an argument. It is, though, a different way of dealing with a

possible confrontation than that described by Connell et al (1982 p73) as a `masculine' "ability to dominate others and face down opponents in situations of conflict".

That Nichola was in a process of transforming her own enculturated expectations of anxiety in the face of conflict was evidenced several times during her interview. Sometimes she talked about negotiating in quite a different way to that described in the telephone episode. In fact, negotiation was something she felt reasonably confident about and was actively seeking in the following incident:

> *Another woman principal and I had discovered that teaching principals in other areas were invited to the Principals' Associations meetings, but this didn't happen in Taranaki. We felt they were quite elitist and though we could have `gate-crashed', that is not in my nature. I wanted to negotiate and I talked to all sorts of people about it, but seemed to be getting nowhere. Then one of the male principals we spoke to who is sympathetic to women's issues took our concerns to the Principal's Association. Mark Brown was asked to talk to us and he invited us down to his school (his territory you see!) to discuss our wanting to join the Association. He listened, but then told us the history of the Association and why we couldn't go and why we couldn't get release time and that if <u>we</u> went, there were DPs on a higher grading and they would also want to go. He said he would report back our concerns... but about six weeks went by and nothing happened. So my friend and I spent a day writing a letter and got it typed up to send it to their Principal's Conference. We also went to our District Senior Inspector and explained that we wanted to be members of the Association but we couldn't attend because the meetings were held during the day - as teaching principals, we couldn't leave our classes. He asked us why we hadn't applied for release to attend, but we, of course, were never informed about the meetings.*
>
> Marian: What happened?
>
> Nichola: *We finally got a letter inviting us to the conference and we went expecting to have to get up and talk about it all. But Mark Brown got up and said he thought the membership should be extended so that rural and teaching principals should have the opportunity to attend. He made a good comment - it was super.*

In this episode Nichola used the support of a woman colleague and enlisted the help of sympathetic men (one in a position of superior power in the inspectorate) as allies in getting her opinions and ideas heard and actioned. Marshall refers to such seeking of

mentors and sponsors as one of women's "strategies for survival and progress within organisations" (1984 p105). The use of such a strategy indicates some understanding of the politics of power on Nichola's part. She also referred to another use of `politics'; she guessed that the principal's inviting of them to *his* school *(his home territory)* disempowered them in relation to him, as well as in a wider sense in that they were `being dealt with behind the scenes'. In response, the women planned their next move carefully. To combat the isolating and containing effects of not being able to speak to the whole group of principals themselves, they wrote a formal letter to the Association. They knew this was an acceptable method of presentation and would gain them some sympathy:

> *We weren't getting anywhere by the normal request so we had to present our case in a way that it would get listened to - and it had to be carefully argued and very well structured. It was all a tension producing situation.*

What can be seen in the analysis thus far is the on-going nature of a power play in this interaction between the (subordinate) women and some of the (dominant male) principals. That newcomers need to know the rules of the dominant group and abide by them to win acceptance is no wonderful new insight: women's lack of knowledge has often been cited as a block to their advancement (and as such has already been discussed in this thesis). But it is important to change the emphasis away from the `blame the victim' stance that always sees women as `deficient' (Acker 1983) and needing to `make up for their shortcomings' (by, for example, improving their qualifications[7]) and focus thought on the part played by the powerful in this kind of exchange.

When Nichola's difficulties in negotiating with Mark Brown over gaining entry to the Principals' Association are analysed more carefully, what emerges is not just that she didn't know enough, but that Mark Brown used his insider knowledge to give his arguments authority and to disadvantage the women, placing them as outsiders. Burton discusses this issue and points to: "...male workers' protectionist strategies designed to protect a position in the labour market and in the home" (1985 p85), and Connell refers to individual men using their position of privilege within a patriarchal system to become part of a "collective project of oppression" by blocking individual women (1987 pp182- 184). Mark Brown drew on both traditional and legal sources of authority when he used his knowledge of the history and `rules' of the Principal's Association to try to persuade the women that the teaching principal's exclusion from

---

[7]Nichola referred to this kind of thinking when she talked about her handling of the IQ issue.

that Association was reasonable and could not be altered without allowing others such as deputy principals in as well. Nichola's response was: *And what would be so bad about everyone having the opportunity to hear the excellent speakers the Association was bringing into the Province?* What was at issue here, of course, was a protection of privilege and a maintenance of the elitism of a structure that could link and advantage its members. Whether Mark's blocking was being done consciously and deliberately is not the issue: that many men benefit from their contacts and participation in such networks is part of the working of the interconnected systems of capitalism and patriarchy.

As well as using a legal kind of authority by `quoting the rules', Mark's final reaction was to ignore the women's requests, a resistance technique that can be difficult to prove and counteract. Gordon notes that:

> Counter hegemonic activities produce tendencies towards change in social relations which must be constantly resisted by institutions (Gordon 1985 p46).

As members of institutions, individual men can act to support or change the effects of patriarchy. Mark Brown's `doing nothing' in the face of requests for assistance left the women only with questions: Is he for us or against us? Once he was made aware of discrimination, to do nothing to remove it was to continue it.

A woman manager can face other problems when she wants to get her point of view listened to. In the patriarchal authority relations in schools which have placed value on qualities of logic and rationality (Blackmore 1988) culturally defined as `masculine' rather than `feminine' (Connell 1987), one of the difficulties for a woman is that stereotypes of `femininity' do not match the stereotypes of leadership: a woman leader is still likely to be seen as emotional rather than logical, intuitive rather than rational, not the kind of person who `should be listened to'. Most women will have experienced the situation Pauline Chapman is referring to in this comment:

> *I've got the cartoon - it's pinned on my wall - "Yes Miss Jones, that's a wonderful idea! We're just waiting until a man says it".*

If you are a small woman like Nichola, to achieve `being listened to' one has first to `get seen' - literally, as well as figuratively, in the sense of winning recognition as a person worth talking to:

> *If you're standing next to men, you'll be talking to some man here, and another one will come along - men are usually much taller than me and I have often felt excluded, pushed out. Because they can have eye contact, they don't have to look at me... I often say to Peter when we've been in a group, he's a nice man: he talked to me as though he really believed in what I was saying - he treated me as someone who could have a reasonably intellectual conversation... He looked at me, he spent time talking.*

If a situation is considered to be outside a woman's expected `natural' interests or so-called `abilities', for example dealing with machinery, getting men's attention can require considerable effort and forbearance:

> Nichola: *A company representative came to school to demonstrate a photocopier and Philip, the School Committee Chairman, came down too. I was introduced as the principal, but the young man couldn't actually talk to me - he had to talk to Philip - he found it very difficult. So I kept quiet and then I asked some question that I thought was rather scintillating and then he had to talk to me. He found it all very difficult. I remember planning to drop something in that would make him look my way. Then I think he actually made eye contact with me - and I was able to say which kind of machine I felt would be most useful for our school.*
> Marian: How did Philip react to all that?
> Nichola: *I can't really remember, because Philip's very tall and I couldn't see his face! (Laughs)*

Pauline spoke about experiencing the kind of `invisibility' that results when women are in minority token positions. She was one of only two women on the national executive of a teachers' union for a while and she found it difficult to have her points acknowledged:

> *Even if you know the procedures, if you don't have the good will of the people in charge, all mostly still chaps, you can't get stuff on the agenda.*

When the number of women on the executive increased, this situation began to alter:

> *We could win a voice if we block voted. But we disagree with one another now and then deliberately to make them see us as individuals. And they'll ask later, `Have you and she fallen out?'*

Men's ignoring of women's concerns or attempts to silence them by `doing nothing' were often commented upon by the women in this study. Robyn Hunt had been a secondary school HOD for about a year at the time of her first interview and she spoke about her relationship with one of her male colleagues (equal in status to herself) like this:

> *Jim treads very gently around me - he's never said anything, but I feel he'd like to. I find him difficult and I sense that he's quite chauvinist really.*

This man's resistance to her was being conveyed in non-verbal ways, messages that are no less powerful for the fact that they are unspoken. With another senior male in her school, Robyn felt that:

> *There is a friendliness there now that wasn't there earlier. It's almost as if I'm passing through my probation - I think I'm in the process of proving myself and that one innane comment would dash it all.*

At the beginning of this chapter it was reported that women often experience resistance from men (older men in particular) in the early stages of working in a new position of responsibility (Neville 1988 p149). Robyn felt that the men on her staff did not support her when she entered her new area of responsibility, but rather they stood back and watched. Doing `nothing' can allow men to feel that they are not deliberately blocking women, but their resistance is often more active. When I interviewed Robyn again three months later, she said:

> *Jim is often challenging me now about my handling of dean's work. He says things like, `We haven't got a policy here - we need one.' And when I say that as he sees a problem, what is his suggestion for a policy, he has none. He shuts up then and goes away, until the next time. I get the feeling that he is brassed off that he did not get the job.*

Another common retaliatory response is to label, in a deprecating way, those who challenge established authorities or ways of doing things. In the case of Nichola and the Principal's Association, the women were labelled `stirrers':

> *When we talked about it with them there was a sort of laughter about it - you're just sort of stirrers - two women stirrers. We were being put in our place.*

Marshall argues that this kind of behaviour from a dominant group is not just `putting the subordinate in their place' but is also a kind of "loyalty test":

> Tokens were encouraged to ...allow themselves and their category to be laughed at by the group, and if they objected to laughing with the others in this way they were accused of lacking a sense of humour...Majority members of a group have some need to know how trustworthy tokens are and put them through `loyalty' tests (1984 p102).

When women behave with an assertiveness that has been culturally defined as more typically a `masculine' quality than a so-called `feminine' one, labelling in a way that calls women's `femininity' into question would seem a powerful way to induce the women's retreat from such behaviour. Neville reports this happening to the women in her study, a "casting into stereotyped roles such as `the iron lady' or `the duchess'" (1988 p149). In this study, Dorothy Anselm said with a laugh that she was called `a battleaxe': *But if it makes the principals respect me, well it saves me a lot of wear and tear!*

The complex and often contradictory nature of the women's gender power struggles is evident here. The use of a negative label did not work to make Dorothy retreat though; she took away its power by using the label to build her own sense of strength. This contradictory empowering effect of the use of `negative' gender stereotypes against women can also be illustrated by Mary Ross, who teaches in a boys' school. She was nicknamed the `Iron Maiden' after she had winded a boy who was *being obstreporous*. This label has undertones of some grudging respect for Mary's strength and its use possibly raised her status in the eyes of the boys rather than diminishing it! (the incident is discussed later in this chapter).

Pauline talked about a different kind of labelling that is more difficult to handle:

> *If, say, you're on the equity committee, you get the jobs to do like putting together a submission on pornography; and you do it very well and you present it with enthusiasm and then you're labelled as a `one issue person.' It's very difficult to get out of that. I think they forget that they've given the starter...but you get polarised for it. And the important point in this is that you did it well.*

Other studies of women in top positions have shown that over-achievement is a common response by such women to their high visibility as tokens (eg. Kanter 1977). They know that they have to do the job well because, as Nichola was told when she

was first appointed to her principal's position, *'You have to make this work Nichola because we're all watching you for the sake of other women.' It was an awful responsibility.* Marshall argues that outstanding performance is a risky strategy though, because "...it reflects poorly on the dominant group's competence and can incite their retaliation" (1984 p101). Pauline's account illustrates this happening. However, she has learnt to counter this kind of difficulty by acquiring an array of strategies that:

> *... come at things in different ways, like sending a letter off, plugging away inside the system, researching the facts and presenting them calmly, being the `humble hypocrite' so that I don't become threatening - like saying, `No I won't have a beer, but I will have a soda. And now, tell me about this rugby match...' And I work for things I can change within the school to make things better for the women - like finding a small portable TV monitor that they can carry around to replace the huge one that is difficult to transport.*

The other women also commented on the need to be non-threatening, not getting backs up as Pauline said when she went on to talk about another factor that can work against women when they are trying to change attitudes. She pointed out that once a woman has become aware of an issue, in her efforts to draw it to the attention of others, stridency can creep in.

> Pauline: *Like when we get a notice at school from the golf club saying it's Ladies' Day on Saturday, and all you ladies who work can come on Saturday. And I hop up and say, `Every woman works. Just because it's not outside the home doesn't mean to say she's not working.' Now that seems to me to unnecessarily put backs up...It's what I see as stridency. Every time it comes up, you have to say something. You don't know when to keep quiet. It's a trap.*
>
> Marian: You can sense the negative reactions in the atmosphere when you do that, can't you?
>
> Pauline: *Yes, but you think, why do I have to put up with this <u>again</u>?*

Winning respect for women can be fraught with more than feelings of frustration though. Since the early 1980s sexual harrassment has become recognised as a particularly unpleasant form of male domination over women. Although none of these women had experienced `casting couch' types of harrassment, two of them spoke

about episodes with male colleagues that had sexual overtones which were in Robyn's case particularly upsetting, and in Dorothy's, humiliating.

Dorothy described an HOD using his `male charm' to: wrap his younger female staff around his finger. She found this man difficult to work with:

> *He could get these younger women to do whatever he wanted - to flatter him and play back to him and that kind of thing. He'd been HOD for such a long time he had the power to get the principal to appoint the young women he wanted. I didn't get that kind of thing from him - probably I wasn't young enough or attractive enough, and I wouldn't wrap round his finger. I wanted to take the 7th form though, but it took him three or four years to let me. Then I made a mess of it. I was pretty disappointed with myself - pretty dissatisfied, though I think anyone doing something for the first time finds it hard. He didn't offer me any help though or tell where I'd gone wrong . I knew then he'd let another younger woman leapfrog over me and I knew it was no use waiting around for help or to be told, `You've been such a good girl that I'm going to let you do this or that'. I was glad to leave that school.*

Leaving such a situation is one way out for women, but it does not remove their feelings of humiliation, nor help them acquire the skills they need. Neither does it challenge the power of the man who behaves in this way. But at that stage of her life, Dorothy had not yet developed the skills needed to confront him.

Robyn told this story:

> Robyn: *I needed a design for a cover for an evolution folder to be used as a textbook by students, and the art teacher said he would do it for me. The design he gave me had a female with one breast uncovered. I felt really angry and upset about it...*
> Marian: Did you feel humiliated?
> Robin: *No, not humiliated, cos I felt <u>right</u> - and there were other teachers, including men, who were agreeing with me. You could tell the support was there... (Pause)... I get upset even talking about it... Why am I getting upset? ... Because the drawing was blatantly sexual, blatantly sexist - using woman as a sexual object. I said, `I can't use that, with the woman with one `boob' exposed.' And he said `boob' was my word, not his, that I was misreading it. I thought it was <u>deliberately</u> provocative - he was provoking me. I couldn't*

> *believe that anyone would suggest that such a drawing should be used for students...I'm just trying to sort out the feeling...I think it was humiliation there in some ways - he was trying to humiliate me. Really he was throwing off at me asking for a female on the cover. All the accounts of evolution are male-biased, even `Lucy' (an early female skeleton) is called `he', and I wanted to even up the balance. He was getting at me.*

Robyn remembers two men who, along with another woman, helped her cope with this harrassment:

> *The men were caring guys, both of them. Afterwards they grabbed a projector and stuck it up and helped me trace the diagram to do another cover myself. The woman was listening during the whole thing - she put in little comments just at the right times. She must have sensed that I was just about at my limit and I was going to cry, or something, you know, and the comments gave me those thirty seconds or so to collect myself and get going again.*

It is important to remember that not all men behave in ways that are uncaring of women's position or feelings and that an individual man's behaviour can also be contradictory: the art teacher probably behaved quite differently at home with his own wife after this incident that upset Robyn. Segal reminds her readers that there are historical and cultural and individual variations in forms of `masculinity' and `femininity', and in systems of male domination:

> ...Machismo takes many forms - and it does not seem to be the personality characteristics of men which remain the same...Over the last two decades, for example, social attitudes and images of masculinity have loosened up in Britain. Men are expected to show more interest in fashion, in childbirth, in their children, are encouraged to express their emotions and pay more attention to women's needs. The soft and gentle man is not such a rare creature (Segal 1987 p143).

However, it is the *continuing existence of differing power relations* which privilege men that is the issue here[8]. Segal explains this well:

> The assumption that masculinity should confer lifelong mastery, authority and privilege on men in relation to women, an assumption central to all ideologies of masculinity, makes some men more prone to sexual coercion and violence... It comes from the inequalities of power between men and women as much as from any internal psychic dynamic in men. Men are simply more likely to get

---

[8]Segal illustrates this power differential by the way women have been increasingly drawn into the growing part-time and casual work areas of the labour market. This is also true of part-time and relieveing teachers.

> away with abusing women than venting their aggression or frustration on most other targets (Segal 1987 p53).

Although the incident involving Robyn was not about `sexual coercion and violence', what she remembered was feeling upset and angry that women's bodies were being objectified and above all her feeling of powerlessness to alter this man's attitudes and assumptions that he had the right to harrass her like that[9]. That this episode created stress for her is obvious from her account: although she said she only got upset when she talked about it, the memory of the episode still upset her nearly a year later.

For women who become involved in a conflict with men, fear can be added to stress when individual men use their physical size and its accompanying threat of violent intimidation as a way of winning a confrontation. Nichola told a story about a parent whom she had to invite to her school to discuss the bullying behaviour of his son. This man was a big, particularly aggressive person and once before when he was a parent help at the school, he had physically blocked a doorway to prevent Nichola from going outside to stop his son goading another child in the playground:

> *So I knew about this man and I knew from the things he had said to me that he didn't value me as a principal or as a person. So the morning he was to come down to school I planned it all. I knew it was a difficult situation - it was most unpleasant. I planned I would sit him down so I would feel an equal and we could have eye contact. Before I left in the morning I played Land of Hope and Glory very loudly and I thought, I'll wear my high heels today so he couldn't tower over me. I knew I had to prove I was a very strong woman and that he couldn't put me down.*

Connell's (1987) point that hegemonic masculinity and force go hand in hand is well illustrated by this incident, but although Nichola admitted to feeling: "a bit scared," at times during the interview (she had planned that she would ring the police if he became violent), she felt that she had dealt with the situation well. She had, in fact, not only resisted the temptation to succumb to potential male violence, but had `rewritten the rules' for the interaction. She changed the expectations of `appropriate masculine and feminine' behaviour in this confrontation.

---

[9]Under the new school charter requirements for policies setting out procedures for dealing with sexual harassment, women and girls are empowered to stop this kind of male behaviour. However, although these policies can challenge those *acts* of harassment, they are unable to alter the hegemonic values which underpin the actions.

He couldn't handle me because I was very low key about it all. I didn't shout or scream or anything like that and I don't think he was used to women like that. He got very angry and shouted that he would take his boy away from the school. I just let him shout, and I let him go out the door, still shouting! But I had not given way to any of his demands.

Although she `won' this negotiation, that it also had a high personal cost is clear from Nichola's `psyching up' at home before the meeting at school.

Other women also spoke about situations where they had had to confront physical threats. In the early days of her job in the boys' school, Mary Ross had to find ways of establishing her authority with boys who were `male macho'. She resorted to calling on her formal authority (based in her position as teacher) at times, and, she said, *I have to admit it, the sarcastic put-down.* But she also talked about an early incident when she was threatened by a boy with a bat:

I got the kid out the door and I said, `If you ever do that again I'm going to give you a left hook and I'm bloody strong!' And he put it down again. He was a real heavy metaller and I thought I was going to get done. I was shaking like a leaf. On another occasion I did actually hit a kid... I was just so sick of him mouthing off all the time and it was in my first year and I had a really obstreperous 5th form bunch of boys. I hit the boy, really hard, and he fell onto a desk and it winded him. I was really fit at that stage... I got the nickname `Iron Maiden' as a result.

When she was pushed to an extreme on this occasion, Mary responded in a language the boys knew and respected - physical strength. An option open to women is to use male methods, to play what Charmaine Poutney calls "the dominance game" (Neville 1988 p105). Mary was not comfortable with this however, nor with the `turning off' and not worrying about the boys she found abrasive.

You've got to be honest, not everyone will like you, and with that kind of boy, I either shut off from him or think they're not even worth worrying about. But then I go home and growl at myself in bed that night and say I shouldn't really feel like that about that boy.

The dilemma in this kind of situation is a difficult one for many women and though Mary's own kind of authority in that school was initially won with a `clout', cuddles felt far more like her style.

> Mary: *Now what they probably see in me is the `big sister' or the mother idea. I think it's important that they have to be able to relate to women as friends in a non-sexual way. I cuddle my boys, big and small. I still get on my father's knee and give him a kiss and a cuddle. Probably that has something to do with the way I function at school.*
> Marian: It has made you demonstrative?
> Mary: *Yes. And although society tells us that's not the way that men should be, they actually like that they don't have to pretend that they are macho when they're not.*

Mary disliked `male macho' behaviour' intensely, but she has not experienced that sort of behaviour much from the boys she teaches:

> Mary: *The macho thing I get mainly from male adults, not the boys. There are probably one or two staff like that.*
> Marian: How do you cope with that?
> Mary: *I basically ignore it and I refuse to ever let them see I'm pissed off.*

Feeling angry about such behaviour, or about discrimination or inequality was something all the women in this study talked about. When their comments were analysed, it was clear that varying reactions to this emotion were playing an important part in their gender relations. Chapter 7 examines the place of anger in the women's developing autonomy.

Chapter eight

Anger, affirmation and action.

In her analysis of the place of anger in her feminist classroom, Culley (1985) describes her students' reactions to learning about the reality of their position as women in a patriarchal culture. Their responses varied, across denial and resistance to acknowledgement of anger, to affirmation and change. The situation Culley describes can be seen to be one of consciousness raising and the stories of the women in this present study showed that they were also involved in this kind of learning process. For some of them it was playing an important part in increasing their confidence in their own authority and some were consciously working on using their anger to motivate their development of personal aspirations and skills, or to challenge patriarchal attitudes within their homes or institutions.

That the women varied in their attitudes towards, and handling of, their anger is of course a result of factors of personality, upbringing and life experiences, which illustrates the complexity of individual's ways of relating to gender stereotypes. Stanley and Wise (1983 p104) report studies showing that many people experience a difference between themselves and their `femininity' or `masculinity' and do not willingly use sex-role stereotyped items when describing themselves. None of the women in this study would describe herself as passive or acquiescent, `typical' qualities of stereotyped `femininity', but each of them revealed a varying awareness and acknowledgement of their own feelings of anger, as well as of their `right' to feel this way. In her first interview, when describing situations where she was meeting blocks, Nichola was denying her anger, describing herself (in contemplative tones) as: *not angry, but rather, disappointed I think.* Five months later though, her comments had changed; then, she was making clear statements about feeling angry. Robin and Mary were quite clear that in some situations they felt: *furious!* or: *'pissed off!'* while for Dorothy, Susan and Pauline, acknowledging their anger had been an important step towards increased trust in their own sense of personal autonomy and authority.

It was while she talked about a decision-making situation with her husband that Nichola came closest to saying she felt angry in her first interview:

> Nichola: *In the beginning I always looked to him when I needed to make a decision. In later years there's been a bit of a reshuffle as I have got stronger. Now when I want to make a decision and I ask his advice he'll say no, you do it, and I think I'm disappointed because he seems disinterested, seems to want me to do it, you know what I mean?*
> Marian: He's putting the responsibility back on you, but not giving any input?
> Nichola: *Mmm. I do find that a little disappointing at times. He's probably saying, `You have to make decisions at school, you need to make them here too.' I don't know. We haven't discussed it - the only times we've said anything about it is when we've been cross with each other, and that's funny because we discuss most things well with each other. At one time I always felt we used to work together on things like improving the house. But now when I want to make a change he says, `Well if you want it, you do it', which disappoints me because I'd rather we worked on it together. But whether he just doesn't want to be bothered in those things, like altering the decor or replacing something in the house...*[1]
> Marian: So this happens in things like buying new things for the house?
> Nichola: *Yes and you know, it's me who wants the change - so he says, `Well you want it, you do it, you pay for it.'*
> Marian: Do you feel angry about that?
> Nichola: (long pause) *No...I still say I feel disappointed.*

The nuances and feelings in this kind of conflict are subtle and contradictory. Nichola wanted her husband to continue sharing the decision-making with her about things like the decor of a lounge or the purchase of a new piece of furniture and she was `disappointed' that he was refusing to work with her like that. On the one hand, Peter was giving his wife decision-making power; but on the other hand, he was actually retaining the ultimate power himself, as he was deciding for both of them that she should make the decisions, refusing to become involved himself. Although it could be argued that Peter was helping his wife develop autonomy by pushing her to take on more responsibility in their day-to-day affairs, the inequality in their relationship is still apparent.

---

[1]This episode also illustrates the way Nichola and her husband's relationship maintained fairly traditional divisions of labour.

When she first talked about the conflict though, Nichola said:

> *We have not discussed it...the only time we've talked about it is when we've been cross with each other - and that is strange, because we talk well about most things...*

She had not at this stage examined what she was really feeling, but her underlying anger about the situation was hinted at in her statement that the only time they had talked about it was when they had been cross with each other. When I responded to this with the question, `Did you feel angry?' she thought about it for a while, then replied:

> *I still say I feel disappointed....(long pause) I don't know.... Maybe...I just wonder whether perhaps it is surfacing. Underneath I might feel angry.*

She came back to this topic again during the interview, and on the second occasion said: *I do feel angry about it.*

Disappointment can be seen to have close links to the beginnings of anger. Lucy Stone said in 1855:

> In education, in marriage, in religion, in everything, disappointment is the lot of woman. It shall be the business of my life to deepen this disappointment in every woman's heart until she bows down to it no longer (cited in Culley 1985 p10).

In a culture where "women have been schooled to look to male authority and to search for male approval as the basis of self-worth" (Culley 1985 p11), disappointment has been a more likely initial reaction than anger for a woman when a man disapproves of something that she wants to do. Many culturally approved sanctions have been placed on women's expression of this emotion. Statements like `Nice girls don't shout' have joined negative labels used against angry women - harridan, virago, termagent, tartar, shrew, vixen, dragon, spit-fire, scold, bitch, nag - the list goes on. These labels are applied to women and girls but not to men and boys, and in them anger is associated with characteristics of being `sharp tongued', of being cruelly nasty or whiningly unpleasant and persistently annoying. It is important to recognise that these latter qualities are linked to the situation of powerlessness. Segal points out that "all power relations enable a more overt expression of aggression from the powerful, while ensuring its greater suppression in the powerless" (1987 p153), and she argues that it is more likely that the powerless will express their own aggression in relatively

powerless ways, such as `nagging'. When one can't demand something as of `right' (ie. the `right' of superior power and status), persistent nagging becomes a `wearing down' strategy.

Women's anger can be belittled by describing it as `petulance' or `throwing a tantrum', while a woman expressing her anger with tears is often described as being `typically emotional' or manipulative - "Don't try that one on me!" In Chapter 1 it was shown how male hegemony works through language which casts women in an inferior light. The negative labels for angry women are aspects of a male control of language use that shapes the consciousness, making it difficult for all to see whose interests are being served by such descriptions. Behaviour itself becomes shaped in this process. Both language and other cultural sanctions on men's anger are fewer than those on women's anger in a patriarchal society. People are schooled to take notice of angry men, with the threat of potential physical violence acting to contain challenges, especially from those who are physically weaker. Although individual men may not use violence nor an aggressive style of anger in their disagreements with others, expectations and stereotypes still endorse the `right' of men to get angry in a culture that links authority with a tough aggressive hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1987)[2]. Women's suppression of their own anger in such cultures is not surprising. The working of ideologies about who has the `right' to express anger has played an important part here in what Millett (1971) called `sexual politics'.

In Nichola's descriptions of her attitudes towards anger, the nature of the researcher/ subject' relationship was also significant. As argued in Chapter 4, such a relationship can never be totally objective nor neutral, and when women interview women, using their personal experience as the basis for the development of `shared meanings' (Oakley 1981), the exercise can become a "process of collaboration" with the gap between the researcher and the researched minimised (Middleton 1988c p132). Such an interactive process also becomes intervention in people's lives that can bring about changes (Middleton 1988c p137). This can bring an added ethical problem into the research process as discussed in Chapter 4. Introducing my own reaction (with my question about whether she felt angry) to the situation Nichola was describing surfaced the angry feelings she had not until then examined. She had also been suppressing her anger in other situations she described in the first interview; for example, she did not describe her feelings about the Principal's Association episode as being angry ones,

---

[2]Phillips' historical documentation of the New Zealand male stereotype would support this assertion, though he also points out that: "the sheer ideological hegemony of the male mythology served to disguise conflicts and obscure diversity within society itself" (1987 p284). Although Phillips argues that the 'tough Kiwi bloke' stereotypes are weakening (p298), such change processes are slow.

but said: *I felt quite strongly about that.* But five months later, in her second interview, she was talking about her anger in a different way. When she described a conflict that had arisen with some parents who had decided to take their children away from her school because the `standard of teaching was not good enough', her expression of anger was a part of the episode:

> *The man said to the teacher's aide, "They're all knitting! What next? Just the thing a woman would do!" I heard the comment and I was so angry!*

She had moved from a position of perhaps not even being consciously aware of her own anger in some situations, to not only feeling it strongly, but also acknowledging it as legitimate. She was also becoming more aware that she needed to think about and `work through' these feelings if she was to be able to negotiate effectively:

> *I knew later that I had let my anger at his sexist comments show, though I didn't talk about it. But he went to the male Board of Trustees Chairman, (with this and a whole list of petty complaints) to sort it out, `man-to man', telling him (I found out later) that I was `short' with him. I was worried that the chairman wouldn't be able to stay neutral, so I talked to him explaining that I wanted to handle it, with him present. At the second interview I was more in control. I had worked through my anger*[3].

At this point, Nichola could be seen to be working on controlling anger as a way of channelling it. Robyn's experiences of anger were very different. From the start she talked about anger as a natural reaction in situations where others were not according her respect: *I expect people to listen to me...why should't they? They're bloody rude if they don't.*

She said she felt really angry when the art teacher presented her with the inappropriate unit cover design, and when she was having to persist with question after question to get an explanation about an assessment procedure which was disadvantaging her students, she said, *What gave me persistence was anger. I was furious.*

---

[3]Nichola added this comment: *It worries me though that because of Tomorrow's Schools, women principals will now come under more of this kind of pressure from men, with no Department Inspectors to support us or give us help.* This is a problem that is causing concern among women teachers and principals (Watson 1989, Travers 1989).

Attitudes towards conflict and personal self-confidence played a significant part in the ways the women negotiated. In comparison with Nichola, Robyn was a more confident and assertive person. Nichola said she felt ambivalent about confrontation:

> *I don't think I'm a person who will argue back about something. I won't get in a situation where you try to challenge someone. I've often thought I'd like to be like that. Some women can do it... I think in my mind some men enjoy that, and I've often thought, gosh if I could talk like that, I'd be able to talk to men more...*

Robyn, though, described herself as:

> *...always having plenty of confidence - always. Probably too much. I was told on my 7th Form report that I should accept correction more easily!*

Nichola accepted that she was: very disruptive at secondary school, describing herself as having been: *rude and cheeky to the teachers - it was an immaturity thing.* But when Robyn was reprimanded at school, she thought: *Why should I be corrected by that old bag?* Robyn's confidence was evident in her unquestioning acceptance of her right to be angry and her statement that this had fuelled her persistence in getting answers to her questions about the sixth form assessment procedures (though she had not consciously thought about it at the time).

Although Robyn had not consciously questioned her `right' to get angry, her confidence was not without its contradictions:

> *I don't know why I am so confident `cos I've always felt quite insecure underneath. And sometimes when I've done something with quite spontaneous confidence I go home and worry about what I've done for hours.*

Marshall found that despite the fact that women managers in her study controlled their awareness of gender (thinking of themselves as `people' rather than `women') still, "stereotyped social scripts where male is superior and female inferior" would intrude on their thinking and influence their behaviour unawares (Marshall 1984 p56). Robyn said of herself:

> *I don't see myself as a woman. I'm a person... There is a gut reaction that I do have power - being an HOD gives me some power. It gives me a lot of*

> *autonomy under the present management structure in my school. But when I think of myself, there's a dichotomy there! (Laughs). I do (have power) but I just can't believe that I do!*

Thus, even for women as outwardly confident as Robyn was, self-doubt could creep in. This is not surprising in a culture where women are not ascribed a traditional right to be authoritative.

When Dorothy started talking about conflict situations, she reflected on how she had developed an awareness of her right to feel angry:

> *In the good old days I'd avoid conflict at any cost. I didn't like unhappiness or shouting or fighting or people I loved being out of step. I can only remember one major row my parents had - they must have had others, but they were out of sight and sound - and this one was in a tent and you couldn't hide it there! So maybe I didn't have much practice at coping with conflict and was terrified my world was going to fall to pieces. Sam says that I'm always willing to give in to him over little things rather than fight about it*[4]*. There came a point though, when I suddenly realised what was happening and I went off to a series of group life labs being run by the church. That was really significant for me. I learnt a lot about being able to say honestly, `I'm angry.' It was the beginning of an enormous growth period for me that coincided with my going back teaching and finding that I `could do it'.*

For Dorothy, recognising and allowing her own feelings of anger went along with learning to allow herself to be a `naughty girl'; these were empowering experiences:

> *I wanted to be a dean, but after the episode of getting no help from my HOD with my 7th form, I suddenly realised that it was no use waiting around or trying to be a `good girl', waiting for someone to pat me on the head. There are no pats on the head for good girls anyway! In fact, I wasn't a good girl anymore - why should I be?*

The theme of `good girls and naughty girls' weaves its way through the women's stories. Nichola accepted the early judgements of her teachers that she was: naughty and disruptive, but the realisation that she was still being treated like a `naughty girl'

---

[4]Several of the women talked about the way they thought men often needed to be right, whereas they felt that it was not worth making an issue over something unless it was really important to them. This is discussed further in the chapter on women's management styles.

when she was in her mid 40s increased her determination to overcome another principal's blocking of her aspirations. Susan also resented that kind of treatment meted out to her as an adult, but although she also had been `a naughty girl' at school, she was puzzled that her friends had said:

> *...`You were always standing outside the headmistress's study.' I was puzzled, because I wasn't trying to be naughty. I enjoyed school. I think it was just because I had a completely different way of looking at things and doing things that nobody else had done.*

She traced some of the beginnings of her `being different' back to an early awareness of there being:

> *...different attitudes for different sexes and I wouldn't accept that. I remember going home from boarding school one Easter and my brother was allowed to go down town on Thursday night and I wasn't. I said, `Why shouldn't I?' `Girls don't do that', I was told. `Why not?' I was very put out that he was allowed to do it. I couldn't see any reason why, just because I was a girl, I couldn't do it. It bugged me - perhaps that was the start of incipient feminism.*

Feeling angry about the unfairness of this working of the `double standard' (Eichler 1980) was an important part of the development of her thinking as a young woman. She remembered a row with her parents that happened after she went to Training College, as being a `separating' event for her, an incident which reinforced her determination to think for herself and to stand alone if necessary. She described this incident like this:

> *When I went home I must have been an insufferable little know-it-all. I had to let them know I was learning all this wonderful stuff! I remember a row I had with my mother over something, and I said to her, `Stop talking such bloody twaddle' - I swore. Girls don't do that - and she tried to hit me, but I wouldn't let her. I held her by the wrist and I said, `You're never going to hit me again.' Dad had come out by then and he said, `You'd better go then'. When I said, `No, I'm not going to', he hit me - he dropped me - he hit me on the chin. When I got up, I wasn't aware of a sense of physical hurt. I was <u>outraged</u>. Tears were straggling down my cheek but I said, `You can knock me bloody senseless, but you'll never stop me thinking'. From then on I think my parents*

> *gave up on me - this child won't do what she's told or won't do the `proper' thing.*

Susan connected her continuing determination to be herself, even when that did bring painful consequences, to her `cussedness', which is revealed here in her refusal to conform to her parent's expectations of what a `good' girl should do.

`Doing her own thing' was also part of Pauline's experience. She listed a string of `naughty' actions that resulted from her choosing to be different:

> *I nearly got expelled at 11 - I went off to a friend's house during the day in the back of the builder's truck. There was a real fuss! I missed S.C. by four marks - I was doing the school newspaper. I didn't get accredited - I was running the drama club. I nearly missed graduating from Training College because I missed doing the last assignment - but I went to them and said it was a bit silly to fail me just for that and they should go back over my record. Which they did - and I passed.*

These women had all become aware that they were judged as `naughty girls' when they did not conform; they had each also developed a certain cussedness as Susan described it. They decided that they did not want to be `good girls': as Dorothy said, *Why should I? Good girls <u>don't</u> get any pats on the head* (she was referring to her seeking of promotion.) Recognition of this fact empowered these women to act as individuals and to see themselves as autonomous, though this recognition came at different stages in their lives. For Pauline and Robyn it came while they were still students, for Mary it developed in her late twenties when she realised that she was good at her job, and for Dorothy and Nichola it was not until after they had finished bringing up their children and had decided to advance in their careers. Yet, their choice of the word `naughty' to describe their perceptions of others judgements about them is an eloquent statement on the status of women in schools, as well as in the wider society. Gaining others' recognition and treatment of them as mature and competent people was part of their struggle for authority and even as women in their 40s, some of them were still being treated as `naughty girls' when they challenged the controls and constraints that a patriarchal system and individual men placed upon them. But they had penetrated the ideology underlying the stereotypes of acceptable `feminine' behaviours and attitudes that sought to treat them as `good little girls' if they acquiesed and as `naughty girls' if they didn't. They were resisting such hegemonic definitions and rewriting the scripts for ways women could behave.

Mary's story illustrates this further. Her thinking about the place of anger in her experience as woman teacher in a boys' school has led to her developing deliberate strategies to deal with anger positively. She talked about dealing with `male macho' behaviour:

> Mary: *I basically ignore that behaviour and I refuse to ever let them see that I'm `pissed off'. I would never give them the satisfaction of knowing they'd brassed me off or rattled me... It comes up in insidious ways and it's happening more rarely now, but when it does I control it.*
> Marian: You mean you control your feelings?
> Mary: *Yes. If I'm pissed off, I usually control that and go off round a corner and swear violently! I think I really love to swear because I was never allowed to. And it's wonderful!*
> Marian: A big release?
> Mary: *Marvellous! It's really good! And it's hopeless just swearing at a wall. You've got to swear at something. There are some people I can go to and say, `Fuck, fuck, fuck, fuck, fuck!' and they don't even say, `What's wrong?' They just let me get it out of my system.*

Although the women responded to their feelings of anger in a variety of ways, some common patterns emerged. They had learned, often through experience, that `getting mad' and letting this show, could count against them in their positions of authority: but they had also found ways to `beat the system'. For example, Mary had learned to express her anger in `safe' situations, with her friends, and using strings of curses was her method of `managing' anger. This was not `managing' in the sense of pushing the emotion down, suppressing it, but rather using it to empower herself. For her, being a `naughty girl' and doing something she had not been allowed to do when she was growing up - swearing - empowered her in her relationships with those who were `hassling' her. She learned that not getting upset with them was an effective defusing strategy:

> *I love that old proverb, `If you've got an enemy, love him, because you'll heap burning coals on his head.' People want you to react - they want you to be angry. They want you to jump on the bandwaggon. When you refuse to, you thwart them at every turn. They don't know what to do. This kind of power is wonderful. And it <u>is</u> powerful to be able to say to them, `That's cool, if that's what you think.'*

She had found real power in her: *good old Christian principles of turning the other cheek'*. By refusing to respond in confrontational ways, she took the sting out of attacks and could also leave the way open for building bridges. Mary showed what Culley describes as "an acknowledgement and claiming of anger as one's own" which allowed her to "direct its legitimate energy" (1985 p212).

However, because of their awareness that in their positions of responsibility they needed to be seen as `rational, logical' people, these women stressed the need to maintain calm controlled exteriors when in situations of conflict in their public roles. Each one talked about the importance of keeping cool in conflict situations. Nichola described how keeping calm had helped her with the angry parent, *who wasn't used to women like that,* and Dorothy said:

> *I believe in absolute courtesy and I don't get steamed up and yell things back. It pays to hold your tongue when others are yelling.*

She illustrated how this had `worked' at a recent principals' meeting where she had to present a case for teachers. Although she was anxious about the possibility of conflict, she planned to maintain absolute coolness and super politeness because:

> *... their (men's) expectation is that a woman will get all emotional anyway, and this takes them by surprise. And I aimed to show them that I was in charge that time. One man always `runs' things, but I didn't let him get away with it. He was interrupting others and dominating the discussion so I just interrupted <u>him</u> when he started repeating himself and said, `Now we've heard that Jack', and then just turned to another person and said, `Ted, you wanted to say something?'*

`Keeping cool' helped her to facilitate in a way that enabled each person to express their opinion in a situation where she had felt anxious about the need to have her authority recognised by what was overwhelmingly a male group. A group of principals is also a group of men who are used to using power and Dorothy said that controlling that one man left her with increased confidence:

> *I felt a sense of power and a small sense of elation - whoopee! I silenced him and stopped him setting up a real filibuster.*

She thought that learning to acknowledge her own anger had helped her deal with conflict in a more constructive way:

> *Whereas in the old days I'd have avoided conflict or done nothing, now I confront difficult situations. I clarify the behaviour or whatever it is that needs sorting out. It's no use hinting about it.*

For Susan, it was only when she became a principal and met an antagonistic withholding of support from the staff that she began consciously planning strategies to deal with her anger. It was thinking about her mother, whose way was: to lose control and scream and shout, that alerted her to her own ways of reacting:

> *I have never been successful at controlling my anger until I was in this situation as a principal. But I knew here that it was essential - if I didn't control it, I'd blow the whole thing. In the past I'd just let it out, but in this situation I knew that would be interpreted as weakness. So I just kept cool and looked them straight in the eye and carried on.*

She described several incidents when the staff were quite uncooperative, even though she was consulting and involving them in the things she wanted the school to be doing. They were polite, but unhelpful:

> *The one man who was the crux of the resistance had a very supercilious smile, and though I noticed it, I would never let it appear that I had. I was very angry at times, but I would just carry on very quietly and firmly and say, 'This is what is going to happen'.*

As in Dorothy's example, Susan's anger was motivating her to move past acting just to defend her position. She was becoming proactive.

Pauline said that she was learning not *waste energy getting angry* so that she could put that energy into acting to change situations. She was moving to a slightly different stance than the other women though. She had thought about the ways in which anger is expressed by women, and she had decided that:

> *If crying is the way you can get rid of your emotions of anger, get through that stage so that you can get on to the logical thinking again, and you're stopped from doing it because of the stereotypes of 'that's a little girl tantrum' or that it*

> *is a way of manipulating someone to get them to do something, then that is another way of holding women back.*

In the example of Mary's expression of her anger in `safe' ways can be seen a a sensible way of getting the anger out of her system and of empowering herself. When Pauline's points are considered however, Mary's response can also be seen to be contradictory in that she was conforming to cultural pressures for women to behave `nicely' in public. Her anger, and its transformative potential, could be seen to be contained and defused by the forces of male hegemony: thus, the dominant value system and stereotypes of passive acquiescent femininity were not being challenged. The ideological split of human experience into two separate spheres of public and private is also working here to `divide and rule': women who don't express their anger in public are separated from the empowering experience of finding that other women may feel the same way[5].

As a consequence of her experience and her thinking about the effects of different reactions to anger, Pauline had decided that if it was bad enough for her to cry, she would cry, not hold her emotion in:

> *Then the other person has to confront me and acknowledge what is going on rather than being able to walk away.*

In androcentric management literature conflict is rarely discussed, and anger is not mentioned. What emerges from these women's comments though, is the fact that this emotion plays an important part in their experience. There was a strong feeling that women are at a disadvantage if they lose their temper. If we consider the opposite gender situation however, for example, a male principal getting angry with a female staff member, quite different images arise. Women's feelings of anger are perhaps sometimes suppressed because they can act to reinforce other feelings of being `inappropriate' (ie. as managers, who are also women, they `should not get angry', even though some situations can warrant this). The experience of some of the women in this study showed though that acknowledging feelings of anger can motivate the finding of positive strategies to not only deal with it personally, but also to use it to bring about change. Their comments reveal a concept of anger as a `tool', a tool that they were consciously using in their work as educational managers.

---

[5]There is a union poster with the slogan 'Uppity Women Unite' which identifies both the power of assertive anger and the power of numbers.

In different ways then, and to different degrees, these women have been recognising their right to feel and express anger and they have been challenging stereotypes of the ways in which women `should' behave. They have also been developing their sense of autonomy as managers, thinking about their management philosophies and working out management styles that suit their own identities as women. Chapter 9 examines these management philosophies.

Chapter nine

Affiliation: A transformative management style

Affiliation, in the sense of an emphasis on building relationships, group belonging and shared decision making, is important in women's viewpoints and styles of management. Shakeshaft identifies this quality in the five factors that she argues might conceptualise the work of women administrators: relationships with others are central; building community is an essential part of their style; teaching and learning are their major foci; the line separating the public and private worlds blurs for them and marginality overlays their daily work as a result of their token status and sexist attitudes towards them (1987 pp195-198). Chapters 7 and 8 have illustrated the last two factors in an analysis that stayed largely within the traditional definitions of authority. This chapter focuses on the concepts of affiliation and nurturing, and sets out to show how these women were perceiving management from a different perspective to those generally portrayed in androcentric accounts.

It is not argued here that all women manage one way and all men another. In even this small group there was a variety of experience and opinions: the women were working through the contradictions and expectations surrounding nurturing and managing in individual ways that did not neatly fit the stereotypes of femininity but reflected their different personalities and backgrounds. However some common themes emerged from their comments which suggested that they were combining their `private' caring/nurturing roles and skills with their `public' roles of managing/leading. Here their views of management can be seen to be based in their experience and identities as women and as such these viewpoints have transformative potential for androcentric definitions of authority and leadership.

The group's philosophies could be summed up in the words of Mary Ross:

> *You've got to have a vision and mine is to do the best that I can to involve people in goals that aim to create stimulating, enjoyable learning environments for kids. As teachers, I believe we are here to `serve' the kids. I try to do this*

> *through involving people in goals and the sharing of ideas and resources. Co-operation and respect for one another are important, and I think it is really important for kids to feel loved and wanted and for teachers to be open and warm.*

This is a philosophy that integrates qualities of caring and emotionality with the goals of instructional leadership and participatory management. Each woman's comments had an interweaving of these emphases in an holistic approach to management that cut across `traditional' dichotomies of private and public, emotionality and rationality, teaching and administration.

Women teachers who become administrators have been shown to take their emphasis on teaching and learning with them into management (Pitner 1981)[1]. Shakeshaft's review of the literature on women's management styles cites many studies showing that whereas more men have been found to view the job from a managerial/industrial perspective, more women view their work as being an educational leader (1987 p171). Like the women in Neville's study who described the motive in their management work as "to improve education for children" (1988 p140), the middle managers in this study were linking the work of the classroom to the management tasks they needed to accomplish. Robyn Hunt was fairly new in her job and she explained her goals like this:

> *The department can't run efficiently without good, well organised resources which the staff know where to find and how to use. And schemes of work are essential for staff sanity and student learning and enthusiasm. Just now I'm having to put a lot of time into doing this kind of organising, but once done, it should run itself and give me and my staff the time and energy to support each other and update our knowledge and pass this on to our students.*

It could be argued that Robyn's position of HOD is the one most closely associated with instructional leadership and therefore it would be expected that she would give it these kinds of emphases. What is interesting in her view of the job though, is the way the instructional, technical and affiliative aspects of educational management are

---

[1] In Chapter 5 it was reported that most of the women in this study had decided early to make teaching their chosen career, and when these six women managers were asked what they enjoyed most about their jobs, all of them were still placing teaching and student contact highly. Robyn Hunt's comment summed up the others: *I really enjoyed the delight most students have in learning and the process of being involved in their development.* Neville also notes that two women adminstrators in her study had continued teaching, although they had attained positions where they could free themselves for a teaching load (1988 p140).

integrated. The technical tasks were not being seen as an end in themselves, but their accomplishment seen as necessary to give her and her staff *the time and energy to support each other* and to have time to update their subject knowledge for their students.

Dorothy Anselm had a similar approach. When she was asked what were the most important things she did as a manager, she said:

> *I don't know how I could rank them - I would prefer to bracket them as of equal importance - like getting more equipment and developing better methods of teaching, alongside listening to staff and encouraging them to solve their problems themselves, and especially encouraging women to have a try - and attempting to modify school procedures like prizegiving and uniforms.*

For both these women, consideration for others was being placed alongside the need for an emphasis on improving instruction and learning. An example of how this can work can be seen in Pauline Chapman's comments. She said she often used her management release time:

> *... to release my teachers. I go into their rooms and teach so that they can have thinking time - and time to take out one child who needs social teaching or counselling.*

In the primary system there has been no release time available to teachers, nor are there any full-time counsellors as in the secondary system, but Pauline was prepared to give her staff some of her own time to help them achieve improved student learning and provide pastoral care. This kind of behaviour needs a different view of women's management and teaching motivations from those which have devalued affiliatory styles by judging them from the viewpoint of Maslow's (1970) androcentric model of motivation. Affiliation in this group's management philosophies is a quality that looks to meeting others' needs, not just a seeking of relationships to boost one's own confidence as one grows to self esteem and self-actualisation - or `full humaness' as Maslow describes it (1970 pxiv). In Mary's comments, for example, developing understanding of other's points of view and feelings went alongside a trust in herself:

> *It doesn't matter who you are, male or female, if you come in and you're really strong at something, people are automatically on the back foot. It comes down*

to being yourself and being able to see where other people are coming from. It's accepting people for who they are.

Affiliation and self-esteem are `hand-in-hand' here, along with empathy and an ability to get alongside people and understand their points of view. These qualities were also illustrated in Susan's response to the man who rudely challenged her authority:

I think he has found the changes in education very hard to take and I really feel very sorry for him. He comes from the old system and he's just got to the stage where he isn't able to accept change. He is an old chap and he is seeing his power eroded. It doesn't hurt me to perhaps pander to his ego a bit to make it easier for him. And I don't feel I have to have power like that. It's more important to develop a sharing, family atmosphere in the school.

Her attitude here illustrates the kind of rationality described by Gould (1983), who argued that in a society where one must live with others, rather than valuing competitiveness and individuality, empathising and connecting with others should be valued to allow the development of collective action.
These were important values for this group of women; they were aiming to develop a sense of community in their schools and were emphasising the building of collegial relationships with their staff. For example, Susan said her primary role as a manager was:

...to get people to work together to improve children's learning. And I want it to be shared - all people working in a school need to feel they are important and necessary.

When Nichola said that she wanted the decision making in her school: "to be an equal thing, with us all planning things together," she was seeing herself as a member of a team. Involving her colleagues in decision making processes was part of building co-operation and mutual respect and a good learning environment for children:

I try to have staff working together for children's learning. This needs openness in decision making and openness to ideas and suggestions. In turn that will develop people who are involved and likely to be happier in their teaching. The learning environment will be better if there is harmony between the principal and staff in the directions they take for children's learning. I've tried to share information and decision making with Helen and Claire, who's

the teacher aide. I've tried to let them know everything that's going on as I feel that's the only way to operate in a small school like this. The past principal who was a man didn't share things, but I want it to be an equal thing, with us all planning things together.

Some of these women saw their kind of affiliative management as a logical extension of their identities as women[2]. Dorothy said:

It's that sharing of yourself with others that you learn to do as you are growing up.

She was debunking here the idea that the ability to share, in the sense of empathy, caring and nurturing, are innate female qualities. The idea that such qualities are part of women's `nature' were criticised in Chapter 1. Rather than argue that way, Blackmore's stance is supported here, that is:

> ...at a specific historical moment, traditional patterns of behaviours prescribe certain roles to which individuals, males and females, partially conform to varying degrees. For example, women's centrality to the family and as principal childrearer is not greatly challenged in practice, and is therefore a dominant part of women's identity, value systems and needs. That is, women's `interests' are associated with caring and commitment to others (1989 p121).

Dorothy saw nurturance and affiliation in this way, as skills and values that women have learnt and developed as a result of both socialising and their experience in the culturally ascribed roles of primary caregivers and childrearers. She said:

Women's nurturing skills are <u>learnt</u> and learnt very quickly if they are bringing up children. You jolly well <u>have</u> to take care of each little person - somebody has to not mind that their nose is running or that they're bad-tempered now and then.

In her comments about her husband watching her doing several things at once and wondering how she managed to do that (discussed in Chapter 6) she stressed that *...It's just long practice at sharing yourself. You're giving out all the time.* However, she also said later:

---

[2]This does not mean that men cannot be caring and work in similar ways to these. As Segal points out: "The soft and gentle man is not such a rare creature". The problem, throughout this thesis, "is the continuing existence of differing power relations which privilege men" (Segal 1987 p143) and the continued existence of a hierarchical and authoritarian paradigm of educational management that is supported by the ascendency of a particular form of hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1987).

> *I guess I carry on being a mother all the time really, nurturing my HOD, carrying him and acting as a go-between with him and the rest of the staff.*

At the level of thinking about her own qualifications and experience, she had not acknowledged that her success as a mother had developed skills that she was using in her work in school management. As shown in Chapter 6, she still lacked confidence in her ability in public roles. This is not surprising. Malcolm pointed out the dilemma for women who are managers:

> ...women are supposed to be subservient, nurturant and maintain effective relationships, yet as administrators are supposed to be independent, assume leadership and be task oriented (1978 p2).

Thus women who move into management positions are enmeshed in a kind of schizophrenic contradiction (and this is especially so in a strongly patriarchal system such as education). They can be viewed as `mothers' trying to be `fathers', without the authority of `fathers': they are surrounded instead by expectations that they will fill nurturant roles (Johnston 1986). Pauline Chapman commented:

> *I get treated as a `mother' if I let myself be. People would like to say that I was the comfortable person over in the B Block who the children could come to if they were hurt. Whereas in fact I'd like someone else to look after them because I'd like to read some papers at lunchtime or plan some strategy so I can get something to happen in the educational area at school. I think every woman has the expectation that she will be the caregiver laid on her though.*

Although links between mothering and teaching are made, such as in the statement "Being a mother has made me a much better teacher", it is not generally accepted that being a `housewife' and mother can be a training ground for management skills as diverse as budgeting and conflict management. There are many links between the two roles that are not usually acknowledged, despite the development of what Cox and James describe as a:

> ...curious conflation of attributes that constitute the `ideal' housewife and mother. She manages the house, does its menial work and provides moral and pyschological guidance. She combines roles that are seen to be quite separate in the public world - administrator, charwoman, counsellor, teacher and priestess (Cox and James 1987 p10).

One area of common skills can be found in the `juggling' nature of the work of both mothers and managers. Dorothy's description of concentrating on several things at

once is a common experience for women working in the home: as she said, *Being a mother is a 24 hour a day, 7 day week job with constant small interruptions.* Many studies (for example, Wolcott 1973, Mintzberg 1973) also describe the need for administrators to work on the run, carrying several tasks at various stages of completion without letting constant interruptions destroy them. However, although `housewives' and mothers are sometimes called `good managers', this is only within the private sphere of the home where their work is unpaid, under-valued and marginalised. In common perceptions the `juggling' skills required by women working in their homes are `different' from, and less important than, those required in the public (and paid) sphere. In schools, `management' has become `administration' and this is increasingly surrounded by a mystique of highly sophisticated techniques that are described in `scientific' terminology - `hygiene motivators', `antecedent transactions', `clinical supervision', `techno-structural intervention strategies'. In the educational administration policy of Tomorrow's Schools (1988) there is a perceived need for `expert' skills of the business management type.

But these women were rejecting the notion that this kind of technical `expertise' was all that their management jobs required. They were laying an emphasis on an instructional leadership that was seen to be best worked out through the development of collegial relationships with their staff whom they saw as their equals. Even when they had achieved a position that gave them authority and status, they did not see this as giving them all the `expertise'. They believed that it was important *to be open and honest and admit you don't know everything,* as Dorothy put it: *I'm no cleverer than anybody else.* Nichola was working from a recognition of her own limitations and a wish to draw others into planning and decision making so that they could each grow from exposure to the others' ideas and strengths:

> *I want to give the other staff the opportunity to be part of making the school go. I find Helen's insight exciting: I can only see things from my own perspective and they can see things differently.*

Mary took her frankness about her own limitations into her teaching as well as her management work and her `private' life:

> *I don't like being with people who can't admit their mistakes. I'm not perfect but I'm willing to say, "Hey, this is where I'm at. I've got some problems in this area - can you help me?" And I say this to my kids as well as to my friends and to the staff. It's about being real and being able to admit your faults*

> *and weaknesses and build on those. Face your fears. They watch me face my fears. If I get something that I don't know I say, "Look you guys, I'm not really sure what I'm doing now. Just hang on a tick." Or I'll say, "I'm not up to that bit myself yet! Let me go home tonight and check it out and I'll let you know tomorrow." Or, "What do you think we should do here?"*

This stance was not reflecting a lack of self-esteem or lack of confidence; it was part of a view of leadership that emphasised a belief in "authenticity and honesty" and a bringing of a sense of "wholeness" to her work that was also observed by Marshall in her study of women managers (1984 p113). Her descriptions of her style of teaching and ways of relating to other staff reflected her emphasis on the importance of building open and warm relationships, and a `marrying' of her `private' and `public' selves. She described this as:

> *...being real. With my kids I talk about what I do at the weekends or my friends. If I'm hungry I ask them what they've got to eat - and they love that. There are friends I can go to on the staff and say, "I want a cuddle - give me a cuddle, quick!' and I cuddle my boys. The senior administration know I do that and they don't mind. I still get on my father's knee and give him a kiss and a cuddle, and probably that background has a lot to do with the way I function at school.*

In a study comparing male and female ways of working as leaders, Charters and Jovick found an emphasis on developing personal relations to be a common style for women and a most effective style for the building of staff morale:

> ...it was because of the female principals' leadership qualities that their faculties exhibited higher levels of job satisfaction. Presumably if the male principals had been able to establish such close personal relations with teachers, and had exerted as much influence over the educational affairs of the school as the women did, their faculties would have shown equally high levels of satisfaction (1981 p328).

However, as has been illustrated in the two preceding chapters, in their attempts to establish their own ways of working the going was not always easy for this group of middle managers. They were `working against the odds' negotiating unequal power differentials in their home and school gender relations and they were having to establish their `right' to be managers. In the first three chapters of this thesis it was argued that the combined forces of male hegemony and capitalism have created cultural expectations that men should lead and be the `authorities' rather than women (Connell 1987, Blackmore 1989). It is not surprising then, that when they were describing their

own management philosophies, the women often did this by making comparisons with aspects of men's management styles as they had experienced these in schools.
For example, Nichola thought that men's styles of decision making:

> *... are more autocratic. I like to think that I say "Shall we?" not "We will" as many men do.*

Research studies comparing men's and women's management styles give support to her opinion; for example, in a study done by Hemphill, Griffiths and Frederickson (1962) cited by Shakeshaft:

> ...women principals involved teachers, superiors and outsiders in their work, while the men tended to make final decisions and take actions without involving others (1987 p187).

Charters and Jovick also found that:

> ...in large and small schools alike, more decisions than were expected were of the collegial variety under female principals, while more decisions were made by the principal alone under male principals (1981 p316).

As stated at the beginning of this chapter though, it is not being argued that all men manage one way and all women another. What is being argued here, is that women's viewpoints and skills have not been included within the theorising of educational administration which has become male-dominated and hierarchical with its purpose being largely to control[3]. As Blackmore argues:

> The dominance of a science of administration has legitimated power relations in schools and maintained a myth of bureaucratic rationality and individualism. Administration is value free, hierarchy is technically rational and domination legitimate... Bureaucratic hierarchy manifests itself as a technical necessity (to co-ordinate the sub-divided tasks)...and principals are seen to be effective only when they are `in charge' or `in control' (Blackmore 1989 pp118-19).

When describing their perceptions of their own different ways of working, the women in this study were seeing other staff as equals rather than as sub-ordinates and they

---

[3]Prebble and Stewart (1985 p80) argue that as a result of "looking through the ideological screen of late twentieth century technological man... the (educational) administrator takes the present form and function of schools for granted. Questions of power and its relation to social inequalities remain largely unexamined except by critical theorists; the prevailing ideology of technical rationality steers the administrator to concentrate on issues of efficiency, output, productivity and systems maintenance". However, although Prebble and Stewart argue that the dominant concern in educational administration is one of managerial control, with this being cloaked by the use of "more acceptable terms such as 'facilitating','persuading' and 'leading'" (p79), at no stage in their text do they consider the possibility that gender factors may be further complicating the nature of such control.

were stressing the need to share tasks. Both these emphases were evident in Pauline's example of how she used some of her management time: rather than sorting out the difficulty or doing all the planning herself, she was prepared to teach another's class so that teacher could be released to solve the problem. She revealed here a non-hierarchical attitude towards management that could empower staff to take action themselves.

Although team-building was strongly emphasised in this group's philosophies, this wasn't a reneging on the need to initiate or provide a guide. For Dorothy, *consensus decision making and dealing with (confronting) sticky problems,* were both important aspects of her management strategies. In her comments about the incident with the principals discussed in Chapter 8, she showed that she was willing to confront power and take responsibility for `sorting out' difficult situations. She was willing to make the tough decisions and not to shirk situations that might cause her personal stress or anxiety:

> *I don't want people to not like me, and when I'm confronting someone, my heart beats like mad and I feel tired afterwards. But I feel very firmly that it's kinder to people in the long run to have honesty.*

Learning that if she was to be seen not merely as a token woman, but as a person in authority, she had to `stand alone' at times, had been an important step for her:

> *You have to stand up and take responsibility. That was a big learning thing for me - can't blame God, can't blame Sam, nor the children - it's got to be me responsible for that lot. I've got to keep plugging away at changing people's minds and educating people.*

Hartsock has warned that there is a danger in the rejection of leadership in some feminist accounts. She argues that this can result in a:

> ...submersion of the identity of the individual, thereby falling into a form of female pathology of loss of self...It is better to have an understanding of power for the individual which stresses both its dimensions of competence, ability and creativity and does not lose sight of effective action (Hartsock 1983 p253).

Basing her ideas on the theories of Bakan (1966) who argues that there are "two fundamental tendencies, or principals in human functioning, `agency' and `communion'", Marshall suggests that an adequate model of women's identity would need to be one that sees tendencies towards interdependence balanced and enhanced by

forces towards independence (1984 pp61, 81-2). Describing dualities such as `agency' and `communion' though, runs the risk of reinforcing the splits underlying other dichotomous ways of viewing experience, such as the dividing of experience into `private' and `public' spheres and dividing work into that which is men's and that which is women's. There needs to be a holistic perspective which considers the continuum of ways of acting. This was evident in this group's comments about their leadership roles. What they enjoyed in their leadership positions, apart from their contact with students which they all placed highly, was (in Nichola's words) the challenge - *the chance to be part of a team, yet have to take responsibility for my own decisions.* This illustrates her recognition of the need to take responsibility for herself and her own decisions alongside an emphasis on developing shared decision-making. This seemingly paradoxical situation was not seen as contradictory, but rather a view of leadership that recognised the need for someone to initiate the group processes and to take responsibility for making sure the decisions were carried through at the end.

Within this framework, the women's comments revealed that they `held the reins' to a varying degree. When Susan took up her principal's position, she met resistance and antagonism from the staff, and although their actions made her feel angry, she knew she needed to control her anger if she was to be able to work with them towards her goal of establishing more collegial ways of working and greater community involvement in the school. Her attitude here was not a meek one though: she said, *I knew I couldn't let them break me... and I'm an extremely determined person.* She was planning strategies that would enable her to confront resistance and challenge while protecting her own position and her situation was reflected in her comments:

> *Co-operation, consensus and delegation are all important, but there is also a need for a principal to quietly and firmly hold the reins and make decisions when this is required.*

Nichola's staff were more supportive of her: they agreed with her aims of wanting a co-operative sharing group who would make decisions together. Her leadership had moved into professional areas where she said she was:

> *...taking the lead in lots of things. Like the IQ testing issue. I talked it all over with Helen because you are responsible for motivating your staff's thinking.*

Robyn had a similar view to this one. She saw the HOD as a researcher for the department, the person who finds out what has to be read and passes material on. She

said: *For proper consensus, the department has to be as literate as you are.* She had a clearly thought through philosophy behind her determination to manage through consensus:

> *If you are the dominant and authoritarian decision maker, you expend an awful lot of energy on: 1) making the decisions, 2) justifying them, and 3) making sure they are carried through. If you expend that time and energy on developing a consensus point of view, you're likely to have a much more motivated department because they've all been involved with the decision and agreed to it. It's less energy sapping. It's not necessarily less time consuming. But you're not IT. You might be the initiator, you might put forward an idea, but if they are really into consensus, they'll come up with six others, so you'll get more ideas out of it too.*

However she said that she was meeting resistance here.

> *I wanted all of it discussed - the setting of priorities, ordering of which resources, the best way to set out the resource room. I wanted it discussed and a consensus reached. And I wanted to make sure everyone spoke to each topic, with no reneging. But I haven't been able to implement that at the moment. That concept is totally foreign to the people in my department - they're not really sure about it. Two agreed, but you can't manage a consensus on two, you've got to have everyone.*

The problem of finding out which decisions teachers want and need to be involved in is not one unique to Robyn: Prebble and Stewart (1984) and others discuss this issue. But she was finding it difficult to get two of the men on her staff to even consider her way of working as a team:

> *One of them just laughed, and another said, 'That's what you're paid to do.' I haven't worked out how to get around that one yet.*

Kanter's (1977) investigation into `men and women of the corporation' has been influential in developing an understanding of how those in a minority with low status and power can become `tokens' who consequently develop certain styles of working to cope with their situation and Neville has suggested that:

> ... a `feminine' style is, in part, a product of being a minority with low opportunity status so being forced to be negotiating and placatory (1988 p144).

Pauline's leadership style can be seen to be be partly a product of being in a position of minority status - she preferred to: *lead from behind, planting ideas,* that she was happy to see others take up. When asked for an example of how that worked, she said:

> *I suppose getting the principal to write and post up agendas for staff meetings was one example. I just kept showing him my agendas for the Junior School meetings, and one day he said he thought he'd try doing that for staff meeting, so I offered to help him.*

This strategy of `leading from behind' can be seen to avoid the glare of being `out front', a position of high visibility and isolation that can have problems for women (Kanter 1977). However, it is also a strategy which fits a philosophy that values team work and co-operation and uses a different kind of authority from that which is based in the tradition and status of a position `at the top'.

In their perceptions of their management styles these women were making distinctions between what they saw as male definitions of authority and a different kind of leadership which they saw as a quality based in relationships with, and responsibility towards, others. Dorothy said:

> *If you are defining authority in the way that it is seen in a competitive male world, I'd say it was probably recognition, and the power to enforce your will. But as a leader I don't see myself wanting to work that way. I see the wisdom thing as more important, being sensible and showing wisdom.*

Robyn said authority was probably defined as:

> *...power - the ability to have people do the things you want them to do, the way you want them to. But leadership should be doing things the way the group wants them done.*

Susan summed up this view of leadership by making the link to the Maori concept of mana:

> *I think authority is based in a person having mana - the Maori concept sums it up for me. It is earned, and then what a person says will be listened to with respect and treated as being of value to the group.*

Blackmore argues that hierarchical authority is associated by women with power over others and she points out that:

> ...leadership `skills' can be used in a different way. Rather than privileging the individual who is often already in a position of status and power because of the possession of specialist knowledge, capacities, skills or role allocation, expertise can, in a co-operative environment, empower the individual and the group. Leadership, and the power which accompanies it, would be re-defined as the ability to act with others (Blackmore 1989 p123).

Pauline's ways of working (in the staff meeting agenda example and the use of her management time to release other staff members) can be seen to be using the kind of leadership that acts with others and bases its authority in "a skill and knowledge ...which demonstrates its force to those concerned in terms they can grasp" (Blackmore 1989 p 123).

Nichola said that many of the men she had known in education had been *selfish about sharing information and power,*[4] and that she'd seen men who *got themselves in awful knots as a consequence. One man actually got very sick in the end.* Empowering others through a giving of information and a consultative approach to decision making was important for her, but she also saw this sharing as a way of empowering herself: *When there's a difficulty for example, we can support each other.* Robyn's comments also show how consensus decision making can share some of the responsibility as well as exposing an individual to others' ideas.

When they were describing their perceptions about their management styles, the women highlighted the place of communication skills in the strategies for building consensus and trust. In all aspects of management communication skills are important; as Gronn points out: "Talk is the work and talk does the work" (1982 p30). Shakeshaft suggests that women's asking of questions involves others in discussions and is a way of facilitating group problem solving (1987 p185). That style emerged in both Nichola's wanting to ask, *"Shall we?"* rather than saying *"We will"*, and in Mary's use of questions, such as *"What do you think we should do here?"*

In Susan's description of her communication style, another factor emerged. She said she tried to be:

> *Non-threatening. I try to be warm and friendly and sympathetic as I can, treading that fine line between sensitivity and gush. I think though that women*

[4]Rather than being seen as 'selfish', this kind of behaviour can be seen to be as much a consequence of social expectations of independent 'masculine' leadership, as nurturing styles are expected of women.

have good negotiatory skills...You have that sixth sense which tells you, no further, draw back and bide your time. If you accept people for what they are, they know that and will trust you.

Pauline described talking as :

...women's strongest way of working - sitting down and talking things out, so that I know your needs and we can come to an agreement. The male hierarchical way doesn't work like that. And I have had experience of a women's way of working like this being seen as a `power play' by men, where they have seen the women as `locking themselves away', and this is threatening to men. They have become very bitter at times.

Each of these women said that she had to avoid being threatening. They said they had to be careful about what they said and how they said things. This suggests the marginal nature of their positions as managers who were also women. As shown in the earlier discussion of Karen Sewell's case, there are plenty of good reasons for a woman who is in a leadership position to take care not to antagonise others. Helen Watson, PPTA Women's Officer, commented:

> The fact that I'm a woman articulating a different vision for women...means I've got to be extremely careful that I don't antagonise when it's going to be counter-productive. I have to attempt to be as unthreatening as possible; my very existence is very threatening for a lot of people" (Neville 1988 p96).

The forces of a dominant male hegemony can be detected in these comments and the need to avoid the kinds of retaliatory responses discussed in the previous chapter is one of the factors lying behind the women's perceptions of the need to be non-threatening. In this situation, Pauline's description of her style of `leading from behind' as: *planting ideas with others and letting them grow,* suggests that she was using a strategy of nudging people towards change (May 1988). Such `nudging' can be an effective technique of transformation; it holds fewer risks of retaliation than more confrontational methods of demanding or imposing change and works through a building of alliances and an initiating of slow changes. However, like Dorothy, Pauline had also learnt that there came the times when she had to be the one to stand `up front'. She was working to change male dominance in both structural and attitudinal areas and here she had found that:

... there is a need to be political; to be really well-prepared, to know my facts and have them right and be able to quote them calmly. I've learnt to be ready,

to dig in and not be afraid of getting knockbacks, to make sure I ask the questions I want to know the answers to, no matter who it is I am talking to... and to have no fear of hierarchical structures.

However, Nichola pointed out the difficulties for her of trying to change the conservative attitudes of the rural community where she works:

When I got this job, I imagined that I would have a free hand to run things my own way, but it doesn't work that way. This community is quite conservative really and the school can't really alter the attitudes that come from home. You've got to think about how much energy you've got. I find the most exhausting thing I have to deal with is people's differing viewpoints. So when you want to create change, you have say to yourself, `Can I cope with the conflict it's going to cause? Have I got the energy at this stage?' You can create your own conflict or you can hold it off. Right now I'm planning for the camp I'm taking the whole school on, and then there's all the management changes under Tomorrow's Schools. What I'm saying is that it's learning priorities. There are so many things one could pursue but there are only so many hours in the day.

Pauline got to school very early in the morning, as early as 5.30am sometimes, because of a heavy workload that can be seen to be partly caused by the way she used her time to help other teachers on her own staff, but is also related to her union responsibilities and her commitment to working for change. In relation to this she said:

I have always felt that women should be equally represented, and the chaps would come back to school with all these facts and this knowledge that I didn't have. And I've never liked that, so I set out to find out and get the knowledge to other women; it has been difficult for them to attend union meetings because they have been held after school when women have to be at home with the kids... Because I'm away a lot, I have to manage my time really well. I get to school early - it's a good time to work, with no interruptions. At the end of the day after teaching and so on, I'm not much good for anything except listening...

When Dorothy talked about her `private' life, it was clear that much of this was taken up with work associated with her `public' roles. During her evenings telephone conversations with teachers take a lot of time:

> *Then comes department work and then the marking and then if we're really lucky it will be to bed by midnight. I can do with less sleep than most people and I'm up by six most mornings.*

During the first interview with her (on the first Saturday of the school holidays) she was rung three times on school-related business (as was Mary Ross.) "And this", said Jenny, her daughter, who dropped in and out during the morning, "is typical. She's spent all her life listening to people."

Despite Dorothy's heavy school-related workload, the division of labour in her home was still a fairly traditional one though, leaving little personal time left for her to: *do things for me.* The sexual division of labour held some complexities however, as was shown in Chapter 6: although Susan said she and her husband still argue about this area of their lives, unequal divisions of labour in the home were not seen as unfair by Dorothy and Nichola. There were contradictions in their situations. As a result of finding in her mothering a source of success, joy and self-esteem, Dorothy was not likely to give up the rewards she gained from giving time to her family, despite the fact that she was aware that her husband was: *better at taking time for himself* than she was. Nichola found a sense of security and peace in her slipping into the `wifely' roles when she got home from school, though she was beginning to feel angry that her husband was refusing to share in the decision making relating to their home. Women can thus have to become `superwomen' (Neville 1988, Clarricoates 1980) as they cope with a multitude of demands upon their time and energy. Whether married or single, women like those in this study who place a high store on nurturing or working for change for other women can end up burning the candle at both ends as they carry heavy workloads in both `private' and `public' roles.

Although this chapter has described an affiliative style of management that emphasises team work and shared decision making, it must be acknowledged that not all women work in these ways and not all women share power. Dorothy commented that she had experienced a woman principal who worked in hierarchical ways and did not share power easily:

They are the Maggie Thatcher types - possibly they think that's the only way to work.

Rather than seeing men and women as having inherently different characteristics, it is important to point out again that both can be influenced by and behave according to dominant system of values and beliefs: and within our present society the dominant system is one supported by a hegemonic masculinity that has been described as an image that is motivated to compete and able to dominate others "by facing down opponents in confrontations" (Connell et al 1982 p73). Dorothy said:

Possibly it's also worse for women in principals' positions, because they've got all the men watching them enviously to see if they're going to make any mistakes. The men have a circle of friends around them all operating in the same way, so it's not so bad for them. They haven't alienated themselves from the rest of their sex. Perhaps because of the struggle women have to get there and to stay there, they must cover up their vulnerabilities.

Eisenstein made similar points, arguing that in their subordinated situations women have three options, firstly:

> ...agreeing to compete in the male-defined world of politics on its own terms, in the manner of Maggie Thatcher. Second, there is the option of withdrawing from that world, out of pessimism as to its essentially patriarchal nature...Finally there is the option of entering the world and attempting to change it, in the image of the women centred values at the core of feminism (1981 p144).

The viewpoints of women such as those in this study were based in the values of nurturance and affiliation and emphasised qualities of sharing and cooperation. Such viewpoints have much to offer not only to the administration of educational institutions but also to society as a whole.

Conclusion

This thesis has focussed on women's marginality in educational administration and argued that it is their position within gender relations of unequal power that underpins the poor representation of women at management levels. Segal has pointed out that by a "myriad of social practices men and boys have been placed in positions of power over women and girls" (1987 p153). Through a combination of capitalist and patriarchal forces, there has developed a splitting of experience into `private' and `public' spheres and a sexual division of labour: women's `place' is seen to be in the private world of the home where they have been given the primary responsibility for childcare and nurturing while men have authority and control in the `public' world. Those divisions have been traced back to liberal political theory and it has been argued that this has combined with positivist scientific method and the processes of male hegemonic control of language and culture to devalue that which is most characteristic of women's lives and experience - their relational, nurturing and emotional qualities and their unpaid work in homemaking and childrearing.

Within the bureaucratic structuring of education, although the patterns and levels of authority and control may vary from school to school (Child 1984) and policy change from central to devolved methods of control, what is largely overlooked is the gendered hierarchy: those who control are mainly men, while women make up the majority of teachers and are concentrated at the most junior levels of each institution (Deem 1978, Connell 1985, Shakeshaft 1987, Blackmore 1988, TEACAPS 1988). Women's viewpoints and interests have been largely overlooked or devalued in educational administration as a consequence of the dominance of male perspectives and a hegemonic linking between `masculinity' and authority in culturally produced beliefs that also see women as more `suited' to teaching than management.

Although a few women are achieving management positions, many more are needed because:

> ...women are half the nation's experience, half the nation's intelligence and half the nation's skills... Decisions that do not take women's experiences and perspectives into consideration will be ineffective as they will not meet the needs of half the population (Shields 1990 p9).

In `mainstream' educational administration theory and practice however, women's absence has remained largely unproblematic. If considered at all, there are few theories or concepts to explain a woman's way of working in this field without viewing it as `deficient' or `deviant' as a consequence of measuring women against male norms (Acker 1983). Even women centred research in this area can fall into the trap of judging women through male paradigms: for example, although Neville reversed the practice of studying the constraints on women's careers and instead celebrated their success, she suggested that women's affiliation `needs' must be `broken through' if they are to gain promotion (1988 pp101-102, p149), thus judging an area of women's strength, their emphasis on relational factors, as their weakness. For women's views and practices to be adequately represented and analysed there must be a changed perspective here, one that confronts and analyses the capture and control of language and concepts, of social structures and institutions, of decision-making processes, by what is only half of the population - the male half. Women's own views of management and leadership need to be constructed (Shakeshaft 1987, Blackmore 1989) and integrated into mainstream theories.

One of the aims of this thesis therefore has been to focus on a small group of women educational managers to investigate their management philosophies. A broader aim was to investigate women's views about their gender relations to contribute to an understanding of how gender inequalities are perpetuated within both the home and the school. Although the larger social, political and economic structures are important in creating a picture of the causes of gender inequalities, this study did not set out to undertake that kind of macro investigation. Rather, it focussed on an in-depth interview study of six women and their perceptions of their day to day experiences, looking for the continuities and contradictions between the so-called `private' and `public' spheres and focussing on the complex nature of resistance and struggle within what Connell called `a balance of forces, a state of play' (1987 p184) within gender relations. Although the women's awareness of gender power struggles varied, these struggles became the centre of the analysis as the research progressed.

The participants in the study were a group of women teachers who had not reached the `top' positions of educational administration, but who had attended a management course, held in 1987 in a provincial area of New Zealand, to gain professional development and the knowledge, confidence and skills to apply for promotion. At the time of the course many were still assistant teachers; eighteen months later, at the time this research was carried out, most of the eighteen primary and twelve secondary women were working in middle management positions such as senior teacher,

assistant principal and Grade 1-3 principal in the primary system and HOD, senior mistress and deputy principal in the secondary system[1]. The first part of the study used a questionnaire survey of this group to document their career backgrounds, teaching service and the constraints they had experienced, to provide some context for the case histories of six of the women. The results of the survey and the points that arose from these will be summarised first.

The relationship between family responsibilities and women's career opportunities has been a focus of much of the research on women in education, and some of those studies have suggested that married women who take time out of full-time teaching service for childbearing and rearing are not likely to want or to pursue management as a career. However, half (14) of the 30 women who attended this course still had teenage children at home, showing that `ordinary' women with families also aspire to management, not just those who remain in teaching `as a career' (ie. without taking breaks for childcare) as suggested in Steele's evaluation of the 1978-80 national management training courses for women (1981 p11). Further, the results of this present questionnaire survey support Acker's (1983) statement that commitment must not be judged by length of time in the service: of the 17 women who had had breaks from full-time service for childcare responsibility, 15 (88 percent) identified these as having constrained their careers: they had lost, on average, five to six years of service time, with several having ten years out. Although this had been a deliberate choice for a few women, others said it was only later that they realised how this had been detrimental to their chances for moving into management.

It is worth noting here that only seven of the 30 women surveyed reported having experienced no constraints in their careers: five of these were aged under 35 and had no children, while the other two women (who had children) had entered teaching at the ages of 31 and 34 and had not taken time out for childcare. As found in other studies, there were several constraining factors associated with women's ascribed responsibility for childcare. In the case of some teaching mothers who worked rather than staying home with their children there was guilt, and sometimes stress and physical illness was the result of carrying a double workload, that of teaching/managing and mothering/nurturing (Clarricoates 1980)[2]. Although Neville (1988) suggests that perhaps women are `content' to remain in teaching because of

---

[1]50 percent of the course participants gained promotions; the course, which has been evaluated in a separate paper (Court 1989), was therefore a most successful one in terms of its intervention model.

[2]Expectations that women will carry nurturing responsibilities in their work situations, on top of their other responsibilities and as well as undertaking nurturing tasks at home, add demands to their workloads that are often unrecognised.

their own affiliative `needs', these women's comments indicated that their families' needs had been placed before their own career aspirations.

Although the patterns of marriage and the age of childbearing may be altering, this study would suggest that a patriarchal ideology that `women teach only until the family arrives' is persisting, and married women in this group reported that they are still being viewed as `second income earners'. Ideologies such as these have become embedded in the past in official policies such as the `broken service' clause (a policy which limited the opportunities of several women in this study) and they continue to influence attitudes towards women in management, permeating the structures and practices in schools in ways that can disadvantage all women teachers.

Gatekeeping could be seen to be blocking women's chances for promotion in several ways. As reported in the TEACAPS studies, primary women reported being given lower grades than men, who they said were not as good, and they also reported not knowing that they could have appealed against this. In one case a recent advertisement for a DP position had been written in such a way that a man would get the job (the principal had even said in the staffroom, `We need a man'). Fewer of the secondary women reported this kind of discrimination though there were some cases where prejudice could be seen to be working against women gaining appointments. Both primary and secondary women said that they had not had the necessary knowledge of the paths to promotion. As found in other studies, these women also reported that gaining experience that would equip them with the skills seen as necessary for promotion was more difficult for them than for young men who were given these opportunities over them.

The sexual division of labour emerged as an important concept in the analysis of both the questionnaire and the case histories of the six women who were interviewed. It has been argued throughout this thesis that it is not only that men and women do different things that is important here, but that women's work is judged as inferior (Shakeshaft 1987). In schools the devaluing of `women's work' of childcare can be seen in the connections between mothering/teaching and fathering/managing. While women have been given the most junior students to teach at each level of educational institutions (Wilson 1986, TEACAPS 1988), significantly, teaching at the older age levels where men are concentrated has been accorded higher status (Deem 1978). Several of the primary women in this study had been expected to train for and work with young children and they reported that this had disadvantaged them because experience in teaching at `senior' levels is still being seen as necessary for promotion

into management positions. Gender discrimination and the dominance of a male hegemony lie behind the judgement that women who have taught only at junior levels are less suitable for positions of responsibility than men who have taught only at senior levels.

Issues of unequal power in gender relations surfaced in the case history interviews, giving support to the argument that the public/private dichotomy in capitalist societies primarily fits male experience, with women being the ones who have to "negotiate the two power structures and the relation between them" (Game and Pringle 1983 p138). The analysis of the women's comments indicate that the sexual division of labour in their homes and workplaces is not altering much, despite men's support of the need for equality. There were some contradictions here however: two of the four married women were content to maintain the existing divisions, one because mothering was an area where she had established her success and sense of self-worth and confidence, the other because after the stress of establishing her authority and carrying responsibility at school she felt she could relax at home into known and comfortable roles. She was also in a sense `repaying' her husband for the `moral support' he was giving her. In both women's situations though, the underlying inequalities were persisting; despite the encouragement they were giving the women in their public roles, at home one husband was retaining the ultimate decision making power and both men had more personal time to relax and do things for themselves than their wives had.

There are several problems here if equality between men and women is to be achieved; one is that children growing up within traditional sexual divisions of labour within the home are likely to reproduce them in their own relationships and future families. A related difficulty is that by carrying the main responsibility for housework and childrearing responsibilities (eg. taking time out of teaching for full-time childcare while men continue to work full- time in the public sphere) women can reinforce other assumptions, such as, there is `women's work' and `men's work' and women should be the ones to make a `choice' between having a family or a career. The idea that it must be one or the other is reinforced by men failing to carry an equal share of nurturing and housework responsibilities in the home.

These kinds of dilemmas had been faced by each of the women in this study, though not always consciously. Two had put family first then come back to their careers much later, two had chosen not to marry so they could advance in their careers, another had married but had chosen to have no children. One had children and had to continue to work full-time: she had two stress related illnesses. Under the persisting

culturally produced divisions of labour, the cost for women can be seen to be high whichever `choice' is made. Most men however, can have both family and a full-time career and rather than family counting against their promotion opportunities it has been argued that being a `family man' actually enhances a man's prospects (Acker 1983). A dominant male hegemony is at work below the surface here to maintain the idea that `women's natural place is in the home' while men work within the public sphere.

Male hegemony also emerged as a powerful force underlying the women's experiences in their schools. It was clear that they have all been involved in a process of having to win authority. Still in the early stages of their administrative careers, they had been working to gain recognition, develop respect for their own expertise and persuade others that they were competent: they were developing their own and others confidence in their abilities and inducing others to work with them in their new roles. This does not sound surprising - anybody moving into a position of responsibility goes through this kind of process. However, in that these women were also competing against cultural definitions and expectations that link authority with masculinity and cast them as women in the role of `followers' rather than leaders, they were working `against the odds': they did not fit `commonsense' definitions of leadership. Thus, beginning work in educational management has involved them in struggles to achieve the right to lead and to be seen as authoritative by others.

This struggle could be seen to be taking place within school cultures that were strongly patriarchal, with hegemonic forces working to convince both women and men that the existing hierarchical patterns of male control were `natural' and `commonsense'. When the women worked in different ways, or challenged the existing patterns and structures of power and control, they met resistance. Much of this came from older men and was expressed in ways that have been identified in other studies (eg. Neville 1988); for example, they had to deal with bantering 'put downs' that trivialised them or labelled them in ways that called their femininity into question, such as being called the `Iron Maiden'. In such situations, the women were expected to be able to join in the laughter at `womankind', a situation that has been identified as a testing of tokens by the dominant group (Marshall 1984). It has also been pointed out that this kind of behaviour can isolate a woman from her own sex; Kanter (1977) has argued that it aims to reduce a token's threat to established patterns and power.

Not surprisingly though, when one remembers the patriarchal and `familial' nature of schooling, paternalism was particularly common in male styles of relating to the women managers in this study. This paternalism sometimes involved the use of

emotional pressure in negotiations, when a woman would not comply with a request for example, but sometimes it was a more aggressive `disciplinary' style. Being treated like `naughty girls' was a common experience for these women, especially when they did not conform to stereotyped expectations of what was `appropriately' acquiescent or passive `feminine' behaviour.

Other ways of blocking women were experienced. Some men used `insider' knowledge, as well as traditional and legalistic power in a quoting of the `rules' and a referring to precedent to deter two women when they requested entry into the Principal's Association. Flattery, sexual innuendo and the use of physical size and threat of violence were more blatant uses of power by some men to try to keep women `in their place'. Other men just ignored them; when they needed or could have expected information and support, this was withheld. However, although most of the resistance came from men, the group also reported a few cases of other women who did not approve of culturally accepted patterns of leadership being challenged or changed and they also withheld their support, examples which illustrate the power of hegemony to convince the subordinated that their position is `natural'.

The picture that emerged from this section of the study was that the women managers were not readily `seen', literally as well as figuratively, as leaders and decision makers. They described situations where they felt `faceless' or `invisible', where they had to work hard to be even noticed before they could achieve being taken seriously as a person who should be listened to.

They were not passive `victims' in these struggles however and were using a variety of strategies to overcome resistance. They gained further qualifications to give them confidence and acceptable `expertise', they researched and prepared their cases thoroughly and used formal channels to argue their point of view as well as informal methods such as lobbying, seeking sympathetic male allies and building support networks with other women, families and friends. Although they were not all equally conscious of doing so, each of them was honing the political skills needed to negotiate problems caused by gender relations of unequal power.

When the women described their reactions to discrimination or prejudice they revealed a varying recognition and acknowledgement of feelings of anger. Although there are many cultural sanctions against a woman's expression of this emotion, these women did get angry, especially when they were treated as `naughty girls' when they did not conform to stereotypes of acquiescent `femininity'. They each showed that they had

developed a certain `cussedness' and a determination to `do their own thing'. Though they reacted to their anger in different ways, each woman had thought about the need to `manage' it, both in the sense of controlling it and in the sense of using it. Accepting anger and learning to express it constructively was playing an important part in their rejection of stereotypes of passive femininity, as well as in their developing awareness of their own autonomy. In this way anger was empowering them to take action.

However, they had decided that keeping calm when others were angry was important in the resolving of conflict. `Keeping cool' was seen as a powerful way to convince others of their authority, especially those who expect a woman to `become emotional' in conflict situations. There are many contradictory and complex forces in play within gender relations though, and it was pointed out by one woman that if women keep containing this emotion, it is possible that their conforming to cultural pressures on them to behave `nicely' may mean other people may never have to confront the fact that their behaviour is unacceptable. It is the stereotypes and negative labelling that contain women's anger that are being challenged here.

Alongside their challenging of the ways women `should' behave, this group of women were developing their own management styles and philosophies. Their ideas showed a considerable consistency across the whole group and although these did not always fit with traditional views of leadership, they echoed styles described in other studies of women managers (eg. Neville 1988, Charters and Jovick 1981, Pitner 1981). Drawing on what has been seen as the `feminine' skills and strengths of nurturing and commitment to others (socially developed as a result of women's centrality in the family and as principal childrearers), they were emphasising relationships and responsibilities to others as well as to themselves. They were marrying the caring/nurturing sides of themselves with their goals as educational leaders.

Blackmore suggests that leadership in a feminist reconstruction would be described primarily as the ability to act with others, a form of empowerment (1989 p122), and this was the way this group of women saw themselves working. They wanted their staff to *have a share in making the school go* in one woman's words, and their involving of others in decision making was based in a view of themselves as members of a team of equals. In this sense leadership is to "be at the centre of the group rather than in front of the others" (Hartsock 1983 p8): one of the women in this study described it as *leading from behind.* This did not mean the submerging of self in the

group or a loss of personal identity though: the women were balancing the work of facilitating, coordinating and researching with that of initiating discussion and ensuring that group decisions got carried out. In this work they were stressing the importance of sharing with others the information, the involvement and the power to make decisions, as well as the importance of caring about others' needs for personal development, satisfaction and happiness. Their style could thus be described as affiliative: it is a team approach to leadership such as that envisaged by Blackmore in which collective processes confront traditional notions of authority, efficiency and organisational rationality and offer ways of building community (in the sense of group `belonging') that recognise and appreciate difference. Such ideas, as Blackmore also points out, necessarily alter bureaucratic hierarchies of control and open up other ways of viewing expertise that can recognise and value the contribution women's experience in childcare, community work and teaching can bring to administration. Here, the possibility of transformation is important, not just to work for the liberation of women, but also to change educational structures and institutions in ways that will make them more caring of people in general, allowing a diversity of interests and concerns to be recognised and considered.

However, such a transformation needs more than just a celebration of the `female' values associated with affiliation and caring though: Segal (1987 p.xiv) maintains that a process of "dismantling the social practices which maintain male dominance and social inequality" must be undertaken. Connell argues that there is presently a weakening of legitimate patriarchy as the form of authority in families. He describes:

> ...a crisis of institutionalisation, a weakening in the ability of the institutional order of family- plus-state to sustain the legitimacy of men's power (1987 p159).

The challenges of the New Right can be seen as a response to the real changes that have occurred. Although these changes may not have realised the hopes of women during the heady days of the 60s and early 70s, contraception, the changing provisions for matrimonial property, the challenging of hegemonic heterosexuality, the increased employment of women which gives them some economic power in the domestic situation are among alterations to gender relations that he identifies. These have opened up further possibilities for transformation.

But the increasing presence of women in paid employment also brings for them the conflicts and demands of a double workload and heavy dual responsibilities as a consequence of persisting stereotyped expectations surrounding the sexual division of labour. If the present inequalities between men and women are to be redressed,

assumptions about the `commonsense' nature of the public/private split and the associated gendered structuring of work must be challenged and changed. Men and women teachers, for example, are not `frozen' within the `private' and `public' worlds of home and school; they `straddle' their various situations. The idea of the need for a separation between public and private worlds is a social construction, and as such it needs to be examined for the damage done to women. This damage results from both the "ideology of separate spheres and the real experience of separate lives" (Cox 1987 p15) wherein `women's work' is classed as inferior in relation to that of men.

Cynthia Cockburn argues that the dichotomies of private and public worlds and of gender differences do not reflect true differences at all:

> The good qualities deemed masculine - courage, strength and skill, for instance - and the good qualities seen as feminine - tenderness, the ability to feel and express feelings - should be the qualities available to all and recognised and acclaimed wherever they occur, regardless of the sex of the person. Any society we set out to organise anew would surely be a celebration of multiplicity and individual difference (1985 p252).

Women educational managers are in an excellent position to help such a reorganisation by challenging the patriarchal culture of schools, exposing the androcentrism of the curriculum and transforming management styles and theories that until now have represented only the male experience and point of view. However, this study has revealed some of the difficulties they may encounter. In the past, women working in management have had to devalue or put aside their past experiences within their nurturing and childrearing roles: these have not been acknowledged as a suitable set of experiences to provide a base for developing the skills of management. Thus women can be faced with having to deny the validity and relevance of their own ways of seeing and their own ways of doing things if these do not cohere with the dominant administrative theories and practices which are still presented and generally accepted as `the' ways to manage. Although she may win appointment to a management position, a woman is still likely to be seen as having no strong personal base of experience and authority from which to work: she has to establish this within her job and convince others that her own ways of working as a leader are worthwhile.

Within education the collective action of women working for other women can be seen in the PPTA and NZEI initiatives that have established new structures supporting women's efforts to gain promotion, but Peter Allen, Senior Vice President of PPTA, writes that: "It is time for men to realise that they have at least an equal responsibility"

in the task of achieving gender equity (1989 p7)[3]. Gender equity in administration means more than just getting as many women as men into all management positions however. If the argument and conclusions of this study are valid, then the way ahead requires that men in particular need to make a shift in their perceptions and understandings of "the way things are", to see that what has generally been accepted as the `reality' of administrative theory and practice has, in fact, only represented their own point of view.

There also needs to be an acceptance from both men and women that women's ways of working as leaders are not `deficient'. The descriptions of the philosophies of women such as this small group of middle managers show that they have much to offer educational administration theory and practice. To test the perceptions and analysis that this thesis has presented, what is needed now is further studies that will observe other women managers ways of working in their schools. Within the existing administration theory perspectives, critical theory offers the most viable framework for the investigation of conflicting interests within struggles for power. Such studies of women educational managers would also need to explore how other people relate and respond to them in both their home and school situations to fill out the picture presented in this investigation of a group of Pakeha women's points of view.

---

[3]Such comments, coming from men, support Lyn Segal's observation that many women have 'given up' on men just when they are beginning to change.

Appendix 1

Copy of letter requesting participation

Mountain Rd
RD9
INGLEWOOD

15 April 1989

Dear.....

During 1987 we attended the Women in Educational Management evening seminars and workshops. My interest in this subject has continued, and I would like to use our group to research the experiences of other women involved in management. I have enclosed a questionnaire which I hope you will complete for me. It is related to two studies:

1) A project researching women's perceptions of their career constraints and an evaluation of the Women In Management seminars.
2) A thesis study of gender relations in the home and at school.

At the end of the questionnaire I ask if you are willing to be interviewed for the second study - I need to find five or six women in a variety of home and school situations. Even though you may prefer not to be interviewed, I would be very grateful if you would complete the questionnaire and return it to me in the enclosed envelope by:

SATURDAY 29 APRIL

Interviews To help you decide whether you are willing to be interviewed for the gender relations research, here is some background. Mollie Neville's book "Promoting Women" describes the experience of sixteen New Zealand women who are successful educational managers, documenting their past experience, some of the blocks they have encountered and the ways they are presently working. In some ways though, these women are not typical of many women in education; their home situations may have allowed them to succeed where others do not. I have always been interested in the ways men and women relate, and although Mollie Neville's research touches on this area, she does not explore it in depth. I hope the gender relations study will contribute to an understanding of this important aspect of women's careers by focussing on the links and contradictions between our situations at home and at school.

Confidentiality There is a need to protect the identity of those involved in both these studies. Any information you give me will be absolutely confidential: your name will not be used and only non-identifying data will be reported.

I hope you will find the exercise an interesting one. I'm aware of the pressures on you at this stage of the term, and I hope this won't take too much of your time. Thankyou - in anticipation of hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Marian Court

Appendix 2

Questionnaire used for the thesis study

*** To start with, there are some questions about your teaching career.**

TEACHING CAREER

1 How old were you when you first decided to become a teacher? .....

2 Did you plan to stay in teaching as a career?

3 What were your qualifications when you commenced teaching? (Tick)

No teacher training
Teachers College Diploma, Certificate or equivalent
Other (please specify)

4 Qualifications obtained since beginning teaching: (Tick)

None ..... > Go to Q. 6.
Some university units or papers
Advanced Teachers' Diploma
Bachelors degree
Bachelors degree with honours
Masters degree or higher
Technical or trade qualification
Other (please specify)

5 Why did you decide to undertake this study?

6 How many years in total have you been employed as a full-time teacher?

Primary..... Secondary.....

7 Have you had any breaks from full-time teaching?
> No ....
> Yes.... Please specify -

Length of break Reason

.....
.....
.....

8 What sort of school do you currently work in? (Circle appropriate categories)

Primary	Contributing	Full Primary	Intermediate	
Secondary	Co-ed	Boys	Girls	Area
	State	Integrated	Forms 1 to 7	

9 What is your present position? (Tick)

Primary Teacher - Scale A
Senior teacher
Assistant principal - senior/junior classes?
Deputy principal - senior/junior classes?
Principal, Grade ..... (Grade 1:1-2 teachers, 2: 3-5, 3: 6-10, 4: 11-17, 5: 19+)
Part-time, or relieving

Secondary

List A	Dean or Guidance
List B	Senior mistress
PR1 or 2	Deputy principal
PR 3	Principal, Grade .... school
PR 4	Part-time or relieving

Other - please specify.....

10 How long have you held this position? .....

11 During your teaching career, how many promotions have you applied for? .....

12 How many promotions have you gained? .....

13 Do you think that you have been constrained in your career by any of the following?

a) family circumstances?

b) any school factors?

c) being a woman?

d) other? (please specify)

> No.....
> Yes.... Please give details in the spaces - eg. partner's job, elderly dependant etc.

14 Briefly describe any involvement you have had in NZEI or PPTA or other comparable organisation.

Note: This section was followed by questions asking for the women's assessments of the management training seminars. The report analysing these assessments is being published separately (Court 1989).

BACKGROUND AND HOUSEHOLD

* The last questions ask for biographical details to help me select five women who would be willing to be interviewed for the study of gender relations. I need to find as wide a variety of cultural and home situations as possible.

25 Name..... Age..... Home phone..... School phone.....

26 With what ethnic group do you identify?

27 How many adults usually live in your house?

Nature of relationship	Male/Female	Occupation
.....		
.....		
.....		
.....		

28 How many children usually live at home with you?

Age	Gender
.....	
.....	
.....	
.....	

29 Would you be willing to be interviewed for the gender relations study?

Yes.....
No.....
Maybe: phone me at..... to discuss this further.

THANKYOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO FILL IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

If you would like to discuss any part of it or the research projects with me, please phone me at home - Inglewood 68555. I would enjoy hearing from you.

References

Acker, S. (1983) `Women and teaching: A semi-detached sociology of a semi-profession' in S.Walker and L.Barton (eds.) Gender, Class and Education Lewes, Sussex: Falmer Press.

Aitken, J. and Noonan, R. (1981) `The politics of resource allocation in New Zealand: The implications for New Zealand women' in M.Clark (ed) The Politics of Education in New Zealand Wellington: NZCER.

Allen, P. (1989) `About time too: A man's view of the greater involvement ofwomen in PPTA' in PPTA Journal Term 2, 1989.

Apple, M. (1983) Work, gender and teaching A paper presented at PESA Conference: Palmerston North.

Arnot M. and Weiner, G. (1987) Gender Under Scrutiny: New Enquiries in Education London: Hutchinson.

Baird, J.E. and Bradley, P.H. (1979) `Styles of management and communication: A comparative study of men and women' in Communication Monographs Vol.46, No.2, pp101-111.

Bakan, Paul (1962) The Duality of Existence Chicago: Rand McnNally.

Barrett, M. (1980) Women's Oppression London: Verso.

Barton, Len (1988) The Politics of Special Educational Needs London: Falmer Press.

Benston, M. (1969) `The political economy of women's liberation' in Monthly Review, September, pp13-25.

Berk, S.F. (1985) The Gender Factory New York: Plenum Press.

Best, J.W. (1970) `The tools of research' in Research in Education (2nd edition) Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Biklen, S.K. (1985) Can Elementary Teaching be a Career? A search for new ways of understanding women's work A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Blackmore, Jill (1989) `Educational leadership: A feminist critique and reconstruction" in J.Smyth (ed) Critical Perspectives in Educational Leadership London: Falmer Press.

Boggs, C. (1976) Gramsci's Marxism London: Pluto Press.

Bowles, G. and Duelli Klein, R.(eds) (1980) Theories of Women's Studies London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bryne, Eileen (1978) Women and Education London: Tavistock Publications.

Buchan, L. (1980) `It's a good job for a girl, but an awful career for a woman!' in D.Spender and E.Sarah (eds) Learning to Lose London: The Women's Press.

Burton, C. (1985) Subordination: Feminism and Social Theory Sydney: Allen and Unwin

Carlson, R.O. and Schmuck, P.A.(1981) `The sex dimension of careers in educational management' in P.Schmuck et al (eds.) Educational Policy and management: Sex Differentials New York: Academic Press.

Charters, W.W. and Jovick, T.D. (1981) `The gender of principals and principal-teacher relations' in P.Schmuck et al. (eds) op.cit.

Child, J. (1984) Organisation: A Guide to Problems and Practice (2nd edition) London: Harper and Row.

Clark, Don (1988) `Human resources: Women at work - different, not deficient' in New Zealand Business May,1988.

Clarricoates, K. (1980) `All in a day's work' in D.Spender and E.Sarah (eds) op. cit.

Cockburn, Cynthia (1985) Machinery of Dominance: Women, Men and Technical Knowhow London: Pluto Press.

Cocklin, B. and Battersby, D. (1987) `Gender, the hidden agenda: A case study in educational decision-making' in NZJES, 22,1.

Codd, J. (1985) `Images of schooling and the discourse of the state' in J.Codd et al (eds) op.cit.

Codd, J. (1988) Knowledge and Control in Evaluation in Educational Organisations Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Codd, J., Harker, R., and Nash, R. (1985) Political Issues in New Zealand Education Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press Ltd.

Codd, J., Harker, R., and Nash, R. (1985) `Introduction: Education, politics and the economic crisis' in J.Codd et al (eds) Political Issues in New Zealand Education Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press Ltd.

Cohen, Michael D. and March J.G. (1974) `Leadership in an organised anarchy' from Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cohen, M. (1981) `Effective schools: What the research says' in Today's Education April-May.

Colgate, H.A. (1976) `The role of the secondary Head' in R.S.Peters (ed) The Role of the Head London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp109-126.

Comer, L. (1974) Wedlocked Women London: Feminist Books.

Connell, R.W. (1983) `Class, gender and Sartre' in R.W.Connell Which Way is Up? Sydney: George Allen And Unwin.

Connell, R.W. (1985) Teachers' Work London: Allen and Unwin.

Connell, R.W. (1987) Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, R.W., Ashendon, D.J., Kessler, S. and Dowsett, G.W. (1982) Making the Difference: Schools, families and social division Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

Corbett, J. (1988) `Thursday's child' in Metro, April.

Cox, Shelagh (1987) Public and Private Worlds Wellington: Allen and Unwin, Port Nicholson Press.

Court, Marian (1989) Women in Educational Administration: A case study and evaluation of a `self-help training strategy A paper presented at the Women's Studies Conference August 1989, Christchurch.

Court, M. and Smith, S. (1988) The Promotion of Women Review unpublished paper produced for PPTA, Wellington.

Culley, M. (1985) `Anger and authority in the introductory Women's Studies classroom' in M.Culley and C. Portuges (eds) op.cit.

Culley, M. and Portuges, C. (1985) Gendered Subjects: The Dynamics of Feminist Teaching Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Culley, M., Diamond, A., Edwards, L., Lennox, S. and Portuges, C. (1985) `The politics of nurturance' in M.Culley and C.Portuges op.cit.

Daly, M. (1979) Gyn/Ecology London: The Women's Press.

David, Miriam E. (1980) The State, The Family and Education London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Deal, Terence E. (1985) `The symbolism of effective schools' in The Elementary School Journal No.5.

Deem, Rosemary (1978) Women and Schooling London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Delamont, S. (1983) `The conservative school? Sex roles at home, at work and at school.' in S.Walker and L.Barton (eds) op.cit.

Dixon, Judy (1988) `Top jobs - inequality persists' in National Education, November.

Donn, Mary (1987) `The position of women in New Zealand education 1986' TEACAPS, Wellington: Department of Education.

Edson, Sakre K. (1981) ` "If they can, I can": Women aspirants to administrative positions in public schools' in Partricia Schmuck et al (op. cit.).

Edwards, Vivian (1988) `Update: Where are the women managers?'in Management 35 (4) May,1988.

Eichler, M. (1980) The Double Standard London: Croom Helm.

Eisenstein, Hester (1984) Contemporary Feminist Thought London: George Allen and Unwin.

Eisenstein, Zillah (1981) `Reform and/or Revolution: Towards a United Women's Movement' in L.Sargent (ed.) The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism Pluto Press.

Erickson, Donald A. (1979) `Research on educational administration: The state of the art' in Educational Researcher March.

Fauth, G.C. (1984) `Women in educational administration: A research profile' in Educational Forum Vol.49, No.1, pp65-79.

Fishel,A. and Pottker, J. (1977) `Performance of women principals: A review of behavioural and attitudinal studies' in J.Pottker and A. Fishel (eds) Sex Bias in the Schools Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.

Firestone, S. (1972) The Dialectic of Sex London: Paladin.

Fletcher, G.J.O. (1978) `Division of Labour in the New Zealand Nuclear Family' in New Zealand Pyschologist 7, pp33-40.

Friedan, Betty (1963) The Feminine Mystique Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Fry, Robin (1989) `Women and girls in secondary education: Women secondary teachers and their union' in PPTA Journal Term 2.

Game, Ann and Pringle, Rosemary (1983) Gender at Work Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

Garlick, Mary (1980) `Women in educational management: Progress of the policy' in Women's Studies Conference Papers,'80: Auckland, Women's Studies Association New Zealand Inc.

Gilbertson, Marilyn (1981) `The influence of gender on the verbal interactions among principals and staff members' in Patricia Schmuck et al. (eds) op.cit.

Gill, J. (1986) `The effect of gender on schooling' in Expanding Options, Vol.3, No.1.

Gilligan, C. (1982) In a Different Voice Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967) The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research New York: Aldine.

Gordon, Liz (1985) `State policy and ideology: Case studies in technical education' in J.Codd et al (eds) op.cit.

Gordon, Liz (1988) Feminist Research Methodologies: Adapting men's models or a new conception of research? Unpublished paper for Seminar, Education Department, Massey University.

Gould, C. (ed.) (1983) Beyond Domination: New Perspectives on Women and Philosophy Totowa, NJ., Roman and Allenheld.

Gray, A. (1983) The Jones Men: 100 New Zealand Men Talk About Their Lives Wellington: Reed.

Gronn, Peter C. (1982) `Neo-Taylorism in Educational Administration' in Educational Administration Quarterly Vol 18 No.4.

Gross, N. and Trask, A. (1964) `Men and women as elementary school principals' Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Hakim, C. (1987) Research Design: Strategies and Choices in the Design of Social Research London: Allen and Unwin.

Hancock-Benseman, Mary (1978) `Knowledge and Control: A Feminist Perspective' in Delta Vol.23 pp43-53.

Handy, Charles B. (1976) Understanding Organisations Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Handy, C. and Aitken, R. (1986) Understanding Schools as Organisations Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Harding, S. (1983) `Is gender a variable in conceptions of rationality? A survey of issues.' in C.Gould (1983) op.cit.

Hartmann, Heidi (1981) `The unhappy marriage of Marxism and Feminism: towards a more progressive union' in L.Sargent (ed) The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism London: Pluto Press.

Hartsock, N. (1983) Money, Sex and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism New York: Longman.

Hearn, Jeff (1987) The Gender of Oppression: Men, Masculinity and the Critique of Marxism Brighton: Wheatsheaf Books.

Hochschild, A.R. (1975) `The sociology of feeling and emotion: Selected possibilities' in M.Millman and R.Kanter Another Voice: Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and Social Science New York: Anchor Books.

Horner, M.S.(1972) `A psychological barrier to achievement in women: The motive to avoid success' in D.C.McLelland and R.C.Steele, Human Motivation. New Jersey: General Learning Press, pp222-230.

Horney, Karen (1973) `The Flight From Womanhood: The Masculinity Complex in Women as Viewed by Men and Women' in J.Baker (ed.) Psychoanalysis and Women Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Horsfield, Anne (1988) Women in the Economy Wellington: Ministry of Women's Affairs.

Hough, J. (1988) `Gender bias in `Educational Management and Adminstration' in Educational Management and Administration Vol.16 pp69-74.

Hoy, W.K. and Miskel, C.G. (1982) Educational Administration New York: Random House.

Hyman, B. (1980) `Responsive leadership: The woman manager's asset or liability?' in Supervisory Management August.

Inkson, Kerr (1987) `Organisational behaviour: A review of New Zealand research' in New Zealand Journal of Psychology No.16, 9-27.

Jaggar, Alison M. (1983) Feminist Politics and Human Nature New Jersey: Rowman and Allanheld.

Janeway, E. (1971) Man's World, Woman's Place New York: Dell.

Johnston, John (1986) `Gender differences in teachers' expectations for primary school leadership' in Educational Management and Administration Vol. 14 pp219-216.

Johnson, W.L. and Snyder, K.J. (1985) `Updating skills for effective leadership' in The Canadian Administrator Vol. XXIV, No.8, May

Kanter, R. (1977) Men and Women of the Corporation New York: Basic Books.

Kelly, A. (1978) `Feminism and Research' in Women's Studies International Quarterly 1,3,pp225-232.

Kuhn, Annette (1978) `Structures of patriarchy and capital in the family' in A.Kuhn and A. Wolpe (eds) Feminism and Materialism: Women and the Modes of Production London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kuhn, Thomas (1962) The Structure of Scientific Revolutions Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Labau, P.J. (1980) Advanced Questionnaire Design Cambridge Massachusetts: Abt Books.

Lipham, J.M. and Hoeh, J.H. Jr. (1974) `The principal and the instructional program' in The Principalship: Foundations and Functions New York: Harper and Row.

Levinson, Daniel J. (1978) The Season's of a Man's Life New York: Alfred a. Knopf.

Malcolm, Margaret S. (1978) The Almost Invisible Woman SET, Number Two.

Malcolm, Margaret S. (1979) `The Executive Role of Women in New Zealand Education' in Journal of Educational Administration 17,1.

Manchester, Judith (1983) Roles of Senior Mistress, Senior Master and Deputy Principal in the Central Region Wellington: Department of Education.

Marshall, Judi (1984) Women Managers: Travellers in a Male World Chichester: Wiley.

Maslow, A.H.(1970) Motivation and Personality New York: Harper and Row.

May, Helen (1988) `Motherhood in the 1950s: An experience in contradiction' in S. Middleton (ed) Women and Education in Aotearoa Wellington: Allen and Unwin, Port Nicholson Press.

McDonald, Geraldine (1976) `Two demanding jobs' in Education Vol.25, No.6, pp.17-22.

McIntosh, Janet (1974) `Differences between women teachers who do or do not seek promotion' in Journal of Educational Administration Vol.12, No.2.

McRobbie Angela (1982) `The politics of feminist research: Between talk, text and action' in Feminist Review No 12 October.

Middleton, Sue (1984) `The sociology of women's education as a field of academic study' in Discourse Vol.5, No.1 pp42-62.

Middleton, Sue (1985) Feminism and Education in Postwar New Zealand: A Sociological Analysis Waikato University: D.Phil. Thesis.

Middleton, Sue (1988) Women and Education in Aotearoa Wellington: Allen and Unwin.

Middleton, Sue (1988a) `Towards a sociology of women's education in Aotearoa' in S. Middleton (ed) op.cit.

Middleton, Sue (1988b) `A short adventure between school and marriage? Contradictions in the education of the New Zealand `postwar woman'. in S. Middleton (ed) op.cit.

Middleton, Sue (1988c) `Researching feminist educational life histories' in S.Middleton (ed) op. cit.

Middleton, Sue (1989) Women, equality and equity in liberal educational policies 1945-1988: A feminist critique A paper delivered at the annual Women's Studies Conference, Christchurch: August.

Miller, C. and Swift, K. (1977) Words and Women London: Gollancz.

Millet, Kate (1970) Sexual Politics London: Abacus.

Mintzberg, H. (1975) `The manager's job: Folklore or fact?' in Harvard Business Review July-August.

Mischler, E.G. (1986) Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Newsletter of the Ministry of Women's Affairs, No.9, June 1988.

Newton, K. (1988) `Teacher talk with girls and boys: Who gets the attention?' in Broadsheet Issue 163, November.

Neville, Mollie (1988) Promoting Women: Successful Women in Educational Management Auckland: Longman Paul.

Nichol, R. (1986) `Women in education: A changing role' in National Education Vol.68.4.

Novitz, R. (1982) `Feminism' in P.Spoonley et al (eds) New Zealand Sociological Perspectives Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Novitz, R. (1987) `Bridging the gap: Paid and unpaid work' in Cox (ed.) op.cit.

Oakley, Ann (1981) `Interviewing women: a contradiction in terms' in H.Roberts (ed) Doing Feminist Research London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

O'Brien, T.J. (1987) Circular (16/21/3 -PWTCS) sent to all Boards of Governors in August 1987, Wellington: Department of Education.

Paddock, Susan C. (1981) `Male and female career paths in school administration' in P.Schmuck et al, (eds.) op.cit.

Paludi, M.A. (1983) College Women's Role Model Choice: A Developmental Analysis A paper presented at the Annual Midyear Conference of the American Educational Research Association, Tempe: [Eric Database].

Parsons, T. (1951) The Social System Glencoe: Free Press.

Parsons, T. and Bales, R.F. (1956) Family Socialisation and Interaction Process London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Scott, K.P. (1980) `Perceptions of communication competence: What's good for the goose is not good for the gander' in Women's Studies International Quarterly Vol.3 (2-3) pp.199-208.

Schmuck, Patricia A. and Carlson, Richard O. (1981) `The Sex Dimension of Careers in Educational Management: Overview and Synthesis' in P.Schmuck et al (eds) op.cit.

Schmuck, Patricia A. et al. (eds) (1981) Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials New York: Academic Press.

Sedgewick, C.P. The Life History: A method with issues, troubles and a future Dept. of Sociology, University of Canterbury: Working Paper No.1, May.

Segal, L. (1987) Is the Future Female? London: Virago.

Sewell, K. (1989) `Widening the power base' in PPTA Journal, Term 2, p14.

Shakeshaft, Charol (1987) Women in Educational Administration London: Sage Publications.

Sheehan, Ann; Kerslake, Jacqui and Slyfield, Helen (1988) Position of Women in Education 1987 (TEACAPS) Wellington: Department of Education.

Shields, M. (1989) `Women and leadership' in Ministry of Women's Affairs Newsletter, No. 15, December.

Shipley, Susan M. (1982) Women's Employment and Unemployment Palmerston North: Department of Sociology, Massey University and The Society for Research on Women in New Zealand Inc.

Simmel, G. (1911) Philosophische Kultur Leipzig, Werner Klinkhardt translated by Lewis Coser in Signs, Vol.2, No.4, 1977, `Georg Simmel's Neglected Contributions to the Sociology of Women' pp869-87.

Simon, Judith (1986) Ideology in the Schooling of Maori Children; Delta Research Monograph 7 Massey University.

Simpson, Clare (1984) `Women primary principals and how they got there" in Women's Studies Conference Papers, 1984 Auckland: Women's Studies Association (N.Z.) Inc.

Smith, D. (1974) `Women's perspective as a radical critique of sociology' in Sociological Inquiry Vol.44, no.1, pp.7-13.

Smith, D. (1978) `A peculiar eclipsing: Women's exclusion from men's culture' in Women's Studies International Quarterly Vol.1, No.4, pp281-295.

Smyth, W.John (1982) `New direction in the study of the principalship' in The Canadian Administrator Vol.XXII, No.2.

Smyth, John (1988) A Critical Pedagogy of Clasroom Practice: Ideological Tone of Educational Reform and a Counter Discourse A paper presented to the annual meeting of the New Zealand Association for Research in Education, Massey University, Palmerston North, December 3.

Spender, Dale (1980) Man-Made Language London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Spender, Dale (1981) `The gatekeepers' in H.Roberts (ed) op.cit.

Spender, Dale (1982) Invisible Women: The Schooling Scandal London: Writers and Readers Publishers.

Spender, D. and Sarah, E. (1980) Learning to Lose London: The Women's Press.

Standford Friedman, Susan (1985) `Authority in the feminist classroom: a contradiction in terms?' in M.Culley and C.Portuges (eds) op.cit.

Stanley, Liz and Wise, Sue (1983) Breaking Out: Feminist Consciousness and Feminist Research London:

Steele, Jill (1981) An Evaluation of In-service Training: Women in Management 1978-1980 unpublished MEd dissertation, Massey University, Palmerston North.

Stewart, D. and Prebble, T. (1985) Making it Happen: A School Development Process Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press.

Stockard, Jean and Johnson, Miriam (1981) `The sources and dynamics of sexual inequality in the profession of education' in P. Schmuck et al op.cit.

Stokes, Evelyn (1985) Maori Research and Development Wellington: National Research Advisory Council.

Strauss, Anselm L. (1987) Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Curriculum Review (1987) Report of the Committee to Review the Curriculum for Schools; Wellington: Department of Education.

Thompson, Jane (1988) Women in Education: Management Training Needs Research Report No.88-1, Education Department, University of Waikato, Hamilton.

Tomorrow's Schools: The Reform of Educational Administration In New Zealand, August 1988.

Travers, A. (1989) `The State Sector Act and Tomorrow's Schools: Implications for women' in Delta No.41, Massey University.

Wadsworth, Ted (1988) `A school leaders professional development project. The first year: Progress in researching the professional development needs of secondary school headteachers' in School Organisation Vol.8, No.3 pp315-330.

Walby, S. (1986) Patriarchy at Work Cambridge: Polity Press.

Walker, S. and Barton, L. (eds) (1983) Gender, Class and Education Lewes, Sussex: Falmer Press.

Watson, Helen (1987) `Women's teachers' reviews mostly positive and encouraging' PPTA Journal Term 1.

Watson, Helen (1989) `Getting women to the top: The Promotion of Women Review' in PPTA Journal Term 2.

Webster, L. (1975) `Women in secondary education' in PPTA Journal, May,1975.

Westwood, John and Slyfield, Helen (1989) TEACAPS: The Position of Women in Education Wellington: Department of Education.

Weick, K. (1976) `Educational organisations as loosely coupled systems' in Administrative Science Quarterly Vol.21, No.1, pp.1-19.

Whitcombe, Judith E. (1979) `Comparison of Career Patterns of Men And Women Teachers' TEACAPS Wellington: Department of Education.

Whitcombe, Judith E. (1980) `The Promotion of Women in the Teaching Service'in SET No.2, Wellington: NZCER.

Wilson, Margaret (1986) Report on the Status of Academic Women in New Zealand Prepared for the Association of University Teachers of New Zealand.

Wolcott, H.F. (1973) `A day in the life' in The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Wolff, Kurt (1971) `Surrender and community study' in A.Vidich, J.Bensman and M.Stein (eds) Reflections On Community Studies New York: Harper and Row.

Young, I. (1987) `Impartiality and the civic public' in S. Benhabib and D. Cornell, Feminism as Critique: Essays on the Politics of Gender in Late- Capitalist Countries London: Polity Press.