This report examines the issue of sexual discrimination within British higher education and argues that further and higher educational services as a whole are discriminatory environments for women. The report's first section involves interviews with six women who had achieved notable success in the field of further and higher education management. Discussions include their motivation to embark on such a career and their experiences concerning discrimination in their careers. The second section deals with legislation on equal opportunities, with the Equal Opportunities Commission Code of Practice, and with codes voluntarily adopted or propagated by other organizations. The third section examines the results of a questionnaire sent to the directors of education of all local education authorities in England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland (82 responses were received) to determine their policies and programs regarding equal opportunity. The report's final section provides provisional statistics for 1985 that detail positions held by women in various grade levels in the further and higher education service. The statistics reveal that women are overrepresented in the lower grades and greatly underrepresented in the higher grades carrying senior management responsibility. Contains three references. (GLR)
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Women who work in male-dominated professions find in their professional lives that their experiences are very different from those of their male colleagues. Their careers are shaped and constrained by their gender; they are frequently 'tracked' into low status, less rewarding work and are often relegated to a marginal role. Only rarely are they able to rise to the top ranks of their chosen profession. Such dynamics of exclusion and marginalisation of women can be identified in many male-dominated professions. Such professions represent 'discriminatory environments' for women, environments in which the careers of women are shaped and channelled in particular ways as a result of their gender rather than of their abilities.

The further and higher education service as a whole is quite clearly such a discriminatory environment for women. The DES statistics, analysed in a paper by Steve Crabb, make it clear that women in the FHE teaching profession are over-represented in the lower grades and enormously under-represented in the higher ones, in particular in those grades which carry senior management responsibility. The extent of this under-representation varies between authorities — but its occurrence does not (with the commendable exception of ILEA). Thus, throughout the service it must be the case that women are under-achieving, are under-rewarded and are under-performing. This seems a legitimate cause for concern. From the point of view of the employer, it represents a waste: of the talents of the women employed, of the investment made in their training and of the benefits that could be gained were they given the opportunity to fulfil their potential. From the point of view of the women themselves this will inevitably be a potent source of discontent.
David Podmore and I have earlier identified ten factors which contribute to the professional marginalisation of women in male-dominated professions, some of which are closely interlinked (Spencer and Podmore 1987):

(i) stereotypes about women — for example, that women's innate characteristics mean that they are 'emotional', 'unstable', 'not decisive enough';

(ii) stereotypes about the nature of professions and professionals — for example, that professions are physically demanding, 'combative', and hence unsuited to women;

(iii) the sponsorship system — the need for young professionals to find a senior who will 'push along' their careers (difficult for women, because of the lack of senior women professionals);

(iv) the lack of role models and peers — the relatively small number of women professionals means that women are often isolated and lacking in peer support;

(v) informal relationships — women find themselves excluded from many of the informal activities which are so important to building a successful professional career;

(vi) the concept of professional commitment — the 'all or nothing' notion of the professional career which women are assumed to find difficult to adhere to;

(vii) the unplanned nature of many women's careers — whereas men's professional careers are typically 'planned', those of women often suffer from breaks and hiatuses;

(viii) 'women's work' — the view (of many men superiors) that women are best suited to work involving the 'expression of feelings', 'caring', etc.;

(ix) clients' expectations — the claim that women professionals are unacceptable to many clients, and so can work only in less 'visible' capacities;

(x) fear of competition — the fear that women will work for less
renumeration than men and/or lower the prestige of a profession.

These factors all operate within professions. The importance of socialisation into gender roles and the domestic division of labour within the home cannot be over-stated as factors outside their professional lives which operate to marginalise women at work. The ‘cultural mandate’ (Coses and Rokoff 1971), the assumed primacy of the commitment of women to house and family, is highly significant as a factor operating to the detriment of all working women.

Many of these factors can be identified as issues raised in the interviews with women managers which feature in this report. Although the interviews, with the exception of the two women interviewed anonymously, are all low-key, it is clear that in many cases problems have been faced which would not have confronted a man. These are all successful women; they have risen to high-status positions of managerial responsibility. If such women have faced additional problems as a consequence of their gender - and only Sue Sandle states that she has not — then common sense tells us that such problems are pervasive, and that for women in the lower echelons of the service, women who have not ‘made it’, or anyhow not yet, the difficulties experienced may well be far more acute, as, indeed, Natasha Finlayson points out.

Domestic work and, in particular, child care responsibilities emerge as a potential source of discrimination against women, in some of the interviews. This is often a source of difficulty for working women in two ways. Firstly, most working women are in fact doing two jobs, their paid work together with their unpaid domestic work and childcare. This is a significant additional burden for most women as compared to men and may well have consequences for their ambitions and ability to achieve them, and for the sacrifice and strain they will experience in the course of their paid work. Secondly, the notion that women’s primary allegiance is to home and family rather than to paid employment can act as a potent source of discrimination and prejudice against them on the part of men. This kind of assumption is frequently seen to operate regardless of the value stance of any particular woman.

Three of the interviews (Gillian Howison, Mary Earl and Lena Stockford) identify either implicitly or explicitly the pressures on women to over-perform, as compared to men, in order to achieve the same levels of
professional recognition and career progression. The problem here is, I believe, nailed down by Mary Earl. Men are assumed to possess any necessary competence, until such time as they demonstrate otherwise, but women need most positively to establish the fact of their competence before this will be recognised. In practice this seems to mean that only women who are demonstrably much more able than the men with whom they must compete for top jobs will be promoted into these jobs.

The question of whether women managers adopt a different and distinctive management style is raised in some of the interviews. Views are expressed which suggest that women managers may work in a more co-operative, participative, ‘people centred’ way than do their male counterparts. Certainly the ways in which women are socialised into gender role tend to promote such qualities. Women are expected to be more ‘people oriented’ and less competitive than men. However, in respect of the FHE service, we have little empirical evidence on which to base such generalisations.

The lack of female role models and female peers is also identified in the interviews as a problem or a potential problem for women managers in FHE. An absence of women in the manager’s peer group may well mean a lack of comfort and support. An absence of women who can act as role models and sponsors can also be a source of difficulty. Sponsorship is very important in respect of career progression, particularly in education. A sponsor of the opposite sex can potentially create another set of problems — in terms of the possible sensitivities of the woman’s partner and in terms of the possibility of gossip generated among her peer group at work.

The associated problems of coping with an overwhelmingly male peer group are also discussed. In particular, one of the anonymous interviewees refers to the expectation that women in such situations should become ‘one of the boys’. What we have here, in fact, is the famous ‘double bind’ for women — ‘damned if you do, damned if you don’t’. In male-dominated areas of work the characteristics needed to be successful are stereotyped by the male majority as ‘masculine.’ Thus, to the extent that women conform to the ‘masculine’ stereotype and are perceived by their male peers as professionally ‘successful’, they are also perceived as ‘unfeminine’ unnatural women. The extent to which this mechanism operates in the higher echelons of the FHE service may be in the process of lessening, and, from the evidence in the interviews, may not operate as destructively for women as in some other even more male-dominated areas of professional work. The evidence suggests, however, that it has by no means disappeared.
Sue Sandle and Gillian Howison both favour positive action for women. Where such a course is undertaken by a particular institution or LEA it is suggested that this would be within the context of the vigorous implementation of an equal opportunities policy. I agree entirely with this view, and this takes me to a related point on equal opportunities policies. Where these have been adopted, but only in the sense of a meaningless statement of intent and with no proper machinery for implementation, they can actually work to the further detriment of women. The statement that ‘we are an equal opportunities employer’ costs nothing to make and carries no guarantee that any action is being undertaken to ensure its truthfulness in practice. However, the making of the statement can lead to a general view, in particular on the part of men, that it is true. In such a context, if women are still under-achieving, it then becomes possible to regard the women as almost definitionally to blame for their predicament. This is particularly worrying in the context of Steve Crabb’s survey of local education authorities. He states that the largest set of positive responses was to the question on the adoption of equal opportunities policy statements, while the questions to which 50 per cent or more of those responding indicated that they had neither taken any action nor planned to do so were those concerned with specific actions.

This suggests that while many may make a verbal commitment to equality of opportunities, fewer are prepared to undertake the hard work of implementing such a policy. A need for more training, on the implications of equal opportunities and on the implementation processes for such policies, seems indicated.

The need for more training also for women managers is pointed up in the interviews. Given the lack of female sponsors and role models in the FHE service this is undoubtedly an area of need. In addition, however, training for men managers would seem to be required. To focus training provision solely on women managers is to suggest implicitly that women are the problem and that it is they who must be trained to cope with the status quo. Training for men, aimed at increasing awareness of the particular problems experienced by women managers, and ways in which male behaviour could be modified to improve the situation, would seem a reasonable strategy, in addition to the other types of training suggested.

The FHE teaching service, as is the case for many professions and occupations, is an example of a labour market which is internally segmented by gender. It is quite easy to identify ‘women’s subjects’ and
‘men’s subjects’ when contemplating the employment of teaching staff in FHE. Further to this, the management of the service can be identified as an area of work within it which, on the whole, is sex typed as male. Thus the FHE labour market is segmented by gender, both horizontally and vertically. This has a number of consequences, none of which is particularly favourable to women.

Firstly, considering the horizontal segmentation of work in FHE, the consequences for entrants of the ‘wrong’ gender are very different. Where women enter a traditionally male-dominated area of work, it is difficult for them to achieve upward mobility. The attitudes and expectations of the male majority lead to a likelihood that women will be treated as trivial and pushed to the margins. (I have experienced the pressures and dynamics of this while working in almost entirely male-dominated departments, and have known many other women who have had similar experiences - pace the women interviewed who disagree.) However, for male entrants to areas of work sex typed as female, a meteoric rise is often indicated. This is not singular to the FHE service. Similar dynamics have been documented in, for example, a variety of female-dominated ‘semi-proessions’ some of which actively attempted to increase their professional status by recruiting men in greater numbers! (See Grimm & Stern 1974.)

A further aspect of this is the ‘channelling’ processes which operate to allocate women, or by which women allocate themselves, to gender ‘appropriate’ kinds of work. Women are likely to experience discrimination on gender based grounds when attempting to gain entry to ‘men’s work’. Also, however, the pressures and strains experienced, having gained access to such areas of work, are likely to be much greater than if they had opted for ‘women’s work’. Thus the subject areas deemed ‘appropriate’ for women are likely to be more comfortable for women to work in, and may constitute a positive choice for women.

Turning to the vertical segmentation in FHE, management is, to a large extent, still ‘men’s work’ and sex typed as male. The DES figures bear this out, although the extent to which it is so may be in the process of changing. Gillian Howison identifies some of the dynamics when she considers the reasons for the relatively small numbers of women in FHE management — that on the one hand it is a result of institutional sexism, but on the other also a consequence of women’s perceptions of management. Women’s perception that management constitutes a potentially hostile environment may in fact be an accurate one.
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There are, however, signs that things are changing. Institutions and LEAs are increasingly aware of the issues, and of the problems confronting women in the FHE service. The implementation of positive action for women, and an increase in training to tackle the issue of discrimination against women, should help with the process of change. The issues are now increasingly appearing on the agendas of the managers of the service, and will not disappear unresolved.
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INTRODUCTION
The brief for this section of the report was to interview six women who had achieved notable success in the field of further and higher education management. We were specifically interested in what had motivated them to embark upon a career in education and to rise to positions of power and status. We also wanted to discover what, if any, experiences of discrimination or prejudice on the grounds of gender they had come up against in their career.

During the compiling of the interviews it became apparent that the methodology was inherently flawed in three ways. Firstly, women who have been successful are unlikely to be those who have encountered discrimination — or conversely, those who have been turned down for promotion because of their gender, sexually harassed or otherwise discriminated against are unlikely to have had the energy, luck or opportunity to overcome it and ascend the career ladder.

Secondly, the very fact that the interviews were to be published and circulated throughout educational circles inevitably inhibited the interviewees. Although most were frank and open, the awareness that colleagues and present and future employers would probably read the report undoubtedly had a moderating influence and prevents me from including some of the more personal anecdotal evidence of discrimination and/or prejudice.

Thirdly, as Mary Earl points out, it might have been interesting and
informative to have included the views of men in the education system. Those who believe that discrimination exists would maintain that men are most frequently the discriminators. If this is so, it would make sense to ask the victims whether it occurs, and ask the perpetrators why.

To combat some of these drawbacks in the brief for this section I interviewed two women with the understanding that any quotes I used would not be attributed to them and that no information would be published which would make it possible to identify them. Both are in senior positions in further and higher education management. The results of these interviews make up the final part of this section.

MARY EARL
ASSISTANT RECTOR, LIVERPOOL POLYTECHNIC

Having risen from a start as an assistant mistress at a girls's school to becoming an HoD in science at a college, Mary Earl joined the City of Liverpool College of Higher Education in 1975. It was amalgamated with Liverpool Polytechnic in 1983, and she is now the Assistant Rector with specific responsibility for student services.

Mary Earl's career has been guided more by a love of education and of her subject rather than a single-minded determination to get to the top. 'I suppose my career has been a mixture of circumstances and hard work. I haven't run away from things — if there has been an opportunity or a challenge, then I have taken it. But often I was just there at the right time, I haven't necessarily asked to be where I am. Yes, I applied for the job of Assistant Principal at what was then City of Liverpool College of Higher Education and that was a conscious decision, but I didn't apply for the position of Assistant Rector at the polytechnic. When the two merged they had to give me a job, and there was no comparable job at the level of Assistant Principal except this, so here I am.'

Miss Earl first decided she wanted to teach around the age of 16, but has not moulded her life to accommodate a certain career structure. She is not married and has no children, but 'that's just the way things have turned out'. She regrets having moved so far away from teaching 'so much so that every now and then I take steps to get myself back into the company of children.'
But what attracted her so strongly to teaching in the first place?

'It was my own enthusiasm for science as a subject, and a desire to share that enthusiasm. I like to see the excitement of children as they discover and learn things. Also, I was conscious that too often in secondary schools girls are put off science because somebody says, 'Oh the boys are good at that but you're not, you can't do that'; which makes me very cross. People do tend to stereotype girls and say they can't do maths, for example, whereas the reality is that they just need encouragement and can do maths as well as any boy. (Luckily) I was privileged to go to an all-girls school where there was equal pressure and encouragement to do well in all subjects; as many of us took science as English or history.'

Having obtained a BSc in botany and zoology and a PGCE (Dip. Ed. at that time), Mary taught science in a girls' grammar school for three years. She then moved to a teacher training college where she stayed for 16 years, moving up the lecturer grades to become an HoD. 'I made the move to a teacher training college because I was not entirely happy about the pressure of examinations in schools, which I felt were distorting education. Also, I very much wanted to work in a more flexible environment.'

'Teacher training for primary-school teachers gave me that measure of freedom — you could interpret the curriculum in the light of whatever was happening at that moment, so if it was snowing you could go outside and play with the snow whereas in a secondary school you had to complete the current piece of work because it was going to be marked in an examination and could not be delayed. I think also that I felt I could do something to help people with no scientific training to think scientifically; I do feel strongly about the need for scientific thought. I believed I could do more good for science and for women in science if I were working through teacher training and in junior schools, than working in a secondary school.'

Mary taught considerably more women than men to become primary school teachers — how does she account for the lack of men wanting to go into such teaching? 'I'm generalising without evidence, but I would say that the men felt there was a limited career structure in primary schools, and saw more scope in secondary schools. However at that time whilst there was no alternative to work for men, many of the girls didn't have a job or career as their main objective: there were quite a number who just wanted to find a nice young man to become their husband. Although I thought they were wrong, their attitude didn't irritate me, it just happened to be their way of thinking.'
Does she mind the fact that there are relatively few women in academic or managerial positions at the polytechnic? ‘A couple of years ago I would be the only woman at a meeting, but it never bothered me. It was a fact, and I just had to make sure my views got aired as much as anyone else’s. But I frequently get irritated by men who hog the debate and pontificate on no evidence at all. I am quite certain that if the proportions were different and we had more women on some of these committees the work would get done a lot faster.’

‘Possibly there are more men who are power-seekers and attach a lot of value to status, but I have been conscious of just as many women striking up relationships purely for what they can get out of it. It’s not peculiar to one sex. By and large though, the women who have risen to the top in this institution have been extremely competent, and there is not really the same level of competence among male HoDs. I suppose, in some cases, the men have never had to prove themselves. As a woman, you are sometimes looked at askance and there is still a sort of subconscious sense that accordingly you have to prove yourself.’

Miss Earl says she has not noticed any difference in the way male or female colleagues and subordinates treat her. ‘On the whole I’m not the sort of person who generates resentment. I try not to exercise an authoritarian approach. I prefer to work alongside people, to stimulate and share. The only resentment there may have been is from people who resented the fact that I had the authority they hadn’t, which has got nothing to do with me being a woman.’

Because she is always careful to think scientifically and rationally and hence reluctant to generalise, I wondered what Mary thought of using personal interviews with successful women in order to discover and analyse prejudice and discrimination? ‘There is no reason why one should not start out with a thesis in order to knock it down. It’s only flawed if one’s evidence is too supportive or too strongly against it. As a scientist, I always start with a hypothesis, and then all my work is designed to test it. But I would add that the women concerned are not really the key to this problem, and the way through is not up to them. If you want to find out why there are so few women here, then perhaps it is the men you should really be talking to.’
BERYL PRATLEY
PRINCIPAL, ABINGDON COLLEGE OF FURTHER EDUCATION

Beryl Pratley started her career in education at Acton Technical College in 1966 as an assistant lecturer grade A (below LI scale). She moved to Garnett College where she later became a senior lecturer, and moved as an SL to South Thames College. She worked as a development officer for the Further Education Unit for two years before becoming vice principal of Abingdon College of Further Education. She is now the principal.

After graduating in English from London University Beryl Pratley went to work for the West Midlands Gas Board on a graduate recruitment programme. After about 18 months it became apparent that the board had no idea what to do with its graduates, and she moved into teaching at Acton Tech. While teaching English and liberal studies through to LII level she had her first major experience of gender discrimination.

`A fortnight before the birth of my first child I was called in from maternity leave for an interview for an LII position. The principal was very much on my side but I had an appalling interview where they kept asking me about my childcare arrangements. I had more or less got someone signed up, but it wasn’t finalised, as I still had four months before I went back to work (it was immediately preceding the summer vacation). I did not get the promotion and was very upset. The principal said to me afterwards that if I’d stuck the name and address of a child-minder on the table I would have had the job. Clearly they had never before interviewed anyone who had done anything as bizarre as having a baby and going straight back to work. At the time I was one of only three women on the college staff. (Things have changed so much in recent years that they now have a woman principal.) Luckily, soon after I went back to work, another LII position arose and the principal made sure I got it that time!’

At around the same period in her career, Beryl experienced the now almost legendary interview question regarding family planning arrangements.

‘They actually asked me whether I was on the pill. I’m afraid I just told them, I suppose I was fairly naive, but it was before the time when women began swapping such stories and sharing their indignation. The majority of one’s colleagues accepted the line that young women were not worth employing or training because they were liable to go off and have babies at
any time. If you were asked a question like that nowadays you’d be justified in giving one of the standard sharp replies, secure in the knowledge that most people would defend you.’

What had originally led Beryl in the direction of a career as opposed to a job or even no paid employment?

‘For a long time, particularly at college, I felt very strongly that I should pay back the good publicly funded education I had had. The other motivation was that I was an only child and, hence, when I left home my mother, who was a very traditional mum, was really quite distressed. She really had to start putting other things in her life. That persuaded me that I wanted to have a life outside of my family. I also think that going through a girls’ grammar school encouraged you to think in terms of a career rather than a nice little job before you find a husband.’

What made her choose a career in education?

‘I suppose that once I actually dived into the educational scene I saw that there were interesting things to get involved in on a long-term basis. I subsequently did a further education teacher’s certificate, a diploma in education and later on a master’s. I’ve hopped about between practical work in teaching institutions and more reflective theoretical work such as at the FEU. My motivation for changing around has never been some driving ambition but more a desire to try something new and different. In my career to date I’ve done some very interesting things and learnt a hell of a lot, so it’s really been a great educational experience for me! I would say, though, that those people who are my age and have been in education for some time have lived through a period of buoyancy and expansion, but the next few years are probably going to be quite dispiriting. Falling rolls in the 16-19 band, constantly changing Government policies, the role of the MSC — all these things indicate that further education is entering a new phase. But we must regard it as a new sort of challenge and get stuck in.’

Beryl is clearly very much at home in her present college. The students like her informal style but her informality in no way diminishes the respect in which she is held. She deliberately chose a smaller college.

‘Sometimes I miss teaching and I try to compensate for that by having as much contact with the students in various ways as I can. I made a positive decision that I didn’t want to work in the management of a very big college
such as the Inner London ones I knew, because they can be such impersonal and potentially alienating places. Here, I get to know some of the students, and not only when they’re frog-marched in for being in trouble! I don’t feel that I’m particularly hung up on status (although that’s easy to say when you have it). I don’t think, though, that my desire for informality is necessarily anything to do with being a woman. I know some terribly pompous women who are always on their dignity and very status-conscious, and some very friendly informal men, so I think it’s very dangerous to generalise’.

So is there no significance in the fact of her being a woman principal? Any significance, she believes:

‘lies in other people’s perceptions of me and not my own perception, so in a sense it’s their problem. To give a recent example of this, I’ve been very concerned about the reaction times of HoDs when we have all agreed to do certain things — the system doesn’t always click into action nearly fast enough. I had reason to express my disapproval of a member of staff’s reaction time quite publicly, and the remark that was subsequently passed on was that I ‘had told him off like a naughty little boy’. Had I been a man I don’t think that expression would have been used. I would just have been being firm, whereas as a woman I was seen as being bossy. There are some people who don’t like having a woman boss because of their own hang-ups, and I might even include some women in that. They think that it’s just not the way things should be for a woman to be at the top — rather like my mum.’

How does Beryl deal with this attitude?

‘You just have to work around it, do the job as well as you can, and hope they’ll gradually accept you for who you are.’

Beryl believes, however, that it is not generally those who work under a woman in management who have difficulty in accepting her, but rather those who have for the first time to include a woman into their ranks.

‘If I let myself, the group among whom I could feel most intimidated is fellow principals. Some men who have reached that level and been there some time, operating exclusively in a male circle, genuinely find it difficult to accept a women among them. There is sometimes a sense of resentment at women coming in and breaking up the gentlemen’s club atmosphere. For example, in this town there has been a long tradition of the college head
dining out with the secondary and public school heads. So, of course, when I came along they had a real problem — should they invite this woman to the men’s dining club? They eventually decided that as they had occasionally invited their wives and managed not to talk about cricket all evening, they would now have dinner parties where all wives would be invited and I could come with my husband. I suppose it was a tribute in itself that they didn’t decide to exclude me. I’ve felt the same hesitancy among some of my fellow principals at times, too. (N.B. We’ve been working hard to change this — I can say that!)

Beryl speaks of these things with ironic detachment rather than indignant anger. She is not piqued at the difficulties of joining in the boys’ games; she just wishes things would change a little faster.

‘I don’t think you get anywhere by becoming neurotic and angry about things that run counter to the way you think. The way to tackle it is to get in there and do things the way you think they should be done. You can show that it works even if it’s a different style from the one the men have been used to. If it produces results then you’ve proved your point and they’ll accept it — and you. As a married mother and career woman you use up too much energy just doing your job and staying fit, to get angry about that sort of thing.’

LENA STOCKFORD
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL,
SOU’1 MANCHESTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE

At the time of this interview Lena Stockford was still Head of the Department of Science, Mathematics and Medical Studies at Central Manchester College, and was interviewed as such. She came to the college in 1971 while it was still Openshaw Technical College, as a Lecturer Grade 1, having been brought in specifically to co-ordinate biology teaching in the college and act as a ‘women’s tutor’.

Despite the fact that Lena Stockford’s mother was the head of a school physics department and her father a senior lecturer in chemical engineering at Bradford University, she did not decide upon a career in education until her final year of an Applied Biology degree at Bradford. ‘I always knew that I wanted to have a career, but for a long time I thought that the last thing I’d ever want to do was teach! In my last year at university we were asked to
do a number of projects and presentations, and I found that I really enjoyed the work that went into preparing the papers. People seemed to understand the information I was conveying, so I began to think that teaching might be quite fun after all.’

Lena did the probationary year’s teaching — at that time an alternative to teacher training — at a school in Bolton. She left to have a baby after a year in post — not long enough to qualify for maternity leave. Almost immediately after having had the baby she began writing to local colleges, enquiring about part time teaching: ‘I wanted to keep in touch with the field, and also ensure that I didn’t lose my career altogether’. She was in fact approached to apply for a full time post at Openshaw Tech, which she took up two months after the baby’s birth — although on a part time basis for the first few months.

Openshaw Technical College at that time had 6,000 students - around 24 of whom were female. Lena was the only woman on a staff of 130. She rapidly set about building up the biology courses on offer, and attracting more women to the college. ‘The publicity for biology as a subject was virtually non-existent. At that time we began to have large numbers of overseas students coming to the college, many of whom wanted to go into medicine or dentistry. We made it known that we offered biology as well as the traditional combination of chemistry, physics and maths, and, interestingly, we acquired 100 girls in those groups in a short period.’

Mrs Stockford soon became an ‘L1+’ (a grade now defunct) with specific responsibility for developing biology at Openshaw. After establishing a pre-medical course she moved on to nursing courses, and these have since become some of the most successful courses offered by the college. She continued working on such new initiatives throughout the lecturer II level, seeing pre-medical studies expand considerably. Because of this work, she was in a strong position to apply for the headship of the department when the then HoD retired, despite still being only a lecturer II. Openshaw was in the process of amalgamating with St Johns College and the College of Building to form Central Manchester College, which resulted in confusion and uncertainty as to what the new management structure should be. Lena became the acting head for an initial six-month period, later extended to a year, while the new college stabilised itself. There had never before been a woman head of department and all the other members of the management team were men. How did they respond to Lena’s sudden promotion?
'I think there were some anxieties, largely deriving from the fact that from LII to head of department was such a large step, and also because they were unsure as to how a woman would perform in the role — there were no previous examples to go on. I was a married woman with young children, so obviously they wondered whether I would be able to cope. These doubts were never raised directly. On the whole they were very supportive and concerned. That was nice, although their concern occasionally made me question whether or not I really was competent!'

Does Mrs Stockford feel that their attitude would have been different if she had not had a young family?

'No, I don’t really believe that was the main factor. It was more that this is a traditional engineering college and no woman had ever been elected to such a position before. They didn’t know what to expect, and in some ways I didn’t conform to their theory of what a head of department should be. Either they expected me to behave as one of the lads and play the same political games, or to be a delicate flower — very caring and conscientious but not really with the cutting edge to compete with them. I was somewhere between the two stereotypes, just trying to be myself. I couldn’t have sustained an act for long, and my techniques are genuinely different from typical male ones. I think my very vulnerability actually helped. People wanted me to succeed and appreciated both my strengths and weaknesses.’

Lena initially found the traditions and conventions of an all-male management off-putting. 'They had all the jargon and the game approaches which I didn’t have. At the beginning I sometimes felt that because I hadn’t yet leaned the rules of the game I wouldn’t be able to live up to my department’s expectations, who were of course depending on me. But it’s surprising how quickly you adapt.’

Did she ever feel that she had to prove herself more because she was a woman? ‘No. I didn’t feel I had to, but I wanted to. I felt an obligation to my staff to make them feel secure after all the structural changes to the college. One of the major problems in a college this size is a lack of effective communication, and I tried extremely hard to let everyone know exactly where they stood and what was happening. There were innumerable memos flying around which perhaps not everyone read, but at least they had the opportunity to be informed of developments and aims and why they were working to certain deadlines. I felt that was important because I myself would have liked that as an LII. I suppose that partly I
wanted to prove that as a woman I could do the job so that other women would not have the qualms that I initially had.'

How does Lena want to be seen by her male colleagues? ‘I want them to remember that I’m a woman. If they forget it that could close the doors to other women wanting to do the same thing. I don’t want my colleagues to think that I’ve done what I’ve done because I’m unique and not typical of most women. Relationships with subordinates have sometimes been a little tricky, because many of the men have come straight from industry and worked their way up and never encountered a woman in a management position. None of them has ever tried to undermine me in any way, but perhaps they occasionally let their emotions get in the way of their judgement. On the whole my working relationships are all extremely good and are one of the sources of satisfaction with the job. I don’t like scoring points and playing games; I can’t divorce the strategies from the people. What I do enjoy is seeing people working away enthusiastically at a project, even if it’s not a great success, and consequently the students getting something out of it.’

Given the success of her career to date, does Lena feel there are any avenues in her chosen profession not open to her? ‘No it’s all a question of getting out there and doing it and forgetting or ignoring any negative feedback. A lot of the barriers women expect are more mythology than fact. If you really want to do it you should just go ahead and not let yourself be influenced by this mythology, whether or not there are role models for you to follow. I’ve never yet come up against a brick wall which isn’t climbable.’

SUE SANDLE
VICE PRINCIPAL, KINGSWAY-PRINCETON COLLEGE

Sue Sandle rose to her present position by a route unpioneered by any female predecessor. Her subject area is housing management and her knowledge of it was acquired not through books but through practical experience. She is not teacher-trained, and has been in work constantly since the age of 16.

Sue left school at 16 with six ‘O’ levels. She later gained ‘A’ levels at evening classes, a professional qualification from the Institute of Housing on a correspondence course and day release, a Masters degree on secondment from ILEA, and a TEC Higher Certificate in Building on
day/evening release. She trained as a housing manager for two and a half years and then got a job with Westminster City Council as a housing assistant. Two years later she became senior housing assistant and, after a further three years, senior management officer.

It was at this point that, as a one-parent family, Mrs Sand le decided that the hours and holidays of teaching would suit her better than local government. It was a practical decision, not the realisation of some great vocational calling. So is housing really her first love career-wise, with teaching an expedient substitute? ‘No, not really. It’s changed over the years, although it’s been a long process. My first year in teaching was absolute hell. I came in at Lecturer Grade II level, never having done any teaching before. Suddenly I was given a timetable of 18 hours teaching and the responsibility for developing the housing courses. There were no other housing lecturers, so I was learning to teach and keeping a few hours ahead of the students at the same time. The second year was better. Once you start to repeat you can review the work you’ve done and improve on it, and you start to feel more confident. There was tremendous development work to be done and I was keen to do it, so as I became more confident of my teaching I could spend more time on administration and development work. When I started at Hackney College there were 30 students on these courses — when I left there were 350.’

Throughout her career Sue has been acutely aware of the particular problems of women employed in non-traditional areas of work, but has never herself been a victim of prejudice or discrimination. ‘I’m very much aware of the different ways in which women are disadvantaged in the job market and in senior management positions, but although I’ve observed it I’ve never experienced it. I know there are women who don’t see it and therefore think it doesn’t happen, but I have looked for it and really can’t see it in my own experience. I have no qualms at all about working in a traditionally male area, and I expect everyone to treat me as an equal.

‘When I was Head of the Technician Studies Department (a construction department) at Vauxhall College, I attended the annual course for all HoDs in construction. I was the only woman with about 100 men, but it never bothered me, and they soon got used to having me around. The first time I attended there were some strange looks and I was questioned as to whether I’d come to the right meeting, but I just laughed about it. On the same occasion I went into the bar where three HoDs were sitting down who obviously thought I needed to be looked after and invited me to join them.
The first question was, was I head of a General Studies Department. I said no, I was Head of a Construction Department at Vauxhall College. And then I could see what was going through their heads, they immediately thought it was some tiny little department so they asked me what grade the department was and so on. I asked them about their departments and discovered that they had a grade 2 and a grade 3, whereas I had grade 5. I then explored with them the range of work they did and found that they had a very narrow range of work in comparison with mine which changed the relationship immediately into one of more respect. You must be confident about your work and knowledge about new developments in your field, because then people will talk to you and be interested and forget what sex you are.'

Does Sue think that being a women means that she appreciates the psychology of work relationships more than a man might? 'It's really very difficult to say. I am a good listener, and always wait and consider the other person's point of view before formulating a judgement. But it's too easy to say that women are more caring and therefore have a different style of management. Anyway, I might perceive myself as caring while my staff might not agree. Having said that, at Vauxhall two members of staff on different occasions commented that I was the first HoD they'd every had who actually asked them what they wanted and was interested in their personal development. Perhaps that's more a reflection on my male predecessors who had not adopted that sort of approach.'

Sue has promoted many women-only courses in construction. Why does she feel there is a need for such courses? 'It wasn't so much that the girls weren't performing well in mixed classes as much as that the women-only classes were designed to appeal to a different group of women to get them into the construction industry. I very much wanted to get mature women to consider technician work as a career that was open to them. Of course, it was a whole new ball game — we had to change all the publicity for the courses, change the curriculum and teaching strategies, get the resources to do it, appoint a women's team within the department, get together with a network of women's organisations who could provide help and advice.'

Was there any opposition from within the college? 'Oh, yes. Firstly, there was the feeling that resources were going to be taken away from traditional courses, which meant that I had to go around reassuring people that the funding was additional and not being taken out of their budgets. Secondly, there were worries about what was going to be taught on the women-only
courses, but quickly organising staff development gave the men a lot more confidence about how to teach on these courses. Now, four years later, they are the most popular courses and people are really keen to be timetabled on them because it's more stimulating than on the ordinary provision. Also, you mustn't forget the background of the ILEA's equal opportunities policy, which rather prevents opposition to such developments being vocalised. Because it's the authority's policy, those who don't agree will tend to keep it to themselves.'

Sue Sandle was seconded as an ILEA advisory lecturer for construction and was responsible for introducing the use of computers into construction courses. The work she did while on two-year secondment also included a survey which persuaded ILEA to finance a 'Women in Construction' programme, which resulted in a video package for schools, aimed at the 13+ age group, encouraging girls to consider construction as a career. Sue felt that recruitment material emanating from bodies such as the Construction Industry Training Board (CITB) portrayed an all-male, very unprogressive image of the industry which would be detrimental to female aspirations. As a result the ILEA sponsored the production of careers information sheets and posters to aid the recruitment of women and girls on construction courses. Sue co-ordinated the production of this material.

Mrs Sandle favours positive discrimination, to counter both racial and sexual discrimination. 'That doesn't imply that one would appoint a woman or a black person not able to do the job. But it is essential that we monitor what we are doing and take positive steps to correct the imbalances and prejudices which that monitoring process reveals. There are often attributes and experiences reflected in a job application which are ignored, because the employer has a fixed idea of what he/she is looking for. If, the job description for the HoD at Vauxhall had been narrowly defined in terms of industrial experience. I would not have been able to apply and be shortlisted.'

Despite her decidedly determined and modern outlook, Sue would not necessarily call herself a feminist. 'I hate being labelled. I belong to women only groups and believe in a woman's right to be treated equally, to decide on abortion, and equal rights for lesbian and gay people. I am outspoken on these issues, and maybe I do fit the label, but I wouldn't choose to label myself.'
GILLIAN HOWISON
VICE PRINCIPAL, CROYDON COLLEGE

At the time of this interview Gillian Howison was one of three assistant principals at Croydon College, with particular responsibility for personnel and student affairs. She has since been promoted to vice principal (operations). She is one of two VPs at the college.

Gill Howison went straight from school into a management traineeship at Cadbury Schweppes. There she met several women who were important both in the power and roles they held and in terms of their influence on her own career development. They persuaded her that to get anywhere in industry she would need a degree, so she left to read sociology and psychology at Bath University.

She then did a teaching certificate 'because it seemed a sensible thing to do'. She taught in a comprehensive school. 'After that I decided that I never, ever wanted to work in education so I became a personnel officer at ICI, and would probably be in personnel now were it not for the fact that I got married in 1975 and moved to Gloucestershire. I couldn’t find a personnel job there, so I decided I might as well use my teaching certificate. I got a job in a comprehensive school, teaching absolutely everything and anything to kids who didn’t want to be in school but had to be because the school leaving age had been raised. After two years I realised I wasn’t being stretched at all, so I moved into FE as an LI at Mid-Gloucestershire College of FE.'

Since then Mrs Howison has rapidly trodden an unusual career path, moving unhesitatingly through the grades. By the age of 32 she was running a Management and Business Studies Department with around 70 members of staff. Now, at the age of 36, she has already been an assistant principal at Croydon for three years. Clearly an ambitious woman, she appears to plan her career quite strategically and has made a conscious decision not to have children. She works many evenings and parts of the weekend, but enthusiastically keeps up many extra-curricular interests such as amateur dramatics ('I think many people in FE are failed actresses or actors and I’m one of them'), spinning, aerobics and skiing.

Mrs Howison feels for many reasons that she has to excel in her job, and works rigorously to her own high standards. 'I act as a role model for other women in the college, which doesn’t mean I have to be exemplary, but as
the only woman in a senior management position I must show that women are competent’, she says.

Why does she think there are so few women in FE management? ‘It’s at the HoD level that the number of women dramatically diminishes, despite the fact there are so many good women SLs around. I think there is an element of institutional sexism within any organisation, but also it’s a lot to do with the way women perceive management. It is extremely tiring and sometimes very tedious, and there are days when I wonder why I didn’t stay as an SL where I was actually directing a course and getting a lot of satisfaction from it. Of course it’s all been easier for me because I’ve never had a career break, which is a problem for a lot of women.’

Gill has run positive action programmes for women since 1981, and after coming to London was also involved in running courses for the GLC. She strongly believes that more work must be done on whether equal opportunities policies are actually being implemented, rather than merely being paid lip service. ‘There are many problems with a quota system, as they’ve discovered in the US. Often economic arguments cut the most ice with employers - they want the best people, therefore they must cast their net as wide as possible and look at women and the ethnic minorities. That’s usually more persuasive than forcing them to take on certain numbers.’

Gill would call herself a feminist, unlike many women in FE management who nevertheless share her views and general outlook. ‘Clearly I am not a separatist feminist. Some women are reluctant to take on the label ‘feminist’ because of their perceptions about what it actually constitutes. I am very upfront about it. I believe that women are an extremely important resource. We are, after all, the majority in society — not a minority. However, I’m not a suffragette, I don’t believe we are in a world where we ought to be Amazons. I am not prepared to sacrifice the beneficial qualities of being a woman, because women do have different styles and approaches from men. But, equally, some women might say that as a manager I can not be a feminist, which I refute. Anyone who came through the ’60s, as I did, would find it hard to say they weren’t feminist, but sadly the popular image of feminism puts some people off.’

How does she think male and female management styles differ? ‘It’s a generalisation, but I think women tend to be more participative, more encouraging and much more capable of coping with differences than men. Women are more sensitive to atmospheres, which I know is something of
a cliche. What we ought to be doing is looking at developing a range of styles and using them in appropriate situations, which is what I try to do. Differences in style are partly to do with the socialisation process, but it's always hard to say what's genetic and what's environmental. The most important thing is that these differences should strengthen management teams, which is not to say you need a load of weak women who never make any decisions. But more women must be trained in management fields — it's vital if we are to have a healthier and better service: my commitment is to training and educating people in FE, and we can improve that by letting more women into FE management.'

**QUOTES FROM ANONYMOUS INTERVIEWEES**

'As a women heading a department it has been strange and isolating not to have any role models. You find yourself noticing how the men behave and sort of trying to be like them because you think that's the accepted way to behave, but then realising that it's not congenial to you as a women. Since the growth in feminism I have found tremendous support from women's groups, although before I hadn't even realised that I needed such support. I belong to a group of women in all levels in polytechnics and universities, not just HoDs, and it was a revelation to me to see how similar our experiences are and to discuss strategies for dealing with being a women in a man's world.'

'I've never experienced physical sexual harassment, but psychological harassment, yes, in terms of men being patronising and trying to put you down. It's getting less now, probably because people are more conscious of feminism, but when I was first appointed I was expected to be 'one of the boys' and laugh at all the usual jokes about women. You always get a severe reaction when they think the nice pleasant docile little women has suddenly become 'threatening' by gaining power.'

'No matter how much men support the notion of women in senior positions, at some emotional level it still makes them uneasy to have to work closely in a professional capacity with women or under them.'

'Hopefully this report will increase awareness of the need for more management training courses for women and more courses to help women develop their career potential. The Further Education Staff College should seriously take up the development of women staff in higher education. I was
asked to act as a tutor on an adult education course at Coombe Lodge and did detect a rather chauvinistic bias there; in fact, I wrote to them suggesting that they should pay much more attention to developing the contribution women can and should make to higher education.'

'No matter how supportive her family is, a women still has a sense of responsibility for organising and running the home. I pay the money for the house-cleaning but still feel responsible for over-seeing that work, making sure the house is kept up to scratch and looking after the emotional relationships within the family. My husband is supportive and helpful, out nevertheless we can’t escape from our social conditioning.'

'I haven’t had any problem from the men in my department, although I do notice sometimes when I go outside the college where I’m not known, the usual experience of saying something in a committee meeting and nobody taking a blind bit of notice. Then a man makes the same remark and the chair acknowledges that this is a major contribution to the discussion. I have now learnt to say, well, I’m glad that Mr so and so has picked up on the point I made half an hour ago . . .'

'I was encouraged to apply for a job in X, as an English adviser, by the previous holder who’d been promoted to HMI. I went to the interview and they were clearly more interested in me than in the five male applicants, but half way through, the Chief Education Officer said, ‘I notice that you have two rather young children. In view of your domestic responsibilities do you think you can hold down such a responsible job as this?’ I tried to keep my cool and point out what I had been doing as an HoD, but after debating for an hour, they didn’t appoint me.'

'The whole ethos in the North is different; there is definitely more male chauvinism. It’s evident in the use of language for a start: I resent going into the principal’s office and having him say ‘Hello, lovey’ in a particular tone of voice. I know he’s fond of me and I’m virtually the same age as his daughters, but there comes a point when you have to ask whether they’d say that to a man. The usual response, when you object, is embarrassment and, ‘Well, we call everybody lovey in the North.’ So you say, well, there are ways and ways of saying it and there are certain situations in which it is simply not appropriate. It will take a long time to change some of the people; it’s a slow battle. Getting the job in hand done is more important, so to an extent principles have to be compromised to maintain credibility and get on with the work.'
‘It’s often terribly difficult to be taken seriously, to be viewed just as a worker or professional rather than as a woman. When I hold a certain line in a meeting it’s put down to being something to do with being a woman and not just simply being firm.’

‘I am interested in joining the HMI or possibly becoming a vice principal, but my thoughts on the future are not determined by pure ambition and desire for status. It’s to do with the job, the challenges it would pose and the interesting issues I could get to grips with. I don’t desperately want to become a principal for the sake of it, although for political reasons I wouldn’t mind being Secretary of State for Education and Science!’

‘I don’t think that you can say that sexism is just the fault of certain bigoted individuals. It is inherent in the economic and social structure of our society and therefore in all its institutions and structures. But which do you change first, the society or the individuals within it?’

And to conclude, a quote from Jean Denton, former business woman of the year, which I saw pinned on the noticeboard of one of the interviewees: ‘I hate the power games men play. I have always thought it wrong to ask women to change themselves. That way they become one of the boys and bring nothing new to their job.’
This paper is divided into three sections. The first deals with legislation on equal opportunities, the second with the Equal Opportunities Commission Code of Practice. Both are based on EOC publications. The third section deals with codes voluntarily adopted or propagated by other organisations, and reproduces in full a model 'check list' on equal opportunities produced by an LEA for its constituent FHE institutions. This has been chosen both because it provides a useful illustration of the provision of the first two sections in action, and because it is a laudable attempt to provide a co-ordinated, LEA-wide system of equal opportunities and practice.

LEGISLATION

Equal opportunities legislation is embodied in two Acts. The Equal Pay Act 1970 (as amended 1983) entitles employees to equal pay and other contractual terms and conditions with an employee of the opposite sex under certain conditions. This Act should not have a bearing on the employment of women in FHE. The Sex Discrimination Act 1975 (as amended 1986) makes sex discrimination unlawful in three areas: education; the provision of goods, facilities and services to members of the public; and employment and training, which is of importance in FHE.

The 1985 Act covers five forms of discrimination. Direct sex discrimination occurs when one person is treated less favourably, on the
grounds of gender, than a person of the opposite gender is or would be treated in similar circumstances. Indirect sex discrimination occurs when a requirement or condition for a job is applied, which cannot be justified other than on grounds of gender, which has the practical effect of disadvantaging a considerably higher proportion of one gender than the other (e.g. non-essential qualifications which few women possess). The third and fourth forms of sex discrimination concern married status, and only affect employment matters. Direct marriage discrimination occurs when a person is treated less favourably because of his/her being married than a single person of the same sex is or would be. Indirect marriage discrimination works in the same way as indirect sex discrimination, for example, requiring a commitment from an applicant to work unsocial hours when this would not be necessary to do the job. The final form of discrimination is victimisation because the employee has done, intends to do, is suspected of doing, or intending to do, any of the following:

- bring proceedings under either of the Acts above;
- help another person to do so by giving evidence or information;
- do anything else under the Acts (e.g. give evidence to the EOC, at a tribunal etc.);
- allege that the employer or another party has contravened one of the Acts.

It is unlawful under the 1975 Act to discriminate in any of the aforementioned ways against employees and applicants in the following areas:

- arrangements for deciding who is offered a job, e.g. advertising or interviews;
- the terms on which the job is offered;
- deciding who is offered the job;
- the provision of opportunities for promotion, transfer and training;
- benefits, services and facilities offered to an employee by an employer;
— retirement ages and age limits for promotion, training and transfer;
— dismissal or other unfavourable treatment of employees.

There are exceptions to these rules where the Act does not apply. Most do not apply to FHE although some might, in exceptional circumstances, be applicable. For example, the ‘Genuine Occupational Qualification’, which applies to the filling of a job (by recruitment, promotion or transfer) and training, applies where an employee provides people with personal services promoting their welfare or education — which can be most effectively provided by a person of the same sex. Other exceptions cover pregnancy, childbirth, retirement or death, whereby it is not unlawful to give special treatment to women in the form of maternity leave and similar benefits. The Act also allows for positive action by employers in training. For example, if during the previous year a particular type of work has been done entirely or mainly by persons of one gender, employers may compensate by lawfully providing single-sex training for that work. Employers may also encourage members of that gender only to take up that work by advertisements which encourage applications from women, for example. However, when the actual recruitment for such posts takes place, there must be no discrimination.

Anyone who feels that they may have been discriminated against can take a number of courses of action, including bringing the case to an industrial tribunal.

— An employer may be asked to complete a questionnaire under what is known as ‘The Sex Discrimination Act Questions Procedure’ (form SD74). Through this the complainant can ask the reasons for the actions held to be discriminatory. Alternatively the same request can be made by letter. The employer’s reply to either of these can be used as evidence in a tribunal; no reply, or an evasive or ambiguous one, may be used by a tribunal to draw any just and reasonable inference, including the fact that discrimination did in fact occur.

— A conciliation officer from ACAS (the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service) may be called in by either party if the initial investigation does not settle the matter.
The complainant can take the matter to an industrial tribunal, with or without conciliation first being tried.

The tribunal will send a copy of the complaint to an officer of ACAS who must try to settle the matter, if requested to do so by either party. The employer will be sent a copy of the complaint. Copies of the response will be sent to both the complainant and the conciliation officer.

If the dispute remains unresolved at this stage, the case will be heard by the tribunal, which is an independent judicial body consisting of a chairperson, who is legally qualified, and two others, with experience as an employer and an employee respectively. Any complaint under the 1975 Act must be presented to a tribunal within three months of the action, or the end of the actions, in question. The burden of proof rests with the applicant who must provide prima facie evidence of discrimination.

An appeal may be made to the Employment Appeal Tribunal if one party thinks that the law was misinterpreted. Appeals must be lodged with 42 days of the date on which the decision of the tribunal was registered. Employment Appeal Tribunals consist of a high court judge and, normally, two appointed lay members. Their decisions are legally binding and create case law.

A further appeal may be made to the Court of Appeal (or the Court of Session in Scotland) and finally to the House of Lords.

The 1975 Act also established the Equal Opportunities Commission which has the power to conduct formal investigations for any purpose connected with any of its duties under either Act. The commission must also conduct formal investigations if required to do so by the Secretary of State. If such an investigation convinces the EOC that acts of unlawful discrimination have been committed, it can issue a ‘Non-discrimination Notice’, requiring the employer not to commit further unlawful acts. The employer will be required to inform the EOC, employees and other parties concerned, of changes in practices or procedure, where applicable, and other evidence of compliance with the notice. Employers have the right to appeal against the requirements of EOC notices. The EOC may seek an injunction against an employer who seems likely to persist in committing further unlawful acts after receipt of a notice.
THE EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES COMMISSION
CODE OF PRACTICE

The Sex Discrimination Act 1975, which set up the EOC, also empowered it to issue Codes of Practice. The current Code came into effect on 30 April 1985. Failure on the part of any person to observe any provision of an EOC Code of Practice does not itself render him/her liable to any proceedings, but EOC Codes are admissible as evidence in any proceedings under the Act before an industrial tribunal, and, where any provision of the Code is deemed to be relevant to the case, it will be taken into account in determining the question. As such it is worth quoting the recommendations of the Code in full, except where it is obviously inapplicable to FHF.

PART 1:
THE ROLE OF GOOD EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES IN ELIMINATING SEX AND MARRIAGE DISCRIMINATION.

(a) Recruitment

— Each individual should be assessed according to his or her personal capacity to carry out a given job. It should not be assumed that men only or women only will be able to perform certain kinds of work.

— Any qualifications or requirements applied to a job which effectively inhibit applications from one sex or from married people should be retained only if they are justifiable in terms of the job to be done.

— Any age limits should be retained only if they are necessary for the job. An unjustifiable age limit could constitute unlawful direct discrimination, for example, against women who have taken time out of employment for child rearing.

— Where trades unions uphold such qualifications or requirements as union policy, they should amend that policy in the light of any potentially unlawful effect.
(b) **Genuine Occupational Qualifications (GOQs)**

- A job for which a GOQ was used in the past should be re-examined if the post falls vacant to see whether the GOQ still applies. Circumstances may well have changed, rendering the GOQ inapplicable.

(c) **Sources of Recruitment**

- Job advertising should be carried out in such a way as to encourage applications from suitable candidates of both sexes. This can be achieved both by the wording of advertisements and, for example, by placing advertisements in publications likely to reach both sexes. All advertising material and accompanying literature relating to employment or training issues should be reviewed to ensure that it avoids presenting men and women in stereotyped roles. Such stereotyping tends to perpetuate sex segregation in jobs and can also lead people of the opposite sex to believe that they would be unsuccessful in applying for particular jobs.

- Where vacancies are filled by promotion or transfer, they should be published to all eligible employees in such a way that they do not restrict applications from either sex.

- Recruitment solely or primarily by word of mouth may unnecessarily restrict the choice of applicants available. This method should be avoided in a work force predominantly of one sex, if in practice it prevents members of the opposite sex from applying.

(d) **Selection Methods**

- Employers should ensure that all personnel, staff, line managers and all other employees who may come into contact with job applicants should be trained in the provisions of the SDA, including the fact that it is unlawful to instruct or put pressure on others to discriminate.
Applications from men and women should be processed in exactly the same way. For example, there should not be separate lists of male and female or married and single applicants. All those handling applications and conducting interviews should be trained in the avoidance of unlawful discrimination and records of interviews should be kept, where practicable, showing why applicants were or were not appointed.

Questions should relate to the requirements of the job. Where it is necessary to assess whether personal circumstances will affect performance of the job (for example, where it involves unsocial hours or extensive travel) this should be discussed objectively and without detailed questions based on assumptions about marital status, children and domestic obligations. Questions about marriage plans or family intentions should not be asked, as they could be construed as showing bias against women. Information necessary for personnel records can be collected after a job offer has been made.

(e) Promotion, Transfer and Training

Where an appraisal system is in operation, the assessment criteria should be examined to ensure that they are not unlawfully discriminatory and the scheme should be monitored to assess how it is working in practice.

When a group of workers predominantly of one sex is excluded from an appraisal scheme, access to promotion, transfer, training and other benefits should be reviewed to ensure that there is no unlawful indirect discrimination.

Promotion and career development patterns should be reviewed to ensure that the traditional qualifications are justifiable requirements for the job to be done. In some circumstances, for example, promotion on the basis of length of service could amount to unlawful indirect discrimination, as it may unjustifiably affect more women than men.
When general ability and personal qualities are the main requirements for promotion to a post, care should be taken to consider favourably candidates of both sexes with differing career patterns and general experience.

Rules which restrict or preclude transfer between certain jobs should be questioned and changed if they are found to be unlawfully discriminatory. Employees of one sex may be concentrated in sections from which transfers are traditionally restricted without real justification.

Policies and practices regarding selection for training, day release and personal development should be examined for unlawful direct and indirect discrimination. Where there is found to be an imbalance in training as between sexes, the cause should be identified to ensure that it is not discriminatory.

Age limits for access to training and promotion should be questioned.

(f) Health and Safety Legislation

Company policy should be reviewed and serious consideration given to any significant differences in treatment between men and women; there should be well founded reasons if such differences are maintained or introduced.

(g) Terms of Employment, Benefits, Facilities and Services

All terms of employment, benefits, facilities and services should be reviewed to ensure that there is no unlawful discrimination on grounds of sex or marriage. For example, part time work, domestic leave, company cars and benefits for dependents should be available to both male and female employees in the same or not materially different circumstances.

Where part time workers do not enjoy pro-rata pay or benefits with full time workers, the arrangements should
be reviewed to ensure that they are justified without regard to sex.

(h) **Grievances, Disciplinary Procedures and Victimisation**

- Particular care should be taken to ensure that an employee who has in good faith taken action under the Sex Discrimination Act or the Equal Pay Act does not receive less favourable treatment than other employees, for example, by being disciplined or dismissed.

- Employees should be advised to use the internal procedures, where appropriate, but this is without prejudice to the individual's right to apply to an industrial tribunal within the statutory time limit, i.e. before the end of the period of three months beginning when the act complained of took place. (There is no time limit if the victimisation is continuing.)

- Particular care should be taken to deal effectively with all complaints of discrimination, victimisation or harassment; it should not be assumed that they are made by those who are over-sensitive.

(i) **Dismissals, Redundancies and Other Unfavourable Treatment of Employees**

- Care should be taken that members of one sex are not disciplined or dismissed for performance or behaviour which would be over-looked or condoned in the other sex.

- Redundancy procedures affecting a group of employees predominantly of one sex should be reviewed, so as to remove any effects which could be disproportionate and unjustifiable.

- Conditions of access to voluntary redundancy benefit should be made available on equal terms to male and female employees in the same or not materially different circumstances. (Certain provisions relating to death and retirement are exempt from the Act.)
Where there is down-grading or short-time working (for example, owing to a change in the nature of an employers' business) the arrangements should not unlawfully discriminate on the grounds of sex.

All reasonably practicable steps should be taken to ensure that a standard of conduct or behaviour is observed which prevents members of either sex from being intimidated, harassed or otherwise subjected to unfavourable treatment on the ground of their sex.

PART 2: THE ROLE OF GOOD EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS IN PROMOTING QUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

The second section of the Code describes employment practices which help to promote equality of opportunity, particularly equal opportunity policies. Such policies are not required by law, although 'their value has been recognised by a number of employers who have voluntarily adopted them.' In addition to the adoption of a policy, the EOC recommends the following.

(a) Implementing the Policy

- The policy should be clearly stated and, where appropriate, included in a collective agreement.

- Over-all responsibility for implementing the policy should rest with senior management.

- The policy should be made known to all employees and, where reasonably practicable, to all job applicants.

(b) Monitoring

On monitoring, the EOC suggests setting up a joint management/trade union review committee to conduct monitoring exercises to find out whether members of one gender:

- do not apply for employment or promotion, or that fewer apply than might be expected;
— are not recruited, promoted or selected for training and development or are appointed/selected in a significantly lower proportion than their rate of application;

— are concentrated in certain jobs, sections or departments.

(c) Positive Action

(i) Recruitment, training and promotion.

Employers may wish to consider positive measures such as:

— training their own employees (male or female) for work which is traditionally the preserve of the other sex, for example, training women for skilled manual or technical work;

— positive encouragement to women to apply for management posts — special courses may be needed;

— advertisements which encourage application from the minority sex, but make it clear that selection will be on merit without reference to sex;

— notifying job agencies, as part of a positive action programme, that they wish to encourage members of one sex to apply for vacancies, where few or no members of that sex are doing the work in question. In these circumstances, job agencies should tell both men and women about the posts and, in addition, let the under-represented sex know that applications from them are particularly welcome. Withholding information from one sex in an attempt to encourage applications from the opposite sex could be unlawful.

(ii) Other working arrangements

In order to assist working parents, employers may wish to consider with their employees whether:
— certain jobs can be carried out on a part time or flexi-time basis;

— personal leave arrangements are adequate and available to both sexes. (It should not be assumed that men may not need to undertake domestic responsibilities on occasion, especially at the time of childbirth.)

— childcare facilities are available locally or whether it would be feasible to establish nursery facilities on the premises or combine with other employers to provide them;

— residential training could be facilitated for employees with young children. For example, where this type of training is necessary, by informing staff who are selected well in advance to enable them to make childcare and other personal arrangements: employers with their own residential training centres could also consider whether childcare facilities might be provided;

— the statutory maternity leave provisions could be enhanced, for example, by reducing the qualifying service period, extending the leave period, or giving access to part time arrangements on return.

PART 3: OTHER INITIATIVES

In addition to the EOC Code of Practice, a wide range of other organisations have produced codes of practice on equal opportunities and done work in the field. For example, the Labour Party NEC Local Government Committee launched an initiative in September 1986 to get local authority Labour groups to work for the implementation of comprehensive equal opportunity employment policies (including disability and race as well as gender). The National Association of Teachers in Further or Higher Education produced a model policy statement in May 1987, with provision for implementation, monitoring and review, and positive action, and a model NATFHE/LEA appointments and interview procedure. These also cover discrimination in areas other than gender.
A number of the LEAs replying to our questionnaire returned copies of their equal opportunities policies. Below, in conclusion, we reprint one of these approaches, where it applies to teachers.

CHECKLIST FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES (GENDER)

This draft has been produced in order to focus attention on the steps needed to be taken to ensure that education establishments are providing equal opportunities with respect to issues of gender and sex discrimination. A similar document has been produced for race. Institutions are invited to consider what is being done, or what is planned to be done, in the following areas.

POLICY

1 Is there a policy on the provision of equal opportunities for both sexes? Is this policy embodied in a statement?

2 Is there an established grievance procedure for dealing with sexual harassment of . . . staff, and for providing support and counselling for victims?

3 Does disciplinary policy make reference to sexism and sexist practices?

4 Have steps been taken to ensure that the ethos of the institution reflects open access and support for women and girls' educational opportunities? Do prospectuses and publicity indicate this?

5 If a college, are child-care facilities and appropriate time tabling offered to enable those with young children to attend educational courses?

6 Is there a clear strategy for developing outreach work in relation to women's and girls' education and training?

7 Has a senior member of staff been designated to co-ordinate and develop initiatives relating to the issue of equal opportunities for both sexes?
8 Is there an internal committee on which staff and, where appropriate, students, can discuss gender and anti-sexist issues?

STUDENTS

9 Have steps been taken to ensure that both sexes are treated fairly in terms of selection and recruitment for courses and subject options? Have staff been alerted to possible unconscious prejudice and stereotyping in selection techniques, interviewing and publicity for courses?

10 Are Careers Teachers and Advisers aware of possible sex-stereotyping when giving guidance to students on employment and training?

11 Are the amenities and facilities for students in all buildings and departments equally available for students of both sexes?

STAFF

12 Is there a policy on job-sharing, flexible working time, parental leave, and provision of child care facilities which relates to the needs of staff with young children?

13 Does the information provided for job applicants encourage applications from both sexes?

14 Are positive attempts made to recruit more female teaching staff into non-traditional subject areas, particularly science, technology and craft areas? Similarly, are attempts made to recruit more male teaching staff into subject areas where there is a comparatively low take-up rate from male students?

15 Are short lists for posts drawn up on the basis of clear criteria which exclude sex discrimination?

16 Have steps been taken to ensure representation of both sexes on interview panels?
17 Are interview panels aware of direct and indirect discriminatory practices as laid down by the Sex Discrimination Act?

18 Are steps taken to ensure that both interviewers and interviewees are aware of the authority's policies on equal opportunities and gender?

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

19 Are in-house opportunities available for staff to develop strategies relating to educational strategies which counter sexism?

20 Have needs been identified for LEA provided courses in this area?

21 What steps are taken to ensure that female staff apply for appropriate promotion opportunities?

22 If a college, does the institutional structure reflect indirect discrimination practices relating to the grading of courses which adversely affect the salary and promotion prospects of women staff?

CURRICULUM

23 Have measures been taken to ensure that teaching materials (books, handouts, film, video, etc.) do not contain sexist stereotyping?

24 Have positive action strategies been developed regarding curriculum development which will encourage both sexes to attempt non-traditional subject areas?

25 If a college, are courses for adult women 'returners' provided which:
(i) give advice or information for women returning to work after a career break;

(ii) retain women in non-traditional areas — e.g. information technology, engineering, management?

and are special access courses, linked to institutions of F and HE, being developed in order to open additional opportunities for adult women?

GENDER MONITORING

26 Is it possible to say whether either sex is under-represented in the institution on particular courses or subject options?

27 Are statistics available for the number of female staff, full and part time, who are employed? Are these staff over-represented in the lower teaching grades?

28 Are statistics available on the comparative success rates of students of both sexes, particularly in non-traditional areas?

GOVERNING BODY

29 What steps are taken to inform and involve governors in anti-sexist strategies?

This checklist has been reproduced with the permission of Avon County Council.
RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES

Steve Crabb

Questionnaires were sent to the Directors of Education of all Local Education Authorities in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. Eight-two replies had been received by 1 June 1987, a response rate of 68 per cent. The replies were on a completely non-attributable basis, so the results do not allow for bias in size or geographical location of the authorities concerned.

RESULTS

Section 1: General

1.1 Have you, or do you plan to issue, a policy statement?

Thirty-three respondents (40.2 per cent) have issued a statement; 21 plan to do so (25.6 per cent); 26 have not (31.7 per cent).

1.2 Have you, or do you plan to sign, a managerial/union equal opportunity agreement?

Nine respondents (11 per cent) have signed an agreement; 13 plan to do so (15.9 per cent); 55 have not (67.1 per cent).
1.3 Have you, or do you plan to carry out, an equal opportunity audit/review?

Twenty-one respondents have carried out an audit/review (25.6 per cent); another 21 plan to do so (25.6 per cent); 35 have not (42.7 per cent).

1.4 Have you or do you plan to designate managerial responsibility for equal opportunities?

Nineteen respondents have designated managerial responsibility (23.2 per cent); 12 plan to do so (14.6 per cent); 41 have not (50 per cent).

Section 2: Recruitment and selection

2.1 Have you or do you plan to revise any aspects of recruitment, e.g. sources, methods, literature, application forms?

Thirty-two respondents have revised aspects of recruitment (39 per cent); 21 plan to do so (25.6 per cent); 25 have not (30.5 per cent).

2.2 Have you or do you plan to revise any aspects of selection, e.g. job descriptions, criteria, methods (interviews, tests)?

Twenty-two respondents have revised aspects of selection (26.8 per cent); 27 plan to do so (32.9 per cent); 29 have not (35.4 per cent).

2.3 Have you or do you plan to arrange training in non-discriminatory interviewing?

Fourteen respondents have arranged such training (17.1 per cent); 23 plan to do so (28 per cent); 41 have not (50 per cent).

Section 3: Training

3.1 Have you or do you plan to review the content and methods of training courses?

Ten respondents have reviewed their training courses (12.2 per cent); 26 plan to do so (31.7 per cent); 42 have not (51.2 per cent).
3.2 Have you or do you plan to review methods for nomination application for training/day release?

Eight respondents have reviewed this (9.8 per cent); 21 plan to do so (25.6 per cent); 49 have not (59.8 per cent).

3.3 Have you or do you plan to introduce equal opportunity training for managers/supervisors?

Nineteen respondents have introduced such training (23.2 per cent); 20 plan to do so (24.4 per cent); 39 have not (47.6 per cent).

3.4 Have you or do you plan to introduce training especially for women?

Seventeen respondents have introduced training especially for women (20.7 per cent); 11 plan to do so (13.4 per cent); 49 have not (59.8 per cent).

Section 4: Promotion and transfer

4.1 Have you or do you plan to review arrangements for promotion transfers?

Fourteen respondents have reviewed their arrangements (17.1 per cent); 22 plan to do so (26.8 per cent); 42 have not (51.2 per cent).

4.2 Have you or do you plan to review mobility requirements and policy?

Six respondents have reviewed their mobility requirements and policy (7.3 per cent); 13 plan to do so (15.9 per cent); 58 have not (70.7 per cent).

Section 5: Domestic responsibilities

5.1 Have you or do you plan to take any steps to assist people to combine career and domestic responsibilities, e.g. part time work at higher levels and after maternity leave, job-sharing, flexi-time, parental leave, extended maternity leave, re-entry arrangements, assistance with or provision of childcare?
Thirty-two respondents have taken all or some of these steps (39 per cent); 17 plan to do so (20.7 per cent); 29 have not (35.4 per cent).

Of those who said they had planned to take such steps, the following examples were cited:

- 'Proposed childcare arrangements in all colleges for staff and students';
- 'Extended maternity leave arrangements introduced, job-share for 'appropriate posts', but none yet established at senior level';
- 'Part time work after maternity leave, job sharing, flexitime, re-entry arrangements and creche in adult college';
- 'Job sharing, re-entry arrangements';
- 'Job sharing, creche by 1988';
- 'Job sharing, creche';
- 'Job sharing, parental leave, extended maternity leave, flexitime; assistance with children under consideration, but few resources available';
- Extended maternity leave'.

One county has a checklist for its institutions which asks: 'Is there a policy on job-sharing, flexible working time, parental leave and provision of childcare facilities which relates to the needs of staff with younger children'? Another reported that 'Two test cases have had no support'.

Section 6: Monitoring

6.1 Have you or do you plan to set up a system for regular monitoring of recruitment and selection, training, promotion, career development and transfer?

Seventeen respondents have set up such a system (20.7 per
cent); 22 plan to do so (26.8 per cent); 38 have not (46.3 per cent).

6.2 Have you or do you plan to set targets, e.g. for recruitment, training, promotion?

Four respondents have set targets (4.9 per cent); 10 plan to do so (12.2 per cent); 56 have not (68.3 per cent).

Section 7

7.1 Have you taken any other action?

This section was used by a number of respondents for general comments on the progress of the education authority towards equal opportunities. Their responses fall into three broad groups of which the following are examples.

Other measures taken

— ‘The authority has set up a working party which is looking at equal opportunities in teaching as a whole’.

— ‘The region has set up a working party on equal opportunities’.

— ‘The LEA has an Equal Opportunities Development Group of elected members and the college has established a working party of the academic board to make proposals on equal opportunities policy’.

— ‘Set up a Women’s Unit in chief executive’s interdepartmental officer group to look at corporate level issues (and) a Women’s Unit in chief executive’s departmental officer group to look at departmental level issues (just getting started). Professional steering group — set up to promote curricula and support initiatives in schools. New college planning to start its own group. These measures are part of council-wide initiatives rather than college-specific plans’.

— ‘There are initiatives generally to improve management skills for women officers (LGBT/SEO course) and a Women and
Technology weekend for teachers and officers. Set up Personal Effectiveness Group.

— ‘A women’s education team has been established to help to implement the policy for women’s education’.

— ‘The authority has a working (pressure) group looking at many of the issues raised above. Arising out of this the education management team has recently approved the establishment of a county working party to develop recommendations to enhance the employment and educational aspects of equal opportunities... this is confined presently to the gender issue’.

— ‘Within the INSET it is intended to encourage staff to take up equal opportunities training. We also hope to provide teaching specifically for gender. FHE branch have five targeted specific issues relative to implementation of equal opportunities policies’.

— ‘A very unenthusiastic panel has been set up to look at this area. Very little progress has been made. Its chair — a woman — declared after the first two minutes of the first meeting that she was against equality for women and that they should stay at home. Follow that?’

WIDER EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES INITIATIVES

— ‘The Council is keen to implement the equal opportunities policy, but the majority of the effort is being concentrated on issues to do with race and disability at present.’

— ‘... the context of equal opportunities is wider than just equal opportunities for women.’

— ‘We would emphasise that the remit of the group relates to equal opportunities in general and NOT to gender specifically.’

— ‘The Council has a fairly sophisticated race equal opportunities policy ... The issues underlying race and sex equal opportunities are similar.’
GENERAL COMMENTS

— Although the authority has no formal policy, it subscribes to the general concept in terms of procedures, including interviews. INSET is to be allocated according to GRIST guidelines and will be assumed to be non-discriminatory. There are a small number of women HoDs, none at a level higher, in the 11 colleges. Of course, outside the colleges, MSC-funded initiatives have a statement of commitment to equal opportunity (ITEC, YTS, CP).

— There are so many other issues, notably NAFE planning, which have higher priority in this LEA that progress and success hinges on the enthusiasm of a few and the encouragement of a few more. There is more hope in curriculum development, where there is a strong commitment to equal opportunities in recruitment, material and staffing — from the LEA officers and key college staff.

— The college’s senior management team of seven contains three women, one of whom was appointed to lead an all male department. We therefore consider that practice speaks louder than policy.

OBSERVATIONS

Eighty-two replies were received to the questionnaire. Of these, two attached copies of equal opportunities policies and three wrote letters. Where it was clear from these documents, the position of the education authority was added to the figures in section A; otherwise they were added to the number of blank responses. The numbers of blank responses varied between one (for question 1.1) and 12 (for question 6.2). It might be argued that blank responses are in fact negative responses, however, since this is not clear in every case, they have been left as a distinct category.

Most responses included a range of ‘yes’, ‘planned’ and ‘no’ answers. Only 25 questionnaires returned gave the same reply to 13 or more of the 16 single-answer questions: two gave predominantly ‘yes’ answers, five predominantly ‘planned’ and eighteen ‘no’. Four left 11 or more answers blank.
The largest set of ‘yes’ answers was for question 1.1, on equal opportunities policy statements (33 replies or 40.2 per cent of those completing the question). This was followed by questions 2.1 (revising aspects of recruitment) and 5.1 (assistance with domestic responsibilities), both at 39 per cent of the sample, 2.2 (revising aspects of selection) at 26.8 per cent of the sample, and 1.3 (equal opportunity audit/reviews) with 25.6 per cent. No other question was answered positively by more than one-quarter of the total.

A similar picture emerges if we look at the ‘yes’ and ‘planned’ answers combined as an indication of intent. Question 1.1 again emerges as the leader, with 65.8 of respondents either having or planning a policy statement. Question 2.1 with 64.6 per cent is again second. Question 5.1 on assistance with domestic responsibilities falls to joint third place with question 2.2 (revising aspects selection) at 59.7 per cent and question 1.3 (equal opportunity audit/reviews) is again bottom of this group. For the remainder of the 16 single answer questions, the combined total of the two represents less than half of those respondents giving a definite reply.

What is interesting about this group is that three out of the five questions are broad ‘catch-all’ questions: respondents need not have carried out all the policies suggested to reply that they had taken, or planned to take, action in this area. These are questions 2.1, 2.2 and 5.1. For example, a number of replies to question 5.1 specified the actions which had been taken on providing assistance with domestic responsibilities, particularly job-sharing (see section 5 above). While this indicates that the authorities concerned have at least considered these issues, it cannot be assumed that everything is being done in this area which could be done.

The questions which feature in the ‘negative’ groups (those to which 50 per cent or more of respondents expressing a definite answer said they neither had nor planned to do anything) are overwhelmingly specific: authorities either have (or plan) a management/union agreement on equal opportunities, for example, or they do not — they cannot have a part of an agreement. In this sense the negative group of questions gives a more reliable indication of intent and practice.

Particularly large numbers of respondents gave negative answers to the following questions: 4.2, on reviewing mobility requirements and policy (70.7 per cent); 6.2, on setting targets (68.3 per cent); 1.2, on managerial/union agreements (67.1 per cent); 3.2 on reviewing methods
for nomination/application for training/day release and 3.4 on women-only training (both 59.8 per cent); 3.1 on reviewing content and methods of training courses and 4.1 on reviewing arrangements for promotion/transfers (both 51.2 per cent); and 1.4 on designating managerial responsibility and 2.3 arranging training in non-discriminatory interviewing (both 50 per cent). Together, those questions for which 50 per cent or more of replies were negative, represent 56.3 per cent of all questions asked.
The information in this section is based on provisional statistics for 1985 from the DES (Source: Table 140 in Statistics of Education: Teachers in Service, England and Wales, 1985). It is derived from records held on the DES main mechanised record of all full time teachers in maintained, assisted and grant-aided establishments of further education; in addition to polytechnics and other further education establishments (formerly described as 'other major establishments'). This includes adult education centres, youth welfare centres, adult welfare centres and nursery training centres. The information is broken down into eight grades of teacher as follows:

- Principals
- Vice principals
  (including vice principals who were heads of department)
- Other heads of department
- Readers
- Principal lecturers
- Senior lecturers
- Lecturers grade II
- Lecturers grade I (including lecturers grades 1A and 1B is agricultural and horticultural establishments).

Information is given for men, women and all teachers in direct grant/voluntary establishments and by education authority in maintained/assisted
### Table 1: Total Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Vice Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>4,117</td>
<td>5,164</td>
<td>9,451</td>
<td>19,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
<td>(9.3)</td>
<td>(10.8)</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
<td>(8.5)</td>
<td>(15.9)</td>
<td>(27.5)</td>
<td>(36.9)</td>
<td>(24.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>3,164</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5,316</td>
<td>21,731</td>
<td>13,625</td>
<td>16,513</td>
<td>61,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(94.4)</td>
<td>(90.7)</td>
<td>(99.2)</td>
<td>(94.4)</td>
<td>(91.5)</td>
<td>(84.1)</td>
<td>(72.5)</td>
<td>(63.1)</td>
<td>(75.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>3,546</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>25,848</td>
<td>18,789</td>
<td>26,164</td>
<td>81,835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Direct Grant/Voluntary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Vice Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(19.4)</td>
<td>(18.75)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(16.4)</td>
<td>(26.9)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(24.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>2,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(80.6)</td>
<td>(81.25)</td>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(83.6)</td>
<td>(73.1)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>(77)</td>
<td>(75.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>2,883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
establishments. There is no way of telling from the statistics what proportion of a given grade is employed in polytechnics and other FE establishments, and what proportion is employed in adult education centres etc. Nor is there any way of telling where on the salary scale for a particular grade the average teacher lies. Finally, there is no way of telling the extent to which women teachers are concentrated in subject areas traditionally defined as ‘women’s subjects’. Consequently the information which follows is at best an outline of the situation, and may conceal major trends in the employment of women in FE.

1 TOTAL: ALL FE

Table 1 shows total figures for men and women and all teachers in FE establishments in England and Wales in 1985. The figures in brackets show the percentage of the total made up by men and women in each of the grades.

The proportion of women in each grade falls steadily from a maximum of 36.9 per cent in the lowest grade, lecturer I, to 5.6 per cent at reader level. Surprisingly the proportion of women then increases at other heads of department level, and only at principal level does it return to the previous low of 5.6 per cent. There thus appear to be two distinct patterns, both pyramid shape, in the employment of women in FE. Over all, women make up 24.4 per cent of FE teachers.

2 TOTAL: DIRECT GRANT/VOLUNTARY

As Table 2 illustrates, this sector makes up a small proportion of employment in further education: 3.5 per cent of the total.

The proportion of women teachers in this sample is the same as for the national sample as a whole, 24.4 per cent. This sector broadly follows the national pattern up to reader level — with the exception of a jump in the population between lecturers I and II, the pattern is one of steady decline with each successive grade. At a sample size of 1, the figures for the reader grade do not mean very much. Above the reader grade the national trend is actually reversed, climbing from 10 per cent with other heads
of department to 19.4 per cent at principal level, over three times the national figure. The sample sizes are very small at principal and vice principal levels, which significantly affects the percentage figures. For example, a single extra woman principal would increase the percentage of female principals by around two per cent, whereas an extra female lecturer grade I would only affect the percentages by around 0.2 per cent. Overall, the proportion of women in this sample is greater than the national proportion for every grade except for other heads of department and lecturer grade I.

3 TOTAL: MAINTAINED/ASSISTED

This sector makes up the other 96.5 per cent of teachers in FE.

Table 3: Maintained/Assisted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Vice Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>9,530</td>
<td>19,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(4.8)</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
<td>(10.8)</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
<td>(7.9)</td>
<td>(15.3)</td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td>(37.2)</td>
<td>(24.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5,135</td>
<td>20,717</td>
<td>13,435</td>
<td>14,109</td>
<td>59,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(95.2)</td>
<td>(91.1)</td>
<td>(89.2)</td>
<td>(94.4)</td>
<td>(92.1)</td>
<td>(84.7)</td>
<td>(72.7)</td>
<td>(62.8)</td>
<td>(75.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>609</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>3,376</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5,573</td>
<td>24,441</td>
<td>18,515</td>
<td>25,639</td>
<td>73,952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, the proportion of women in this sample is the same as for the national sample as a whole, 24.4 per cent. In this case, the distribution of women between the grades follows the pattern for the total sample exactly: a steady decline from lecturer grade I to reader, a recovery at other heads of
department level to above the level for principal lecturer, and then another steady decline to 4.8 per cent of principals, slightly lower than the national level of 5.6 per cent.

Splitting direct grant/voluntary establishment off from the rest of FE clearly does not eliminate this trend: if anything it establishes it more clearly. Given that we do not know the ages of teachers in our sample, it is possible that this is evidence of a period of high recruitment levels of women teachers in the past, working its way through the system, producing a bulge. What is more likely is that this distribution reflects the presence in the sample of adult education centres (and other institutions with small department sizes) in which women hold senior positions with very few teachers in other grades below them.

4 PROPORTIONS AND AVERAGES

The following section examines the proportions and averages of women in each of the eight grades concerned in the maintained/assisted sector, in the Inner London Education Authority, in the rest of Greater London and the six other metropolitan districts, the members of the AMA and the ACC, and in the Welsh ACC authorities.

The uppermost figures in each row represent the numbers of men, women and men and women combined in each area concerned; the figures in brackets represent the proportion of the total for the area composed by men and women respectively.

4.1 The sample sizes in Table 4 are sufficiently small to provoke major variations in the population of women principals in each area from none to 11.1 per cent. The West Midlands, South Yorkshire, West Yorkshire and Wales all have no women principals. One principal in Tyneside represents 11.1 per cent of the sample. Within Greater London (not ILEA), 17 authorities out of 20 have no women principals and three have one each. On Merseyside only one authority out of five has a women principal; in Greater Manchester one authority has two
### Table 4: Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ILFA</th>
<th>Greater London</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>Merseyside</th>
<th>Greater Manchester</th>
<th>South Yorkshire</th>
<th>West Yorkshire</th>
<th>Tyneside</th>
<th>AMA</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(5.8)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(11.1)</td>
<td>(5.7)</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(90.7)</td>
<td>(94.2)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>(89.3)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(88.9)</td>
<td>(94.3)</td>
<td>(95.8)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(95.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5: Vice Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ILFA</th>
<th>Greater London</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>Merseyside</th>
<th>Greater Manchester</th>
<th>South Yorkshire</th>
<th>West Yorkshire</th>
<th>Tyneside</th>
<th>AMA</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(26.2)</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
<td>(9.6)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(4.5)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(12.2)</td>
<td>(6.2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(73.8)</td>
<td>(90.4)</td>
<td>(90.4)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(97.1)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(95.5)</td>
<td>(97.8)</td>
<td>(95.8)</td>
<td>(93.8)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(91.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
women principals out of a total of four. In the AMA as a whole, 57 authorities have only 13 women principals between them, five of those in ILEA; in the ACC 48 authorities have only 16 women principals between them.

4.2 As Table 5 shows, the proportion of women vice principals in ILEA is considerably greater than the proportion of women principals over all — 26.2 per cent as against 9.3 per cent. It is also nearly twice as great as in Greater London, with 10.7 per cent. Fifteen out of 20 Greater London authorities have no women vice principals, one has two women vice principals and only one male vice principal. In the other metropolitan authorities, the West Midlands is above the national level for the maintained/assisted sector — 9.6 per cent; one authority in the West Midlands has only one vice principal, who is a woman; another has two, one woman, one man; a third has 27 vice principals, of whom only two are women.

Merseyside has no women vice principals, nor have South Yorkshire and Tyneside. Greater Manchester has only one woman vice principal out of 34: one authority there has 15 vice principals, all male. West Yorkshire has one woman vice principal, in an authority with only three vice principals in total. Three other authorities in West Yorkshire, without any female vice principals (or female principals), have eight, six and four vice principals respectively. Over all the AMA is ahead of the national figure with 12.2 per cent women vice principals.

The ACC has nearly half the proportion of female vice principals that the AMA has: 6.2 per cent, or 23 women vice principals, in 48 authorities. One authority has 17 vice principals, all male, and three have 13. One authority with 29 vice principals has three women vice principals, the largest number in a single authority outside ILEA. Wales has no women vice principals.

4.3 Once again ILEA has the largest proportion of women in this sample of all the groups examined, 23.7 per cent,
Table 6: Other Heads of Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILEA</th>
<th>Greater London</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>Merseyside</th>
<th>Greater Manchester</th>
<th>South Yorkshire</th>
<th>West Yorkshire</th>
<th>Tyneside</th>
<th>AMA</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(23.7)</td>
<td>(12.4)</td>
<td>(10.1)</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td>(9.4)</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td>(5.9)</td>
<td>(12.7)</td>
<td>(9.4)</td>
<td>(10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(74.3)</td>
<td>(87.6)</td>
<td>(99.9)</td>
<td>(93.1)</td>
<td>(90.6)</td>
<td>(91.1)</td>
<td>(92.9)</td>
<td>(94.1)</td>
<td>(87.3)</td>
<td>(90.6)</td>
<td>(89.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Readers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILEA</th>
<th>Greater London</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>Merseyside</th>
<th>Greater Manchester</th>
<th>South Yorkshire</th>
<th>West Yorkshire</th>
<th>Tyneside</th>
<th>AMA</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(6.6)</td>
<td>(4.8)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(90.9)</td>
<td>(90.5)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(93.4)</td>
<td>(95.2)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(94.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
compared to the total for the whole sample of 10.8 per cent, and for the AMA authorities, of 12.7 per cent. The lowest is Tyneside, with only 5.9 per cent women in other heads of department jobs: this figure includes one authority with four women out of 56 other heads of department, one with one woman out of eight, and one with one woman out of 29. The rest have no women in other heads of department roles. (See Table 6.)

Other areas where the proportion of women in this group is in single figures include Merseyside (6.9 per cent), West Yorkshire (7.1 per cent), South Yorkshire (8.9 per cent) and Greater Manchester (9.4 per cent). One authority in the West Midlands (which has only one, woman, vice principal) has five male other heads of departments and four women. All the authorities in the West Midlands have at least one woman other head of department. Five of the ten authorities in Greater Manchester have no women in this grade.

Over all the AMA is again ahead of both the ACC and the total figure. However, if we deduct the ILEA from both the AMA and the total results figures, the proportion of women in both the AMA and the sample as a whole drops to 9.4 per cent, exactly the same figure as for the ACC. Women in Welsh authorities make up 10.1 per cent of the sample, the highest grade in which women appear in Wales. This figure is still below the national level, although by only 0.7 per cent.

4.4 Once again, for the group shown in Table 7 the sample sizes are so small that one or two individuals can make a significant difference to the over-all proportions involved. Certain trends are obvious: there are no women readers outside of ILEA and Greater London in the AMA. In this sample ILEA is slightly behind Greater London in the proportion of women in the grade, although both figures are well ahead of the national average. One London authority has ten readers, none of whom are women; another has one woman out of nine readers; and a third has one woman reader out of two. No other London authorities have any readers.
The West Midlands readers are spread across three of the seven authorities in the area — one with five, one with three and one with two. Both readers on Merseyside are in the same authority, as are the two on Tyneside. The proportion of women readers in the AMA (i.e. Greater London and ILEA) is very slightly ahead of that for the ACC.

Within the ACC, one authority has one woman reader out of nine, another has one out of two and a third has only one reader, a woman. Thirty-one authorities in the ACC have no readers at all.

4.5 The pattern at principal lecturer level is substantially the same as for the other grades so far examined. ILEA again has the highest proportion of women principal lecturers, well ahead of the national average, with the AMA ahead of the ACC. The difference is much narrower if we eliminate ILEA from the AMA total, giving us a score of 7.7 per cent of women principal lecturers in the AMA and 7.1 in the ACC. (See Table 8.)

The range is large for this grade, from 2.6 per cent in Tyneside to 12.4 per cent in ILEA. Five authorities in Greater London have no women principal lecturers. One has three women out of 12 principal lecturers, while another has only nine out of a total of 125. The West Midlands has poorer representation of women in this grade, 6.5 per cent, than it does at either vice principal or other head of department level, although again the one outstanding authority in the West Midlands in these grades has two principal lecturers, one of whom is a woman. All the West Midlands authorities have at least one woman principal lecturer.

Two of the five authorities on Merseyside have no principal lecturers at all, and a further two have no women principal lecturers. Women principal lecturers in Greater Manchester range from one in 26 in one authority to four out of 25 in another. Five authorities out of ten have no women principal lecturers. Only two authorities
Table 8: Principal Lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REA</th>
<th>Greater London</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>Merseyside</th>
<th>Greater Manchester</th>
<th>South Yorkshire</th>
<th>West Yorkshire</th>
<th>Tyne and Wear</th>
<th>AMA</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(12.4)</td>
<td>(9.8)</td>
<td>(6.5)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(9.4)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
<td>(8.7)</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(87.6)</td>
<td>(90.2)</td>
<td>(93.5)</td>
<td>(93.3)</td>
<td>(90.6)</td>
<td>(93.3)</td>
<td>(90.9)</td>
<td>(97.4)</td>
<td>(91.3)</td>
<td>(92.9)</td>
<td>(96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2,832</td>
<td>2,741</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Senior Lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REA</th>
<th>Greater London</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>Merseyside</th>
<th>Greater Manchester</th>
<th>South Yorkshire</th>
<th>West Yorkshire</th>
<th>Tyne and Wear</th>
<th>AMA</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(23.6)</td>
<td>(20.3)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
<td>(15.2)</td>
<td>(17.2)</td>
<td>(16.3)</td>
<td>(12.4)</td>
<td>(17.5)</td>
<td>(13.1)</td>
<td>(12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>10,129</td>
<td>10,588</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(76.4)</td>
<td>(79.7)</td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>(88.4)</td>
<td>(84.8)</td>
<td>(82.8)</td>
<td>(83.7)</td>
<td>(87.6)</td>
<td>(82.5)</td>
<td>(84.9)</td>
<td>(87.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>2,371</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>12,283</td>
<td>12,178</td>
<td>1,182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on Tyneside have women principal lecturers, making up four out of 108 in one authority and two out of 90 in the other.

Seven ACC authorities have no women principal lecturers. One of these has 34 principal lectures, another 33. The largest proportion of women in a single ACC authority is eight out of 37, and the lowest (not counting those with no women principal lecturers) is one out of nine. Welsh authorities vary from a high of one out of ten to one out of 91, the lowest in the ACC.

4.6 ILEA has the highest proportion of senior lecturers of any of the groups examined, followed by the Greater London authorities. In one London authority women make up 49 out of 127 senior lecturers, or 38.6 per cent; in another they account for only 9.9 per cent of senior lecturers. The range in the West Midlands is from 3.8 per cent in one authority to 31.8 per cent in another (interestingly, the same authority which registered very high proportions of women at vice principal, other heads of department and principal lecturer levels). No other AMA authority has a lower proportion of women than 3.8 per cent; one authority on Tyneside has five women senior lecturers out of a total of 12, giving a proportion of 41.7 per cent, although the small numbers involved inflate this figure. It might of course be argued that in a small body such as this it is highly significant that there is near parity of representation, since the presence of women in the teaching body would be very evident. This must be qualified by the fact that we do not know where these women are located, in what subject areas, and where on the senior lecturer scale they sit.

Three broad groups are obvious within the AMA areas. ILEA and Greater London are both in the 20 to 25 per cent range. South Yorkshire, West Yorkshire and Greater Manchester are in the 15 to 20 per cent bracket (in the centre of which is the total AMA figure of 17.5 per cent) and the West Midlands, Tyneside and Merseyside are in the final, 10 to 15 per cent, group. The difference
between the figure for ILEA and that for the AMA as a whole is less great in this case — if we remove ILEA from the AMA figures the proportion of women still stands at 15.7 per cent, comfortably ahead of the ACC figure of 13.1 per cent.

Within the ACC the highest proportion of women senior lecturers in a single authority is 19.5 per cent (75 out of 385) and the lowest is 4.2 per cent (one woman senior lecturer out of 24). One Welsh authority has eight senior lecturers, all male. (See Table 9.)

4.7 Following the established pattern, ILEA has the highest proportion of women at LII grade, at 39.4 per cent, and Greater London the second highest, 32.1 per cent. One London authority comes close to parity — 28 out of 58 lecturers grade II are women, or 48.3 per cent of the total. Three others have more than 40 per cent women lecturers in this grade, one on 44.1 per cent, one on 41.8 per cent and one on 41.1 per cent. Only two authorities in London have less than 20 per cent women lecturers grade II, one on 12.9 per cent (16 out of 108) and one on 18.2 per cent. (See Table 10.)

Outside of London, West Yorkshire has the next highest proportion of women, 30.5 per cent. The range in West Yorkshire is quite narrow, from a high of 35.2 per cent (43 women out of 122 lecturers grade II) to a low of 26.5 per cent (49 out of 185). Tyneside is significantly below the rest of the AMA areas with only 18.5 per cent women lecturers grade II. Both the highest and lowest percentages are to be found in London authorities (44.1 per cent and 12.9 per cent respectively).

Again following the pattern, the proportion of women in this grade in the AMA is ahead of that in the ACC. There is no discernible pattern in the relationship between the two figures, other than the obvious consistent AMA lead. The difference between the two varies from 1.6 per cent at principal level to 6.4 per cent at vice principal level. In no cases is the proportion of women in this grade in ACC
### Table 10: Lecturers Grade II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ILEA</th>
<th>Greater London</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>Merseyside</th>
<th>Greater Manchester</th>
<th>South Yorkshire</th>
<th>West Yorkshire</th>
<th>Tyneside</th>
<th>AMA</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>594</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2,328</td>
<td>2,732</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39.4)</td>
<td>(32.1)</td>
<td>(24.9)</td>
<td>(22.8)</td>
<td>(29.5)</td>
<td>(25.6)</td>
<td>(30.5)</td>
<td>(18.5)</td>
<td>(29.9)</td>
<td>(25.5)</td>
<td>(23.4)</td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>5,449</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>13,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(60.6)</td>
<td>(67.9)</td>
<td>(75.1)</td>
<td>(77.2)</td>
<td>(70.5)</td>
<td>(74.4)</td>
<td>(69.5)</td>
<td>(81.5)</td>
<td>(70.1)</td>
<td>(74.5)</td>
<td>(76.6)</td>
<td>(72.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>7,797</td>
<td>10,718</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>18,515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11: Lecturers Grade I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ILEA</th>
<th>Greater London</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>Merseyside</th>
<th>Greater Manchester</th>
<th>South Yorkshire</th>
<th>West Yorkshire</th>
<th>Tyneside</th>
<th>AMA</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>642</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3,876</td>
<td>5,654</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>9,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(43.9)</td>
<td>(38.9)</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>(36.7)</td>
<td>(38.5)</td>
<td>(35.6)</td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
<td>(38.6)</td>
<td>(38.3)</td>
<td>(36.8)</td>
<td>(36.8)</td>
<td>(37.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>6,185</td>
<td>9,924</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>16,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(56.1)</td>
<td>(61.1)</td>
<td>(63.6)</td>
<td>(63.3)</td>
<td>(61.5)</td>
<td>(64.4)</td>
<td>(62.5)</td>
<td>(61.5)</td>
<td>(63.7)</td>
<td>(63.2)</td>
<td>(62.8)</td>
<td>(62.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>10,061</td>
<td>15,578</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>25,639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
authorities above 40 per cent. The highest single figure is 35.3 per cent. The lowest figure registered is 13.8 per cent (26 women out of 189 lecturers grade II). Five ACC authorities have less than 20 per cent women among their lecturers grade II.

4.8 ILEA is again the leader in this grade. Over all, lecturer grade I has the largest representation of women of all the grades examined. It is also the largest single grade in terms of numbers of incumbents. Greater London is again second — just — with 38.9 per cent representation. Within the London authorities two have majorities of women lecturers in this grade — 67 out of 119 (56.3 per cent) and 41 out of 80 (51.25 per cent). Another has equal numbers of men and women (39 in each case). The lowest proportion of women in an authority is 17.9 per cent, or 14 out of 78 — one of only two authorities in London with fewer than 30 per cent women lecturers grade I.

London is followed closely by Tyneside, on 38.6 per cent. One Tyneside authority has a majority of women in this grade, 37 out of 64 (57.8 per cent). One other authority, in Greater Manchester, has a majority of women, 43 out of 80 (53.75 per cent). Over all, the AMA’s highest proportion is in the Tyneside authority, and the lowest is the 17.9 per cent in London. The lowest proportion in an AMA region is 35.6 per cent in South Yorkshire where proportions range from 30.8 to 41.2 per cent.

The AMA is again ahead of the ACC. No ACC authorities have a majority of women in this grade. The highest proportion in an ACC authority is 41.9 per cent (in a Welsh authority) and the lowest 28.2 per cent (31 out of 110 lecturers grade I). The proportion for Welsh authorities is marginally ahead of that for the ACC as a whole in this grade. (See Table 11.)

5 AREA BY AREA COMPARISONS

5.1 We shall now examine this information by area, to get a
clearer picture of how each area relates to the national pattern (if at all). The figures in the second row of Tables 12 to 22 show the percentage of male teachers in each grade, and in the final column, the percentage of male teachers in the authority, or groups of authorities, as a whole. The first row of figures shows the percentage of women teachers in the same grades. The third row of figures indicates the difference between the proportion of women in each group in percentage terms, and the percentage for that grade in the whole of the maintained/assisted sector. For example, in ILEA women make up 9.3 per cent of principals, compared to 4.8 per cent in the maintained/assisted sector generally (see Table 3); the difference between these two figures, +4.5, is given at the foot of column one in Table 12.

Taken together, the figures in Tables 12 to 22 show the levels of employment of women by grade in each of the areas studied in absolute terms and relative to the sample as a whole. By comparing these figures with those in Table 3 it is possible to see how the progression of women through each grade matches the national pattern of the pyramid-shaped distributions, with their bases at lecturer grade I and other heads of department (see above).

As we have seen above, there is significant variation between authorities within each of the sub-groups examined (except ILEA) in terms of numbers of staff employed in each grade, and the proportion of women in each grade. Some authorities have a higher percentage figure for the number of women employed in each grade than for the area as a whole. Others of course do much more badly.

5.2 ILEA has the highest proportion of women in each grade, bar two, of all the areas studied. Only at principal level, where Tyneside and Greater Manchester have a higher proportion, and reader level (Greater London has 9.5 per cent), is it not top. It also has the highest proportion of women in its teaching staff taken as a whole, 30.3 per
Table 12: ILEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Vice-Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>+4.5</td>
<td>+17.3</td>
<td>+12.9</td>
<td>+3.5</td>
<td>+4.5</td>
<td>+8.3</td>
<td>+12.1</td>
<td>+6.7</td>
<td>+5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of women in each grade is consistently ahead of the proportion for the whole maintained/assisted sector in each grade, ranging from a level of 17.3 per cent at vice principal level to 3.5 per cent at reader level.

ILEA does not follow the pattern for the sample as a whole, since there is a clear bulge at vice principal level. Otherwise the pattern is the same — a steady drop from lecturer grade I to reader, then a recovery in the representation of women to similar levels to that at senior lecturer grade, then another decline to principal level.

5.3 Taken together, the Greater London authorities have the

Table 13: Greater London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Vice-Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1.8</td>
<td>+1.6</td>
<td>+3.9</td>
<td>+1.9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>+4.8</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
highest proportion of women of any area at reader level, 9.5 per cent. These authorities have a lead over the sample as a whole in each grade, and for the total teaching body. The pattern here is substantially the same as that for the sample as a whole, after the bottle neck at reader level, the proportion for other heads of department falls between those found at principal and senior lecturer level.

Table 14: West Midlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Viced-Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 The West Midlands authorities do more poorly than the sample as a whole in all but one grade — vice principal — and even there the proportion is only 0.7 per cent greater. The results would have been even worse had it not been for one exceptional authority in the higher grades (see sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 above).

Table 15: Merseyside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Viced-Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5 Merseyside authorities perform more poorly than the nation as a whole in every grade except principal. Particularly poor levels of representation are found at other heads of department and lecturer grade II level. Merseyside also has the lowest proportion of women senior lecturers of any of the areas studied.

The two-pyramid distribution is again in evidence here, although it is disrupted by the absence of any women vice principals in the authorities.

Table 16: Greater Manchester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Vice- Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>+2.2</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
<td>+1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 The most interesting aspect of the employment of women in Greater Manchester is the low level of women vice principals, and the (comparatively) high level of women principals — higher in fact than ILEA. While the lower pyramid is clearly there, the distribution above reader level is completely distorted, falling from other heads of department to vice principal and then rising again to the highest level of all the senior grades at principal level.

The proportion of women in Greater Manchester authorities is higher than the national figure in four grades and lower in three, giving an over-all figure of 1.4 per cent ahead of England and Wales collectively.

5.7 South Yorkshire does worse than the nation as a whole in all but one grade. In three grades there are no women at all. The proportion of women at lecturer grade I is the
Table 17: South Yorkshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Vice-Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>+1.9</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lowest of all the areas in this study. It is impossible to chart the distribution of women above principal lecturer level compared to the national figure, except to say that the figure for other heads of department conforms to the expected pattern, falling between the figures for principal and senior lecturers.

Table 18: West Yorkshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Vice-Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+3.2</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

West Yorkshire authorities are behind the national figures in all but two of the grades in Table 18. One interesting feature of the figures for West Yorkshire is that the distribution is in the form of a single pyramid, from the base at lecturer grade II to the pinnacle at vice principal level. Over all West Yorkshire is marginally ahead of the country as a whole, by 0.1 per cent.
Table 19: Tyneside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Vice-Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>+6.3</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-8.8</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.9 Tyneside authorities have the highest proportion of women principals of any group of authorities shown in the Table — 6.3 per cent more than for the whole sample. However, they also have the lowest proportion of women in three grades — other heads of department, principal lecturer and lecturer grade II and the lowest over-all proportion of women in the teaching body — 5.2 per cent below the national figure.

The distribution of women in Tyneside authorities follows the national pattern up to other heads of department, falling to 2.6 per cent at principal lecturer level. The absence of women vice principals and the unusually high proportion of women principals throws the pattern out of shape above other heads of department level.

5.10 AMA authorities are consistently above the national figure, with a range from 0.8 per cent at principal lecturer level to 3.3 per cent at vice principal level. The distribution follows the national pattern exactly.

5.11 The ACC authorities are consistently below the national figures, ranging from 0.6 per cent at principal level to 2.7 at vice principal. Again, as might be expected, the ACC follows the national pattern faithfully.
Table 20: AMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Vice-Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>25.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>74.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
<td>+3.3</td>
<td>+1.9</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
<td>+2.2</td>
<td>+2.6</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
<td>+0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: ACC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Vice-Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Vice-Principals</th>
<th>Other Heads of Department</th>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Principal Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade II</th>
<th>Lecturers Grade I</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>-9.9</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.12 The Welsh authorities have no women at all in three grades, and are below the national proportion in all other grades and for the teaching body as a whole. The largest variation from the national figure is 3.9 per cent (in two cases) and the least is 0.4 per cent (at lecturer grade I), in terms of grades with some women teachers.

The distribution here is identical to that for the country as a whole.