



Australian
Human Rights
Commission

Review into the
Treatment of Women in the
Australian Defence Force

PHASE 2 REPORT • 2012



© Australian Human Rights Commission 2012.

This work is protected by copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968* (Cth), no part may be used or reproduced by any process without prior written permission from the Australian Human Rights Commission. Enquiries should be addressed to Communications Team at: communications@humanrights.gov.au

ISBN 978-1-921449-29-1

Acknowledgements

The Australian Human Rights Commission thanks the following people for their assistance with the Review:

The Review Team

Review Panel:

Commissioner Elizabeth Broderick (Chair), Professor Marian Baird, Ms Sam Mostyn, Mr Mark Ney, Dr Damian Powell

Review Secretariat:

Director: Alexandra Shehadie; Research Director: Marlene Krasovitsky; Executive Officer: Natasha de Silva

Research Team: Elena Campbell, Jeremy Etkind, Patrick Haid, Lisa Pusey, Tanaya Roy, Kylie Stephen

Support Team: Lynette Garrick, Simone Guirguis

Consultants:

Christine Fougere, Janet Menzies, David Tan, Roy Morgan Research

Defence Liaison Officers

SQNLDR F James, CMDR A Westwood

The Sex Discrimination Commissioner wishes to thank the following additional people who assisted the Review:

Alison Aggarwal; Bridget Akers; Nathan Borgelt; LTCOL Gwenda Caspersonn; LCDR Sue Cunningham; Simone Cusack; Annebelle Davis; LTCOL John Duff; Graeme Edgerton; COL Natasha Fox; COL James Gaynor CSC; WGCDRE Dee Gibbon; Darren Grogan; Steven House; Emily Jacka; Leo Li; Michelle Lindley; Kim Malafant; Brinsley Marlay; Lee McCormick; Ron McLay; Julie O'Brien; William O'Brien; Russell Philbey; Diala Raad; Padma Raman; Tracey Raymond; CAPT Katherine Richards; Marcie Richards; Jane Seymour; Matthew Stanton; Ellen Swavley; Jodie Vaile; Terry Wang; Kenny Xie; Neo Zou

Photography

Photos on pages 18, 40, 72, 86, 214, 248, 298 Thinkstock. Photos on pages 62, 162 and 280 taken in Afghanistan by Elizabeth Broderick.

Quotes

The quotes appearing at the beginning of each Chapter are taken from:

- Focus Groups – 11C, 19B, 23B, 27A, 32A, 38B, 42B and
- Confidential Submissions.

This publication can be found in electronic format on the Australian Human Rights Commission's website at:

www.humanrights.gov.au/defencereview

For further information about the Australian Human Rights Commission, please visit: www.humanrights.gov.au

or email: communications@humanrights.gov.au

You can also write to: Communications Team Australian Human Rights Commission GPO Box 5218 Sydney NSW 2001

Design and layout Jo Clark **Cover photography** Imagery provided by Defence **Printing** Paragon Printers Australasia

Review into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force

Phase 2 Report

Australian Human Rights Commission 2012



**Australian
Human Rights
Commission**



**Australian
Human Rights
Commission**

8 August 2012

The Hon. Nicola Roxon MP
Attorney-General
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Attorney,

Review into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force

I am pleased to present to you the Phase 2 Report of the Commission's Review into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force.

This Report represents the second stage of the Review, the first stage being the Review into the Treatment of Women at the Australian Defence Force Academy, tabled in Parliament on 3 November 2011.

This Report is an independent review into the effectiveness of cultural change strategies and initiatives for increasing the representation of women in the senior ranks of the Australian Defence Force.

Yours sincerely,

Elizabeth Broderick
Sex Discrimination Commissioner

Australian Human Rights Commission

Level 3, 175 Pitt Street, Sydney NSW 2000
GPO Box 5218, Sydney NSW 2001

Telephone: 02 9284 9600

Facsimile: 02 9284 9611

Website: www.humanrights.gov.au

Contents

A Message from the Commissioner	1
Terms of Reference	5
Acronyms and Glossary	7
Methodology	13
Overview and Recommendations	20
Chapter 1: The Case for Change – Why the ADF Should Care about Women’s Representation and Progression	42
1.1 Attract the Best Talent – maximising opportunities in a changing workforce	44
1.2 Costs – recruiting and retaining valued personnel	50
1.3 Capability	54
1.4 A First Class and High Performing Employer	55
1.5 Leadership	57
1.6 Conclusion	57
Chapter 2: Chief of Defence Force Action Plan for the Recruitment and Retention of Women: How effective was it?	64
2.1 Overview	65
2.2 Background	66
2.3 Key findings	67
2.4 Conclusion	68
Chapter 3: The ADF Culture: The experience of and attitudes towards women	74
3.1 Organisational culture in the ADF	75
3.2 Women – same or different?	76
3.3 Women as ‘other’	78
3.4 Sexual harassment	79
3.5 Making a complaint	80
3.6 Work or family – the ‘choices’ women make	81
3.7 Representation of women	82
3.8 Conclusion	83
Chapter 4: The ADF Workforce Pipeline: Women’s representation and critical issues	88
4.1 Representation	91
4.2 Recruitment	108
4.3 Retention	126
4.4 Career management and progression	138

Chapter 5: The ADF Workforce Structure: Opportunities, Pathways and Barriers	164
5.1 Occupational Segregation	165
5.2 The Under-representation of Women in Leadership	175
5.3 Women in Combat: Removal of Gender Restrictions	182
5.4 Mentoring, Networking and Sponsorship	198
Chapter 6: Combining a Military Career with Family	216
6.1 Pregnancy	219
6.2 Maternity and Parental Leave	221
6.3 Flexible Working Arrangements	227
6.4 Child care	237
6.5 Conclusion	240
Chapter 7: Sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse	250
7.1 Introduction	251
7.2 Incidents of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse	252
7.3 Reporting sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse	262
7.4 Complaints policy framework	265
7.5 Proposal for reform	270
7.6 Conclusion	274
Chapter 8: Adequacy and Accessibility of Support Mechanisms	282
8.1 Impact on families	283
8.2 Housing	289
8.3 Health and injuries	291
8.4 Conclusion	294
Chapter 9: International Trends and Lessons: A Review of Practices in Comparable Militaries	300
9.1 An elusive critical mass	302
9.2 Limited opportunities – occupational segregation	302
9.3 Combat exclusion	303
9.4 Lack of women in leadership	305
9.5 Hyper-masculine culture	306
9.6 Gender-based violence and harassment	307
9.7 Broad Observations – from Integration to Inclusion	308
9.8 Principles and Lessons Learned	310
9.9 Conclusion	312

Appendices	318
Appendix A: Consultations	319
Appendix B: Survey Information: <i>The Review into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey</i>	341
Appendix C: <i>Review into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey</i>	369
Appendix D: Chapter 1: The Case for Change: Why the ADF Should Care about Women’s Representation and Progression	375
Appendix E: Chapter 2: Chief of Defence Force Action Plan for the Recruitment and Retention of Women: How effective was it?	385
Appendix F: Chapter 4: The ADF Workforce Pipeline: Women’s representation and critical issues - Section 4.1 Representation	397
Appendix G: Chapter 4: The ADF Workforce Pipeline: Women’s representation and critical issues – Section 4.2 Recruitment	401
Appendix H: Chapter 4: The ADF Workforce Pipeline: Women’s representation and critical issues – Section 4.3 Retention	415
Appendix I: Chapter 4: The ADF Workforce Pipeline: Women’s representation and critical issues – Section 4.4 Career management and progression	421
Appendix J: Chapter 5: The ADF Workforce Structure: Opportunities, Pathways and Barriers – Section 5.1 Occupational Segregation	423
Appendix K: Chapter 5: The ADF Workforce Structure: Opportunities, Pathways and Barriers – Section 5.3 Women in Combat: Removal of Gender Restrictions	431
Appendix L: Chapter 5: The ADF Workforce Structure: Opportunities, Pathways and Barriers – Section 5.4 Mentoring, networking and sponsorship	433
Appendix M: Chapter 6: Combining a Military Career with Family	439
Appendix N: Chapter 7: Sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse	449
Appendix O: Chapter 8: Adequacy and Accessibility of Support Mechanisms	579
Appendix P: Chapter 9: International Trends and Lessons Learned: A Review of Practices in Comparable Militaries	583
Appendix Q: Referencing documents received from Defence Liaison Officers	595
Select Bibliography	609

A Message from the Commissioner

Elizabeth Broderick

*Sex Discrimination Commissioner
Australian Human Rights Commission*



As Australia's Sex Discrimination Commissioner, leading the Australian Human Rights Commission's Review into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force has been both a priority and a privilege. It has been a priority because the equal treatment of women should be at the core of any Australian workplace – regardless of its size, history or purpose. When indications suggest that this is not always the case, it is a matter of direct and immediate concern.

Equally, however, it has been a rare opportunity to engage with the distinctive nature of a defence force – a place that demands personal sacrifice and often personal risk from its members well beyond that ever asked of most citizens – in which the reality of posting cycles, operations and deployment, together with a linear hierarchy and career structure, makes the ADF experience unique. It has been a privilege, then, to gain insight into the day to day lives of ADF personnel – to hear, in their own words, their fierce commitment to service; their determination to perform at their best for the security and wellbeing of the nation.

I sense a readiness by the ADF leadership to engage with change – to meet the dedication of thousands of personnel with a resolve to make one of Australia's largest employers one that is, in all respects, an employer where men and women are treated equally and respectfully.

Meaningful change is never easy – it takes courage to set aside the status quo. When that status quo, however, perpetuates marginalisation and loss of personnel, when it threatens the future capacity of the organisation, new and innovative ways of thinking must be embraced. The ADF senior leadership comprises people of integrity; leaders committed to cultural evolution, who recognise the critical link between an increase in women's representation and the future sustainability of the Defence Force – who are determined to ensure an environment that is optimal for, and takes full advantage of, the strengths of both men and women. Leading cultural change of the magnitude required by the Review demands strong focus, an unwavering determination and a willingness to be held accountable.

While this Review was sparked by events relating to the improper sexualised treatment of ADF women, a broader imperative was to examine the underlying culture and structures that may contribute to their marginalisation – and to the failure of the ADF to keep pace with Australia's workforce demographic. Despite progress over the last two decades, today, I am not confident that in all the varied workplaces that comprise the ADF, women can and will flourish. That is the reality the ADF must change.

I observed that for many in the ADF, service comes above all else – above family and relationships, above personal wellbeing – with the inevitable impact on individual's lives. I firmly believe that service to the ADF does not extend to sacrificing basic human rights – a member's right to a family, the right to a work environment free from sexual violence, the right to equality.

Along the way I have heard many positive stories – stories in which the ADF has clearly served its members well. I have also heard, however, deeply distressing stories from women – stories of extreme exclusion, of harassment and bullying, of sexual assault and victimisation. Many of these women felt that lodging a formal complaint was not an option. In undertaking the Review, then, I was acutely aware of the impact that the process itself may have on ADF members, and of my duty to report accurately the experiences recounted to me and the team. On occasion, as information was uncovered, I immediately raised these matters with the ADF leadership. Their responses were consistent with their wider commitment to eliminate all unacceptable behaviour. This leaves me in no doubt that progress is achievable. Meanwhile, the bravery of those women who chose to tell their stories – to the Review and to leadership – was both moving and extraordinary. Their courage has made very real the necessity for meaningful reform.

The vast majority of the recommendations contained in the report are gender neutral, in part because the issues of work and family, unacceptable behaviour and sexual assault are not unique to women. Equally, ADF women strongly believe that when they are singled out, it makes it harder for them to fit in. Highly resistant to any initiative being directed solely at them, ADF women view identical – not differential – treatment as the path to delivering equality. This is most likely in part to avoid the backlash that inevitably trails any treatment perceived as 'preferential'.

Certainly, there are circumstances where it is appropriate to treat men and women identically, such as where any significant gender differences are not relevant and where a 'level playing field' already exists. This must be balanced with circumstances where identical treatment will lead to inequality; such as when existing policies and practices are assumed to be neutral but in fact are embedded in a 'male norm'. It is in these areas that we have made recommendations directed specifically to women.

The simple fact is that, while capable of making equally valuable contributions to a workforce, the needs and experiences of men and women are different. ADF members must recognise and build this knowledge into the structures, systems and practices that underpin their organisation. With this in mind, the application of targets in a small number of selected areas is crucial to ensuring that women have the same opportunities as men in all aspects of ADF life. Without targets in selected areas there will be no change.

It has been heartening to observe in recent months, following the initiation of the Review and the new forms of engagement made possible, the progress which is already occurring within the ADF.

In closing, I wish to thank GEN David Hurley, AC, DSC, Chief of the Defence Force; AIRMSHL Mark Binskin, AO, Vice Chief of the Defence Force; VADM Ray Griggs, AO, CSC, Chief of Navy; LTGEN David Morrison, AO, Chief of Army; AIRMSHL Geoff Brown, AO, Chief of Air Force; LTGEN Ash Power, AO, CSC, Chief Joint Operations and MAJGEN Gerard Fogarty AM, Head People Capability. Their readiness to be open and transparent – to engage with difficult issues and vulnerable Service members, as well as to provide unparalleled access to personnel, bases, facilities and deployed environments – is testament both to their commitment to the imperative for change and to their understanding of the standards that Australians demand of their Defence Force.

I thank the three talented Defence Liaison Officers who worked tirelessly to ensure that all our requests were acted upon and that the Review had access to everything needed. From the outset we agreed that if COL Natasha Fox, CMDR Alison Westwood and SQNLDR Fleur James are representative of ADF members, then our military future is in good hands.

I thank my fellow panel members Sam Mostyn, Damian Powell, Mark Ney and Marian Baird all of whom are experts in their fields and who have brought different perspectives to the Review. Each one travelled to different military bases, often at short notice, and offered sage and perceptive observations to ensure the Report set out a high quality reform agenda.

Thank you, also, to the ADF Review team led by Alexandra Shehadie. The team has worked extremely hard to capture the major themes from thousands of pages of transcript and documents. They have ensured all our recommendations are underpinned by strong evidence.

Finally, I thank the thousands of ADF personnel and those beyond who gave us their valuable time and opinions. As varied as your voices may have been, ultimately, one ambition was shared by all. This is for a strong and unified ADF – one of which Australians can be justifiably proud. The commitment is there. A path, by way of these recommendations, is laid out. It is now for the ADF to make good on this ambition – to realise an organisation which, in return for their service to Australia, gives all of its members, irrespective of their gender, the opportunity to thrive.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "E. Broderick". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Elizabeth Broderick
Sex Discrimination Commissioner

August 2012

Terms of Reference

Review into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Academy and Australian Defence Force

The Terms of Reference were developed by the Australian Human Rights Commission after consultation with the ADF. The Terms of Reference requested the Review Panel, led by the Sex Discrimination Commissioner, to review, report and make recommendations on:

- a) The treatment of women at the Australian Defence Force Academy with a particular focus on the adequacy and appropriateness of measures to: promote gender equality, ensure women's safety, and to address and prevent sexual harassment and abuse, and sex discrimination.
- b) Initiatives required to drive cultural change in the treatment of women at the Australian Defence Force Academy, including the adequacy and effectiveness of existing initiatives and of approaches to training, education, mentoring and development.
- c) The effectiveness of the cultural change strategies recommended by the Chief of the Defence Force Women's Reference Group in the Women's Action Plan including the implementation of these strategies across the Australian Defence Force.
- d) Measures and initiatives required to improve the pathways for increased representation of women into the senior ranks and leadership of the Australian Defence Force.
- e) Any other matters the Panel considers appropriate that are incidental to the above terms of reference.

Additionally, 12 months after the release of the Panel's report (the Report), the Terms of Reference require a further independent Report to be prepared which:

- audits the implementation of the recommendations in the Panel's Report by the Australian Defence Force Academy and the Australian Defence Force more broadly
- makes any further recommendations necessary to advance the treatment of women at the Australian Defence Force Academy and in the Australian Defence Force.

The Panel was asked to consult widely in conducting the Review.

In preparing the Report the Panel may have regard to the evidence and available outcomes of the additional reviews announced by the Minister for Defence in April 2011.

The Panel may release interim reports addressing different elements of the terms of reference ahead of the completion of the Report.

The Review has been divided into two Phases. Phase One previously addressed objectives (a) and (b) in the Terms of Reference and Phase Two addresses objectives (c) to (e). This Report addresses Phase Two.

Pursuant to the Terms of Reference, a Review Panel, led by the Sex Discrimination Commissioner, was formed to review, report and make recommendations on the treatment of women in the Australian Defence Force.

The Review Panel brings together expertise in key areas relevant to the Review including educational development, cultural change, command and control environments and the progression of gender equality. Below is a brief biography of each of the Review Panel members.

Marian Baird

Marian Baird is Professor of Employment Relations and co-editor of the Journal of Industrial Relations. She is a leading researcher in the fields of women, work and family and the Director of the Women and Work Research Group at the University of Sydney Business School. Her research group brings together academics, practitioners and policy makers from private, public and not-for-profit organisations to inform policy making.

Professor Baird is very well known for her work on maternity and parental leave policies and she is currently a Chief Investigator on the Paid Parental Leave scheme evaluation team. She supervises a number of PhD students, teaches in both the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Business School and is widely published in Australia and internationally. She is the co-author of 'Human Resource Management: Strategy and Practice' (2010), a major Australian HRM text, and co-editor of the recently published book 'Work and Employment Relations: An Era of Change' (2011).

Sam Mostyn

Sam Mostyn is a non-executive director and corporate adviser. She currently sits on the boards of Virgin Australia, Transurban and Citibank Australia and has previously held a range of senior executive positions. These roles have encompassed human resources and culture change, corporate and government affairs, and corporate sustainability. In 2005 she was the first woman appointed AFL Commissioner and she continues to advocate for the inclusion of women in the AFL industry. She is a member of the advisory board of the Crawford School of Economics and Government at the ANU, and is the Deputy Chair of the Diversity Council of Australia.

Ms Mostyn has long worked to build strong and trusting relationships across the Australian community, particularly focused on equality of opportunity for women and the need for diversity in leadership. She was a member of the Chief of the Defence Force Reference Group on Women. Ms Mostyn graduated with a BA/LLB at the ANU.

Mark Ney

Mark Ney retired as an Assistant Commissioner in the Australian Federal Police (AFP) in 2009 after 25 years of service. During this time he held a range of senior executive positions. As an Assistant Commissioner he had responsibility for executive management of Northern Operations (2001-2003), Human Resources (2003-2006) and Protection (2006-2009). After leaving the AFP in 2009, Mr Ney consulted with a range of private and public sector organisations, assisting in organisational change and diversity initiatives. He returned to the AFP in 2011 and is currently managing the Australian Federal Police College.

Mr Ney has extensive operational and investigative policing experience, conducting and managing serious, complex and sensitive investigations. He has been an active participant promoting the diversity agenda over the past decade and was a member of the Diversity Council of Australia Board from 2004 until 2009, and later the chairperson of the board of directors. Mr Ney has postgraduate qualifications from Monash University in Business and Charles Sturt University in Management.

Damian Powell

Dr Damian Powell is Principal of Janet Clarke Hall in the University of Melbourne. He graduated with prizes in history and archaeology from the Universities of Melbourne and Adelaide, working on Melbourne University's Tell Ahmar Archaeological Expedition in Syria. Having lectured in New Zealand at the University of Canterbury, Dr Powell has worked over two decades in university colleges including Lincoln College, Adelaide and Trinity College, Melbourne.

Dr Powell has served on a range of boards addressing adolescent educational development including the Board of Ballarat, Queen's Anglican Grammar School and the national executive of University Colleges Australia. A Senior Fellow in Melbourne's School of Historical and Philosophical Studies, he speaks and publishes regularly on aspects of Australian and British legal and military history.

Acronyms and Glossary

1. Abbreviations, Acronyms and ADF Terms

AB	Able seaman (Navy rank)
Ab initio recruitment	Entry level recruit with no previous military experience
AC/W	Aircraftman/aircraftwoman
ACSC	Australian Command and Staff College
ADF	Australian Defence Force
ADFA	Australian Defence Force Academy
ADFIS	Australian Defence Forces Investigative Service
ADHREC	Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee
ADMIN	Administration
ADML	Admiral (Navy rank)
AFS	Average Funded Strength
AIRCDRE	Air commodore (Air Force rank)
AIRMSHL	Air marshal (Air Force rank)
Allowance	Pay and special compensation
APS	Australian Public Service
ARA	Australian Regular Army
ASLT	Acting sub lieutenant (Navy rank)
ASX	Australian Securities Exchange
AVM	Air vice-marshal (Air Force rank)
BRIG	Brigadier (Army rank)
CA	Chief of Army
CAF	Chief of Air Force
CAPT	Captain (Navy or Army rank)
CDF	Chief of the Defence Force
CDRE	Commodore (Navy rank)
CDSS	Centre for Defence and Strategic Studies
CE	Constrained Establishment
CF	Canadian Forces
Chain of Command	Leadership structure in the military
Chaplain	Military minister, priest, padre or pastor
CMDR	Commander (Navy rank)
CN	Chief of Navy
CO	Commanding officer
COL	Colonel (Army rank)
Conditions of Service	Pay and entitlements of Defence members
CONF	Confidential (Security Classification)
COSC	Chiefs of Service Committee

Court Martial	Trial system within the Military
CPL	Corporal (Army and Air Force rank)
CPO	Chief petty officer (Navy rank)
CRMC	Candidate Relationship Management Centre
CWINF	Committee for Women in NATO Forces
DACOWITS	Defence Advisory Committee on Women in the Services
DCCP	Defence Child Care Program
DCO	Defence Community Organisation
Deployment	When a member is sent on a military mission outside their normal area of operation, usually for more than one month, without family members/dependents
DFA	Defence Families of Australia
DFDA	Defence Force Discipline Act 1982
DFR	Defence Force Recruiting
DHA	Defence Housing Australia
DOCM-A	Directorate of Officer Career Management (Army)
DoD	US Department of Defense
DP	Directorate of Personnel
DP-AF	Directorate of Personnel – Air Force
DREAMS	Defence Remote Electronic Access Mobility System
DSC	Defence Service Centre
DSCMA	Directorate of Soldier Career Management Army
DSPPR	Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research
DSTO	Defence Science and Technology Organisation
DVA	Department of Veterans' Affairs
DWIntel	Directorate of Workforce Intelligence
E&D	Equity and Diversity
FET	Female Engagement Team
FLGOFF	Flying officer (Air Force rank)
FLTLT	Flight lieutenant (Air Force rank)
FSGT	Flight sergeant (Air Force rank)
FSU	Navy Fleet Support Unit
FWA	Flexible Working Arrangement
GEN	General (Army rank)
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GPCAPT	Group captain (Air Force rank)
HMAS	Her Majesty's Australian Ship
HQJOC	Headquarters Joint Operations Command
IGADF	Inspector General Australian Defence Force
IMPS	Initial Minimum Period of Service

IPS	Initial Period of Service
JAG	Judge Advocate General
Kellick	Leading seaman
LAC/W	Leading aircraftman/aircraftwoman
LCDR	Lieutenant commander (Navy rank)
LCPC	Lieutenant commanders Promotion Course
LCPL	Lance corporal (Army rank)
LDC	Long Day Care
Leave	Approved time away from duty
LEUT	Lieutenant (Navy rank)
Logistics	Equipment and support needed for performance
LS	Leading seaman (Navy rank)
LT	Lieutenant (Army rank)
LTCOL	Lieutenant colonel (Army rank)
LTGEN	Lieutenant general (Army rank)
LWOP	Leave Without Pay
MAJ	Major (Army rank)
MAJGEN	Major general (Army rank)
Married separated	Posted to a different location from his or her spouse
MEC	Medical Employment Classification
Mess	Club and Dining Facilities
MIDN	Midshipman (Navy rank)
MLDC	Military Leadership Diversity Commission (US)
MP	Military Police
MST	Military Sexual Trauma
MWDH	Military Working Dog Handler
MWD(U)	Members With Dependants (Unaccompanied)
MWO	Maritime Warfare Officer
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NCO	Non commissioned officer
NGN	New Generation Navy
NORCOM	Northern Command
NPCMA	Navy People Career Management Agency
NZDF	New Zealand Defence Force
OC	Officer commanding
OCDT	Officer cadet (Army)
ODMP	Office of the Director of Military Prosecutions
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OHS	Occupational Health and Safety

OIC	Officer In Charge
OPS	Operations
OPSO	Office for the Prevention of Sexual Offences
OR	Other rank (those not Officers, general enlisted personnel)
OSHC	Out of School Hours Care
Other ranks	Ranks other than officer ranks, general enlisted personnel
PACMAN	Australian Defence Force Pay and Conditions Manual
PAF	Permanent Air Force
PAR	Performance Appraisal Report
PEC	Primary Emergency Contact
Permanent ADF	Members of the Royal Australian Navy, Australian Regular Army, and Royal Australian Air Force
PFA	Pre-enlistment Fitness Assessment
PLTOFF	Pilot officer (Air Force rank)
PO	Petty officer (Navy rank)
Posting	Moving work location as required
PQ	Primary Qualification
Psych	Psychologist
PT	Physical Training
PTE	Private (Army rank)
PTLWOP	Part Time Leave Without Pay
PTSD	Post-traumatic stress disorder
RA	Rental Allowance
RAAF	Royal Australian Air Force
RADM	Rear admiral (Navy rank)
RAF	Royal Air Force
RAN	Royal Australian Navy
Rank	Official title and level of a serving member
RAR	Royal Australian Regiment
RCMP	Royal Canadian Mounted Police
REC	Recruit
REGT	Regiment
Reserve/Reservist	Volunteer for part time service in the Navy, Army and Air Force
RMC	Royal Military College
ROSO	Return of Service Obligation
RoWS	Recruitment of Women Strategy
RSM	Regimental sergeant major (Army appointment in the rank of WO1)
RSM-A	Regimental sergeant major of the Army
SAPRO	Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office
SASR	Special Air Service Regiment
SBLT	Sub lieutenant (Navy rank)

SCDT	Staff cadet
SDA	Sex Discrimination Act 1984 (Cth)
SGT	Sergeant (Army and Air Force rank)
SMEPED	Secure Mobile Environment Personal Electronic Devices
SMN	Seaman (Navy rank)
SQNLDR	Squadron leader (Air Force rank)
SRP	Strategic Reform Program
SSGT	Staff sergeant (Army rank)
Unrestricted Service	The requirement to serve anywhere, anytime
UNSCR	United Nations Security Council Resolution
VADM	Vice admiral (Navy rank)
WGCDR	Wing commander (Air Force rank)
WHS	Work Health and Safety
WHS Act	Work Health and Safety Act 2011
WO	Warrant officer (Navy Rank)
WO1	Warrant officer class one (Army Rank)
WO2	Warrant officer class two (Army Rank)
WOFF	Warrant officer (Air Force rank)
WOFF-AF	Warrant officer of the Air Force
WO-N	Warrant officer of the Navy
XO	Executive Officer (Second In Charge)
2LT	2nd lieutenant (Army rank)

2. ADF Badges of Rank and Special Insignia

AUSTRALIAN DEFENCE FORCE BADGES OF RANK AND SPECIAL INSIGNIA


NAVY




ARMY




AIR FORCE




NAVY



ARMY



AIR FORCE



Methodology

Introduction

The findings and recommendations in this Report are based on an independent assessment of the treatment of women in the ADF. This included the examination and analysis of both qualitative and quantitative research.

Qualitative Data

Considerable qualitative data was gathered to inform the Report and its recommendations. Much of this was gathered from consultative sessions with ADF personnel although information from written submissions and confidential, individual discussions was also relied upon. During the consultation process, various incidents of alleged unacceptable behaviour, including sexual misconduct, were brought to the attention of the Review. While the Report does refer to alleged misconduct, it should be noted that the scope of the Review did not extend to investigating and making findings or determinations about any incidents or allegations of unacceptable conduct or sexual misconduct.

(a) Focus Groups and Meetings

Consultations with members of the ADF were held in a range of different environments with the aim of connecting with those most vulnerable in the system. The Review visited naval, air force and army bases, training colleges and recruit schools. It observed exercises and demonstrations, interviewed personnel on ships, submarines, helicopters and fixed wing aircraft.

The Review considered it was critical to consult with ADF members in deployed environments and to learn first-hand of their experiences and opinions. To that end, the Commissioner and a Review team member travelled to Al Minhad base in the United Arab Emirates, as well as Tarin Kowt and Kabul in Afghanistan. The Review also held two teleconferences with female troops deployed in East Timor.

Overall, the Review held:

- 110 focus groups with over 1100 personnel in 33 bases across Australia
- 16 focus groups with 177 personnel deployed to Afghanistan and the UAE
- 2 focus groups via videoconference with 26 personnel deployed to East Timor
- 82 meetings with approximately 360 senior ADF officers and stakeholders
- 10 meetings in Washington (Pentagon) with 28 US Defense Personnel
- 13 confidential interviews in Afghanistan and the UAE.

Focus group facilitators were guided by a structured series of questions designed to explore themes relevant to the Terms of Reference. This process was also flexible, allowing issues and themes of particular interest to the group, or new issues which had been raised by previous groups, to be explored.

Focus group discussions addressed the representation of women; women's recruitment and career progression; women in combat; women's living arrangements; awareness and prevalence of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and abuse; mentoring and sponsorship; women in leadership; combining work and family; women's employment status and opportunities; and the CDF's Women's Action Plan.

Focus group participants were assured of their privacy and confidentiality. With the permission of participants, discussions were recorded and transcribed. Only de-identified information has been used in the Report. Transcripts of all focus groups and meetings were analysed by the Review Secretariat.

(b) Written Submissions

Written submissions for Phase 2 opened on 5 November 2011 and closed on 1 June 2012.

Advertisements inviting submissions for Phase Two of the Review appeared in major Australian metropolitan and regional newspapers. The call for submissions was also placed on the Australian Human Rights Commission website and disseminated through key ADF networks.

A total of 61 submissions were received, including 36 public and 25 confidential.

All submissions were analysed by the Review Secretariat which identified emerging themes. All public submissions were placed on the Review website: www.humanrights.gov.au/defencereview.

(c) Access to 1800 number

A toll-free confidential telephone line was established for the entirety of the Review for individuals wishing to speak confidentially to a member of the Review team about his or her experiences in the ADF. The availability of the phone line was promoted during the Review's visits to the naval, army and air force bases as well as on the Review website. A number of telephone interviews and/or verbal submissions were conducted as a result of calls to this number.

(d) Individual processes

During Review visits to various locations, many people took the opportunity to raise matters of concern directly with the Commissioner and the team. On a number of occasions, the Commissioner then raised these issues directly with the leadership of the ADF.

On other occasions, the Commissioner became aware of matters of concern independently of a disclosure. With the consent of the individual involved, the Commissioner organised appropriate interventions and, in this way, was able to expedite resolution of the issue or facilitate solutions. This measure was important for both the relevant individual and the senior ADF leadership personnel who were involved in these processes.

Quantitative Data

To gather the Review's quantitative data, two survey instruments were developed and applied across the ADF.

(a) Survey 1: Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey

The Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force survey collected views and information about the experiences and opinions of ADF members in relation to the Review's Terms of Reference.

The survey was submitted to Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee (ADHREC) for approval on 17 November 2011 with the assistance of the Department of Defence's Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research (DSPPR). Approval was granted on 6 December 2011.

The survey was distributed in two ways:

- Focus groups: 523 members completed the survey in focus groups.
- On-line: The survey was circulated to a stratified sample of approximately 20 per cent of ADF members. In raw figures, 4,766 responses were received, of which 3,639 were from Permanent members and 1,127 were from Reservists.

This survey collected information on a range of issues relevant to the treatment of women, including work and family issues, women's representation in leadership roles (including views on promotional opportunities for women as compared to their male counterparts), sexual harassment, abuse and sex discrimination. It also collected other demographic, behavioural, attitudinal and experiential data. DSPPR provided the raw data for the Review to undertake its own analysis. DSPPR also analysed the results and provided their own report to the Review.

A copy of the Survey is attached in the Appendices.

(b) Survey 2: Australian Human Rights Commission Sexual Harassment National Telephone Survey

The Australian Human Rights Commission's Sexual Harassment National Telephone Survey is administered at regular intervals to examine the nature and prevalence of sexual harassment in Australian workplaces. In 2012 the Commission's national survey of sexual harassment in the workplace in the Australian population was also conducted in the ADF workplace. A random, partially stratified sample of 1,000 ADF personnel were surveyed on the issue of sexual harassment. The simultaneous administration of both surveys allowed for comparisons between the ADF workplace and National Survey more generally.

Ethics approval for this research was sought from the Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee (ADHREC) on 13 April 2012 with the assistance of the DSPPR. Final approval was granted on 2 May 2012. The survey was administered by Roy Morgan Research in collaboration with the Department of Defence. The ADF participants were surveyed by telephone.

A copy of the Survey and the results are attached in the Appendices.

ADF Documentation and Literature reviews

During the course of the Review, the Review Secretariat requested and received documentation and information from the ADF on policies, strategies and various other data. In total, 387 requests were made of the ADF. All requests were actioned by the ADF and almost all requested material was received. The only exception to this was where the ADF did not have knowledge or data on the type of information requested.

The Review team also undertook literature reviews in a number of key areas to support its recommendations.

Analysis of Comparable International Militaries

A review and analysis of the literature relating to the treatment of women in comparable overseas militaries was undertaken. The Review distilled the key principles and lessons learnt from the international evidence into a set of promising practices. The suitability of these promising practices was assessed for possible adoption by the ADF.

Limitations to research

The ADF was responsive to all requests made by the Review team including requests for access to bases and personnel, provision of documentation and data and participation and support for the two surveys conducted, i.e. the *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey* and the Australian Human Rights Commission's *Sexual Harassment National Telephone Survey*.

In some areas, such as in relation to the incidence of sexual offences, consistent data was not available. Further, given that each Service responded to many of the data requests in different ways, it was at times difficult to draw comparisons across the Services or to gain a picture of the ADF as a whole. Data was often provided in different formats and drawn from different databases. Different Services and departments also had different conventions and assumptions underlying the quantitative data that they used. The report records as footnotes all sources drawn upon and, where necessary, identifies the assumptions underlying figures.

Previous Reviews

In the past, the ADF has been subject to a range of reviews and reports that have directly and indirectly examined the culture of the organisation and the impact of that culture on the treatment of women. The following are those that are of most relevance to this Review:

- Women in the Australian Defence Force, Clare Burton (1996)
- Women's Participation in the Navy, Christine McLoughlin (2009)
- Review of Mental Health Care in the ADF and Transition through Discharge, Professor David Dunt (2009)
- Mental Health in the Australian Defence Force: 2010 ADF Mental Health Prevalence and Wellbeing Study, University of Adelaide and Vice Chief of the Australian Defence Force (2010)
- Defence's Management of Health Services to Australian Defence Force Personnel in Australia, Australian National Audit Office 2010
- Defence Women's APSD Leadership Pathways, Carmel McGregor (2011)
- Beyond Compliance: An Operations Focussed Culture and The Australian Profession of Arms, MAJGEN Craig Orme (2011)
- Review of the Management of Incidents and Complaints in Defence including Civil and Military Jurisdiction, Inspector General ADF (2011)
- HMAS Success Commission of Inquiry Report, Hon Roger Gyles AO QC (2011)
- Pathways to Change: Evolving Defence Culture, ADF (2012)
- Report of the Review of Allegations of Sexual and Other Abuse in Defence: Facing the Problems of the Past, Volume 1 DLA Piper (2012)

Principles underpinning the Review

The methodology employed by the Review was based on the following principles:

1. Comprehensive

Members of the ADF and the public were provided with as many avenues as possible to communicate with the Review. This effort was made to ensure the information coming to the Review was as broad and extensive as was possible.

2. Consultative

The Review aimed to consult as widely as possible with members of the ADF in order to hear their views, experiences and suggestions for change. The Review actively sought out those most vulnerable to the system's deficiencies.

3. Inclusive

Both male and female members of the ADF were encouraged to make a contribution to the Review. This was done through consultations with individuals, mixed gender focus groups, women-only focus groups and men-only focus groups.

4. Voluntary

Involvement of all participants in the Review process was voluntary. Participants could withdraw at any time with no negative consequences.

5. Confidential

The Review recorded most of the discussions and focus groups. Information gathered from these consultations has been de-identified and confidentiality has been strictly maintained. Similarly, all survey responses were de-identified and only aggregated responses are reported. As a further precaution, no associated demographic information is reported that could be used to indirectly identify individuals.

6. Evidence based

Evidence gathered through the Review reflects the range of information, views and experiences of ADF members.

7. Sensitivity of process

The Review was acutely aware of the effects that the process could have on members of the ADF. When, the team came across information, evidence or experiences that were of concern, the Commissioner, with the appropriate consent of the person(s) involved, would address the issue immediately with the ADF Senior Leadership.



“A lot of the problems we face, we all just shrug off as ‘oh that’s part of the military and it’s just the way it is’. I would question whether it needs to be like that and whether it will stay like that forever.”

**Deployed ADF member
(Focus Group)**

Overview and Recommendations

A Strong Future for the ADF – Initiatives Required to Drive Change in the Treatment of Women

This section gives an overview of the Review's findings and recommendations. Taken together, the recommendations create a coherent and powerful platform for change.

Introduction

A military organisation is unique within the context of a nation's society and institutions. It demands sacrifices and commitment from its serving members beyond those most citizens will ever be asked to make. Military organisations do not easily lend themselves to the 'tried and true' strategies which are available to most other government or corporate entities. The reality of posting cycles, operations and deployment makes the military different. The need for personnel to stand in harm's way distinguishes a military career from other careers. The organisational structure of ranks, strict hierarchy and linear career paths make the Services different to most other civilian organisations. Australian society demands high standards of its armed forces and the scrutiny under which the ADF operates is relentless.

None of this detracts from the urgent and compelling need for change. The ADF must address the problem of a shrinking talent pool, the significant cost of unwanted departures, the lack of diversity at leadership level and its desire to be a first class employer with a first class reputation. Increasing the representation of women and improving their pathways into leadership goes to the very heart of the sustainability and capability of the ADF. As one senior female leader observed:

Imagine what an amazing fighting machine we could be if there were more women in both the star rank leadership and in our Warrant Officer population?¹

As importantly, an increased representation of women will build a more inclusive and gender equal culture. The ADF senior leadership understands this at a profound and personal level. Their willingness to be open and transparent, and to provide the Review with unparalleled access to personnel, bases and facilities, is clear testament to their commitment to change.

The Process

The process of conducting the Review has itself been extremely important as a tool for cultural change. The methodology underpinning it has been consultative, comprehensive and evidence-based. Full details of the Review's methodology are set out under "Methodology" in this Report.

Our thinking has been shaped and developed through engagement with, and observation of, the work of the thousands of ADF members who were part of this Review. Our recommendations to drive change have therefore been crafted to recognise that which is unique to the ADF. We have not merely 'imported' a typical suite of strategies.

The deep courage of the women who chose to tell their stories during this Review was a source of inspiration to the Review Panel and team members. We appreciated the personal and organisational commitment displayed by the Service Chiefs who participated in a number of innovative strategies, including meeting individually with some of the women. These strategies were designed to enhance the Service Chief's understanding of the unequal treatment experienced by women in the ADF. Their responses convinced the Review team that fundamental cultural change is possible. We have no doubt that the bravery of the women, who recounted their stories directly to each Chief, opened pathways for a better understanding of the challenges and hurdles to be addressed if the ADF is to build a truly inclusive culture.

Existing Service Specific Reform Programs

In recent times, Navy, Army and Air Force have introduced a range of promising reform programs aimed at building more diverse and inclusive Services.² The Review supports these efforts and considers that the recommendations set out in this Report build on these initiatives and other ADF reform strategies, such as "Pathway to Change: Evolving Defence Culture" and "Plan SUAKIN". Our intention is that the recommendations in this Report will complement and strengthen the existing momentum for change within the ADF.

(a) Navy³

In Navy, the New Generation Navy (NGN) cultural reform program was established in 2009 as a five year strategy to address the cultural, leadership and structural changes to meet the challenges of delivering future capability.⁴ NGN is a broad program encompassing a range of initiatives underpinned by certain values and ten signature behaviours that Navy personnel are encouraged to adopt in their day to day working lives.⁵ The NGN program is driven at the highest levels with the full support and commitment of the Chief of Navy.

Through implementing NGN, Navy aims to challenge the current culture and bring change to create a sustainable and capable organisation. A key element of NGN includes training on effective, inclusive and ethical leadership based on the Navy values. Navy itself has stated that:

Navy is starting to see a change in its culture, but true and sustained cultural change takes time and there remains a significant amount of effort required if these changes are to be enduring.⁶

(b) Army

The Chief of Army has committed to a number of change initiatives aimed at attracting and retaining more women. These include the establishment of recruitment targets for women, a reduction in the Initial Minimum Period of Service obligations in certain categories, and building greater flexibility into career pathways.

A further key initiative is the removal of gender restrictions on combat related roles which will enable women to enter non-traditional areas of employment, thereby reducing occupational segregation and helping clear the way for women to progress to higher ranks.

(c) Air Force

In Air Force, Project Winter and a range of flexible work initiatives have been introduced in an attempt to increase the overall representation of women.⁷ Project Winter has a particular focus on attracting women into non-traditional employment areas. The current focus of the project is on the recruitment, support, retention and progression of women in non-traditional roles, including areas such as Pilots and Air Combat Officers.

In addition, Air Force has also developed the Women's Integrated Networking Groups (WINGS) program – a customised mentoring program aimed at encouraging the formation of mentoring relationships. The focus of the program is to build support networks for women in areas where they are under-represented and have fewer opportunities for regular networking or mentoring through everyday workplace interactions. Following a successful trial, the program is being replicated across major Air Force bases.

Identified barriers to women's progression

The Review supports the initiatives identified above but considers that by themselves, they will not overcome the systemic, cultural and practical impediments to cultural change that still exist in the treatment of women in the ADF. From the extensive consultations and research conducted during the Review a number of barriers were identified. These included: the lack of critical mass of women in the ADF, stemming from attraction and retention difficulties; the rigid career structures and high degree of occupational segregation; the difficulties combining work and family; and a culture still marked, on occasion, by poor leadership and unacceptable behaviour including exclusion, sexual harassment and sexual abuse.

An analysis of the data relating to senior leadership levels in the ADF demonstrated just how difficult it is for women to succeed, particularly women with children. While 88.9% of men in the star ranks have children, only 22.2% of women do.⁸

In some areas, good progress has been made and promising initiatives have been put in place. These initiatives though will not be enough to drive the change required – a broader imperative for change must be communicated.

The Necessity for Targets

We understand there will be organisational resistance to the idea that women may need different and specific supports to overcome systemic and cultural barriers.

On many occasions we heard that gender equality and increased representation of women within the ADF would only come from treating women and men identically.

The Review disagrees. In certain areas, identical treatment will not deliver the desired outcome, but will instead lead to greater inequality. This is the case where existing policies and practices are assumed to be neutral when, in fact, they are embedded in a 'male norm'. In these areas, we have made recommendations to level the playing field between men and women.

As one senior female leader advised:

Many will argue that they don't want to be promoted based on a quota, that they want to get there on merit. Well, quotas and merit are not mutually exclusive ideas. Well, we all need to get over it. The reality is that every woman who goes to the short list at a promotion board has merit anyway.⁹

There will be organisational resistance to targets. Merit is a deeply and widely held core value in the ADF. Targets will be seen to fly in the face of this value. As another female member explained:

The biggest mistake, however, would be to give special treatment to women. This would reinforce the view that women are inferior and can only compete if given an advantage. It breeds division and is totally counter-productive to attempts to have women advance.¹⁰

This is a view shared by many women across the ADF.

Given the barriers identified, the lack of success to date in achieving change and the inadequacy of relying on a 'trickle up' strategy, the Review has found that targets are required in selected areas to drive cultural change in the treatment of women in the ADF and to improve career pathways for women.

Possible Risks

Driving cultural and structural reform of the scale intended by the Review's recommendations carries inherent risks. Some people will embrace the changes and see merit in the arguments and strategies. Others will not. There will be strong resistance to some measures, such as targets, which could result in a backlash against women. Women's place within the ADF may be called into doubt. They may be 'accused' of attracting special treatment. Their merit may be questioned. Their contribution may be undermined. Behaviours of exclusion or harassment may intensify and these behaviours may come from both men and women.

At all levels of the ADF, leadership must be alive to these possibilities and must be constantly vigilant in ensuring that any negative or unintended consequences of this reform are acted upon immediately and effectively.

The change management processes underpinning the implementation of the Review's recommendations must explicitly manage the risks of reform and ensure that safeguards are in place to protect those who are vulnerable.

Principles to underpin success

In framing the Review's recommendations, we have drawn upon existing ADF practices that show promise, as well as lessons learned from national and international evidence. As explored in Chapter 9, many militaries around the world are addressing these issues with varying degrees of achievement and organisational impact. The Review has identified recurring themes and principles which underpin success:

- **Principle 1 – Strong leadership drives reform**
- **Principle 2 – Diversity of leadership increases capability**
- **Principle 3 – Increasing numbers requires increasing opportunities**
- **Principle 4 – Greater flexibility will strengthen the ADF**
- **Principle 5 – Gender based harassment and violence ruins lives, divides teams and damages operational effectiveness**

These themes and principles provide the framework for the Recommendations that follow.

Principle 1: Strong leadership drives reform

Strong statements and modelling by leadership are vital to the success of increasing gender diversity. For women who are striving to ascend to senior positions, personal commitments from leaders who understand the imperative for change are essential.

The recommendations that follow actively promote broad organisational understanding of diversity as both a core defence value and an operational imperative linked to capability and operational effectiveness.

Commanding officers need to be accountable for creating and maintaining a healthy organisational culture. This includes being available, on a regular basis, to engage directly with members about workplace concerns and inappropriate behaviour. This should be done with a view to early identification and expeditious resolution.

The recommendations are designed to secure strong and unequivocal commitment from defence leadership, as well as from middle management, particularly non-commissioned officers. Middle management plays a critical role in ensuring that the ADF is a well-functioning organisation which treats men and women equally.

For the reforms outlined in this Report to be successful, the ADF Senior Leadership must take full responsibility for the implementation of the Recommendations.

Recommendation 1:

The Chiefs of Services Committee (COSC) should take direct responsibility for the implementation of the Review's recommendations, make decisions, monitor key metrics and take corrective action.

Recommendation 2:

COSC should articulate and communicate a strong and unambiguous commitment to the effect that:

- **Targets are required to create an environment that is optimal for, and takes full advantage of, the strengths of both men and women.**
- **Leaders will be held to account for the wellbeing and culture of their teams.**
- **Every sexual offender and harasser will be held to account together with leaders who fail to appropriately address the behaviour.**
- **Flexible working arrangements underpin capability and are an important recruitment and retention tool.**
- **Women are essential to the sustainability and operational effectiveness of the ADF because they contribute to a diverse workforce which strengthens the ADF's ability to be an effective, modern, relevant and high performing organisation.**

This statement should be supported by a performance framework to ensure high performing defence environments where both men and women can thrive. The performance framework should be incorporated into all leader development, including individual performance appraisals, and formal development occurring in training organisations and recruit schools, and will be reinforced at all levels of the organisation. The consequences of non-adherence to the framework will be actioned including through limiting career advancement opportunities.

Recommendation 3:

COSC should publish a “Women in the ADF” report each year, as a companion document to the ADF Annual Report. The companion document should publically report on the progress of the implementation of the Review’s recommendations and key metrics including, but not limited to:

A. Women’s Participation

- Number and proportion of women recruited in each Service (via ab initio, mid-career/ lateral entry, recruit to trade, recruit to area, from the Reserve and other specific recruitment initiatives)
- Number and proportion of women in each Service and rank
- Number and proportion of women:
 - » at executive level in each service
 - » in the pipeline in each service
 - » in targeted occupations which are highly gender segregated
- Number and proportion of women’s promotions by Service and at each rank
- Gender balance on key decision making bodies within ADF
- Retention of women:
 - » Gap between men and women’s retention and separation rates
 - » Number returning to work from paid and unpaid maternity and parental leave
 - » Number of men and women taking career breaks
- Measures of occupational segregation
- Outcomes of gender pay audits
- Number of women accessing mentoring/sponsorship.

B. Women’s experience

Gender disaggregated data from key organisational surveys including:

- Defence Attitude Survey
- Exit Surveys
- Climate, Culture and Pulse surveys.

C. Access to flexible work

- Number of men and women accessing formalised flexible working arrangements across all ranks
- Number of applications submitted for flexible working arrangements
- Proportion of applications for flexible working arrangements that are approved.

D. Sexual harassment and abuse

- Number of complaints
- Types of complaints e.g. sexual harassment, sexual assault
- Relevant demographics of complainant and respondent e.g. work area, rank
- Number of complaints dealt with internally:
 - » Number investigated
 - » Number resolved
 - » Time taken from receipt of complaint to finalisation

- **Number of complaints dealt with externally:**
 - » **Number investigated**
 - » **Number resolved**
 - » **Time taken from receipt to finalisation**
- **Cost per complaint:**
 - » **Internal**
 - » **External.**

This data is to be reported by Service and work location or base.

Recommendation 4:

COSC should ensure that commanding officers are accountable for a healthy organisational culture, for being regularly available to engage directly with members and for taking any corrective action as required. This includes effective management of alleged incidents of harassment, discrimination and unacceptable behaviour, managing flexible work arrangements (FWA), meeting FWA targets, and involvement in mentoring and sponsoring members. The ADF will administer regular climate surveys to assist commanding officers understand and improve organisational culture and performance. The last survey prior to the conclusion of the posting should inform the commanding officer's Performance Appraisal Report (PAR).

Principle 2: Diversity of leadership increases capability

Harnessing all available leadership talent and ensuring a mix of skills, perspectives and experience is critical to increasing capability. Capitalising on diversity of thought and experience provides powerful leverage to problem solve more effectively, make sound decisions and to innovate. The current rigid, linear, one-size-fits-all career continuum is not serving the ADF well. It does not allow the ADF to actively and creatively manage its talent in a flexible way. Too many highly trained, talented people leave.

As an organisation, the ADF does not reflect the society from which it is drawn. It is overwhelmingly an organisation comprised of white Australian men. It lacks the perspectives and experiences of women, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and those of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

Women are significantly underrepresented in leadership positions:¹¹

- In Navy, of the 52 generalist star ranked officers, there is only one woman (1.9%), despite women representing 20% of officers in Navy.¹² Additionally, out of three specialist star ranked officers, there are currently two women from the Health Services category.¹³
- In Army, of the 71 generalist star ranked officers, there are currently only four women (5.6%), despite women representing 14.5% of officers in Army.¹⁴ Additionally, out of the three specialist star ranked officers there is currently one woman from the Legal category.¹⁵
- In Air Force, of the 53 generalist star ranked officers, there is currently only one women (1.9%), despite women representing 18.9% of officers in Air Force.¹⁶ Additionally, out of the two specialist star ranked officers, there is currently one woman from the Health Services category.¹⁷

Further, an examination of the workforce pipeline indicates that women remain underrepresented in key developmental roles that currently act as gateways to senior leadership. Senior leadership positions in all three Services are traditionally appointed from categories in which women have been precluded, or in which they are underrepresented. The ADF should review and redesign the way it develops and appoints its senior leadership. It should seek to create pathways through non-war fighting categories in order to increase diversity in leadership.

Women are underrepresented in command positions compared to the proportion of women in the permanent workforce in all three Services. Given the importance of command positions for career progression, this suggests a structural impediment to women moving into senior leadership positions. In some categories in which women are well represented, there are structural impediments which impact on a woman's ability to progress to the most senior positions. A shortage of women in leadership also means other female personnel are deprived of role models ('you can't be what you can't see') and of potential mentors and sponsors.

There are unwritten, but strong and broadly understood, organisational expectations about the age range within which certain promotional pathways and /or types of experience are to be attained. In order to enable more flexibility in the career continuum and to better serve the talent needs of the modern ADF, these deeply held cultural beliefs and assumptions must be acknowledged, re-examined, and, if necessary, changed.

Given the structural impediments identified by the Review, a 'trickle up' strategy will not address these stark imbalances. Therefore, while we are acutely aware of the resistance to differential treatment – targets and quotas – targeted interventions are required if the ADF is to increase the representation of women and build pathways for them into senior leadership.

These recommendations address the significant under-representation of women at decision making level.

Recommendation 5:

COSC should review and redesign the custom and practice of selecting the most senior strategic leadership positions in the ADF from combat corps codes with the object of selecting from a broader group of meritorious candidates, particularly women. In this endeavour, promotions boards to senior ranks should be as diverse as possible and include at least one person external to the Service.

Recommendation 6:

In order to broaden the talent pool from which leadership is drawn, each Service Chief should identify and implement a target aimed at broadening the work background of people available to enter into leadership positions. The Service Chiefs should:

For Officers:

- **Identify all promotional gateways across the Services, including, and commensurate with Australian Command and Staff College and Centre for Defence and Strategic Studies.**
 - **Establish a target in Australian Command and Staff College and Centre for Defence and Strategic Studies (or commensurate promotional gateways) for people who are drawn from non-warfare corps codes (with an initial focus on categories which have a higher representation of women including Supply, Logistics, Administrative or Health Service roles).**
-

For Other Ranks:

- **Identify promotional gateways and career development opportunities that position individuals for selection to rank of Sergeant (or equivalent) and establish a target for women.**

The Service Chiefs should report annually against these targets in the “Women in the ADF” Report.

Recommendation 7:

The Service Chiefs should instruct their Director General of Personnel to build flexibility into the career model, time in rank provisions, timing of and access to ‘career gates’ and career pathways to enable more flexibility in career progression. This includes, but is not limited to:

- **Developing, on request, longer term career plans (i.e. more than 5 years) for personnel to allow for different life stages and changing requirements.**
- **Developing joint career plans for partners who are both serving members to ensure greater family stability and career opportunities for both members.**
- **Developing mechanisms that would allow people on leave, who so wish, to access training/career gate courses online to enable a person’s currency of their role to be maintained. This could also include a register of voluntary tasks or projects which, if undertaken while on leave, could be reported on for purposes of performance appraisal and therefore be put to promotions boards.**
- **Reforming time in rank requirements by decoupling traditional career pathways and continuous service from promotions processes.**
- **Offering an active talent management program for high performing individuals with leadership potential who choose to participate.**

Principle 3: Increasing numbers requires increasing opportunities

The ADF’s talent pool is narrowing. Competition for talented workers, particularly young workers, has intensified. In order to enhance capability and operational effectiveness, the ADF must draw on, and develop, a broader talent pool. Women are a critical part of this broader talent pool.

The ADF must also improve the efficiency of recruitment. Given that there has only been a one percent increase in recruitment of women over the last 10 years, and only two percent over the last 20 years, the ADF must vigorously address this area.

A number of strategies within the ADF have had success in increasing the proportion of women being recruited. The most successful has been the Gap Year program which provided ‘an opportunity for young adults to experience military training and lifestyle within a 12-month program’.¹⁸ The three year evaluation of this program indicated that, compared to normal recruitment methods, it attracted a higher proportion of women into the ADF. Further, a higher proportion of women transferred from the Gap Year program into the Permanent Forces than through any other form of entry into the Permanent Forces. Though funding for it

has now ceased, the Review recommends that the ADF retain the successful principles of this program by implementing a 'try before you buy' recruitment model.

The overall figures for women's representation in each of the Services mask the uneven distribution of women across the different occupations within the ADF. The ADF has many categories, trades and specialisations. Women and men are not proportionately represented in all of the occupations open to them. The actual occupations women fulfil within the three Services are starkly segregated with most women serving in support roles, particularly administrative, clerical, logistical or health service roles. Occupational segregation perpetuates gender stereotypes and undervalues those occupations considered to be 'women's work'. This slows the progress of gender equality and of the number of women achieving at senior leadership level. A burden and risk also exists for women seen as 'trail-blazers' or who enter occupations where very few women are represented.

When small numbers of women enter a male dominated workplace or trade, there is always an inherent risk. Care needs to be taken, not only to ensure their welfare, but to ensure the appropriate supports and feedback mechanisms are in place – particularly when the numbers of these women are increasing.

The following recommendations not only aim to increase the number of women recruited to the ADF as a whole, but also to specific occupational areas and units. The use of targets is required, both to improve recruitment and to broaden occupational opportunities available to women, including in combat roles. A 'target' is not discriminatory if it constitutes a 'special measure' under the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth) and is imposed for the purpose of achieving substantive equality between men and women in the ADF.¹⁹

In successfully implementing the removal of gender restrictions for combat roles (which will predominantly affect Army), the focus should be on ensuring that leaders, and teams as a whole, are engaged and educated about how they can contribute to effective performance in mixed gender environments. Critical lessons should be shared between the Services.

Given the small numbers of women who are initially likely to consider corps transfers into combat roles, clear policies which recognise non-reduction in rank and pay are needed. To build leadership and preparedness, the focus should be on one combat unit/work section/platoon/company in each Service. To ensure a safe and supportive environment, there should be no less than two women in mixed gender work sections of ten or less, with clustering of women within a category to achieve as close to a critical mass as possible.

The success and progression of women in non-traditional workplaces will be assisted by enhanced mentoring, networking and sponsorship programs. A wide body of evidence confirms that mentoring, networking and sponsorship are essential for women's progression in non-traditional workplaces, and also provide benefit to employees and their organisations. Mentoring and sponsorship should therefore be a strategic priority for developing leaders in the ADF.

Recommendation 8:

To attract and successfully recruit more women, COSC should establish innovative strategies that appeal to women at different stages of their careers including:

- A “try before you buy” option (e.g. initial commitment of 12 months) and/or removal of Initial Minimum Period of Service, including in mid-career.
- A “recruit to area” model, where some women and men are recruited directly from the area where they will be posted for a set period, at least initially.
- Actively facilitating the re-entry of women and men who have moved from the Reserve back into the ADF Permanent Force in order to strengthen the retention of talented people.
- Providing incentives to Defence Force Recruiting to recruit more women.

Recommendation 9:

Each Service Chief should identify and commit to a growth target for the number of women to be recruited into their service. The Service Chiefs should report annually in the “Women in the ADF” Report on progress against the recruitment target.

Recommendation 10:

To address occupational segregation, COSC should drive and commit to a specific program to recruit and build a critical mass of women in areas that have low representation of women, appoint high performing women to key roles in these areas, ensure women are well supported in these occupations and monitor their retention and career progression. The categories include:

For Officers:

- In Navy – Maritime Warfare Officers (Principal Warfare Officers) and Engineering (Marine Engineering and Electrical Weapons Engineering).
- In Army – Combat Officer roles including Infantry Officers and Armoured Officers; non-combat officers including Field Artillery Officers and Engineer Officers.
- In Air Force – Aircrew (Pilots and Air Combat Officers) and Engineering and Logistics (particularly Electronic, Armament and Aeronautical Engineers).

For Other Ranks:

- All technical trades in each of the Services.

This includes the Services trialling:

- Removal of the Initial Minimum Period of Service for women entering particular occupational categories.
- A “recruit to trade” model which allows the timely intake of women into particular occupational categories, irrespective of when the next trade course commences.

Where necessary, the ADF will work with educational institutions to encourage women’s entry into these fields.

Recommendation 11:

To support the removal of gender restrictions (women in combat) COSC should:

- **Ensure that the transition program incorporates corps transfers, peer support for women, specially selected leaders and teams appropriately skilled and trained to create the conditions for mixed combat teams to perform effectively. In relation to corps transfers of women into combat units, the ADF should implement a policy of non- reduction in rank and pay. The transition program is to be reviewed regularly and evaluated based on feedback from the mixed teams and their leadership, and performance against key metrics including perceived level of support, success of integration, tenure and injury rates.**
- **Ensure the environments into which women will enter are ready, appropriately briefed and trained and that the leadership and team are fully engaged and educated about how they can contribute to effective performance in mixed gender environments.**
- **In the first instance:**
 - » **Focus on one combat unit/work section/platoon/company in each Service where effective performance in mixed gender environments has been achieved.**
 - » **Ensure that in mixed gender work sections of ten or less ADF personnel there should be no less than two women.**
 - » **Ensure that women are clustered within the category to achieve as close to a critical mass as possible.**
- **Communicate and share lessons learned across the Services.**

Recommendation 12:

COSC should integrate and rationalise the current suite of mentoring, networking and sponsorship programs available and facilitate access to an appropriate mentor or sponsor for any member who so desires, at any stage of her/his career. A mentor or sponsor could be male or female, from within the Service, another Service or outside the ADF. Mentoring and sponsorship programs are to be based on best practice principles, and their purpose, objectives and duration of the relationship to be determined by the member and the mentor or sponsor.

Principle 4: Greater flexibility will strengthen the ADF

In order to achieve and retain a diverse workforce, where both women and men thrive, the ADF must improve the level to which it assists serving women and men to balance their work and family commitments. Many ADF members face a stark choice – a career in the ADF or a family, but not both. This is evident at the most senior leadership levels of the organisation and may be a contributing factor as to why the ADF is being deprived of more women in senior roles. While 88.9% of men in the star ranks have children, only 22.2% of women do.²⁰ This demonstrates that women are more impacted by the difficulties of combining an ADF career with family.

The ADF relies on ab initio recruitment, and there is considerable investment in members from entry level and onwards. When people leave because they cannot balance their work and family commitments it takes a long time and a great deal of investment to train replacements. Flexibility is therefore an important retention tool and critical to ensuring the ADF's capability.

The Review has identified a range of entrenched structural and cultural impediments to members being able to combine work and family commitments. Difficulty in backfilling maternity and parental leave positions, or finding additional capacity to accommodate a flexible work arrangement, can result in reluctance by supervisors to approve flexible work. There is also a negative stigma attached to these forms of leave and work practices. Members can feel guilt that the team will have to accommodate an additional load. There are often no workload adjustments to accommodate reduced working hours and there is a strong expectation that the full time work load will continue to be carried. This often means working through lunch times, arriving early or leaving late. Members spoke of the negative impact on their career of taking leave and/or working part-time. Even where flexible working arrangements are used by members, these have to be renegotiated if they are posted to a new location.

A new workforce management system that enables more than one member to be posted to the same position is fundamental to increasing the availability and number of flexible working arrangements within the ADF. Additional resources may be required to achieve this objective, but reforming the current workforce management system in this way is a critical tool for the retention of members.

The Review met many individuals who had access to 'informal' flexible work arrangements. Such arrangements included, for example, negotiating to arrive at work after dropping children at care or taking the occasional afternoon off to attend a child's sporting carnival. However, few of these were enduring or 'formalised' arrangements. The Review recognises the value of informal arrangements, but also considers it important that members have certainty about their access to flexible work. The ADF should therefore increase the availability of formal flexible working arrangements to its members.

There are deeply held beliefs within the ADF that many roles cannot accommodate flexible working arrangements. The Review concedes that flexible work arrangements may be difficult in some circumstances. However, it finds that in the majority of roles, much can be done to increase workplace flexibility by looking at new or different ways in which work outcomes can be achieved.

For instance, the Review is aware of the trials and evaluations of alternative crewing and 'Minimum Duty Watch' arrangements in Navy. We understand that many of these trials have been successful and are currently well established on some vessels. Other evaluations have suggested areas that require the attention of leadership include team building, handover and equity in rotation.

The financial implications of implementing such measures have also been brought to our attention. Whilst the Review acknowledges additional expenditure will be necessary, it finds that a proportion of the costs could be offset by reduced expenditure on relocation. Also, the retention of personnel over the longer-term will result in further cost efficiencies. Given the positive benefits of flexible work models to support work/life balance and the impact on the retention of women (and men) in the ADF, the Review recommends that the Services actively build and implement alternative workforce models. Holistic cost/benefit assessments must apply not only the direct costs of the alternative models, but also the benefits back to personnel and the organisation.

A further impediment to accessing flexible working arrangements is the variability amongst supervisors and decision-makers in respect of their willingness to approve these arrangements. This difference in approach can be due to a lack of will on the part of supervisors, difficulty in determining how a role could be adapted or to confusion about policy and funding issues. Also there is currently no explicit incentive to encourage commanders to effectively manage flexible work.

Lack of access to quality child care, was a key recurring theme raised in focus groups. This is particularly the case given that many members are moving every three years. However, data provided to the Review shows that Defence child care centres appear to be under-utilised and indications are that the Defence Community Organisation is 'rethinking' the provision of child care.

The Review urges the ADF to adopt and promote the more inclusive position of 'ADF and family', rather than 'ADF or family'. To that end, it makes the following recommendations to assist the ADF. These recommendations recognise the importance of retention through the use of work and family policies that promote flexibility for members.

Recommendation 13:

Each Service Chief should set an annual growth target for the number of flexible work arrangements (FWA) to be agreed with the CDF. This recommendation applies to both men and women. Progress against this target is to be reported annually in the “Women in the ADF” Report.

Recommendation 14:

COSC should:

- **Establish a central ADF Flexible Work Directorate, reporting to the Deputy Secretary, Defence People Group, to inform policy and best practice. Responsibilities include:**
 - » **Monitoring progress against the growth targets of FWA.**
 - » **Collecting tri-Service data on applications for flexible work arrangements, applications that are refused, applications that are granted, in order that there is a better understanding of and strategic assessment of flexible work arrangements across the ADF.**
 - » **Training and educating middle managers, including NCOs on available tools and how to manage FWAs effectively.**
 - » **Reporting to COSC on progress.**
 - **Direct that, within each Service, the responsibilities of the Service personnel agencies include:**
 - » **As a priority, reviewing job design, statements of duty and team work allocation to identify those positions where full time work is the only sensible model. All others roles should be identified as potentially available in flexible work arrangements.**
 - » **Building workforce models and personnel arrangements to increase workforce flexibility, address the negative impact of work/life balance and increase locational stability, such as fly-in/ fly-out and alternative crewing.**
 - » **Reviewing all FWA applications in consultation with the commanding officers. For those which are rejected the application will be referred to the Director General of Personnel of each Service for review. These instances will be reported and monitored.**
 - » **Maintaining an up to date FWA register which includes expressions of interest, information on locality, type of work and matching applicants for job sharing/ FWA where possible.**
 - » **Reporting to COSC through the Service Chiefs.**
-

Recommendation 15:

COSC should introduce a workforce management system that enables more than one member to be posted/assigned to the same position. Such a system would enable commanders to request and, where appropriate, be provided with additional staffing to facilitate flexible work practices, such as job sharing. This reform must be widely communicated and effectively explained to all ADF members.

Recommendation 16:

COSC should ensure that, in implementing the recommendations outlined in Plan SUAKIN (part of the Rethink Reserves study into the Reserve Forces), the specific impact of the reforms on women is monitored and that any issues arising are addressed.

Recommendation 17:

The Service Chiefs should instruct their career management agencies, as part of career planning and/or when posting decisions are made, to develop a support to posting plan for members. Such a plan should be developed in consultation and with the agreement of each member, and address issues of locational stability (e.g. back to back postings), recruitment to geographical area, schooling, child care, occasional care, emergency support, and other supports, as required. A support to posting plan should also consider ways to support flexible work arrangements across postings.

Principle 5: Gender based harassment and violence ruins lives, divides teams and damages operational effectiveness

The Review heard that, for many members, working in the ADF is a positive experience. Apart from the obvious risks associated with deployment and the use of weapons, the Review was told that generally, the ADF provides a safe working environment.

On occasion, we heard of distressing instances from women who had experienced sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse. The Review also found that some ADF workplaces are highly sexualised environments. Members described workplaces where there is a high tolerance for sexual and sexist jokes and sexually suggestive banter, emails or SMS messages, inappropriate comments or sexual advances. At the most extreme end, members described instances of certain workplaces where the environments can be particularly degrading to women and, in some cases, men as well. Both women and men stated that sometimes the line between inoffensive and offensive was difficult to determine. If one member took offence, they were accused of not being able to take a joke and accused of not 'fitting in'. Members frequently stated that this behaviour was "just part of the military and that's the way it is".

During the Review's focus groups, some members considered the complaints system to be effective. Others spoke generally about the impact of making a complaint, with a number believing that it would have a detrimental effect on their careers.

We heard from women who had been sexually assaulted, or subject to harassment, who did not report their experiences for fear of being victimised by peers or supervisors. Others feared that their complaint would adversely impact their career progression and promotional opportunities. Still others said that they did not trust the reporting system nor did they believe that their privacy or confidentiality would be upheld. As well as the deep personal trauma suffered as a result of their experience, others said that they simply felt they would not be believed. This places a heavy burden on the women who continue to serve, particularly given their Return of Service Obligations or the obligations to complete their Initial Minimum Periods of Service. It also means that perpetrators are not held to account.

A survey conducted for the Review on the prevalence, nature and reporting of sexual harassment in the ADF found that in the last five years 25.9% of women and 10.5% of men in the ADF have experienced sexual harassment in an ADF workplace. This compares to prevalence rates in the wider Australian workforce of 25.3% of women and 16.2% of men in the last five years. The survey results also found that in the ADF women and men had experienced a *behaviour* that constitutes sexual harassment but had not identified it as such, indicating a lack of awareness about appropriate workforce behaviours. The survey is part of a broader project undertaken by the Australian Human Rights Commission that examines sexual harassment in Australian workplaces and will be released later in 2012.²¹ The most common types of behaviours that constituted sexual harassment as experienced by women in the ADF included: sexually suggestive comments or jokes, intrusive questions about one's private life or physical appearance, and inappropriate staring or leering. Some women reported experiencing inappropriate physical contact and unwelcome requests or pressure for sex or other sexual acts.

The Review was concerned about the deficiencies in policy and Defence Instructions, and the inadequacies in data collection and the strategic use of the data in relation to incidents of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse. An accurate picture of the extent of sexually based unacceptable behaviour cannot be ascertained. This means that offenders cannot be tracked, repeat offenders cannot be identified, outcomes cannot be measured for their appropriateness and the level of risk to other ADF members cannot be determined and addressed.

The Review found that while some strong policies exist to address sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse their implementation can be ad hoc and deficient. One disturbing example of systemic inadequacies led to the retention of a member who was convicted of a serious sexual offence in circumstances where, as a result of the conviction, it was debateable that he was a fit and proper person to serve in the ADF.

The Review also found that prevention and education measures designed to combat unacceptable sexual conduct do not go far enough. In many cases, they are not appropriate or effective tools to enhance healthy and respectful sexual attitudes and behaviours.

We acknowledge that in recent times the ADF's senior leaders have actively demonstrated a commitment to creating a culture where sexual misconduct and sexual abuse is not tolerated.

To more fully address many of the issues raised above, the Review recommends a new and more robust approach to responding to unacceptable sexual behaviours and attitudes. The new approach, to be overseen by a dedicated Sexual Misconduct, Prevention and Response Office (SEMPRO), is about making the system more responsive to the needs of complainants. This requires that the ADF urgently investigate mechanisms that allow members to make confidential (restricted) reports of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse.

The new approach is also concerned with embedding a more effective prevention and education response, grounded in sexual ethics and respectful and healthy relationships. It is about ensuring that all relevant data is accurately and consistently collected, so that trends can be monitored and appropriate action put in place to respond to those trends. It is critical that the new approach is overseen by senior leadership and that there are links with external expert service providers. Only by elevating the status of sexual misconduct, harassment and abuse matters to the highest level will these issues be consistently and systematically treated with the seriousness they demand.

Recommendation 18:

As a priority, COSC should establish a dedicated Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response Office (SEMPRO) to coordinate timely responses, victim support, education, policy, practice and reporting for any misconduct of a sexual nature, including sexual harassment and sexual abuse in the ADF. This Office is to be adequately and appropriately staffed, including with personnel that have experience in responding to people who have been subjected to sexual harassment or abuse and is to be headed by a senior leader (of no less than one star rank or at SES level) and located at Defence Headquarters.

The Office is to be adequately resourced and report directly to COSC, and will:

- **Respond to complaints of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse including ensuring the immediate safety and well-being of the complainant.**
- **Provide a 24 hour/seven day a week telephone hotline and online service (click, call or text access) that is staffed by personnel with expertise in responding to complainants – female and male – who report sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse.**
- **Collaborate with expert independent educators to provide recruits and trainees with interactive education on: respectful and healthy relationships, and sexual ethics; the meaning, inappropriateness and impact of sexist language and sexual harassment; the meaning of consent; the appropriate use of technology; stalking controlling and threatening behaviours; and the importance of bystander action. The effectiveness of these education and training efforts should be evaluated every two years with an external evaluator and assessed against key indicators that measure attitudinal and behaviour change. Appropriate training and education should also be provided to all members entering command positions.**
- **Provide an outreach service to all ADF establishments including a rolling cycle of visits to each base every two years. This service would provide both relevant training and education and offer members an opportunity to discuss issues of concern with SEMPRO personnel.**
- **Enter into appropriate arrangements with expert external service providers so as to offer complainants an alternative avenue for support and advice if the complainant does not wish to engage with the ADF's internal complaints system. The ADF must provide adequate resourcing and assistance to these organisations to ensure that they have the capacity to provide these services and that their expertise in sexual harassment and sexual assault matters is enhanced by an understanding of the military.**
- **Be the single point of data collection, analysis and mapping of all sexual misconduct and abuse matters. Prevalence, trends and key issues should be regularly reported to COSC and strategies to address any issues of concern arising from the data, implemented as soon as possible.**

SEMPRO's role should be widely advertised and promoted across the ADF so that all members are made fully aware of the reporting options and the measures to be taken to ensure confidentiality when reporting confidential complaints.

Recommendation 19:

As a matter of urgency, the ADF should investigate mechanisms to allow members to make confidential (restricted) reports of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse complaints through SEMPRO.

Recommendation 20:

As a matter of urgency, COSC should review all relevant policy and legislative provisions to provide for the mandatory assessment of an ADF member's ability to perform the inherent requirements of their job if convicted of any criminal offence, and in particular any sexual offence, including but not limited to:

- **The insertion of an addition in the list of matters that must be considered in all personnel determinations and decisions in the Defence (Personnel) Regulations 2002 of the requirement that individuals must be "fit and proper persons" for service in the ADF.**
 - **An amendment to Regulation 87(1) of the Defence (Personnel) Regulations 2002 so that the specific reference currently found within the termination grounds for officers is also available for consideration in relation to enlisted members. Importantly, the reference should include that termination may be considered where the member has been convicted of an offence or a service offence and the Chief of the officer's Service has certified that, having regard to the nature and seriousness of the offence, the retention of the member is not in the interests of the Defence Force.**
-

Recommendation 21:

COSC should amend all policies addressing the waiver of Initial Minimum Provision of Service and Return of Service Obligations to ensure that a member who has made a decision to discharge from the ADF because of sexual assault or sexual harassment, is able to do so expeditiously and without financial penalty, upon production of supporting evidence of physical, psychological or emotional trauma.

- 1 GPCAPT S McGready, *Speech to the Air Force Women's Development Forum*, 20 June 2012, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 28 June 2012. See Appendix Q.
- 2 More detailed information on these and other programs can be found throughout the Report and in particular at Appendices H.3 and J.4.
- 3 At the time of writing the Review became aware of a Navy Women's Leadership Strategy, 2012-2015, which the Review understands will be released shortly.
- 4 Royal Australian Navy, *What is New Generation Navy?* At http://www.navy.gov.au/About_New_Generation_Navy (viewed 16 July 2012).
- 5 Signature Behaviours are: Respect the contribution of every individual, Promote the wellbeing and development of Navy people, Communicate well and regularly, Challenge and innovate, Be cost conscious, Fix problems and take action, Drive decision making down, Strengthen relationships across and beyond Navy, Be the Best I can and Make Navy proud, make Australia proud. Royal Australian Navy, *Navy Values and Signature Behaviours*, http://www.navy.gov.au/Navy_Values_and_Signature_Behaviours (viewed 16 July 2012).
- 6 Royal Australian Navy, *What is New Generation Navy?*, note 4.
- 7 '120411 – Decision Brief for CAF – Air Force Women Pilot Recruitment Strategy – Graduate Pilot Scheme (GPS).pdf' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 30 May 2012; '120524 – Brief for CAF – Women in Non Traditional Employment Roles (Winter) Marketing Campaign.pdf' provided to Review by SQNLDR F James, 30 May 2012.
- 8 154 of 174 of men at star rank have children, whereas only 2 of the 9 women at star rank have children, Defence Workforce Information, 1 June 2012.
- 9 GPCAPT S McGready, *Speech to the Air Force Women's Development Forum*, note 1.
- 10 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 11 Note, the below figures are calculated based on star ranked officers (O07 – O10). 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer categories' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 26 March 2012; 'ARA SENOFF entry method' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 13 June 2012.
- 12 Current senior officers originate from the following categories: Maritime Warfare Officer (32) = 61.5% (this includes Seaman NO that was replaced by Maritime Warfare Officer); Engineer (9) = 17.3%; Supply NO (5) = 9.6%; Aviation NO (4) = 7.69%; Legal (2) = 3.8%. WO of Navy is also man. The one woman generalist star ranked officer is from the Legal category. 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer categories', above.
- 13 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer categories', above.
- 14 Of the 71 star ranked officers who entered via General Service Officer, they originate from the following categories: Infantry (21) = 29.5%; Ordnance (5) = 7%; Armoured Corp (8) = 11.2%; Artillery (10) = 14%; Engineers (7) = 9.8%; Signals (5) = 7%; Intelligence (5) = 7%; Electrical and Mechanical Engineers (2) = 2.8%; Transport (5) = 7%; Aviation (2) = 2.8%. Note, the category of one of the Senior Officers is not provided. RSM is also a man. The four women generalist star ranked officer is from the Ordnance category and Signals category. Figures from 'ARA SENOFF entry method' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 13 June 2012.
- 15 'ARA SENOFF entry method' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 13 June 2012.
- 16 The categories from which the Senior Officers originated from are: Aircrew (32) = 60.3%; Engineering and Logistics (18) = 33.9%; Support Operations (2) = 3.7%; Operations (1) = 1.8%. Exec WOFF is also man. The one woman generalist star ranked officer is from the Engineering and Logistics category. Figures from 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer categories' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 26 March 2012.
- 17 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer categories' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 26 March 2012.
- 18 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 5-10, 'Australian Defence Force Gap Year'*, 27 May 2011.
- 19 *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth), s 7D(1) and (2). A target will not, however, be regarded as a special measure once the purpose of achieving substantive equality has been achieved: s 7D(4).
- 20 154 of 174 of men at star rank have children, whereas only 2 of the 9 women at star rank have children, Defence Workforce Information, 1 June 2012.
- 21 The broader project is the 2012 version of the Australian Human Rights Commission's sexual harassment in the Australian workplace survey. A comprehensive report on sexual harassment in the Australian workforce will be released by the Sex Discrimination Commissioner in the last quarter of 2012.



“Men and women are different. They should be all given opportunities to get to their potential. If a man or a woman needs a different working environment to get there, that’s what we need to move forward.”

**Deployed ADF member
(Focus Group)**

Chapter 1:

The Case for Change –
Why the ADF Should
Care about Women’s
Representation and
Progression

In summary

An increase in the representation of women in the ADF, both from a recruitment and retention perspective will:

- broaden the talent pool from which the ADF can draw its members or seriously risk falling short of its workforce and capability needs
- provide a return on the considerable investment it makes in its people:
 - » the cost of recruiting has tripled from \$7,000 per enlistment to almost \$22,000 per enlistment
 - » the total cost of turnover for the ADF in 2011 is estimated at \$1.5 billion
- build and strengthen capability, and a workforce that is responsive to the realities of modern warfare
- meet Australia's international commitments under UN Security Council Resolution 1325 Women Peace and Security.

To be a first class employer, the ADF must ensure that all its people have opportunities to thrive. This requires strong action to:

- create a workplace that reflects contemporary expectations and needs
- eradicate from the workplace sexual misconduct, sexual harassment, bullying, and sexual abuse; take swift action to hold perpetrators to account; and support complainants when this behaviour occurs.

As one of Australia's largest employers, and as an important source of people development, the ADF should position itself as national leader in workforce and workplace issues.

The equality of women in any workplace is a priority in its own right, but an improvement to the representation of women in the ADF also has the potential to address many of the other significant challenges currently facing the ADF. It will enable the ADF to harness the talents of a broader cross section of the population and strengthen its ability to attract Australia's best, enabling it to better achieve recruiting targets. Better leveraging and extending the duration of women's career in the ADF will reduce the cost of turnover and recruiting – for both men and women. A more diverse mix of backgrounds and skills, meanwhile, will lift performance and capability in a world where fast paced problem-solving is a significant requirement. Greater inclusion of women in the ADF's core business will cement its place as a workforce leader – not only of Australian organisations, but of equivalent services worldwide. In this way, the ADF can ensure a future not only as a first class employer but also as a high-performing Defence Force in service of a proud nation.

Accordingly, the Review identifies five critical reasons that a change in the treatment of women must be a priority for a strong and sustainable ADF:

- 1. Attract the Best Talent**
- 2. Reduce Cost**
- 3. Increase Capability**
- 4. Be a First Class and High Performing Employer**
- 5. Take a Leadership Position**

The case for change is understood at the ADF's senior levels, as well as in many of its policies. Genuine change also requires commitment from the broader organisation, yet many ADF personnel have little exposure to the argument for each of these imperatives.

This means that an important step for the ADF is to develop a wider conviction for the case for change throughout the organisation. Without this, the gap between the ADF, other organisations and broader society will grow. Equally importantly, the future capability and sustainability of the ADF will be undermined.

This Chapter discusses the case for change and examines why it is important that the ADF:

- Increase the representation of women in each of the services
- Increase the proportion of women in leadership positions in each of the services
- Improve its response to bullying and exclusion, sexual harassment, sexual misconduct and sexual abuse.

1.1 Attract the Best Talent – maximising opportunities in a changing workforce

Across Australia, and around the world, organisations are facing a range of challenges in attracting the employees that they require. Simultaneously, they are also realising that there are benefits to their operation or business when they are able to access the largest talent pool available.¹


In particular, organisations are actively investing in attracting, developing and retaining women.² Motivations for this vary, though all centre not only on the need to recruit from a wider talent pool, but also on recognition that gender-balanced teams perform better.³ For the corporate sector, there is also a focus on the importance of women as customers, given that they wield an increasing share of purchasing power.⁴

Regulatory guidelines have played a part in encouraging this focus. For example, in the private sector, the ASX Corporate Governance Council guidelines mandating disclosure of female representation have provided a level of transparency and scrutiny never previously available.⁵

Encouragingly, there is evidence of progress in Australia. For example, the share of women being appointed to new ASX200 board positions increased from 5% in 2008 and 2009 to 28% in 2011 and 23% in 2012 so far.⁶ There have also been gains in the public sector. Steady progress towards the goal of 40% women on Australian Government boards has been made. As of 30 June 2011, the percentage of women on Australian Government boards was 35% – an all time high.⁷

In contrast to these trends, the ADF's progress has stalled. Figure 1.1 is the representation of women in the ADF over time, which is around 14% today, up less than 1% in the last 10 years, and 2% in the last 20 years.⁸ When all reserves and Defence Australian Public Service positions (where some permanent ADF roles shifted due to 'civilianisation'⁹) are included, the share of women in this group has increased just 2.1% in 10 years.¹⁰

Figure 1.1: Women in the ADF over time¹¹



(a) Australian Demographic Trends

Like other organisations, the ADF is also facing demographic shifts. Figures 1.2 and 1.3 illustrate two of these key changes – namely, women’s participation in the work force, and increasing linguistic and cultural diversity.

Figure 1.2: Workforce participation in Australia¹²





Figure 1.3: Language other than English spoken at home¹³



Men and women's workforce patterns have converged, particularly at ages of typical ADF entry. The proportion of women in Australia's workforce has increased as more women defer child-bearing, and return to work afterwards. In fact, more than 67% of women aged 15-24 years participate in paid work today, compared to 69% of men. Twenty years ago, the equivalent gap was more than 6%.¹⁴


Australian society is increasingly multi-cultural, with more than 22% of Australians speaking a language other than English. In 2011, the Census revealed that over a quarter (26%) of Australia's population was born overseas and a further one fifth (20%) had at least one overseas-born parent.¹⁵

Meanwhile, leaders and demographers also warn of a changing workforce reality. As CEO of Deloitte, Giam Swiegers, has observed:

the problem in Australia over the coming years won't be a lack of jobs – it will be a lack of workers.¹⁶

In fact, Australia is about to enter a period with the highest ratio of job market retirements to new entrants in its history. Over the next five years, Australia is projected to see fewer than 125 people exiting education for every 100 people retiring.¹⁷ As Figure 1.4 shows, this shift is particularly significant in the ADF's core target market of 17-24 years which will experience very little growth over the next 15 years.¹⁸ This means that the pool from which the ADF traditionally recruits is diminishing, placing further pressure on Services to engage and retain talented employees.


Figure 1.4: Australian population growth¹⁹



Additionally, the ADF today is made up of almost 80% of men who speak English at home,²⁰ a group that represents less than 40% of Australia’s general population.²¹ This means that the ADF has not capitalised on these demographic shifts and remains “frozen” at its 1990 demographic, with Figure 1.5 comparing the ADF and wider Australian demographics. As the March 2012 Defence Workforce Outlook describes:

The wider demographic trends (such as the decline of the primary ADF recruitment pool as a proportion of the total population) will gradually increase the vulnerability of the ADF recruiting... A reasonable expectation is that the recruiting environment will become more difficult for all methods of ADF entry by no later than the end of this decade.²²

Figure 1.5: Comparison of ADF and Australia’s demographic profile²³



Despite the imperative to attract more young people, the Review's focus groups revealed significant ADF concern about younger members. According to one member:

I'm seeing people who know their rights, better than their job. I know people [who] put more effort into finding out how they can get time off, as opposed to just doing their job.²⁴

Certainly, career patterns and expectations of younger generations differ markedly from previous generations. In 1959, average tenure across all ages and industries was 15 years. Today, it is just over 4 years, with one survey finding that only one in four of those from Generation Y would consider staying at a single employer for five years.^{25 26} Many young men and women are looking for flexibility in ways that previous generations did not, with these attitudes forcing companies to think more creatively.

Meanwhile, a decreasing proportion of young people are connected to a family member or friend in the ADF or with prior ADF service. This is particularly true of women and Australians from culturally linguistic and diverse backgrounds. Given that this is one of the strongest influences on a candidate's decision to seek enlistment,²⁷ the ADF acknowledges that it "cannot rely on employing only those who have had a family member join or serve to attract our share of the labour market."²⁸

Concern exists that the skills and cognitive abilities of young people applying to the ADF do not appear to be improving, despite record participation in tertiary education. The ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-2021 states:

the general cognitive ability of candidates enquiring into ADF careers...has not shown any practical or consistent improvement. This may partly be attributable to the lower propensity of those with high aptitude and skills towards a career in the military.²⁹

To meet this challenge, the ADF adopted a number of innovative new approaches, including a Gap Year program that allowed candidates to explore the ADF without a longer return of service commitment. The early results of this program were promising, with women comprising 28% of participants, twice the general rate of enlistments.³⁰ Although this program was discontinued, its underlying principles were promising and signal one way in which the ADF can avoid falling short of its workforce and capability needs.

(b) Increased competition for talent

Further complicating the demographic challenges, the overall demand for workers is growing rapidly in Australia. This is particularly true in industries that directly compete with the ADF. As the Defence Posture Review notes:

Rapidly growing demand from the resources sector...place similar pressures on the availability and cost of skilled labour...Our clear impression is that in this competitive environment, the resources sector has deeper pockets and much quicker decision-making processes than Defence.³¹


The pull factor of a career change to civilian life has always had a strong influence on the decision of members to leave the ADF. In the most recent ADF Exit Survey results, 'To make a career change while still young enough' was the third most influential reason for leaving (after 'the desire to stay in one place and for less separation from family'). 'Better career prospects in civilian life' also ranked as the ninth most influential reason for leaving in 2010. Both these factors have ranked in the top ten since survey data has been collected.³²

The increased competition for talent is raised in numerous discussion papers and initiatives, with ADF members well aware of the value placed by companies on their military experience. The Review heard during its consultations, for example:

...we have a technical workforce who are highly attractive outside. And as a 25 year old sailor where you can go to sea and be away from your family routinely for two weeks at a time let's say... The comparison is you can go to the mines, do exactly the same thing but be paid three times as much.³³


Corporate and government estimates (see Figure 1.6) support this anecdotal information, suggesting that by 2015-16, there will be 10% more jobs in Australia than there were in 2010-11 with the fastest growing industries including Construction, Professional Services, Transport and Mining.³⁴

Figure 1.6: Australia’s expected employment growth³⁵



Meanwhile, Figure 1.7 shows the significant investment (and therefore job creation) predicted in geographic areas of importance to the ADF, both as a historical source of talent, and for future Defence capability.³⁶ Competition for skilled workers is already fierce and will only intensify, particularly in regions like Western Australia and Queensland, where investment is expected to be particularly high.³⁷

Figure 1.7: Investment levels by state³⁸



1.2 Costs – recruiting and retaining valued personnel

Against this backdrop, the ADF has struggled in the last decade to meet recruiting targets, particularly those in critical categories. Perhaps even more concerning, is that ADF personnel are leaving far earlier in their service than previous generations, depriving new entrants of precious experience and mentorship.

The importance of retention as a critical workforce planning consideration, and risks surrounding departures, are covered in great detail in Defence Strategic Workforce Plan 2010-20.³⁹ The Defence Strategic Workforce Plan 2007-2017 summarised the key concerns as follows:

Retaining ADF personnel for longer periods of service is currently the most urgent workforce challenge for Defence, with too few trained personnel reaching and electing to serve beyond their Initial Period of Service (IPS). Length of Service outcomes for the single Services have been gradually changing over the last decade, with notable decreases in the proportion of ADF members serving through to the previous twenty year career milestone. The capability implications of this are serious, reflecting a decline in the seniority and experience bases of the ADF. This also causes shortages of appropriately skilled and experienced personnel for promotion to higher ranks, and a growing lack of adequate supervisors and skilled trainers to be able to safely mentor and develop junior ADF personnel.⁴⁰

Figures 1.8 and 1.9 show recruiting target achievement from 1995-2010. The ADF's ability to reach its target was in decline in 2007-2009, until the events of the Global Financial Crisis and the launch in December 2006 of a recruiting and retention program known as 'R2'. With \$3.1 billion in funding allocated over a ten year period, R2 identified a need to increase overall enlistments from 4,700 per year to around 6,500 and to stem the tide of experienced personnel departures. Financial incentives (cash bonuses) were a significant element of the program.⁴¹

Figure 1.8: ADF recruiting target achievement⁴²





Figure 1.9: Recruiting target achievement by service⁴³



Concerns endure, though, that short-term incentives, such as cash bonuses, have temporarily masked “natural” retention rates. Research shows that when such measures (particularly cash bonuses) are removed, separation rates are likely to accelerate. As the report of the R2 program observed:

Bonuses address the symptom of high separations in a given workforce segment, not the cause, and cannot be relied upon as a standalone retention measure.⁴⁴

Certainly, there is growing evidence to support these predictions. In March 2012, the ADF announced that the separation rate had crept back up to about 9.3 per cent and was expected “to continue to rise.”⁴⁵

In addition, the 2011-2021 Recruiting Strategic Plan states that the results of the last few years may not be sustainable. As the plan observes:

These circumstances will not last. The recruiting pipeline in December 2010 held half the candidates it did in June 2009. ADF separation rates are rising. The most likely watershed year will be 2012-13 when the gap between actual AFS (Average Funded Strength) and guidance is expected to close and rising separations will directly impact on recruiting targets. Financial pressures by 2012-13 are unlikely to permit the advertising expenditures that precipitated the surge in enquiries from 2007-2010. With a gradually tightening labour market, fewer recruiting prospects will be available in any case.⁴⁶

Clearly, the ADF must increase its efforts to recruit and retain its most talented employees.

In just one example, competition for talent has required the ADF to accelerate its recruitment spending, particularly on TV advertising, to generate enquiries. Figure 1.10 shows an increase in spend from \$61 million in 2001-2002, to more than \$140 million in 2011. Figure 1.11 illustrates that the cost of recruiting each new member has more than tripled from approximately \$7,000 to over \$21,000 per enlistment.⁴⁷

Figure 1.10: DFR Expenditure 2001-2010⁴⁸







Figure 1.11: DFR spend per enlistment 2001-2010⁴⁹



Meanwhile, Figure 1.12 contains an estimate of the investment that the ADF makes in its personnel, estimated as an average of \$580-\$680,000 per member, with the return on this investment becoming apparent as members become increasingly productive and develop others. Departures, particularly those with specialised trades or those with significant experience, are extremely difficult to replace, with the development investment in the “High Value Officer Category” sometimes reaching \$2 million.⁵⁰

Figure 1.12: Development investment and the cost of turnover⁵¹



In fact, for 2011, the total cost of turnover for the ADF was estimated as \$1.5 billion (up from an indicative figure of \$1.1 billion in 2010) despite this being a year of record low turnover.⁵² As will be explored in later Chapters, it follows that initiatives with potential to reduce separation rates are critical to the ADF's cost effectiveness.

1.3 Capability

(a) Building a contemporary and adaptable Defence Force

As well as maximising access to a wider pool of talent and minimising costs associated with the loss of existing personnel, the ADF must also use its personnel to build a workforce whose skills fit with the realities of modern war-fare.

With an increasing focus on technology and problem-solving, modern military workplaces are complex. They require new and additional skills and adaptability, rather than simply manual or physical strength.

These changes are impacting the ADF's workforce requirements. As described in the ADF's Recruiting Strategic Plan:

Automation has reduced the proportion of low skill, manual jobs and increased the demand for systems managers. The use of small teams, either operating independently or in close cooperation with coalition partners has increased the requirement for ADF members to work autonomously – solving problems, learning and adapting, and identifying and servicing stakeholders.⁵³

Other sources describe this changing battlefield, noting that intelligence collecting and outreach to local populations, work where women are often essential, will grow in importance, while remote work through technology becomes increasingly possible.⁵⁴ Problem-solving, communication and adaptive skills are becoming increasingly important in sourcing the right talent from a workforce that is already under pressure.

This changing mission and workplace are likely to create demand for new skills, strengths and perspectives, a reality which the ADF shares with other workforces. Studies demonstrate that diverse and gender balanced teams perform better, particularly where innovation and problem-solving is important – anticipating risk more accurately, and delivering better outcomes.⁵⁵ Despite this, only a few pockets within the ADF can claim to have achieved diversity, with men and women mostly “clustered” in different occupations.⁵⁶ The ADF must get better at harnessing all talent at its disposal, drawing on its collective capability and nurturing its skills.

(b) Commitment to implementing UN Security Council Resolution 1325 'Women Peace and Security'

Strengthening the role of women in times of conflict and post conflict is critical to meeting Australia's international obligations and, in particular, to its commitment to the Australian National Action Plan on Women Peace and Security 2012-2018 for implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (UNSCR 1325), adopted by the Security Council in October 2000.

Discussed in detail at Appendix D, UNSCR 1325 calls on member states to integrate a gender perspective into all peacekeeping operations, peace processes and return, resettlement, and reintegration programs in post-conflict settings. UNSCR 1325 calls for the role of women to be increased in the planning, preparation, decision-making and execution of peace missions, and for more attention to be given to the effects on women of conflicts and peace operations. UNSCR 1325 provides a general framework for the integration of gender into policy surrounding international peace and security. In the context of this Review, this involves the greater participation of women in the Australian military in critical roles in fragile, conflict and post-conflict situations.

The National Action Plan contains a number of high level strategies that the Australian Government will undertake against the thematic areas of UNSCR 1325:

1. Integrate a gender perspective into Australia's policies on peace and security.
2. Embed the Women, Peace and Security agenda in the Australian Government's approach to human resource management of Defence, Australian Federal Police and deployed personnel.

3. Support civil society organisations to promote equality and increase women's participation in conflict prevention, peace-building, conflict resolution, and relief and recovery.
4. Promote Women, Peace and Security implementation internationally.
5. Take a co-ordinated and holistic approach domestically and internationally to Women, Peace and Security.

The ADF is involved in activities supporting UNSCR 1325 aims. For example, the ADF deploys female personnel to work in Female Engagement Teams. These Teams meet with local women in conflict zones to discuss their security needs, including meeting with female community leaders to discuss gender issues.

The National Action Plan identifies that women are still largely excluded from formal processes and institutions that can prevent, manage and resolve conflict. For example, they are under-represented in high level advisory, negotiation and decision making positions. The ADF plays a critical role in redressing this situation. Fundamental to this is giving practical recognition to the vital contribution that women make to Australia's military capability.

1.4 A First Class and High Performing Employer

The ADF will enjoy a strong and sustainable future by securing a position as a first class and high performing employer – one which enables all employees to seize opportunities to thrive, to feel valued for their contributions, and acknowledged as individuals.

Many members reported to the Review that their experience in the ADF has been rewarding and positive. One senior female ADF member reported:

I have had a wonderful career...in the ADF...and I believe that my gender has not, in any way, limited my progress in this organisation thus far. I have been sponsored to study full-time at civil universities, permitted to work part time and flexibly since having my children... [I have] worked remotely overseas while accompanying my husband on an overseas posting; [and] my predominantly male supervisors have always been absolutely honourable in their behaviour and provided strong mentorship to develop my career.⁵⁷

These sentiments were echoed frequently in many of the Review's focus groups, in the written submissions and through comments from the *Treatment of Women in the ADF Survey*.

However, the Review also heard that the ADF can be an ambivalent, unsupportive, and sometimes hostile workplace. In particular, it heard that some members, peers and even supervisors can make it an unsafe workplace, individual accounts of which feature in detail in Chapter 7. This must change if the ADF is to realise its potential as a first class employer.

(a) Rigid Structures and Entrenched Attitudes

In particular, the rigidity of the ADF's organisational structures and the entrenched attitudes regarding the nature of defence force work often requires members to make difficult career and life choices, with job requirements often detrimental to personal and family lives. Frequent posting cycles, back to back deployments and limited opportunities to access flexible and part time working arrangements without compromising career progression are issues that impact significantly on ADF members' ability to balance work with their personal life, including work and family.

A prevailing view across the ADF was reflected in one submission which observed:

when we join up we make a choice, we knew what life this was and yes it is hard to sustain a normal family life. But we all make a choice male or female to choose family or career.⁵⁸

Over and over, the Review heard from members, particularly women, who intended to discharge from the ADF when they have children and from those who were discharging because the impact of the posting cycles had become too great for them to balance with their personal life.

This means that, unless the ADF can create a workplace that reflects contemporary expectations and needs, its attraction and retention capacity will be undermined.

There are a range of strategies that the ADF can put in place to enable members to balance a strong career with their personal life, including family obligations. Such strategies will be identified throughout the Report and include more targeted career plans, as well as the development of joint career plans for couples who are both ADF members; greater support for members and their families who are posted away from their home city or town; and greater access to flexible work arrangements. The advantages of increasing the acceptance of flexible work arrangements were identified in a recent report and include: enabling organisations to be sustainable and adaptable to change; creating pathways to gender equality; attracting and retaining talent; and increasing productivity.⁵⁹

In the ADF context, all of these advantages are about building capacity and capability in the ADF, not diminishing it, with the ADF only likely to attract and retain a wider talent pool if its work practices reflect the needs of a cross-generational and diverse workforce.

(b) Sexual Misconduct, Sexual Harassment, Bullying, Victimisation and Sexual Assault

Though the ADF is, by nature, a workplace involving inherent risks, the possibility of being subjected to sexual misconduct, sexual harassment, bullying, victimisation and sexual abuse, should never be one of them.

Nevertheless, the Review heard from women who had experienced such behaviour. It also heard that the complaints system was not always responsive and, in some instances, was even hostile to their complaints.

In addition, the Review heard of certain work environments that are highly sexualised and demeaning to women, where sexual innuendo and sexist language and behaviour occurs and impacts on the functioning of both individuals and the team. Though swearing and 'colourful' language can occur in any workplace, particularly those that are male dominated, the personal trauma that a number of ADF women related and the unsatisfactory processes and outcomes arising from their experiences, highlights serious and unacceptable deficiencies in key aspects of the ADF's treatment of women. Many women with whom the Review spoke, stated that they did not report the behaviours against them, including sexual abuse, to their chain of command for fear of victimisation and reprisals. Others did not believe there would be a successful outcome. Some also felt that complaining would have a negative impact on their career opportunities.

Though these experiences are not representative of all women's experiences, they demonstrate that, in certain environments within the ADF, women can be de-valued and degraded. Poor leadership is often a major contributing factor in this. While some positive strategies have been developed by each Service to address this behaviour and enhance complaints processes, a number have been poorly implemented and are not responsible to the needs of the complainant. They have also not sought to examine whether there is a culture, in certain areas, that might enable this sort of behaviour to continue unreported.

One female member told the Review:

Until the stereotyping and sexual objectification of women is eradicated from the Services the complementary policies promoting advancement and retention will not be successful as women continue to deal with attitudes and practices which limit their opportunities.⁶⁰

If the ADF is seriously committed to increasing the representation of women, retaining talented women and enhancing their status, it needs to eradicate these unacceptable behaviours as a matter of urgency.

1.5 Leadership

Competitive governments and organisations – even those in resource rich countries like Australia – must focus on their people as their greatest asset if they are to maintain their place as national and international leaders. This is particularly so when international evidence shows that the more women participate in the workforce, the more per capita income rises.⁶¹

Meanwhile, Australian research confirms that closing the gap between male and female employment rates, and successfully attracting women into the most economically productive sectors,⁶² would have a “profound” impact on Australia’s economy – worth more than 11% of GDP.⁶³ Closing this employment gap would also help address pension sustainability through increased employment among those of working age, lifting household saving rates and lifting taxation receipts for government.

As one of Australia’s largest employers, and as an important source of employee development, the ADF is in a position to act as a national leader in this area. In this way, increasing gender balance in the ADF has the potential to enhance our nation’s productivity and economic growth, as well as to materially advance the economic independence of women.

As Chapter 9 will outline, Defence forces around the world are addressing the challenges of attracting, developing and retaining women. They are also responding to sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual assault. Like these international services, the ADF has an opportunity to lead – maximising the best possible talent from a competitive workforce, minimising the costs of recruiting and lost personnel, securing its capability in the field, valuing its members and creating environments where both men and women thrive. This means that change offers the ADF the chance to set an example not only throughout Australia, but for other Defence Forces around the world.

1.6 Conclusion

Equality and fairness are imperatives in any workforce. However, as in any contemporary organisation, additional forces drive the need for greater participation of women, and for greater numbers of women in positions of leadership. These include the competing demand on the organisation’s traditional talent pool, the costs of recruiting and loss of personnel, the requirements of a changing military environment, the expectations that employees have of a first class, 21st century employer, and finally, the opportunity to set an example as both national and international leader.

These imperatives have been understood by ADF leadership for some time, and are reflected to varying extents in a range of strategies that the organisation has put in place. Although well intentioned, these efforts have had marginal impact – in part because they have failed to communicate the wider case for change and have encountered a degree of cultural resistance. Chapter 2 will examine the ADF’s most recent attempt to improve women’s representation. Following this, the Report will then look at the ADF culture for women, and undertake a detailed examination of the ADF workforce.

- 1 Deloitte, *Building the Lucky Country: Business Imperatives for a prosperous Australia – Where is your next worker?* (2011). At http://www.deloitte.com/view/en_AU/au/news-research/luckycountry/whereisyournextworker/index.htm (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 2 Australian Human Rights Commission, 'Our experiences in elevating the representation of women in leadership. A letter from business leaders' (October 2011), pp 17-18. At http://www.humanrights.gov.au/sex_discrimination/publication/mcc/index.html (viewed 2 May 2012).
- 3 L Joy, N Carter, H Wagner, S Narayanan, *The Bottom Line: Corporate Performance and Women's Representation on Boards* (2007). At <http://www.catalyst.org/publication/200/the-bottom-line-corporate-performance-and-womens-representation-on-boards> (viewed 26 June 2012); McKinsey & Company, *Women Matter 2012: Making the Breakthrough* (2012). At http://www.mckinsey.com/client_service/organization/latest_thinking/women_matter (viewed 26 June 2012). Deloitte, *Only Skin Deep? Re-Examining the Case the Business Case for Gender Diversity* (2011). At http://www.deloitte.com/view/en_AU/au/More/index.htm?key_modCount=82&moreChannelId=8f0a16a77a49f210VgnVCM3000001c56f00aRCRD&key_DPMComponentId=a57d586f514bf210VgnVCM3000001c56f00aRCRD (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 4 A Wittenberg-Cox, *How Women Mean Business* (2010).
- 5 On 30 June 2010, the ASX Corporate Governance Council introduced new guidelines for Australian listed companies to both set measurable objectives for and report on gender diversity. See <http://www.asx.com.au/governance/corporate-governance.htm> for more information.
- 6 Australian Institute of Company Directors, *Statistics: Appointments to ASX200 Boards* (2012). At <http://www.companydirectors.com.au/Director-Resource-Centre/Governance-and-Director-Issues/Board-Diversity/Statistics> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 7 Minister for the Status of Women, *Gender Balance on Australian Government Boards Report 2010-2011* (2012), p 1. At http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/sa/women/pubs/govtint/Pages/gender_balance_rpt_2010_2011.aspx (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 8 Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2001-2002, Table 5.7: ADF Permanent and Reserve Forces, and Civilian Employees by Gender and Employment Category*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/01-02/dar/index.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012); Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2002-2003, Table 5.3: ADF Permanent and Reserve Forces, and APS Personnel, by Gender and Employment Category*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/03-04/dar/index.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012); Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2003-2004, Table 5.9 ADF Permanent and Reserve Forces, and APS Personnel, by Gender and Employment Category*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/03-04/dar/index.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012); Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2004-2005, Table 3.10 ADF Permanent and Reserve Forces, and APS Personnel, by Gender and Employment Category*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/04-05/dar/index.htm>; Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2005-2006, Table A1.2— ADF Permanent and Reserve Forces, and APS personnel, by gender and employment category*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/06-07/dar/index.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012); Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2006-2007, Table A1.2— ADF Permanent and Reserve Forces, and APS personnel, by gender and employment category*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/06-07/dar/index.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012); Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2007-2008, Table A1.3 ADF Permanent, Gap Year and Reserves Forces, and APS personnel, by gender and employment category*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/07-08/dar/vol1/online.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012); Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2008-2009, Table A7.3 ADF Permanent, Gap Year and Reserves Forces, and APS, by gender and employment category*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/08-09/dar/index.htm>; Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2009-2010, Table A7.3 ADF Permanent, Gap Year and Reserves Forces, and APS, by gender and employment category*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/Budget/09-10/dar/index.htm> (viewed at 27 June 2012); Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2010-11, Table A5.11 ADF Permanent, Gap Year and Reserve Forces, and APS by gender and employment category*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/10-11/dar/index.htm>; Australian Strategic Policy Institute; *Australian Defence Almanac 2011-2012*. At http://aspi.org.au/publications/publication_details.aspx?ContentID=303.
- 9 The *Strategic Reform Program* has mandated the civilianisation and centralisation of military support roles (such as human resources, administration, finance, and health). This will see the transfer of many non-technical support roles to the Australian Public Service: Department of Defence, *Strategic Reform Program: Delivering Force 2030* (2009). At www.defence.gov.au/publications/reformBooklet.pdf (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 10 See tables cited in note 8: Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Reports 2001-2002 to 2010-11 inclusive*, note 8; Australian Strategic Policy Institute; *Australian Defence Almanac 2011-2012*, note 8.
- 11 See tables cited in note 8: Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Reports 2001-2002 to 2010-11 inclusive*, note 8; Australian Strategic Policy Institute; *Australian Defence Almanac 2011-2012*, note 8.
- 12 Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Labour Force Australia Table 17 – Labour force status by Sex – Persons aged 15 to 24 years – Trend, Seasonally Adjusted*, cat no 6202.0, ABS, Canberra. At [http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Products/6103.0-Dec-2009-Chapter-Detailed%20information%20on%20products:%20Labour%20Force,%20Australia%20\(cat.%20no.%206202.0\)](http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Products/6103.0-Dec-2009-Chapter-Detailed%20information%20on%20products:%20Labour%20Force,%20Australia%20(cat.%20no.%206202.0)) (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 13 Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Labour Force Australia Table 17 – Labour force status by Sex – Persons aged 15 to 24 years – Trend, Seasonally Adjusted*, above.
- 14 Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Labour Force Australia Table 17 – Labour force status by Sex – Persons aged 15 to 24 years – Trend, Seasonally Adjusted*, above.
- 15 Australia Bureau of Statistics, *Cultural Diversity in Australia: Reflecting a Nation: Stories from the Census*, cat no 2071.0, ABS, Canberra. At <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2071.0main+features902012-2013> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 16 Deloitte, *Building the Lucky Country: Business Imperatives for a prosperous Australia – Where is your next worker?*, note 1, p 3.
- 17 Deloitte, *Building the Lucky Country: Business Imperatives for a prosperous Australia – Where is your next worker?*, note 1, p 8.
- 18 Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Labour Force Australia Table 17 – Labour force status by Sex – Persons aged 15 to 24 years – Trend, Seasonally Adjusted*, note 12.

- 19 Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Labour Force Australia Table 17 – Labour force status by Sex – Persons aged 15 to 24 years – Trend, Seasonally Adjusted*, note 12.
- 20 'RFI350 – Languages' provided to the Review by SQLDR F James, 13 March 2012
- 21 Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Cultural Diversity in Australia: Reflecting a Nation: Stories from the Census*, note 15.
- 22 Department of Defence, *Workforce Outlook* (March 2012), p 5, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 16 May 2012.
- 23 'RFI350 – Languages' provided to the Review by SQLDR F James, 13 March 2012; Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Cultural Diversity in Australia: Reflecting a Nation: Stories from the Census*, note 15.
- 24 Focus group 14A.
- 25 McCrindle Research, *New Generations at Work: Attracting, Recruiting, Retraining & Training Generation Y* (2006). At <http://mccrindle.com.au/publications> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 26 T Penelope, 'What Gen Y really wants' (2007) *Time Magazine*. At <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1640395,00.html> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 27 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), p 12, provided to the Review by Defence Force Recruiting representatives, 16 November 2011.
- 28 Department of Defence, *People in Defence: Generating the Capability for the Future Force* (2009), p 8. At http://www.defence.gov.au/dpe/dpe_site/about_dpe/vision_mission.htm (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 29 Department of Defence, 'Technical Brief-General Cognitive Ability Trends', *Directorate of Occupational Psychology and Health Analysis 2010*, quoted in 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 27.
- 30 Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2007-2008*, Table 4.7, note 8.
- 31 Department of Defence, *Australian Defence Force Posture Review – Progress Report* (2011), p 3. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/oscdf/adf-posture-review/docs/interim/default.htm> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 32 Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research, *2010 Australian Defence Force Exit Survey Report: Reasons for Leaving*, DSPPR Report 14/2011 (January 2012), provided to the Review by SQLDR F James, 29 February 2012.
- 33 Focus group 1A.
- 34 Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, *Industry Employment Projections 2011 Report* (2012). At <http://www.deewr.gov.au/lmp/default.aspx?LMP/Publications/IndustryEmploymentProjections> (viewed 26 June 2012); Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, *2011 Australian Jobs* (2011). At <http://www.deewr.gov.au/Employment/Pages/default.aspx> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 35 Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, *2011 Australian Jobs*, above; Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, *Industry Employment Projections 2011 Report*, above.
- 36 Deloitte, *Long term economic and demographic projections: ADF Posture Review* (2011), p 72. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/oscdf/adf-posture-review/docs/final/default.htm> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 37 Deloitte, *Long term economic and demographic projections: ADF Posture Review*, above.
- 38 Deloitte, *Long term economic and demographic projections: ADF Posture Review*, above.
- 39 Department of Defence, *Defence Strategic Workforce Plan 2010-2020* (2010), pp 54-55
- 40 Department of Defence, *Defence Strategic Workforce Plan 2007-2017* (2007), p 29.
- 41 Department of Defence, People Strategies and Policy Group, *Review of the Australian Defence Force Retention and Recruitment (R2) Program* (2010) vol 2, p 2. At http://www.defence.gov.au/foi/docs/disclosures/234_110520_PSPG_Review_August_2010_V1andV2.pdf (viewed 26 June 2012). Note that R2's approach was that 'Financial incentives were introduced quickly, with a view to stem the immediate outflow of members. This was intended to buy time during which more substantial reform could be undertaken, in both financial and non-financial dimensions.'
- 42 Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2001-2002*, Table 5.12: *ADF – Permanent Force Recruiting Activity 2000-01 and 2001-02*, note 8; Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2002-2003*, Table 5.8: *ADF – Permanent Force Recruiting Activity 2001-02 and 2002-03*, note 8; Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2003-2004*, Table 5.16 *ADF Permanent Force Recruiting Activity 2002-03 and 2003-04*, note 8; Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2004-2005*, Table 3.17 *ADF Permanent Force Recruiting Activity 2003-04 and 2004-05*, note 8; Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2005-2006*, Table 4.10 *ADF Permanent Force Recruiting Activity 2004-05 and 2005-06*, note 8; Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2006-2007*, Table 4.10—*ADF Permanent Force recruiting activity, 2005-06 and 2006-07*, note 8; Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2008-2009*, Table A7.9 *ADF Permanent Force ab initio entry, 2007-08 and 2008-09*, note 8; Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2009-2010*, Table A7.9 *ADF Permanent Force ab initio entry, 2008-09 and 2009-10*, note 8; Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2010-11*, Table A5.17 *ADF Permanent Force ab initio entry, 2009-10 and 2010-11*, note 8; Australian Strategic Policy Institute; *Australian Defence Almanac 2011-2012*, note 8.
- 43 See tables cited in note 42: Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Reports 2001-2002 to 2010-11 inclusive*, note 8; Australian Strategic Policy Institute; *Australian Defence Almanac 2011-2012*, note 8.
- 44 Department of Defence, People Strategies and Policy Group, *Review of the Australian Defence Force Retention and Recruitment (R2) Program*, note 41, p 13.
- 45 'Number of people leaving ADF on the rise', *ABC News*, 27 April 2012. At <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2012-03-16/adf-confirms-military-exodus/3893826> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 46 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 27, p 17.
- 47 'RFI 47 – (Cost of recruitment per Service – last 10 years)' provided to the Review by Defence Force Recruiting representatives, 16 November 2011. Table 2 provides total direct expenditure for Defence Recruiting Branch (or Directorate prior to formation of the Branch).
- 48 'RFI 47 – (Cost of recruitment per Service – last 10 years)', above.
- 49 'RFI 47 – (Cost of recruitment per Service – last 10 years)', above.

- 50 'RFI 175 Consultant Report: Cost of Military Turnover (2009)' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 18 January 2012. The Review was advised that this Cost of Military Turnover Model was designed for the Workforce Modelling Forecasting and Analysis Directorate in People Strategies and Policy Branch. The report advises that 'the model may be used to help inform cases for retention measures, optimal turnover and a reference point for budgets including AFS. This model is not to be used as an authoritative document for financial planning purposes or budgetary inputs to strategic policy issues.'
- 51 'RFI 175 Consultant Report: Cost of Military Turnover (2009)', above.
- 52 'RFI 369 – Briefing Note on Defence HR Metrics System (HRMeS) – Cost of Turnover Model' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 21 March 2012. It should be noted that the estimates are a rough, indicative measure only. Specifically, 'the Cost of Turnover (COTO) model used on HRMeS is an interim, indicative metric focused on ADF permanent members: interim in that further refinement is required; and indicative in that only certain costs are taken into account. Most importantly, the model only calculates turnover costs based on an indicative costing for an 'average' officer and 'average' other ranks member ie the model does not take into account the different initial employment costs of members of various employment categories. For example, the very high training costs of a pilot are not taken into account in this model.'
- 53 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 27, p 10.
- 54 M Sheehan, *The changing character of war* (2007); S McLeod, 'Robots are changing the face of war: analyst', *ABC News*, 28 September 2010. At <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2010-09-28/robots-are-changing-the-face-of-war-analyst/2277532> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 55 Numerous research efforts confirm the link between diverse teams and enhanced performance. Some of the most commonly cited are those from Catalyst, a US-based research house. Examples of Catalyst reports include *The Bottom Line: Corporate Performance* (2010) and *Women's Representation on Boards* (2004-2008.) See catalyst.org for more information. Other studies include McKinsey & Company's Women Matter series including: *Women Matter 2012: Making the Breakthrough* (2012). At http://www.mckinsey.com/client_service/organization/latest_thinking/women_matter (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 56 See section 5.1, Occupational Segregation in the ADF.
- 57 Confidential submission 25.
- 58 Public submission 10 Lau.
- 59 Diversity Council of Australia, *Get Flexible! Mainstreaming Flexible Work in Australian Business*, (2012), p 7. At <http://www.dca.org.au/News/News/Get-flexible-or-get-real%3A-It%E2%80%99s-time-to-make-flexible-working-a-legitimate-career-choice/245> (viewed 28 June 2012).
- 60 Confidential submission 14.
- 61 Numerous studies, including large scale efforts by the OECD and the World Bank, provide evidence of the correlation between closing the global gender gap with increased competitiveness and higher GDP per capital: Deloitte, *The gender dividend: Making the business case for investing in women* (2010). At <http://www.deloitte.com/investinginwomen> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 62 Note this 'productivity' gap is created by the concentration of women in 'lower productivity' sectors such as retail, personnel, education, training, health and social services: Goldman Sach JB Were, *Australia's Hidden Resources: The Economic Case for Increasing Female Participation* (2009).
- 63 Goldman Sach JB Were, above.



Chapter 2:

Chief of Defence Force
Action Plan for the
Recruitment and
Retention of Women:
How effective was it?

In summary

- Very little progress has been made in implementing the Chief of the Defence Force's *Action Plan for the Recruitment and Retention of Women*.
- The progress that has been made has had limited impact and the Action Plan is not widely known across the ADF.
- The lack of progress in implementing the Action Plan suggests that commitment and buy-in from the leadership of each Service is a pre-condition for success.
- The implementation of the Action Plan should be discontinued in its current form.

2.1 Overview

As Chapter 1 has outlined, a strong case for change exists within the ADF to increase the representation of women across the services. The ADF has initiated strategies aimed at reform in this regard.

One strategy is the Chief of the Defence Force *Action Plan for the Recruitment and Retention of Women* ('the Action Plan'), intended to address organisational and cultural issues in relation to women in the ADF.

The Review's Term of Reference (c) requires the Review to review, report and make recommendations on:

The effectiveness of the cultural change strategies recommended by the Chief of the Defence Force Women's Reference Group in the Women's Action Plan including the implementation of these strategies across the Australian Defence Force.

The Action Plan was developed to increase participation of women in the ADF, with a 'small number of initiatives and targets' for which Service Chiefs could be held accountable to the Chief of the Defence Force (CDF). These targets are aimed at 'closing the gap' between men and women in regard to retention rates and length of service.

The Action Plan contains 30 initiatives grouped under six themes:

1. Increase enlistment of women into the ADF
2. Reform of career management policy and practice
3. Make commanders accountable for retention
4. Provide a workplace that accommodates career flexibility and difference
5. Develop mentoring and networking frameworks
6. Communicate organisational attributes and the suite of available working conditions.

As this Chapter outlines, there are several important lessons to be learned from the lack of success in implementing the Action Plan. Most critically, commitment and buy-in from senior leadership is essential to ensure accountability and a clear organisational understanding of the case for change.

2.2 Background

In 2008, the Minister for Defence Science and Personnel, the Hon Warren Snowdon, hosted a series of meetings with ADF and Defence Australian Public Service women from all ranks, levels and backgrounds, culminating in the *Report of the Roundtable Meetings between Defence Women and the Minister for Defence Science and Personnel (2008)*.¹ The Report identified common issues of concern such as cultural change, career management, training and professional development, recruitment initiatives, access to flexible working arrangements, work/family balance, support mechanisms, childcare, schooling and housing.

Also in 2008, the CDF set up a Reference Group on Women that consisted of a panel of senior women with a track-record of success in male-dominated and non-traditional work environments.² The Reference Group was guided by the following Terms of Reference:

- a. Consider the existing range of policies and practices within the ADF that should assist in attracting women to the ADF and aid their progression to the senior leadership levels.
- b. Identify possible gaps in these policies and programs that need to be addressed through new initiatives in order to achieve substantial momentum in the attraction and retention of women in the ADF.
- c. Identify barriers to accessing the existing policies and programs and make recommendations to overcome those barriers.
- d. Identify the action required to ensure enduring change once these barriers have been overcome.

As the themes of the 2008 Roundtable Report closely aligned with the work of the Reference Group on Women, these were merged and considered jointly. This means that the development of the Action Plan reflects a consolidation of the various gender initiatives being undertaken by Defence's Values, Behaviours and Resolution Branch (formerly known as the Fairness and Resolution Branch and which provided support for administration of the Reference Group and coordination of progress reports on the Action Plan to COSC³), the Reference Group, Defence Force Recruiting (DFR) and the activities of each Service.⁴

The Action Plan was launched by the CDF on 19 November 2009. A scheme was established through which quarterly reports were to be provided to the Chiefs of Service Committee (COSC) on all the Action Plan's tasks, with each Service giving progress updates on implementation. A Working Group was established comprising representatives from the Office of the CDF, VCDF, each of the Services and non-Service groups.⁵

In a meeting of the Working Group in November 2011, it was reported that COSC had directed that the Action Plan initiatives would be integrated with the outcomes of the Defence Cultural reviews. In the interim, quarterly updates would be provided to the Personnel Steering Group through the Working Group process.

The Review was initially provided with COSC's Quarterly Report for April 2011. This Quarterly Report stated that work on all 30 initiatives had commenced. Thirteen tasks were reported as 'complete'. Only one task was identified as being 'of concern', with all the remaining tasks reported as being 'on track'.

Where an action was listed as 'complete', however, this did not necessarily mean that it was accompanied by the cultural change intended by the initiative. In recognition of this, in November 2011, COSC also directed that the tasks previously listed as 'completed' be reviewed to ascertain if any further action was required, moving away from 'traffic light' reporting (where items were moved from 'red' to 'green' as the result of a single action being undertaken).

Following the Working Group meeting in November 2011, progress on the Action Plan was amended to indicate that only two of the initiatives were complete: the launch of the Action Plan (initiative 28) and development of a 'behavioural compact' (initiative 21). Other initiatives which had been marked as 'on track' or 'complete', but where no substantive change had resulted, were to be reconsidered. A further Working Group meeting was scheduled for March 2012, however this has been put on hold.

Appendix E.1 provides a snapshot of each of the initiatives and their status as at April and November 2011. It is clear that indicators of success in relation to each of the initiatives are lacking.

Appendix E.2 provides a broad description of the six key themes and corresponding initiatives contained in the Action Plan. Many of the key themes are the subject of detailed discussion throughout this Report.

2.3 Key findings

(a) Structural issues

The updates referred to above indicate that little progress has been made on the implementation of the CDF Action Plan. This appears to stem from a number of structural problems associated with unwieldy internal processes, and from a broader lack of commitment and accountability.

For example, the Review heard that progress on the Action Plan has been slow in part because of resourcing and process issues.⁵ Further, while the provision of progress reports through the chain of command and coordination through the Values, Behaviours and Resolution Branch should allow each Service to learn from each other, the process seems cumbersome in application. One member suggested that this ‘bureaucratic’ process should be streamlined so it is less ‘committee based’:

Everything that then gets resolved at this working level has to go...to a higher level, and then a higher level, and then a higher level, and so, it's ridiculous.⁷

Another member commented that the Action Plan was no longer being ‘driven’:

It is just a plan that every quarter we have to report on what on we're doing, and we've already reported it and gone through our Chief to get half of these things going.⁸

The Working Group process also seems to have contributed to the lack of progress and there was a view that it needed to be ‘reinvigorated’. Following the November 2011 meeting, the Working Group is producing minutes of meetings for the first time, and, as already noted, is now in the process of revisiting each of the initiatives.

More fundamentally, there is a perceived lack of commitment to implementing the Action Plan and ambivalence about making genuine change within the Services. One senior leader within Defence made the following observation:

The progress of the CDF Action Plan has really been down to the working group of the service representatives and [the Values, Behaviours and Resolution Branch] to tick and flick a number of initiatives, but there has been no genuine oversight or commitment to... ensuring the proper progress of strategies by the individual services. I don't see any genuine commitment from the senior leadership to actually really actively pursue that plus more.⁹

Further, competing strategic or resourcing priorities appear to exist which may further test leadership commitment. For example, the *Strategic Reform Program* (SRP), released in 2009, aims to make Defence more efficient and effective and will result in significant savings¹⁰ but, as the former CDF has noted, the SRP's proposal to ‘civillianise’ non-deployable ADF positions may well come at the expense of many positions currently held by ADF women.¹¹

In 2009, an advisory report by leading human resources and business consultant, Christine McLoughlin (‘McLoughlin Report’) examined the Action Plan in the context of its contribution to women's participation in Navy.¹² The McLoughlin Report made several recommendations to improve implementation of the Action Plan, including changing its governance structure so that ownership and delivery comes from leaders within each

Service rather than personnel or human resources branches (further key findings from the McLoughlin Report are at Appendix E.3). This was reiterated by one member who told the Review:

If we are going to have a CDF Action Plan, if we are going to be doing anything to change things and support women you have to have that commitment from the senior leadership group, and they have to be driving it for their individual services, not people down at my rank or down lower.¹³

The importance of engagement and commitment of senior leadership to the success of such initiatives is clearly demonstrated by the experiences of other organisations and businesses. The way in which buy-in from senior male leadership is essential to increasing the representation of women in senior positions has been emphasised in the corporate sector.¹⁴

(b) Content and communication issues

The Review also encountered a significant lack of awareness or understanding about the Action Plan amongst ADF personnel. In some cases, those who had heard of the Action Plan or its initiatives considered that it was not relevant or that it was ‘overkill’ and that there was no need for initiatives such as women’s mentoring programs.¹⁵ More fundamentally, there has been no compelling case made as to why achievement of the Action Plan initiatives is vital to Defence, nor has such a case been communicated. In the absence of this, it is not surprising that progress on the Action Plan has been slow and inconsistent.

Meanwhile, in identifying the key areas of concern within the Action Plan, members of the Working Group observed that the issue of flexible work was now less controversial and ‘just needed time to sink in’.¹⁶ The initiatives around career management and accountability, on the other hand, still faced significant cultural barriers to their implementation.

To combat these cultural barriers, the McLoughlin Report observed that change initiatives need to be supported by both men and women in leadership, but the difficulties of communicating the case for change message consistently was highlighted in the Review’s focus groups. One participant noted that in speaking about the Action Plan at a staff promotional course ‘you can see them all roll their eyes’:

I said there’s 28 initiatives here; 21 of them it doesn’t matter if you’re a bloke or a girl because they’re about improving the way we help people work and actually have a life while we do things. The problem is the people who are at the top and because we don’t laterally recruit ... our ability to be able to look like we’re doing something different is really hard because we’ve only got people at the moment in those more senior areas who’ve followed that straight [career path].¹⁷

2.4 Conclusion

The CDF Action Plan was a genuine and well intentioned attempt to address issues of enlistment, career management, retention, flexible work practices and organisational culture. However, progress on its initiatives has stalled, with many strategies slowed by organisational inertia and little changing as a result. Further, the Review spoke to over 1,600 ADF personnel in focus groups, most of whom were not aware of the Action Plan, let alone had any personal or professional buy-in to achieving its aims. In fact, only a handful had heard of the Action Plan and often they were the people involved in its implementation.

The Action Plan’s six key themes clearly intersect with the areas of focus of this Review. In some areas, the Action Plan initiatives are consistent with the Review’s recommendations.¹⁸ For example, several Action Plan initiatives focus on increasing enlistment of women through implementation of the Recruitment of Women Strategy. Given the Review’s recommendations regarding improving the recruitment of women, there should be continued monitoring and evaluation of the Recruitment of Women Strategy initiatives to see if they are increasing the attraction/conversion of women through the recruiting pipeline (see section 4.2 and Appendix E.2). However, the Recruitment of Women Strategy will not be enough on its own to increase

the representation of women across the ADF. This means that particular strategies are needed to enhance recruitment at different ages and stages of their lives, and to broaden the occupational opportunities available to women.

In other areas, the Review's recommendations extend far beyond the initiatives contained within the Action Plan. They also address the key criticisms of the Action Plan as outlined in the McLoughlin Report – for example, the commitment by senior leadership, systemic barriers, accountability and the need for targeted interventions.

While the Review has no doubt about the positive intent of the Action Plan, there are critically important lessons to be learned from the lack of success in its implementation, and the Review proposes that the implementation of the Action Plan should be discontinued in its current form. Lessons from the Action Plan's lack of success should, in turn, be acknowledged in the implementation of this Review's recommendations – implementation which will require commitment and focus by senior leadership, a broader organisational understanding of the case for change, strengthened and transparent governance and reporting, clear and consistent communication, new and innovative organisational responses, and accountability built into performance management.

It will also require a determination to grapple with the cultural and attitudinal forces that often greet the implementation of change in any organisation. Consequently, the next Chapter of this Report offers an insight into these powerful and sometimes contradictory forces – using the words of ADF personnel, and women in particular, to highlight those factors which affect their decisions and day to day experiences.

- 1 Expressions of interest were called from Defence women interested in talking about their career experiences and perceptions as a member of ADF or APS employee working in Defence: see Minister for Defence Science and Personnel, *Report of the Roundtable Meetings Held Between Defence Women and the Minister for Defence Science and Personnel* (December 2008). At www.defence.gov.au/fr/RR/Womenindefence/Progress.html (viewed 13 June 2012). Participants ranged from Gap Year representatives and junior ranks to Senior Executive Service women. Meetings were held in Canberra, Perth, Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, Hobart, HMAS *Cerberus*, Townsville, Darwin and RAAF Base Tindal.
- 2 The Reference Group on Women group comprised:
 - Elizabeth Broderick
 - Christine Charles
 - Margaret Gardner AO
 - Sam Mostyn
 - Christine Nixon APM
 - Elizabeth Proust.
- 3 The Values, Behaviours and Resolution Branch has policy responsibilities for equity and diversity, indigenous matters, privacy and the integrated complaint handling system.
- 4 Meeting with Defence personnel on CDF Action Plan.
- 5 The CDF Action Plan Working Group included: representatives from Navy (Navy Strategic Command); Army (Workforce Strategy); Air Force (Workforce Diversity); Defence People Group (People Strategy and Culture, Defence Force Recruiting, People Policy and Employment Conditions, Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research; Defence Support Group (People Services); Office of the Chief of Defence Force; Vice Chief of Defence Force (Cadet Reserve and Employer Support Division, Joint Health Command); the Defence Community Organisation; and Public Affairs: A Brentnall, email to the Review, 15 June 2012.
- 6 Meeting with Values, Behaviours and Resolution Branch.
- 7 Meeting with Defence personnel on CDF Action Plan.
- 8 Meeting with Defence personnel on CDF Action Plan.
- 9 Focus group 2A. A recent report notes that the Values, Behaviours and Resolution Branch also 'has many competing priorities', such as its equity and diversity oversight role and a heavy workload in managing complaints: Department of Defence, *The Review of Employment Pathways for APS Women in the Department of Defence* (2011), p 8. At www.defence.gov.au/culturereviews/docs/epapsw/index.htm (viewed 17 June 2012).
- 10 Department of Defence, *The Strategic Reform Program 2009 – Delivering Force 2030* (2009), p 5. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/SRP/> (viewed 14 June 2012).
- 11 'Action Plan for Improving Recruitment and Retention of Women', Chiefs of Service Committee, Agendum Paper 04/09 (21 July 2009), para 19, provided to the Review.
- 12 C McLoughlin, *Women's Participation in the Navy*, Report of the Participation of Women in New Generation Navy Review, 7 October 2009, provided to the Review. The CDF appointed McLoughlin to conduct a review into the participation of women in the Royal Australian Navy in response to a request by the former Minister for Defence, Senator Faulkner.
- 13 Focus group 3A.
- 14 See Australian Human Rights Commission, 'Our experiences in elevating the representation of women in leadership. A letter from business leaders' (October 2011), p 20. At http://www.humanrights.gov.au/sex_discrimination/publication/mcc/index.html (viewed 2 May 2012).
- 15 Focus group 8C.
- 16 Meeting with Defence personnel on CDF Action Plan.
- 17 Meeting with career management representatives.
- 18 See Appendix E.1.



“Why is the responsibility being placed all on the woman to maintain her honour without correcting the culture and sexism that the men are showing.”

ADF member (Focus Group)



Chapter 3:

The ADF Culture:
The experience of and
attitudes towards women

In summary

- Most ADF members are ambivalent about whether the ADF should increase the representation of women.
- There are differences between the views and experiences of men and women about women's place in the ADF.
- There are inconsistencies and contradictions about whether men and women should be treated identically or differently.
- Quantitative research indicates that female ADF members are less likely than male ADF members to believe that women have the same career opportunities as men in their Service.
- The binary choice between the ADF or family is more keenly felt by women.
- Both men and women fear negative consequences if they bring a complaint.
- Many argue that the low representation of women in the ADF is just a reflection of the wider Australian culture.
- Many women spoke to the Review about feeling marginalised.
- Navy, Army and Air Force have introduced programs that aim to create more inclusive and diverse workplaces. The Recommendations contained in this Report build on those programs.

The ADF is the one of the nation's largest employers, yet despite this many Australians would have minimal insight into what it is like to work as a member of the ADF – to put on a uniform, train for duty, establish friendships, and compete for promotions, all while juggling family and other outside obligations.

Change within any organisation must be founded in an understanding of its daily reality, and so the Review was determined to develop a better appreciation of the way the ADF is experienced by personnel. This Chapter draws on extensive consultations, submissions and survey data undertaken by the Review to gain insight into the way that ADF members, both women and men, perceive their careers and the organisation.

This Chapter commences with a brief consideration of organisational culture, before exploring the contradictions that abound in how women in the ADF are assumed to be treated the same as men yet, too often, are pushed to the margins.

3.1 Organisational culture in the ADF

Definitions of organisational culture can be elusive but according to Jans:

Culture is to an organisation as 'personality' or 'character' is to an individual...Like 'personality', culture provides a coherent view of the world and a way of thinking about and making sense of that world. Defined as a 'system of shared meaning held by organisational members', it goes beyond 'style' to the spirit or the soul inside the body corporate.¹

Like many large, complex, geographically diverse organisations, there is no single, homogenous organisational culture in the ADF. Each Service is proud of its particular heritage, and within each Service there are many different cultures, often based on trade or occupational grouping. Pilots are different to technicians, sailors stationed on board ships are different to submariners. Sometimes these groupings are referred to as tribes. MAJGEN Craig Orme describes tribalism in the ADF as:

A sense of hyper-alignment with a component of the organisation. This can be anything from a small team, Platoon, Flight, Regiment, Platform, Ship, Department or Force Element Group. It can also be found amongst sub-groups in the ADF. This concept of tribalism in military culture is often masked by the more reasonable notion of team, identity and loyalty. Tribalism in this sense is not just about those in the team; it is a cultural view of the world that sees the team to which someone belongs as better than the other teams in the organisation ...[generating] a commitment to mission and each other that accepts the risk of death to ensure the team achieves its objective. To compromise that characteristic is to risk compromising military effectiveness.

The down side to military tribalism is that while those who are in the tribe belong; those who are not, are considered to be outsiders (those “others”) and somehow lesser contributors. The “others” are seen to be less worthy and therefore less deserving of the status of those “in” the dominant sub-group.²

This sense of belonging, or not belonging, of being ‘same’ or ‘other’ underpins much of the experience of women in the ADF.

3.2 Women – same or different?

Many women spoke positively about their experience of being a woman in the ADF. They described workplaces that were respectful and supportive and where performance was assessed in objective and transparent terms. Many spoke of having excellent career and development opportunities and most women felt that the ADF was a good employer for women:

Particularly during my pregnancy/maternity leave I felt very well supported both medically and employment-wise, but more so since then. I’m married to a Service member... and I’ve found the support, particularly from my Unit, very, very good in understanding I guess the more unique issues that go along with having a Service member partner and a small child with that partner deployed.³

In my 15 years of service at sea and ashore, I have never been disadvantaged because I am a woman. I have never felt harassed or discriminated against. Even early in my career I believe I was given all the same opportunities as my male counterparts. I would recommend joining the ADF to any woman.⁴

The Review also uncovered some deep and systemic contradictions. On the one hand, there is an overwhelming organisational ‘mantra’ in the ADF to ‘treat everyone the same’. Everyone wears the same uniform, is assessed on performance, is promoted on merit:

Doesn’t matter if you’re male or female. If you do your job and do it well, then you’re well respected.⁵

Last week I got one of the biggest compliments ... I was talking to the guys and I said something jokingly ... but I’m a chick and they went ‘you’re no chick, you’re just a cool dude with a pony tail’ ... for me that was a compliment from my colleagues because that would mean that I’m not any different.⁶

Further, there are strong organisational pressures to treat women and men identically:

Gender is not an issue to be considered in the sense of whether or not someone’s capable of more senior appointments. It’s based on merit and performance, not what type of clothes they wear, how they wear their hair and so forth.⁷

It’s just about nuking out gender at the moment, and going back to the fundamentals. We all contribute as individual members to a team collectively, it doesn’t matter what background we have, doesn’t matter what gender...but we all should feel comfortable in the workplace.⁸

On the other hand, there are some aspects of ADF life and operations that very clearly set women apart. For example, different requirements regarding physical fitness, their ability to come in from field exercises to take showers and separated living quarters mean that women are sometimes seen as having special privileges:

We're all supposed to be doing the same job. My view is they sort of over reacted ...giving a lot of concessions, like giving separate rooms. Half the shower block was taken away. They shouldn't be giving women those extra titbits and things.⁹

That's the double standard we see. We all wear basically the same issue clothing, we are treated the same but then they get all this sort of special isolation and treatment.¹⁰

...as a male I have had to sacrifice many things in my personal life to have the privilege of serving and I find it hard to accept that a female could be afforded many more benefits just because of her sex. I thought it was all about sexual equality in the workplace so we should all get the same benefits. Only once we are all receiving the same thing will full acceptance and workplace equality happen.¹¹

We find that women will get 'special treatment' out field. Exceptions are made for them that my men are not entitled to. Sometimes it seems that the DFDA [Defence Force Discipline Act] does not apply to women who can merely 'flutter their eyelashes'.¹²

Many women are also against any form of special treatment:

It's eight blokes going out to go on patrol to get dirty and grubby and messy. They don't want to have to consider female cycles, female showering. We've got all these other entitlements that come with being a female, which are quite embarrassing if you ever want to try and enforce them.¹³

The ADF shouldn't be developing strategies to 'improve the representation of women in the senior ranks'. They should be developing strategies to ensure women have the same opportunities as men. Different or better treatment than men, either perceived or real, will undermine women in the ADF. We just want to be treated equally, not different.¹⁴

You joined the Army, it didn't join you. It's a man's world. Why should those fifty people stop being able to use a particular word because I'm sensitive to that, why do fifty people have to be impacted by my one view on a particular thing.¹⁵

In addition to views that women receive preferential treatment in the field, there is an equally strong view among some members that women generally have it easier than men in terms of their careers:

The majority of females I reckon get it easy...If they request something and two people put their paperwork in, generally females would probably get it first.¹⁶

If [a man doesn't] do it correctly...he'll get blasted, he'll deal with it...Imagine if I started crying during a weapons drill how much these blokes would give it to me, forever.¹⁷

A woman can take extended leave to look after children without impact on her career. A man would be disadvantaged if he took leave for the same reason. A woman can take 'easier' or less 'high profile' jobs in her career without detriment, as the Army is looking to increase women in senior ranks. A man's promotional prospects would be negatively impacted from this.¹⁸

Beyond this, the Review encountered a genuine fear, distrust, or resentment of women by some male personnel who were uncertain about how to interact with them:

The reason some [Instructors] won't tear shreds off some of the women...is because there is that thought in the back of their mind that if they turn around and say something, one thing slightly wrong to a female recruit, all they've got to do is put their hand up and scream sexual assault and the rest of their career's gone.¹⁹

In my role...I'm usually required to speak to people one on one. With females I won't do one on one. Shit scared. In the past I've spoken to a person that's worked for me and I've told her she's no good at her job because she wasn't...She took that as far as she could because she didn't like being told she was no good at her job. And since then, I won't speak to a female one on one.²⁰

I feel like sometimes when I'm talking to [women], you look down the hallway and people look at you... There's nothing going on, but even I myself sometimes get worried about that whole fraternisation thing getting brought up when there's nothing happening.²¹

Mixed messages about whether women are the same or different, as well as about relationships between men and women, can be confusing, especially for recruits:

They [women] are sort of made to look like us, I mean they've got to act like us as well.²²

When we were out field when we were setting up all the tents we had to keep a five metre radius away from them and they were pretty much segregated from us, because we were all close together. Literally my tent would be right next to his tent and the girls were a good three, five metres away. So it makes them feel different, and makes you feel like they're different or other in some way [and] you don't really want to talk to them just in case you get in trouble.²³

They sell condoms at the shop where you get bread. And they give them away in medical. They do a big talk you know if you want condoms, come and get them, but you can't fraternise.²⁴

3.3 Women as 'other'

Unsurprisingly, 'mateship' and the bonds between colleagues is a key feature of team work and operational effectiveness. In fact, in surveys conducted of soldiers undertaking various training courses, 'mates' was cited as the number one 'thing I like most about the Army' by those who attended Corporal courses, Sergeant courses, Warrant Officer courses and Regimental Sergeant Major courses.²⁵

Rather than feeling the bonds of mateship, many women repeatedly reported feeling or being treated as 'other'. They spoke of risks associated with trying to 'fit in', some women describing it as a 'no-win proposition', with some who tried to be friendly accused of 'always being on [their] back'; while those who did not try to fit in accused of being 'a bitch'.²⁶

When I had my first interview with XXXX, the first thing he said to me was 'Private XXXX, just so you know, I don't think women should be in [this Service]'.²⁷

If there was one female, they all bitched about it in their off hours, going 'oh, I've got a girl in the class, can't talk about this, can't show these pictures'. To be honest, I find the same jokes funny, but they still don't like girls in the class.²⁸

Baking a cake for unit members is acceptable whereas disciplining recalcitrant members is not.

Women in ADF are defined by their gender first prior to being identified by their rank or position. They are still seen as objects who need to be sexually conquered by their male counterparts.²⁹

Additionally, despite perceptions about women having it 'easier', some women also spoke about the pressure to succeed and to do 'twice as much' to be recognised for their efforts. This is despite the fact that, in many cases, they function at a palpable disadvantage:

You do have to work harder as a woman to prove yourself in the Navy. It's like that in every male dominated area, and I'm sure the men would say that's bullshit, because they don't have to do it.³⁰

I have the smallest armour that they could provide me and it was too wide in the chest therefore I can't hold my weapon standing up, let alone laying down.³¹

I have to wear my armour back to front just to make it fit properly. It just doesn't work.³²

Meanwhile, some women spoke to the Review about extremely demeaning attitudes towards women. Women often spoke of being called sluts and bitches³³ or of being called gay, dykes or lesbians³⁴ in a derogatory manner:

An instructor would constantly make unacceptable comments about female's menstrual cycles. He had a [sailor] working for him that was pregnant and he would refer to her as the bag of spare parts.³⁵

We had one girl get promoted not long ago and one of the guys actually turned around and said 'I'm sick and tired of incompetent vaginas being promoted around this place'.³⁶

A: His quote was, and excuse my language here, but the only thing that a woman at my patrol base would be good for is to get fed every night by us while we're on picket. I don't know if you know what the term 'fed' means.

B: Having sex?

A: Yes, basically.³⁷

Some women felt that these attitudes were promulgated or reinforced by male supervisors and that this influenced younger male members:

Older male members of the military...should be told they shouldn't publicly express their personal opinions about women in the military... They turn around and (say) I don't think women should be in the Army, I don't think women should be allowed to do this, and these younger guys are like, 'well I didn't see a problem with it before but yeah'.³⁸

...they learn the ethos from the older ones. It sort of breeds itself.³⁹

Further, a number of women also spoke to the Review about the importance of reputation and the onus they felt was on them to behave appropriately. Some women described 'the talk' that they received to be careful of their reputation and not 'sleep around'. Differences were perceived between the 'talks' for men and women:

It was, take all the girls aside and have that chat and say don't sleep around, be careful of your reputation. Be aware that when you step on a ship guys will have points against your name and they'll keep a ledger and try and get you... they'll turn on the charm because they're just trying to get you into bed so that they can brag about it in the mess... I don't know that that's the best approach to tell women to be fearful...But men don't get that side chat.⁴⁰

You get given the 'perception' talk very early on... Even just in social settings, work get together..., you're expected to leave as soon as the fun was starting.⁴¹

A woman's reputation regarding sexual behaviour 'sticks' and follows her throughout her career:

I've had it where guys have actually said, 'yeah I've slept with her'...no one listens to you, you just get the reputation and once you got the reputation, [clicks fingers] it goes round every single base in Australia.⁴²

They're a stud, and you're a slut.⁴³

The Review's online survey also indicated that there are marked differences between men and women's attitudes about the impact of 'reputation' on one's career.⁴⁴ Men and women were more likely to believe that a woman's 'reputation' would have more impact than a man's and women were much more likely to believe this. Nearly twice as many women (68%) as men (35%) agreed that a woman's reputation can inhibit her military career. Much lower proportions of women (13%) and men (25%) agreed that a man's reputation can inhibit his career.

3.4 Sexual harassment

Women spoke to the Review about their experiences of sexual harassment and of working in highly sexualised workplaces. These issues will be explored in detail in Chapter 7, and are of relevance to the culture of the ADF as experienced by women:

The corporals, sergeants and above are supposed to be leading by example displaying high levels of professionalism. Instead they prey on unsuspecting teenagers, lie or just fail to mention their marriages, engagements, existing relationships and inevitably people get hurt.⁴⁵

At the time I was living by myself in an isolated area, all they would have had to do was follow me home. These [text] messages were psychotic This guy is still in the [workplace] and I still have to work with him every day and no-one will do anything about it because it's not classed as harassment.⁴⁶ I've had a sergeant come on to me and because I've said no, bugger off, I've then got a really bad PAR [Performance Appraisal Report].⁴⁷

I've heard all the comments as soon as someone posts on board, all the males' opinions on whether they think that that person's hot or not. It's like, 'oh, fresh meat'.⁴⁸

There was a strong recurring theme that it was the very nature of the ADF that somehow explained the prevalence of these attitudes:

Something happens when you put on a uniform as a male, and when you step into that environment and you are fixing a \$70 million [piece of equipment]. You just tend to take on a persona that you might not ordinarily.⁴⁹

Once you get out field in an all-male environment it's almost primal.⁵⁰

I've had the [commanding officer] explain to me that it's because of the nature of our business that the culture is different... He was trying to explain to me that we're in the profession of arms and the business of war so people have to let off steam and that sort of makes it ok, because we are different and we are special. And I just kept saying to them, we should be held to a higher standard.⁵¹

There were many who argued that what happens in ADF is just a reflection of wider Australian society:

It troubles me that often people vilify the [ADF] culture ...It's not really [ADF] culture, it's just Australian culture. You go to a bunch of truckies, a bunch of mine workers, a bunch of council workers, elite sportsmen, they'll have exactly the same mentality.⁵²

As part of the Review, a survey of 1,000 members was undertaken to determine prevalence rates of sexual harassment in the ADF. The survey found that prevalence rates of sexual harassment in the ADF are similar to the general population. The survey also found that women experience sexual harassment at a greater rate than men and that, on average, the harassment continued over a longer period for women than men. In addition, women tended to perceive the harassment as more offensive and more intimidating than male targets of harassment.

The ADF component of the survey is discussed in Chapter 7 and the full ADF results are contained in Appendix N.4.

3.5 Making a complaint

Whilst women and men spoke of being aware of the complaints mechanisms that exist they also spoke of their reluctance to report unacceptable behaviour and the possible consequences if they did:

People don't want to cause too much trouble. I think that's always a concern. Not so much being a victim, but just people knowing that you've had a whinge.⁵³

He [the harasser] was the person who wrote my assessment. That's probably a common thought that if you do report it or if you do take it further, at some stage in the future I'm going to come across him again.⁵⁴

I don't know whether it was just the culture of where I actually was, (but) it was always said, that you put complaints forward you kiss your career goodbye.⁵⁵

Many people the Review spoke with expressed concerns about the Equity and Diversity (E&D) process:

If you stick up for yourself and do E&D, you'll be isolated, no-one will like you.⁵⁶

You do on occasion hear immature comments, 'I'm going to E&D you' like it's a cricket bat.⁵⁷

Higher ranks and a lot of teachers will be very cautious around that female because [she is] known for E&D...You look at [her] the wrong way, [she'll] go and put a complaint in, which ruins it for people that want to put in a proper complaint and have a legit reason to put a complaint in.⁵⁸

Women and men differ in their views about experiencing and reporting sexual harassment. In the Review's online survey, perceptions regarding the incidence and impact of sexual harassment, discrimination and abuse tended to be less positive for females compared to males:

- A higher percentage of female respondents felt that experiencing sexual harassment or discrimination would have a negative impact on career progress (60% females, 41% males).
- A higher percentage of female respondents believed that women are more likely to experience sexual harassment or discrimination in the ADF than men (65% females, 44% males).
- A higher percentage of female respondents believed that women are more likely to experience sexual abuse in the ADF than men (54% females, 39% males).
- A higher percentage of female respondents felt that experiencing sexual abuse in the ADF would have a negative impact on career progress (58% females, 41% males).
- A higher percentage of male respondents believed that appropriate action would be taken if they were to report an incident of unacceptable behaviour (66% females, 83% males).

3.6 Work or family – the 'choices' women make

Beyond this, ADF women feel they face a stark choice between career and family. This mutually exclusive choice was described by both men and women, but it was women who felt most keenly that they must choose whether to have a career, or a family, but could certainly not have both:

I'm 35, and I'm at that point now where I'm looking at my career going, do I want to stay in the Navy... because I can't see me putting 100 percent into my job...as well as being ...100 percent into my family... I have to choose.⁵⁹

It all depends what you're willing to sacrifice. Women tend to take on the role as primary care giver... it really comes down to how much you want it, but it is obviously going to backtrack your career.⁶⁰

I don't want to feel as though I've taken on a Command role to make Army happy... and then find that my kids are failing grade 3.⁶¹

In contrast, men often framed this choice as 'just the way things are':

Women get to a certain level and then they leave or they don't progress further. I've not seen anything that [doesn't] want them to progress. I think human nature happens.⁶²

Female officers ... fight against that maternal instinct. They want to be a mum...that's what they're hardwired biologically to do.⁶³

Both men and women across all ranks perceived this 'choice' as an individual one. In fact, a widespread organisational acceptance was apparent regarding the inevitability of losing serving women when they become pregnant and needed to balance work and family responsibilities. As discussed in Chapter 1 and section 4.3, losing highly committed, trained women has an impact on the capability and sustainability of the organisation, representing a major loss on the time and resources Defence has invested in skills and talent development.

In the Review's online survey, men tended to have a more favourable view of the balance between work and family responsibilities than women:

- A higher percentage of male respondents felt that the ADF supports women through the different stages of their lives. (51% females, 67% males).
- A higher percentage of female respondents believed that their career is impacted by family/caring responsibilities (57% females, 36% males).
- A higher percentage of female respondents believed that the ADF should be more flexible towards the different life courses of men and women (61% females, 49% males).
- A higher percentage of female respondents agreed that family responsibilities affect their ability to go on deployment (56% females, 39% males agreeing).

There was a high degree of uncertainty about whether accessing flexible working arrangements would have a negative career impact. Further, only 18% of female respondents and 20% of male respondents did not believe that accessing flexible work would negatively impact on their career. These issues will be further detailed in Chapter 6.

3.7 Representation of women

Finally, the Review found deep organisational ambivalence about whether the ADF should increase the representation of women. The Review heard many times that women are simply not attracted to a career in Defence; that there were no impediments to women's progression; and that the representation of women at about 14% was 'about right'.⁶⁴

There is strong resistance to any targets or quotas for women from men and women – the notion of differential treatment flying in the face of 'equality' as it is understood in the ADF. Many ADF members consider that equality will be achieved through identical treatment, with very little appetite, for example, for targets or quotas:

I think there are two key problems with [quotas]. One, every single person in this room would fight back because you're taking one of our spots and two, there are females who can make it without a quota and you're completely undermining their position... You're just going to completely ruin the female name within the ADF.⁶⁵

I don't think we should have targets for any of this gender stuff because it diminishes what all of us in this room have achieved to date.⁶⁶

[For] the people that have worked so long for twenty years to be thought of as equal and then when you finally get promoted they'll say you only got it because you're a female. Ruins everything we've done. Horrible, horrible thought.⁶⁷

Results from the Review's online survey suggest that large numbers of ADF members are uncertain about, or disagree with the idea that the ADF should increase the representation of women (47% of female respondents, 66% of male respondents). About half of women and one-third of men agreed that the ADF should increase the representation of women (53% of female respondents, 34% of male respondents); and more men than women believed that the ADF supports the recruitment and retention of women (64% female respondents, 81% male respondents) and also that the ADF is committed to improving the representation of women in senior ranks (50% female respondent, 63% male respondents).

Men were slightly more likely than women to believe that ADF personnel were promoted on merit. 73% of male respondents and 63% of female respondents believe that men are promoted on merit; and 64% of male respondents and 60% of female respondents believed that women were promoted on merit.

Finally, men and women also returned different responses to the survey items dealing with career progression:

- A higher percentage of male respondents believed that women have the same career opportunities as men in their Service (62% females, 80% males).
- A higher percentage of male respondents believed that women are well represented in career streams where there are good opportunities for progression (57% females, 72% males).
- A higher percentage of female respondents (and very few male respondents) believed that women hit a glass ceiling at Lieutenant Colonel / Commander / Wing Commander level (27% females, 7% males).
- A higher percentage of female respondents believed that there should be more women in leadership positions in the ADF (62% females, 32% males).

The results suggest that there is evidence of 'blind spots' in the organisation about the adverse, differential impact on women of the current career development and promotion processes. This is explored in section 4.4.

By contrast some personnel do see a role for quotas. As one senior officer acknowledged:

Many will argue that they don't want to be promoted based on a quota, that they want to get there on merit [but] quotas and merit are not mutually exclusive ideas. Well, we all need to get over it. The reality is that every woman who goes to the short list at a promotion board has merit anyway.⁶⁸

3.8 Conclusion

Clearly, there is some dissonance between the views and beliefs of many in the ADF and the reality that was apparent to the Review. Despite assertions that men and women receive equal treatment, for example, there are many complaints about women receiving preferential treatment, while women often report feeling decidedly on the margins. For many personnel there is also an enduring ambivalence about whether and where women 'fit', whether there should be more serving women, whether the presence of women affects capability and what roles they should perform. This is of concern, given research informs us that gender diversity is a key marker of the health of organisations.⁶⁹ As one expert states: 'The canaries aren't just warning that the mine is a bad place for birds; they are just the first ones to indicate that something is wrong in the mine, which needs to be addressed.'⁷⁰ Perhaps the experience of women is signalling that the "mine" is no longer the most effective workplace for today's people and families.

The Review acknowledges the programs introduced in recent times by Navy, Army and Air Force aimed at creating more diverse and inclusive workplaces. The Recommendations in this Report will build on these programs and create a blueprint for further reform.

As women and men's working patterns and expectations converge, what will make a difference for women will likely also make a difference for men. After a detailed examination of the ADF workforce pipeline, the Report will explore some of these perceptions and experiences further before moving to its final recommendations. The recommendations have been developed having in mind the culture and beliefs of the ADF that are reflected above. They have also been developed with a view to improving the experiences of both women and men, and creating a better and high performing ADF.

- 1 N Jans and D Schmidtchen, *The Real C-Cubed: Culture, Careers and Climate and How They Affect Capability* (2002), Chapter 3.
- 2 MAJGEN C Orme, 'Beyond Compliance; An Operations Focussed Culture and the Australian Profession of Arms', draft discussion paper, 2 June 2011, provided to the Review.
- 3 Focus group 3B.
- 4 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey.*
- 5 Focus group 20D.
- 6 Focus group 30A.
- 7 Focus group 9A.
- 8 Focus group 13B.
- 9 Focus group 34F.
- 10 Focus group 24A.
- 11 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey.*
- 12 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey.*
- 13 Focus group 20B.
- 14 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey.*
- 15 Focus group 20D.
- 16 Focus group 24C.
- 17 Focus group 24A.
- 18 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey.*
- 19 Focus group 34B.
- 20 Focus group 17D.
- 21 Focus group 24A.
- 22 Focus group 24A.
- 23 Focus group 24A.
- 24 Focus group 24A.
- 25 K Woods, 'Has ADF Leadership Changed over the Last 20 Years and Can We Make it Better?' (2012) 187 *Australian Defence Force Journal* 48, pp 52-54.
- 26 Focus group 35B.
- 27 Focus group 6A.
- 28 Focus group 7B.
- 29 Confidential submission 14.
- 30 Focus group 4C.
- 31 Focus group 34E.
- 32 Focus group 34E.
- 33 Focus groups 4A, 16B, 27A, 34B, 12B, 4B; Public submission 9 Lang; Confidential submission 14.
- 34 Focus groups 16B, 9B.
- 35 Focus group 3B.
- 36 Focus group 11E.
- 37 Focus group 11E.
- 38 Focus group 34E.
- 39 Focus group 11E.
- 40 Focus group 19B.
- 41 Focus group 27A.
- 42 Focus group 16B.
- 43 Focus group 35F.
- 44 All survey figures in this Chapter are taken from the electronic sample of the *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*. Further discussion and analysis of the survey is at Appendix B.
- 45 Public submission 30.
- 46 Focus group 7B.
- 47 Focus group 7B.
- 48 Focus group 19B.
- 49 Focus group 7B.
- 50 Focus group 11D.
- 51 Focus group 16B.
- 52 Focus group 11D.
- 53 Focus group 7A.
- 54 Focus group 4B.
- 55 Focus group 6A.
- 56 Focus group 7B.
- 57 Focus group 17D.
- 58 Focus group 24C.
- 59 Focus group 12B.
- 60 Focus group 11E.
- 61 Focus group 27A.

- 62 Focus group 23C.
- 63 Focus group 9A.
- 64 For example, Focus group 24C.
- 65 Focus group 11C.
- 66 Focus group 27A.
- 67 Focus group 27A.
- 68 GPCAPT S McGready, *Speech to the Air Force Women's Development Forum*, 20 June 2012, provided to the Review by SQNDLR F James, 28 June 2012.
- 69 Deloitte and Women & Leadership Australia, *Impacting Gender Diversity, Exploring the Challenges and generating strategies for Change* (2011), p 3. At <http://www.deakin.edu.au/equity-diversity/assets/resources/impacting-gender-diversity-2011.pdf> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 70 B Bagley, 'Women and Workplace Flexibility: Canaries in the Coal Mine', *The Glasshammer*, 2 November 2010. At <http://www.theglasshammer.com/news/2010/11/02/women-and-workplace-flexibility-canaries-in-the-coal-mine/> (viewed 26 June 2012).



“I’ve done all this hard work to get where I am and I had to make a choice – do I take this next step and move forward with my peers or do I take a break knowing that I will never catch up with them and knowing that the opportunity to progress might be gone forever?”

ADF member (Focus Group)



Chapter 4:

The ADF Workforce Pipeline:
Women's representation
and critical issues

The ADF workforce provides opportunities unlike any experienced in the civilian environment, while also imposing very specific parameters on its workers. All workforces face their own challenges and many still grapple with achieving a significant representation of women. The particular nature of the ADF workforce, the complex requirements of its overall mission and its highly defined career pipeline, can compound these challenges. Understanding this pipeline and the forces that affect it is essential to achieving meaningful organisational change.

This Chapter will examine the representation of women across the ADF workforce, analysing recruitment and retention efforts and trends, as well as the ways in which career management processes impact upon women's progression.

(a) Overview of the ADF Workforce Pipeline

The ADF workforce is primarily built upon ab initio or entry level, recruitment. This means that the bulk of ADF recruits come from the civilian environment, with no previous military experience, and enter the base training rank. Most are from the 17-24 year old age bracket, often straight out of school or tertiary institutions. Ab initio recruiting is seen as the best way to 'progressively train individuals for the specific category and capability requirements' of the Service.¹

Applicants select their preferred occupations at recruiting and are allocated a position in a particular corps/mustering/category. They then commit to an Initial Minimum Period of Service, Return of Service Obligation or similar, which requires them to complete a certain number of years in the ADF or, alternatively, pay back a proportion of their training costs should they discharge at an earlier date. Opportunities for progression vary within these occupations, with some categories having what is known as a 'low rank ceiling' – that is where the most senior position in a certain category will be at a relatively junior level.

As later sections will discuss, promotion through the ranks is determined not only by performance, but also by a length of 'time in rank' that must be served before a member is eligible to be considered for promotion. Promotions are considered after members have served this time, rather than after specific application to more senior positions. This means that, rather than considering members' suitability for a particular role, a Service specific promotions board considers their elevation in general terms on the basis of time served, performance reports received and how well they have functioned in comparison to their peers according to well defined metrics.

In other words, the ADF's pipeline – a concept often used in relation to an organisation's workforce – follows a rigid and linear path, with recruits and junior personnel entering at one end, and the organisation's leadership emerging at the other.² This Chapter provides an analysis of the representation of women within this ADF pipeline, while Chapter 5 will examine some of the structural and systemic barriers that women may encounter along the way.

(b) Workforce structure – the basics

The ADF workforce is comprised of 'officers' and 'other ranks'. Officer positions are management focussed, requiring team leadership and decision-making. Other rank positions tend to be more trade related and team oriented. The other ranks include technical positions (e.g. mechanics, electricians, carpenters) and non-technical positions (e.g. cooks, dental assistants, drivers).

There are fewer officers than other ranks, and while each workforce component has its own hierarchy, the most senior leadership positions in the ADF are occupied by officers. Ranks O07-O10 are the most senior leaders in the ADF, and are known as 'star ranks'.

The rank hierarchies and inter-Service equivalents are listed below.³ The following Chapter discusses these ranks and uses the abbreviations listed.

Table 4.1: Other ranks hierarchy and inter-Service equivalents

Code	Navy	Army	Air Force
E00	Recruit (RCT)	Recruit (PTE REC)	Aircraftman/Woman Recruit (AC/W REC)
E01	Seaman* (SMN*)	Private Trainee (PTE TRN)	Aircraftman/Woman Trainee (AC/W TRN)
E02	Seaman (SMN)	Private (PTE)	Aircraftman/Woman (AC/W)
E03	Able Seaman (AB)	Private Proficient (PTE(P))	Leading Aircraftman/Woman (LAC/W)
E04		Lance Corporal (LCPL)	
E05	Leading Seaman (LS)	Corporal (CPL)	Corporal (CPL)
E51			Non-commissioned Officer Cadet (NCOCDT)
E06	Petty Officer (PO)	Sergeant (SGT)	Sergeant (SGT)
E07		Staff Sergeant (SSGT)	
E08	Chief Petty Officer (CPO)	Warrant Officer Class 2 (WO2)	Flight Sergeant (FSGT)
E09	Warrant Officer (WO)	Warrant Officer Class 1 (WO1)	Warrant Officer (WOFF)
E10	Warrant Officer of the Navy (WO-N)	Regimental Sergeant Major of the Army (RSM-A)	Warrant Officer of the Air Force (WOFF-AF)

Table 4.2: Officer ranks hierarchy and inter-Service equivalents

Code	Navy	Army	Air Force
O00	Midshipman (MIDN)	Officer Cadet (OCDT)	Officer Cadet (OFFCDT)
O01	Acting Sub Lieutenant (ASLT)	Second Lieutenant (2LT)	Pilot Officer (PLTOFF)
O02	Sub Lieutenant (SBLT)	Lieutenant (LT)	Flying Officer (FLGOFF)
O03	Lieutenant (LEUT)	Captain (CAPT)	Flight Lieutenant (FLTLT)
O04	Lieutenant Commander (LCDR)	Major (MAJ)	Squadron Leader (SQNLDR)
O05	Commander (CMDR)	Lieutenant Colonel (LTCOL)	Wing Commander (WGCDR)
O06	Captain (CAPT)	Colonel (COL)	Group Captain (GPCAPT)
O07	Commodore (CDRE)	Brigadier (BRIG)	Air Commodore (AIRCDRE)
O08	Rear Admiral (RADM)	Major General (MAJGEN)	Air Vice-Marshal (AVM)
O09	Vice Admiral (VADM)	Lieutenant General (LTGEN)	Air Marshal (AIRMSHL)
O10	Admiral (ADML)	General (GEN)	Air Chief Marshal (ACM)

4.1 Representation

In summary

- Women are under-represented across most areas of the ADF and vastly under-represented in senior leadership positions in the organisation.
- At the end of 2010/11 women comprised 13.8% of all ADF personnel (17.4% of all officers, and 12.6% of all other ranks).
- By Service, women make up 18.5% of Navy, 9.9% of Army and 17.1% of Air Force.⁴
- Women make up less than 5% of star ranks, and less than 8% of warrant officers.
- Better recruiting practices and developmental pathways are required to address the under-representation of women in the ADF and leadership.
- The lack of diversity, including gender diversity, will increasingly impact on the ADF's overall capability and operational effectiveness.

This section maps the representation of women in different parts of each Navy, Army and Air Force, in order to identify areas where women are progressing, as well as those where they are encountering hurdles. Without this information, a solid understanding of the barriers and opportunities that women face cannot be reached.

An examination of the ADF pipeline requires a number of analyses. As described above, the ADF is organisationally comprised of three separately managed Services (Navy, Army, Air Force), each of which has an officers and other ranks component. In addition, a number of ADF personnel are posted to tri-service establishments, such as Headquarters Joint Operations Command. Each of the single services' workforce components has its own senior leadership positions, drawn from its own ranks. For this reason, this section will conduct separate analysis of each of these six workforce components.

At the outset, it is important to note that broad similarities apply across all three Services:

- Women are under-represented in most categories across the ADF, and make up 13.8% of ADF personnel overall.⁵
- Women are vastly under-represented at the most senior levels of each Service in comparison to their overall representation, making up less than 5% of all star ranks (senior officers), and less than 8% of warrant officers (senior other ranks).⁶
- There is a higher proportion of women in each Service's officer corps compared to the other ranks. Overall, women make up 17.4% of all officers, and 12.6% of all other ranks.⁷
- In general, women progress better through the other ranks than the officer ranks.

There are also significant differences between the Services. Disaggregated by Service, the figures show that:

- Navy has the highest overall representation of women (18.5%), but has issues with the progression of women beyond its junior ranks.
- Army has the lowest overall representation of women (9.9%), but is doing comparatively well with women's progression, particularly in its other ranks.⁸
- Air Force falls somewhere between the other two Services with regards to both the representation (17.1%) and progression, but has had the best proportional improvements in the representation of women over the period examined.

The Review's research reveals that underlying issues which are contributing to the low representation of women include:

- The failure of gender-related initiatives to increase the proportion of women being recruited into the ADF.
- The lack of a critical mass of women within the ADF, reducing the opportunity to create sustainable cultural reform in a number of areas.
- Occupational segregation and the traditional structure of the workforce, which has acted as a barrier to the progression of women into the most senior ranks of each Service.
- Real or perceived lack of support in the context of work/life balance, leaving many women feeling they must choose between their career and family.

As later areas of this Report will explain, the Review believes that addressing issues of recruitment, the lack of critical mass, occupational segregation and work/family balance will help the ADF address some of the areas of concern within its workforce pipelines.

(a) Methodology

The baseline data used in this section is end of financial year 2004/05 to 2010/11 snapshot figures provided to the Review by the Workforce Planning Branch.⁹ These figures are broken down by gender and rank for each Service.¹⁰ Further data, commentary and clarification by ADF workforce and career management personnel is also used, and cited as appropriate.

The analysis below examines each of the six ADF pipelines. Each subsection begins with three key graphs:

1. Women as a proportion of each rank over time, from 2004/05 to 2010/11. This time period is used because of the availability of comparable data over this period. It illustrates patterns and changes over the period.
2. Women and men as a proportion of each rank, end of financial year 2010/11. This graph indicates the representation per rank for women and men from the most recent information in this data-set.
3. Number and proportional representation of women in senior ranks. This graph focusses in on the number and proportional representation of women at the most senior ranks at each end of the data sample – 2004/05 and 2010/11 – to illustrate any changes that have occurred over this time.

(b) Army, other ranks

Figure 4.1: Proportional representation of women, Army other ranks, financial years 2004/05 to 2010/11




Figure 4.1 shows the representation of women as a proportion of each other rank in Army over the previous seven financial years. The fact that representation at various ranks is tracking similarly over this time indicates that these patterns are well established.

Figure 4.2: Proportion of women and men, Army other ranks, financial year 2010/11




Figure 4.2 shows the breakdown of women and men in each rank at the end of financial year 2010/11. In financial year 2010/11 women made up 8.7% of all Army other ranks (2,020 out of a total 23,335).¹¹ This compares with 2004/05 when women made up 9.1% (1,800 out of a total of 19,844). While the total number of women has increased, the proportional representation has decreased.

Figure 4.3: Army women senior non-commissioned officers, 2004/05 and 2010/11

RANK	2004/5		2010/11	
	Number and proportion of total women (and men) / rank		Number and proportion of total women (and men) / rank	
SGT + SSGT	260 (men 2,342)	10%	293 (men 2,512)	10.4%
WO2	142 (men 1,705)	7.7%	169 (men 1,822)	8.5%
WO1 + RSM-A	25 (men 503)	4.7%	56 (men 629)	8.2%

Figure 4.3 shows the number and proportional representation of women at senior Army non-commissioned ranks in 2004/5 and 2010/11.¹² There are more women in these senior ranks, particularly at the rank of WO1, in 2010/11 compared to 2004/05.

(i) Overall representation

The overall representation of women in Army's other ranks is low. At 8.7%, it is proportionally about half the representation in Navy (17.9%) and Air Force's (16%) other ranks.¹³

It should be noted however, that Army contains several large categories – for example infantry and parts of artillery – which are not currently open to women.¹⁴ Setting aside the categories from which women are excluded, women's participation rate in the open parts of the workforce rises to nearly 13%.¹⁵ However, when the exclusion is lifted, women's representation by both measures (absolute *and* open categories) will be closer to 9% than 13% if current recruitment and retention trends remain in place.¹⁶

As the largest sector of the ADF, the low representation rates for women in Army's other ranks has a large impact on women's representation in the ADF as a whole. Improvements in this part of the Force will be favourably reflected within the wider ADF.

(ii) Progression

The overall representation, representation at senior ranks, and separation and movement figures illustrate that women have been progressing through Army's other ranks in a relatively equitable fashion.

In 2010/11 women made up 8.5% of all warrant officer class 2s and 8.2% of all warrant officer class 1s. These figures compare favourably to women's overall representation at 8.7% of all other ranks.¹⁷

Women are equitably represented in both the separations and movements (promotions minus demotions, or net promotions) totals for financial year 2010/11, in comparison to their overall representation. Women made up 192 of the 2,142 (or 9%) total separations from Army's other ranks and 796 of the 9,393 net movements per rank (8.5%).¹⁸ Women made up a higher proportion of separations from the corporal (15.9%) and sergeant (12.7%) ranks, but also a higher proportion of movements into lance corporal (10.5%) and corporal (11.6%).¹⁹ As figure 4.1 shows, women have been more highly represented at the rank of corporal than any other rank throughout the period examined, and so higher figures at and around this rank are also to be expected. Beyond the rank of corporal, representation begins to trend downwards again.

Figure 4.3 also indicates that there has been an improvement in the number of women progressing to the most senior ranks in this part of the Service between 2004/05 and 2010/11.

(iii) Conclusion and issues

Currently, the representation of women in Army's other ranks is stable but low. The main obstacle is recruitment.

The Review understands that Army and Defence Force Recruiting are currently seeking to address this issue by streamlining the recruitment process, and increasing the conversion rate between the number of enquiries (which they see as 'healthy') and recruits (which could be improved).²⁰ These initiatives are commendable, and the Review has made recommendations about other innovative recruitment strategies that should be trialled or adopted in order to increase the number of female recruits.

Analysis of enlistments and separations from the rank of recruit also indicates that retention of female recruits may be an issue.²¹ A higher separation rate for women at recruit schools may be due to a number of factors, such as the absence of a critical mass of women, and the strict gender segregation in much of recruit training which can isolate women and fail to provide them the support network that is available to men.²² Given Army will be expecting more female recruits in the future, it should examine ways to provide ongoing support structures to its new recruits, to make sure they are well equipped to deal with the challenges of recruit school, and progress through the early stages of their careers.

Finally, figure 4.1 indicates a spike in women's representation at corporal over the entire period examined by the Review. This is acknowledged by Defence, but neither the ADF nor the Review have a hypothesis as to why this might be at this time.²³ An examination of this, and whether there are particular barriers facing women at the rank of corporal, as well as any similar areas of interest in the workforce pipeline would be beneficial to the goal of increasing leadership pathways for women.

(c) Army, officers

Figure 4.4: Proportional representation of women, Army officer ranks, financial years 2004/05 to 2010/11




Figure 4.4 shows the representation of women as a proportion of each officer rank in Army over the previous seven financial years. As with other ranks, the patterns here are similar across the period, indicating established trends. There are some discrepancies at the more senior ranks, which are a result of the very small numbers of personnel involved, and the fact that individual promotions and retirements subsequently result in visible graphical shifts. There are no women in the most senior ranks, indicating a barrier at this level.

Figure 4.5: Women and men as a proportion of each Army officer rank, financial year 2010/11




Figure 4.5 shows the breakdown of women and men in each rank at the end of financial year 2010/11. In financial year 2010/11 women made up 14.5% of all Army officer personnel (897 out of a total 6,166).²⁴ This compares with 2004/05 when women made up 14.2% of Army officer ranks (746 out of 5,262).

Figure 4.6: Army women senior officers, 2004/05 and 2010/11

RANK	2004/5		2010/11	
	Number and proportion of total women (and men) / rank		Number and proportion of total women (and men) / rank	
MAJ	177 (men 1,130)	13.5%	228 (men 1,385)	14.1%
LTCOL	32 (men 437)	6.8%	62 (men 527)	10.5%
COL	4 (men 115)	3.4%	7 (men 152)	4.4%
BRIG	0 (men 40)	0%	4 (men 48)	7.7%

Figure 4.6 shows the number and proportional representation of women at senior Army officer ranks in 2004/5 and 2010/11.²⁵ Although representation has improved, particularly at lieutenant colonel and brigadier level, it remains very low, and there are no women at the most senior ranks.

(i) Overall representation

Women make up 14.5% of Army officer ranks, a much higher proportion compared to other ranks (8.7%). This figure is much closer to women's representation in the other Services' officer corps (Navy 20.3%, Air Force 19.3%), and indicates that women's lower representation in Army as a whole is largely a result of the low representation in its other ranks.

There are a number of Army officer roles which are not open to women, although these restrictions are soon to be lifted.²⁶ If the categories from which women were excluded at the end of 2011 are set aside, women's participation rate among Army officer ranks rises to over 17%, a figure more in line with women's representation in the other Services.²⁷

(ii) Progression

Women are not progressing into Army's senior ranks in numbers commensurate to their overall representation in the Service. Figures 4.4 and 4.5 show that the representation of women falls away as rank increases. In 2010/11, women made up 17.8% of lieutenants but only 4.4% of colonels, with a steady decline in representation between these ranks.²⁸ At the most senior three levels of Army, there are no women.

In 2010/11 women made up 60 of the 457 (or 13.1%) separations across all ranks, and 134 of the 915 net movements/promotions (14.1%).²⁹ Between 2004 and 2010, women have been over-represented in separations from more junior ranks. Figures for calendar years 2004 – 2010 show that women comprise between 25% and 40% of separations from captain, and between 2007 and 2010, women made up between 16.5% and 20.5% of separations from major.³⁰ As women are lost from the pipeline at these ranks, issues of critical mass become more obvious. While the representation of women is improving at more senior ranks (see figure 4.6) there remain very few star ranked women in Army. In 2010/11, women made up only 4.6% of all movements to colonel, and none of the 25 promotions to Brigadier (17) Major General (6) or Lieutenant General (2).³¹

An analysis of the most senior ranks in the ADF indicates that they are customarily filled by personnel from employment categories in which men are well represented and women less so, if at all. The same situation exists in mid-ranking career gateway positions. Recent figures indicate that women only occupy 4 out of 81 commanding officer positions within Army, and almost 30% of these positions are in categories that women have been precluded from occupying.³²

(iii) Conclusion and issues

The workforce issues facing Army's officer ranks differ from those facing the other ranks. Overall representation and attraction are less pressing issues, but progression through the ranks is more problematic.

At the end of 2010/11, women only made up 11 of the 211 colonels and brigadiers, and none of the 24 generals (ie. majors general, lieutenants general or generals).³³ The small numbers of women in senior roles means that the critical mass of leaders that may assist in bringing about cultural change does not exist in this part of the ADF. Further, there is no clear or established pathway to which junior women can identify and aspire.

As it will be noted in Chapter 5, women are under-represented in key developmental roles such as command which act as gateways to leadership positions. As long as Army retains a workforce structure which draws its senior leadership from categories in which men are dominant, women will remain under-represented in its most senior ranks.

(d) Navy, other ranks

Figure 4.7: Proportional representation of women, Navy other ranks, financial years 2004/05 to 2010/11




Figure 4.7 shows the representation of women as a proportion of each other rank in Navy over the previous seven financial years. The similar trends indicate that a critical point has existed around leading seaman over recent years, before which women's representation is relatively steady, and after which it falls away.

Figure 4.8: Women and men as a proportion of each Navy other rank, financial year 2010/11




Figure 4.8 shows the breakdown of women and men in each rank at the end of financial year 2010/11. In 2010/11 women made up 17.9% of all Navy other ranks (1,940 out of a total of 10,818). This compares with 2004/05 when women made up 16.6% (1,659 out of a total of 10,014).

Figure 4.9: Navy women senior non-commissioned officers, 2004/05 and 2010/11

RANK	2004/5		2010/11	
	Number and proportion of total women (and men) / rank		Number and proportion of total women (and men) / rank	
PO	117 (men 1,160)	9.2%	162 (men 1,110)	12.7%
CPO	57 (men 789)	6.7%	74 (men 848)	8.0%
WO + WO-N	11 (men 185)	5.6%	11 (men 167)	6.2%

Figure 4.9 shows the number and proportional representation of women senior non-commissioned officers in Navy in 2004/5 and 2010/11. It illustrates that women remain under-represented in the most senior ranks in comparison to their overall representation.

(i) Overall representation

At 17.9%, the proportional representation of women in Navy’s other ranks is relatively strong, and more than twice the representation in Army’s other ranks.

At the end of 2011, 97.8% of all categories were open to women, with the remaining small number of categories associated with clearance diving.³⁴ Removing the categories from which women were excluded in 2010/11 does not greatly alter the representation of women in Navy’s other ranks – the overall figure rising slightly to about 18.5%.³⁵

(ii) Progression

Women progress through the junior other ranks at a similar proportional rate to their overall representation, but representation falls away starkly from the rank of leading seaman onwards.

Women are not reaching the most senior Navy other ranks in proportion to their overall representation. In 2010/11 women made up 8% of all chief petty officers and 6.2% of all warrant officers in Navy. These figures compare to women’s absolute representation of 17.9% of all other ranks. The issue again appears to be one of lack of progression rather than separations.

Women were slightly over-represented as a proportion of both the separations and movements/net promotions within Navy’s other ranks in financial year 2010/11. Women made up 171 of the 885 (or 19.3%) total separations from Navy’s other ranks, and 703 of the 3,584 net movements per rank (19.6%).³⁶ When compared to overall representation per rank, women made up a slightly higher proportion of the separations from recruit (26.4%), leading seaman (24.1%) and warrant officer (14.3%); and also a higher proportion of promotions to petty officer (16.9%), chief petty officer (13.1%) and warrant officer (12.5%).³⁷

The above figures are supportive of the trends seen in figures 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9. Women enter Navy’s other ranks at a comparatively high rate, but have high proportional rates of drop-outs between recruit and seaman*, and after the rank of leading seaman. These figures are also supportive of the slow trend of improvement in women’s representation at more senior ranks between 2004/05 and 2010/11.

(iii) Conclusion and issues

Navy is doing comparatively well with regards to attraction, and recruiting women into its other ranks workforce. The representation of women in all ranks up to leading seaman has hovered around 20% since 2004/05, with minor discrepancies from year to year. The issues in this part of Navy revolve around the promotion of women into senior ranks, especially beyond leading seaman. The Review believes that the difficulty of combining sea time with family responsibilities is a major issue contributing to this.

Female personnel in numerous focus groups, interviews and submissions have told the Review that they have experienced, or foresee experiencing, difficulties in balancing their careers in Navy (particularly in terms of sea service) with their families. The median age of women at leading seaman is 28, and women at this rank are about twice as likely to be married or have dependents compared to those at able seaman.³⁸ This is also the rank at which women's representation starts decreasing markedly, suggesting that the difficulties in balancing work and family at this particular stage of life and career play a part in this pipeline blockage for Navy's female workforce.

It is notable that throughout Navy's ranks women are much less likely than men to be married and/or have dependent children. This will be discussed further below.

(e) Navy, officers

Figure 4.10: Proportional representation of women, Navy officer ranks, financial years 2004/05 to 2010/11




Figure 4.10 shows the representation of women as a proportion of each officer rank in Navy over the previous seven financial years. In a similarity to Navy's other rank profile (Figure 4.7), representation for women is steady across the junior ranks, then falls away beyond lieutenant.

Figure 4.11: Women and men as a proportion of each Navy officer rank, financial year 2010/11




Figure 4.11 shows the breakdown of women and men in each rank at the end of financial year 2010/11. In financial year 2010/11 women made up 20.3% of all Navy officers (644 out of a total 3,172). This compares with 2004/05 when women made up 19.2% (543 out of 2,824).

Figure 4.12: Navy women senior officers, 2004/05 and 2010/11

RANK	2004/5		2010/11	
	Number and proportion of total women (and men) / rank		Number and proportion of total women (and men) / rank	
LCDR	106 (men 590)	15.2%	124 (men 587)	17.4%
CMDR	17 (men 286)	5.6%	38 (men 313)	10.8%
CAPT	5 (men 79)	6%	11 (men 102)	9.7%
CDRE	0 (men 27)	0%	2 (men 35)	5.4%

Figure 4.12 shows the number and proportional representation of women at senior Navy officer ranks in 2004/5 and 2010/11.³⁹ There have been improvements over this period, but representation remains low, and there are no women at the most senior ranks.⁴⁰

(i) Overall representation

Women make up 20.3% of Navy officer ranks. Navy does not have as much of a discrepancy between the proportional representation of women in its officer and other ranks (17.9%) as Army does (Army 14.5% officers, 8.7% other ranks). This is reflective of the fact that Navy, unlike Army, does not contain large categories from which women have been excluded, but it also speaks to the fact that Navy has been more effective in attracting and recruiting women in the past.⁴¹

(ii) Progression

As in Navy's other ranks, the progression profile for Navy officer women is a mixed picture. Women are well represented across junior officer ranks, where representation is almost one-quarter of the workforce, but this falls away beyond lieutenant. In 2010/11 women made up 26.3% of all midshipmen, 23.7% of sub lieutenants and 23.4% of lieutenants but there were only two women among the 50 star ranked officers, and no female admirals.

In 2010/11 women were slightly over-represented as a proportion of the total separations and promotions. Women made up 37 of the 157 separations (or 23.6%) across all ranks, and 107 of the 432 movements/net promotions (24.8%).⁴² Recently women have made up a substantial proportion of separations from lieutenant in several years, contributing to the diminishing progression of women beyond this point.⁴³ In 2010/11, women were proportionally well represented within promotions to commander (19.6%) and captain (16.7%), but did not feature in movements to or from the star ranks.⁴⁴ The 23 separations at Commander and above were all men; and the seven promotions to commodore and above were all men.⁴⁵

Figure 4.12 indicates a small increase in women's representation at more senior officer ranks in Navy between 2004/05 and 2010/11, but there are still very few women overall in these senior positions.

(iii) Conclusion and issues

The issues present in Navy's officer pipeline are very similar to those in its other ranks. The representation of women is strong at the most junior ranks, but falls away dramatically at a mid-career point that appears to correlate with increased work and family balance pressure.

The demographic profile of women at the rank of lieutenant (where officer representation begins to decline) is remarkably similar to that at leading seaman (where other rank representation begins to decline). The median age of women lieutenants is 29, and the marriage and dependents rates at this rank are more than double those at sub-lieutenant.⁴⁶ Again, this appears to be the point in many members' life cycle where they are starting families and have difficulty combining their competing responsibilities.

Figure 4.13 indicates that across Navy's senior officer ranks, men are much more likely to be married and/or have children than women.⁴⁷ These figures reflect the fact that women continue to be the primary caregivers in Australian society. If Navy is to achieve the goal of promoting women into its senior leadership, it will need to address the fact that work and family appears to be a major structural barrier for many women in its workforce.

Figure 4.13: Proportion of Navy personnel married, with dependents, 2011 (by gender)⁴⁸

Rank	Women married percent	Men married percent	Women dependents percent	Men dependents percent
LEUT	28.1%	49.9%	22.9%	39.2%
LCDR	53.8%	80.6%	49.5%	69.5%
CMDR	56.7%	84.2%	56.7%	73.6%
CAPT or higher rank	Insufficient respondents	84.8%	Insufficient respondents	81.9%

This is not just an issue for Navy. Work and family balance issues are also felt by personnel in the other Services, and Figures 4.14 and 4.15 indicate that women in Army and Air Force are also less likely to be married and/or have dependent children than their male colleagues.⁴⁹

Figure 4.14: Proportion of Army personnel married, with dependents, 2011 (by gender)⁵⁰

RANK	Women married percent	Men married percent	Women dependents percent	Men dependents percent
CAPT	27.5%	59.7%	26.8%	45.7%
MAJ	56.6%	75.8%	47.3%	65.3%
LTCOL	62.0%	85.8%	62.0%	81.4%
COL or higher rank	Insufficient respondents	86.1%	Insufficient respondents	82.1%

Figure 4.15: Proportion of Air Force personnel married, with dependents, 2011 (by gender)⁵¹

RANK	Women married percent	Men married percent	Women dependents percent	Men dependents percent
FLTLT	39.2%	58.2%	30.4%	46.0%
SQNLDR	65.6%	81.4%	60.0%	74.2%
WGCDR	65.2%	87.1%	67.4%	74.3%
GPCAPT or higher rank	Insufficient respondents	90.3%	Insufficient respondents	70.3%

(f) Air Force, other ranks

Figure 4.16: Proportional representation of women, Air Force other ranks, financial years 2004/05 to 2010/11




Figure 4.16 shows the representation of women as a proportion of each other rank in Air Force over the previous seven financial years. As is the case with the other Services' other ranks, women are represented throughout the higher ranks, although representation falls away at the highest ranks.

Figure 4.17: Women and men as a proportion of each Air Force other rank, financial year 2010/11




Figure 4.17 shows the breakdown of women and men in each rank at the end of financial year 2010/11. In financial year 2010/11 women made up 16% of all Air Force other ranks (1,605 out of a total of 10,019). This compares with 2004/05 when women made up 14.8% (1,363 out of a total of 9,191).

Figure 4.18: Air Force women senior non-commissioned officers, 2004/05 and 2010/11

RANK	2004/5		2010/11	
	Number and proportion of total women (and men) / rank		Number and proportion of total women (and men) / rank	
SGT	236 (men 1,349)	14.9%	283 (men 1,482)	15.9%
FSGT	59 (men 596)	9.0%	102 (men 624)	12.7%
WOFF + WOFF-AF	20 (men 492)	3.9%	44 (men 527)	7.7%

Figure 4.18 shows the number and proportional representation of women at senior Air Force other ranks in 2004/5 and 2010/11. It shows some improvements over the period.

(i) Overall representation

The representation of women in Air Force’s other ranks, at 16%, is almost as high as in Navy’s other ranks (17.9%) and well above Army (8.7%).

At the end of 2011, 97.8% of all categories in Air Force were open to women, with the remaining categories being Airfield Defence Guard (other ranks) and Ground Defence Officer (officer).⁵² Removing Airfield Defence Guard from 2010/11 workforce figures raises the representation of women slightly to about 16.7%.⁵³

(ii) Progression

The profile of women’s representation in Air Force bears similarities to elements of both Army and Navy. Overall representation is relatively strong (similar to Navy), as is progression through the ranks (similar to Army).

Women’s representation at the most senior non-commissioned officer ranks (flight sergeant and warrant officer) has increased in number and proportion over the period examined. In 2010/11, women made up 12.7% of all flight sergeants and 7.7% of all warrant officers in Air Force, compared with 9% and 3.9% in 2004/05. This is the most substantial proportional increase in any of the Services during this period.

Women were slightly over-represented as a proportion of separations and movements/net promotions within Air Force’s other ranks in financial year 2010/11. Women made up 121 of the 669 (or 18.1%) total separations, and 430 of the 2,252 net movements per rank (19.6%).⁵⁴ Women comprised slightly higher proportions of the separations from leading aircraftman/woman (23.8%) and corporal (19.4%), and of the promotions to corporal (23%) and sergeant (21%). At higher ranks, women only made up 20.3% of promotions to flight sergeant, and 6.5% of promotions to warrant officer in 2010/11.⁵⁵

Air Force’s career and diversity officers do not see any overt discrimination in the promotions processes, and view the initiatives being pursued in their Service over the recent past very positively. They have told the Review that ‘if there are positions there, women get there.’⁵⁶ This flows to the issue of occupational segregation. A disproportionately large number of warrant officers are drawn from the airman/aircrew and technical mustering in which women are not well represented.⁵⁷ This anomaly appears to explain why women are proportionately represented throughout most of the other ranks, with a drop-away at warrant officer.

(iii) Conclusion and issues

Air Force other ranks is doing comparatively well with both attracting women into its pipeline, and facilitating progress through it. Further, there have been small improvements in the number and proportion of women among the other ranks over the period examined. As in all Services, the absolute number and proportion of women entering Air Force remains low, and the most senior ranks are more populated by male dominated workforce categories.

(g) Air Force, officers

Figure 4.19: Proportional representation of women, Air Force officer ranks, financial years 2004/05 to 2010/11




Figure 4.19 shows the representation of women as a proportion of each officer rank in Air Force over the previous seven financial years. The overall picture is one of steady decline throughout the ranks, with some fluctuations at the more senior levels. However, there have been small increases in representation across most ranks between 2004/05 and 2010/11.⁵⁸

Figure 4.20: Women and men as a proportion of each Air Force officer rank, financial year 2010/11




Figure 4.20 shows the breakdown of women and men in each rank at the end of financial year 2010/11. In financial year 2010/11 women made up 19.3% of all Air Force officers (894 out of a total 4,623). This compares with 2004/05 when women made up 16.2% (656 out of 4,044).

Figure 4.21: Air Force women senior officers, 2004/05 and 2010/11

Rank	2004/5		2010/11	
	Number and proportion of total women (and men) / rank		Number and proportion of total women (and men) / rank	
SQNLDR	110 (men 740)	12.9%	178 (men 896)	16.6%
WGCDR	45 (men 334)	11.9%	53 (men 397)	11.8%
GPCAPT	3 (men 105)	2.8%	12 (men 109)	9.9%
AIRCDRE	0 (men 27)	0.0%	1 (men 38)	2.6%
AVM	1 (men 9)	10.0%	1 (men 9)	10.0%

Figure 4.21 is a comparison of the numbers and proportion of women in senior officer ranks in Air Force in 2004/05 and 2010/11. Air Force had a female two star officer in 2004/05 and in 2010/11, but representation in the star ranks has been low throughout this period.

(i) Overall representation

Women make up 19.3% of Air Force officer ranks, a figure slightly higher than its other ranks (16%), and comparable to the figure for Navy officers (20.3%). At the end of 2011, there were only 63 Ground Defence Officers – the only category which was not open to women in Air Force – and removing these from the equation raises the participation rate of women among Air Force Officers only slightly (to 19.6%).⁵⁹

(ii) Progression

The progression profile for women among Air Force officers shows a steady attrition in the representation of women as rank increases. In 2010/11 women made up 25.6% of pilot officers and flying officers, 20.4% of flight lieutenants, and 16.6% of squadron leaders. There is no particular point at which this decline deviates greatly but rather there is a steady decline prior to the star rank level, following which movement over time appears exaggerated due to the small numbers of personnel involved (figure 4.19).

In 2010/11 women in Air Force were slightly under-represented as a proportion of the total separations and slightly over-represented as a proportion of total movements/net promotions. Women made up 43 of the 243 separations (or 17.7%), and 170 of the 776 movements/net promotions (21.9%).⁶⁰ In 2010/11, there were eight promotions to, and five separations from, Air Force’s star ranks. All of these were men.⁶¹ Aside from the near absence of women at star ranks in these movements, there are no particular patterns of note over the recent past.⁶²

The numbers and proportion of women at Air Force’s most senior ranks has increased over time. Still, very few women are progressing beyond group captain, with leaders customarily drawn from categories which have historically been male dominated, such as aircrew and engineering.

(iii) Conclusion and issues

There has been a rise in the absolute number and proportion of women across most Air Force officer ranks between 2004/05 and 2010/11. However, there remains a general decline in women’s representation as rank increases. Occupational segregation, custom, and the current design of the Air Force workforce are the major reasons for this. At the end of 2010/11, there were only two women among the 51 star ranked RAAF officers.

Subsequent sections of this Chapter and Chapter 5 will examine the various ways in which issues relating to recruitment, retention, career progression, occupational segregation and leadership pathways all have an impact on the figures analysed above – and, if unaddressed, on the future representation of women in the ADF pipeline.

4.2 Recruitment

In summary

- The ADF relies heavily on ab initio (entry level) recruitment. Fifty percent of ab initio recruited personnel leave the ADF after only a few years of service. The proportion of women ab initio enlistees has not changed significantly in the past decade.
- Women are exiting at higher rates than men through the recruiting pipeline.
- Workforce pressures and the ADF's shrinking talent pool mean that current initiatives, such as the Recruitment of Women Strategy, are not sufficient. The ADF needs to draw on a broader cross section of the population or risk not meeting its future workforce needs.
- The ADF should explore other innovative strategies in order to appeal to women at different ages and stages of their careers, and minimise the loss of women through the recruiting pipeline.
- The cost of recruiting new personnel has dramatically increased over the past decade but the ADF has continued to fall short of its recruiting targets.
- Increasing the number of women recruited to the ADF, particularly into non-traditional occupational areas, will require targeted intervention.

The *Defence White Paper 2009: Force 2030* ('2009 White Paper') states that 'people are at the heart of delivering the Defence capability'.⁶³ In the last decade, however, the ADF has struggled to meet recruiting targets, particularly those in critical categories. Over the same period, recruitment costs have tripled. With ADF personnel leaving far earlier in their service than previous generations, pressure is increasing on a recruiting system that is already not achieving its targets.

It is clear that the ADF must draw on a broader talent pool in order to ensure its sustainability and operational effectiveness. Comprising almost half the wider workforce, women are a critical part of this broader talent pool. As this section will outline, however, the ADF's efforts to date to increase the representation of women have stalled. Although some innovative strategies have successfully attracted more women to enlist, others continue to be lost through the recruiting pipeline. The ADF manages its workforce supply through a focus on attraction and recruitment of personnel on the one hand, and on retention of personnel on the other.

(a) Recruiting policies and pressure points

The Defence workforce is made up of a mix of military (ie ADF members), civilian (ie Defence APS) and contractor personnel. ADF members are employed within the Services but are also employed within non-Service groups, which assist in delivering operational capability.

The 2009 White Paper sets ADF workforce numbers.⁶⁴ To support the increase in military equipment and systems envisaged in the White Paper, it estimated that the workforce would need to grow to 57,800 full time military members over the next decade.⁶⁵

At initial glance, this is more than achievable as, at 30 June 2011, Defence had 58,139 permanent ADF members, and is currently over strength.⁶⁶ This is largely because separation rates have been low in recent years, while there has also been increased recruitment from within the Services, transfers from the Reserve and prior service re-enlistment.

As the economy improves, however, separations are increasing again. At the same time, Australia's demographics are changing and social and labour market pressures are intensifying. The 2009 White Paper identifies attracting and retaining the future workforce as one of the most significant challenges facing Defence, highlighting two key areas of focus:

- addressing trade shortfalls, which requires new ways to recruit and retain technical trades as well as key professional groups such as tradespeople and health professionals
- ensuring that Defence reflects the composition of the broader Australian community. In particular, the attraction of women and Australians from Indigenous and more diverse ethnic backgrounds to the ADF are articulated as a priority.⁶⁷

(i) The Recruitment Process

In 2005, Defence established a dedicated Defence Force Recruiting (DFR) Branch to develop a long term recruiting strategy and manage the recruitment function for the ADF.⁶⁸ Under this tri-service system, significant components of ADF recruiting activities are also outsourced to an external service provider.⁶⁹

Defence Force Recruiting ('DFR') provides marketing and recruiting services to the ADF through a 'public sector/private sector collaboration between Defence and Manpower Services (Australia) Pty Ltd' ('Manpower').⁷⁰ DFR's stated mission is to 'recruit the right people to sustain and enhance Defence capability'. This arrangement replaces the previous system where each Service was responsible for its own recruitment.

DFR is staffed by Service personnel, APS personnel and Manpower staff with 16 Defence Force Recruiting Centres around Australia.⁷¹ In the mid-1990s, approximately 1500 ADF and Defence APS personnel were involved in recruiting operations within the single Services.⁷² DFR now provides the ADF's recruiting capability with around half that figure.

Recently, the ADF signed a five-year contract with Manpower covering 'marketing, recruitment operations, medical and psychological assessments and the co-ordination of selection boards and employment offers'. Defence has stated that future renewal of the contract 'fundamentally requires that the company delivers the numbers.'⁷³

The ADF has key responsibilities for recruitment planning and activities through DFR, such as setting recruiting targets, entry standards and recruiting policy.⁷⁴ ADF personnel undertake the key interviews during the recruitment process and are responsible for the final selection of candidates for enlistment.⁷⁵

Manpower is responsible for providing recruiting services, including recruitment processing and managing candidates through the recruiting pipeline. As part of this model, Manpower operates the 'Candidate Relationship Management Centre' ('CRMC'), a centralised call centre to provide for closer case management of candidates.

An overview of the key stages of the recruiting process is set out in Appendix G.5.

(ii) The recruiting supply

As explained at the beginning of this Chapter, the main source of new personnel for the ADF is through ab initio recruitment. In 2010-11, ab initio entrants (both men and women) made up approximately 87% of all categories of entry into the ADF.⁷⁶

Some of the perceived benefits of ab initio recruitment include:

- more stability and control over workforce (because of defined minimum periods of service and return of service obligations, training timeframes and continuums)

- more predictability in terms of career progression and separations
- less outside competition for labour as the ADF is able to recruit and train its own skilled labour force.⁷⁷

This confidence in ab initio recruitment hides the concerning reality that, across the three Services, 50% of recruits are lost after only a few years of service (5-6 years in Navy, 4-5 years in Army and 7-10 years in Air Force, with women at the lower end of these timeframes in all three Services). This means that the ADF is under constant pressure to bring through new recruits.

A small percentage of personnel supply is made up of 'lateral transfers'. In the ADF context, this refers to transfers from the Reserve to the permanent forces, inter- or intra-Service transfers, or transfers from overseas forces. As will be discussed later, lateral transfer from non-military workforces has not been a focus for ADF recruitment.⁷⁸ Appendix G.1 shows the sources of recruitment supply for the 2010-11 financial year.⁷⁹ Apart from the 87% of new personnel who were ab initio entrants:

- transfers from the Reserve made up 5.8% of entries
- transfers from Gap Year made up 2.2% of entries
- re-enlistees made up 2.7% of entries
- service transfers made up 1.6% of entries
- overseas transfers made up 0.7% of entries.

As noted in Chapter 1, increasing competition for young talent and simultaneous reduction in the ADF's primary target market means that the almost exclusive reliance on ab initio recruitment to deliver the ADF's capability is unsustainable.

(iii) Failure to meet recruiting targets

Recruiting targets are developed by the ADF to meet its future capability requirements. The ADF has fallen below its recruiting targets for over a decade.⁸⁰

As noted above, separation rates have been low in recent years, particularly for Air Force, driven largely by conditions created by the global financial crisis and a series of successful large-scale initiatives and bonuses directed towards retention of personnel. There has also been an increase in lateral recruitments and re-enlistments.⁸¹

This overachievement in Average Funded Strength ('AFS') has meant that the ADF's failure to meet recruiting targets has not been an immediate concern. In fact, this overachievement has created funding pressures for Defence.⁸² To help reduce the impact of this overachievement, ab initio recruiting targets have been lowered yearly, yet even these targets are not being met.⁸³ This creates the risk that, if recruiting were to slow further, it would create future capability gaps for the ADF.

The Review was provided with a draft of the most recent *ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21* ('RSP'), which states that 'in the short term, Defence is well placed to recruit the number of personnel it needs to meet the workforce requirements of the 2009 Defence White Paper'.⁸⁴ According to the RSP, Defence has competed for new labour 'with increasing success' since 2009, based on a number of factors:⁸⁵

- the GFC came at a time when availability of labour with at least Year 12 qualification level (required for most jobs in the ADF) was high
- an increased recognition of post-secondary qualifications available through ADF employment
- improved recruitment into 'critical categories' and skill set areas through a range of initiatives, including targeted recruiting and accelerated processing of candidates and improving the 'training pipeline' to ensure that people are not lost through the long training continuums for these skill sets⁸⁶
- there has been greater scope for recruiters to redirect candidates toward hard to fill targets, because available targets for popular jobs have been filled.

The result has been improved ab initio recruitment across most job categories in 2009-10 to 92% of its target, which the ADF reports it has successfully sustained through to June 2011.⁸⁷

Although this recruiting success is expected to continue in the short term, the RSP warns that it is unlikely to last. There were half the candidates in the recruiting pipeline in December 2010 than in June 2009.⁸⁸ If there was a sudden need to increase recruiting targets, the RSP warns there would be insufficient candidates in the recruiting pipeline to meet such targets, due to the lower current enquiry rate and the lower rates of conversion from enquiry to actual enlistment.⁸⁹

As the ADF's strength returns to actual AFS guidance, a number of factors are expected to place increased pressure on recruiting performance:⁹⁰

- separation rates of already qualified personnel are increasing, with demand for skilled workers in the labour market being matched with attractive remuneration conditions⁹¹
- winding up of the retention incentives are expected to cause a further rise in separations
- demographic projections indicate that, although the Australian population will continue to grow, the size of the ADF's traditional recruiting pool will shrink as a proportion of the rest of the population.⁹²

This combination of factors will lead to workforce pressures which could impact on ADF capability.

A 2011 Defence *Workforce Outlook* report identified that 'attracting enough candidates with the necessary skills and abilities' will be a 'significant challenge' for the ADF:

Given the Australian demographic, educational and health profile over the next ten years, Defence will need to ensure its employment offer remains attractive if it is to retain its share of the applicant pool. The greatest recruitment risk is perhaps in the ten year period, when the demand for higher level skills and qualification is forecast to outstrip supply to unprecedented levels.⁹³

(iv) The rising cost of attracting and recruiting personnel

The 2009 White Paper estimates that, on average, within the Defence workforce, full-time military personnel cost around 30% more than civilian personnel.⁹⁴ The costs of recruiting personnel are also significant.

The Review was provided with the costs of recruitment in the form of total DFR Branch expenditure over the past decade, including:

- Defence (ADF and APS) staff costs
- costs of the recruiting services contract
- marketing and advertising costs
- administrative and operating costs.⁹⁵

In the last decade, the cost of recruiting each new member has tripled from approximately \$7,000 to over \$21,000 per enlistment.⁹⁶ From 2001-02 to 2010-11, DFR's spending had more than doubled from around \$61 million to \$142 million. The estimated expenditure for 2011-12 was provided as around \$151 million.⁹⁷ A further breakdown of DFR expenditure is provided in Appendix G.2.

To attract potential recruits, Defence relies heavily on mass media advertising to generate job enquiries, and this has a large budget allocation.⁹⁸ There are also significant costs within the recruiting pipeline, particularly due to long processing times. As well as cost implications, these delays create problems for managing numbers through the pipeline and make it more likely that candidates will be lost to competitors.⁹⁹

Despite this increased expenditure, enquiries have been decreasing.¹⁰⁰ The Review was told that the recent drop in enquiries and applications was intended to 'reflect lowered Service recruiting targets' rather than reflecting a decline in interest in joining the ADF. DFR advised that the amount of money spent on advertising is calculated to 'generate just enough enquiries to ensure a reliable supply of suitable recruiting candidates for available ADF jobs'.¹⁰¹

Although the ADF relies on the relatively stable proportion of those with a propensity to enlist within its core target market, competing for talent in an increasingly challenging recruiting environment is costing the ADF more overall to generate enquiries. The RSP notes:

Financial pressures by 2012-13 are unlikely to permit the advertising expenditures that precipitated the surge in enquiries from 2007-2010. With a gradually tightening labour market, fewer recruiting prospects will be available in any case.¹⁰²

(v) Narrowing recruitment pool

As noted above, the ADF relies on the fact that the proportion of its traditional target group who are predisposed to consider a career in the ADF has remained relatively steady over time, at around 25-29% over the past few years.¹⁰³ Defence observes that:

This stability is likely to be at least partly attributable to the factors which motivate Australians to join the ADF, which are inherently enduring in nature.¹⁰⁴

However, the recruiting process filters the recruitment pool further through health, fitness, aptitude and psychological requirements,¹⁰⁵ while changing technology is also impacting on the type of recruit the ADF needs to attract. The need for low skill, manual labour has decreased, with ADF members increasingly required to work autonomously and needing skills in problem-solving and servicing stakeholders.¹⁰⁶

This means that although improvements have been made in some 'critical category' areas, recruiting remains problematic in others:

Personnel with engineering, technical, intelligence and communication skills will be more difficult to attract and retain. The unique issues relating to securing sufficient personnel in the health domains will continue. If national skill shortages broaden... the wider elements of the ADF, such as management and logistics functions will also come under pressure at the 20 year mark.¹⁰⁷

Meanwhile, the Australian labour market is continuing to change, based on factors such as a low national birth rate, ageing population, more women in the workforce and increasing ethnic diversity. As noted in Chapter 1, the RSP acknowledges that the ADF has been slow to reflect and capitalise on these demographic changes occurring in the Australian community.

At the same time, the primary ADF recruitment pool is predicted to decline as a proportion of the total population, along with a shortfall in the ability of Australia to meet the required student and labour market demand over 2015-2020.¹⁰⁸ The 2009 *People in Defence* blueprint paper warns that reliance on the ADF's traditional recruitment pool will not attract a sufficient share of the labour market if workforce numbers need to be increased. It concludes that 'Defence must find new ways to attract talent from a broader portion of the community'.¹⁰⁹ Clearly, this must include women.

(b) Enlistment rates of women

In 2010-11, women represented 15.6% across all categories of enlistment into the ADF. Women made up 14.4% of general entry enlistees (other ranks) and 20.6% of officer entry enlistees.¹¹⁰ Though it is important to note that the proportion of women varies within each Service and job category, overall women are under-represented across enlistments in all three Services. For example, in 2010-11, women represented:

- 20.5% of all Navy enlistments
- 11.7% of all Army enlistments
- 18.5% of all Air Force enlistments.¹¹¹

In terms of categories of enlistment, women represented 15.2% of ab initio entrants in 2010-11. When comparing the representation of women in other categories of entry for that financial year, women made up:

- 21.6% of transfers from the Reserve
- 33% of Gap Year transfers
- 9.9% of re-enlistees
- 7.8% service transfers
- 0% of overseas transfers.¹¹²

These figures show that, proportionately, there are certain avenues of entry which are more successful in attracting women to enlist than ab initio entry. For example, although the Gap Year program (discussed later in this section) only comprised 2.2% of all new entrants (men and women) for this period, a third of these Gap Year transfers were women, a significantly higher proportion than through any other form of entry. Women also made up a greater proportion of those transferring from the Reserve than ab initio entrants.¹¹³

Women had higher representation in officer ranks than other ranks across most entry categories (for example in 2010-11, women made up 21.5% of officer ab initio entrants but only 13.9% of other rank ab initio entrants). Of those transferring from the Gap Year program, however, there was a higher proportion of women in other ranks, indicating that the Program has been proportionately more successful in attracting women as general entry enlistees than other forms of entry. The proportion of women transferring from the Reserve was roughly the same for officer and other ranks.¹¹⁴

Despite efforts by the ADF to focus more attention on the recruitment of women in recent years, the proportion of women of all ab initio enlistees, which by far makes up the largest avenue of entry into the ADF, has not changed significantly since 2002-03.¹¹⁵

(c) Barriers to attracting women to the ADF

The March 2012 Quarterly Defence *Workforce Outlook* report observes that addressing the ADF's future recruiting vulnerability requires a focus on 'broadening the recruiting base into areas where the labour force pool is either growing or stable'.¹¹⁶ However, significant barriers exist to broadening this pool and in particular, to attracting more women.

These include the historical under-representation of certain demographic groups in the ADF which, in part, is the result of policies such as the exclusion of women from employment categories, citizenship and English language proficiency requirements, and physical fitness requirements.

The strongest predictor of whether or not a person will join the ADF has traditionally been exposure to a family member or friend who has served, or is currently serving in the ADF.¹¹⁷ The historically low representation of particular demographic groups has flow on effects for future recruiting from those groups. It means that there will be fewer family members or others with service experience from these groups who can influence a person's decision to seek an ADF career.

The lack of diversity also further perpetuates the perception that the ADF has a masculine culture, geared towards recruiting men, potentially steering women away from the recruitment pipeline.

Media reporting of incidents of sexual harassment, assault and victimisation, meanwhile, may compound this. One focus group participant observed in relation to the ADFA Skype incident:

It's done huge damage to I would say female recruitment... It was going on whilst I was going through recruiting but people were like 'do [we] really want to recruit during this whole Skype blow up?'¹¹⁸

As discussed in Chapter 3, another barrier is the belief that women are not suited for combat or are not naturally attracted to a military career, and that they make educational choices away from core Defence professions. The small proportion of women in the ADF is seen as the natural consequence of societal values about the role and nature of women and women's work, and their choices around work and family.

The nature of the ADF's war-fighting mission and emphasis on its 'warrior culture' perpetuates this belief, as has, until recently, the policy restriction on the employment of women in direct combat roles. The removal of this restriction means this formal policy barrier is gone, but the practical impact on women's participation is less clear. Although it may have more significance for Army, the policy change will likely have limited impact on the percentage of women serving in the Navy and RAAF as there are very few categories remaining from which women have been restricted in these Services.¹¹⁹

Defence representatives told a parliamentary inquiry hearing in March 2012 that opening up the remaining 7% of trades to women was not expected to cause a significant increase in women wanting to join the ADF. However, the need to move beyond reliance on the traditional recruiting pool was stated to be an important consideration in the decision:

The experience of many of our allies is that there will only probably be about a three or four per cent participation rate in those combat trades, so that is the reality. But we are doing this because, to sustain the workforce into the future, we want to access our fair share of the talent in the Australian labour market, which is increasingly female.¹²⁰

(i) Experiences of the recruiting process

Finally, research on behalf of DFR has found that lower conversion rates of enquiries to enlistments for women stem from a number of issues with the recruiting process. The process of applying has itself provided a barrier to many women considering enlisting,¹²¹ some key factors identified being:

- call centre staff having limited knowledge, candidates not being able to speak to the same person, or being transferred
- a lack of responsiveness by recruiting staff, inconsistent answers to queries or failure to keep candidates updated on progress
- inflexibility and a lack of understanding in relation to needs of candidates (for example, calling or scheduling appointments at inconvenient or inappropriate times, not understanding candidates' school or work commitments)
- frustration with delays, complexity and costs of the recruiting process
- changing financial, personal or career opportunities arising from delays.

As part of its Recruitment of Women Strategy, the ADF has put in place some initiatives to address these barriers to recruitment of women, such as having current serving women visit schools and community events to share their experiences, a targeted Women in the ADF website profiling current serving ADF women and containing specific information and resources for women, and an online mentoring program to enable female candidates to communicate with serving female ADF members.¹²² The Review supports these initiatives.

In the course of its consultations, however, ADF members told the Review that, along with the barriers of occupational segregation, gender restrictions and beliefs about the proper role of men and women, many of these problems with the recruiting process still exist. There was a widespread perception that the recruiting process was effectively being run by 'civilians'. This was seen to impact on the quality of candidates, as people were being recruited to fill 'quotas', despite the fact, for example, that they may not be able to meet requirements for training.¹²³

Similarly, some members reported being provided with inadequate, or simply incorrect, information by recruiting staff about particular roles. Others felt they had been 'pushed' into jobs that were not their preference or misled about the ease with which they might transfer to another category. Other complaints concerned a lack of access to staff with knowledge about a candidate's preferred Service or specialisation.¹²⁴

Many of these more general complaints about the recruitment process and staff reflect the difficulties with an inflexible, 'one size fits all' recruiting system. For women, in particular, an inability to tailor the recruiting process to provide them with appropriate support can be a reason for women dropping out of the recruiting pipeline. For example, the DFR's own research conducted in 2010 found that women felt discouraged from

joining by reinforced perceptions of the ADF as a male dominated organisation, because in the early stages of the recruiting process they had largely dealt with 'older male recruiters' in some recruiting centres.¹²⁵ In some focus groups, female participants said they had been told by DFR to apply for certain jobs because these were seen as being more appropriate for women:

They were saying 'do a clerk position, be at a desk'... when I went through DFR again last year ... I was questioning about the other things that I wanted [such as] plant operator and life support fitter, I was asking them what are these jobs? [They said] 'I don't know'.¹²⁶

A couple of girls wanted to be techos or engineers and they got pushed into a clerk position as well.¹²⁷

Recruiters play an important role in influencing which occupational branches a person may consider, meaning that the process for their selection and training is important. A recent evaluation of recruiting techniques in the Canadian Forces, for example, showed that recruiters were one of the most influential factors in the decision of potential personnel to join an organisation.¹²⁸

The Review was told that ADF personnel considered for posting to DFR are required to undergo selection interviews to establish their suitability, and all military, civilian and contractor personnel posted to a DFR Centre receive training relevant to their roles.¹²⁹

The role of the Defence Interviewer is to assess the candidate's compatibility with the military and understanding of their designated role, or 'organisational fit within the ADF'. However, research has found that, where organisations only seek the 'right type of person' to fit into an existing organisational culture, this can perpetuate a lack of diversity and make it even more difficult to create cultural change. In the case of the ADF:

They will also need to recognise that in applying selection standards that homogenise the workforce they may cause a large proportion of the population to disengage from the military, because the institution looks and feels too different from the wider social context.¹³⁰

Although some recruits told the Review they had dealt with female recruiting staff, including female Defence Interviewers, there needs to be increased use of women as role models and as a 'visible' part of the recruiting process, including staff dedicated to marketing, mentoring and support for women. In the Netherlands, for example, qualified women have specifically been appointed as recruiting officers, visiting secondary schools to raise the profile of a defence career amongst potential future personnel.¹³¹ Focus group participants agreed that more visibility of women throughout the recruiting process would be beneficial:

I think that would influence a lot more women to join... You see someone in that position and ...you want to mirror that... If you saw a woman out there who's pretty powerful you know it's like yeah, I want to be like that.¹³²

The Review was told that the induction training modules for Defence Interviewers deal 'specifically with the objective and appropriate treatment of recruiting candidates'. Additionally, Defence Interviewers undertake annual Equity and Diversity training. Given the pivotal role of recruiting staff, consideration should be given to specific inclusion of gender awareness and unconscious bias training to DFR staff, including ADF, civilian and contractor personnel.

(ii) Problems with delays in the recruiting process

There are several points in the recruiting pipeline where there are delays or bottlenecks. Delays in the recruitment process have the potential to reduce an applicant's motivation to continue, risking the loss of candidates and also consuming more resources in management of the process.¹³³

Conversion rates between the point where a person makes an enquiry to the point of enlistment show that candidates are dropping out of the recruiting pipeline, and women are dropping out at higher rates than men:

- In 2009, the conversion ratio from enquiry to enlistment for women was 20:1 compared to 11:1 for men.¹³⁴
- In 2011, the conversion ratio from enquiry to enlistment was approximately 12:1 for women compared to 7:1 for men.¹³⁵

Surveys conducted of enlistees between September 2004-August 2005 showed that a significant majority were 'very happy with the service' at recruiting centres.¹³⁶ However, 30% of respondents considered the delay within the recruiting process as 'unreasonable'. The median length of time during this period was approximately 10 months for general enlistees and 13 months for officers. Focus group participants also commented on the lengthy delays for recruiting, with many candidates not kept informed about the progress of their application. Candidates may also be lost because of delays related to training intakes, when there is a mismatch between recruitment targets and available candidates.

Following the implementation of the New DFR model, discussed below, a national audit report on the DFR recruiting contract found that in 2009-10 the average time between enquiry and enlistment of a general entry candidate was more than 60% higher than it had been in 2006.¹³⁷

(iii) Loss of women through the recruiting pipeline

As the conversion rates demonstrate, women are being lost at higher rates than men through the recruiting pipeline. This loss is concerning given the smaller numbers of women making enquiries in the first place, though identifying points where the attrition of women occurs in the recruiting pipeline is not straightforward with the data available. In part, the Review was advised that this is because recruiting data is collected through multiple different systems.¹³⁸

For example, the Review requested data on pre-enlistment fitness assessment (PFA) performance by gender. DFR advised that their online system 'Powerforce' currently has no 'capacity to provide detailed reporting in relation to candidate performance during the [PFA]'.¹³⁹

If candidates continually fail their PFA they are withdrawn from the recruiting process. Because employment category targets are often linked to enlistment/appointment dates, delays due to repeated failures of the PFA can also mean that a candidate's employment opportunity may pass without them being allocated to that target.

Physical fitness is an issue that also appears to contribute to attrition of women following their enlistment.¹⁴⁰ For example, although fitness test failure rates during recruit training and the progress of recruits are tracked and monitored closely by Army at Kapooka, the Review was advised that, generally, fitness test failures at training are:

managed at a local level and no central database is kept...information regarding key drivers for failures is not available (other than 'people aren't fit enough'). Members are excused from conducting a [fitness test] if they are not medically fit to do so.¹⁴¹

There also appears to be some attrition of women occurring in the early stages of the recruiting pipeline. The Review heard that this was partly because candidates often visited recruiting centres with limited understanding of available ADF jobs and jobs for which they may be suitable. Following their initial session speaking to a careers counsellor and taking an aptitude test (known as the 'YOU session' – see Appendix G.5), candidates often had more information resulting in a job preference change or withdrawal from the recruiting pipeline altogether.¹⁴²

The *Defence Portfolio Budget Statements 2011-12* included 'streamlining recruitment processes and improving recruitment outcomes' as one of its priorities.¹⁴³ The RSP provides that ideally the recruitment process needs to be practical, tailored to individual circumstances, and provide incentives for candidates to choose hard to fill employment categories.¹⁴⁴

Improving recruitment processes to ensure that women are not lost at higher rates through the recruiting pipeline requires a more individualised process which better accommodates diverse needs. This might include establishing processes to accelerate, prioritise and support women through the recruiting pipeline, providing assistance with fitness, reviewing entry standards to remove/reduce unnecessary barriers to women's enlistment and creating more flexibility in the enlistment/appointment timeframes. The ADF has adopted some specific initiatives which are considered below.

(d) Current ADF initiatives to improve recruitment

(i) Retention and Recruitment (R2) Program

As indicated above, the ADF has recently undertaken a major retention and recruitment program called R2 – a program aimed at improving recruitment and retention. R2 was approved in 2006, with the aim of expanding the ADF from around 51,000 full-time personnel (in 2005-06) to 57,000 by 2016-17. This target was revised to 59,000 in light of the 2009 White Paper and Strategic Reform Program.¹⁴⁵

To meet this target, the R2 program contained 12 initiatives aimed at both increasing enlistment and reducing the separation rate.¹⁴⁶ Over \$3 billion has been allocated to these reforms.¹⁴⁷ A large part of this has been directed to targeted retention bonuses. These are discussed further in section 4.3.

In 2010, there was an overall net increase in ADF enlistments compared with the five years prior to the implementation of R2.¹⁴⁸ Army, in particular, significantly increased the number of permanent ab initio enlistments. However, this was still less than ADF enlistments achieved in 2001-02.

Key initiatives in the area of recruiting encompassed by R2 involved reform to DFR and the development of a 'New Defence Force Recruiting Model', marketing and branding, a technical trades strategy, the cadets program and the ADF Gap Year. A summary of some of these recruiting related initiatives is provided in Appendix G.4.

Increasing participation rates of women in the ADF was not a focus of the R2 Program. Although evaluations of R2 initiatives have considered their success in improving recruiting and reducing separation rates across the ADF generally, their gender impact has not been evaluated in any systematic way.¹⁴⁹

(ii) The Recruitment of Women Strategy

Despite this, Defence does have some specific programs to attract groups which are currently under-represented in the ADF.¹⁵⁰

The 'Recruitment of Women Strategy' (RoWS) captures a series of programs, activities and initiatives targeted specifically at increasing attraction and recruitment rates of women by raising the ADF's profile as an 'employer of choice'. Although the strategy was initially developed in 2006-07, ongoing dedicated funding to implement these initiatives was not provided for until the 2009 White Paper, which allocated \$3.16 million over 10 years.¹⁵¹

The aim of the RoWS is to increase the appeal of ADF careers to women and to counter stereotypical views which turn prospective candidates away. The RoWS initiatives, which are outlined in Appendix G.4 have two main points of focus:

- generating more enquiries from women by better promoting employment opportunities for women in the ADF
- addressing the significantly higher rate at which women drop out of the recruiting process compared to men.

Evaluating the success of the Recruitment of Women Strategy

A key thematic area of the *CDF Action Plan for the Recruitment and Retention of Women* is increasing the enlistment of women. Implementation of the RoWS is a central component of this.¹⁵² Progress reporting on the CDF Action Plan has indicated that implementation of the RoWS is 'on track', with each Service in the process of ongoing implementing RoWS initiatives led by Defence Force Recruiting (DFR).

There was some awareness in Review focus groups that the ADF was making efforts to include women in advertising and promotional campaigns, by 'sending service women' out to schools and 'using women throughout the advertising product':

They have a very rigorous Women in Defence program now. I've just come from recruiting and it's good...It's [a] significantly funded Women in Defence campaign, it's a priority from the Chief.¹⁵³

However, others said there was still a need to better target females in recruiting:

I went to an all-girls school and Defence recruiting didn't come to my school. They went to my brother's school...If you want to attract females, you actually need to ask for females and sell it to them and send some females.¹⁵⁴

Targeted recruiting on women, showcasing women in Defence, I don't think we do that. I think we do generalised recruiting.¹⁵⁵

Others thought that the ADF could do better generally in communicating the range of job opportunities available. The 'average person' still perceived ADF jobs as confined to 'infantry' or being 'a pilot or sailor':¹⁵⁶

The recruiting and marketing campaigns, that Defence have [are not] representative of all the jobs you can do in Defence.¹⁵⁷

There were also strong views that advertising targeted towards women continued to focus too much on traditional roles:

The other problem with have with recruiting is that a lot of the areas will push a lot of administration jobs towards females...A lot of females don't know that there are a lot more jobs.¹⁵⁸

If you look at a lot of the advertisements the majority of the photos...[are] males doing other trades with females doing clerical jobs.¹⁵⁹

The importance of promoting successful women role models and the ADF 'lifestyle' was also highlighted:

They also need to know that when we recruit, we sell a lifestyle so you can have a career, you can have a family, you can have a social life, you can have the experience of travelling abroad albeit to Afghanistan, a war torn country.¹⁶⁰

It was also noted that some Services were better at 'selling' this package than others:

Navy went down a lifestyle path and it's been our most successful campaign...It's skyrocketed enquiries.¹⁶¹

Army in particular was not seen as successfully appealing to women. One submission suggested that Army needed to look at its recruitment strategies 'through the eyes of civilian females' and promote itself as being accessible to women by changing "the pre-conceived mindset the Army is only for those who are "rough and ready":

We are recruiting women who, in the large part, expect to be spending their days with a rifle in one hand and a grenade in the other...[W]hy not employ a recruitment strategy targeted at females that involves a tour of their local military base and interviews with females of all ranks/job roles within that base? Why not educate women prior to enlistment on the great maternity schemes etc., available to women?¹⁶²

The original objective of the RoWS was to achieve a 1% increase each year in enlistment of women, to reach 20% annual enlistment of women by 2009-10.¹⁶³ The Chiefs of Services Committee (COSC) endorsed the ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2007-17 to achieve this objective.¹⁶⁴

In the first year of the RoWS (between 2006-07 to 2007-08) there was an 'incremental improvement' in the representation of women as full-time recruits from 13.5% to 15%.¹⁶⁵ This improvement was seen to be due to more 'female enquiries being converted into enlistment'.¹⁶⁶

However, over the same period, it was found that the percentage of enquiries made by women had dropped (from 31% to 25%). A 2008 progress update on the RoWS concluded:

It is clear that the current RoWS target of 20% is unachievable in this timeframe. DFR is aiming to maintain 15% achievement at the end of FY 2008/09.¹⁶⁷

The RoWS targets were revised to achieve 20% female recruitment into full-time ADF by 2012-13. In 2010, it was reported that the RoWS had contributed to the female participation rate amongst ab initio recruits rising to over 15%. More recent data provided to the Review shows that this reflects the current figure.¹⁶⁸

The Review was provided data on enquiries and applications to join the ADF (Appendix G.1). According to this data, from 2007-08 to 2011-12:

- the percentage of total enquiries which are made by women has remained fairly stagnant between 24-26% over this period
- the percentage of applications by women, over the same period, has gone down from 19.5% (in 2008-09) to 16.34% (in 2011-12).

The difficulties in improving women's representation are not confined to the early enquiry and application stages of the recruiting process. Despite the 'incremental improvements' to women's conversion rates, the 2008 RoWS Progress Report reported that 50% of all women receiving letters of offer for full-time positions were not converting to enlistees.¹⁶⁹

The report suggested that this was due to physical fitness assessment failures, particularly as this correlated with higher average rates of injury amongst female Army recruits.¹⁷⁰ The report argued that the RoWS fitness initiatives had the potential to assist in increasing female conversion rates as well as reducing compensation costs associated with enlistees who later fail at recruit school. However, as the program is still in its early stages, accurate data on its success is not available.¹⁷¹ Clearly, there should continue to be monitoring and evaluation of RoWS initiatives to see if they are increasing attraction/conversion of women through the recruiting pipeline.¹⁷²

To date, the enquiry, application and conversion rates mean that it will be impossible to achieve the attraction and conversion rates within the revised RoWS timeframe. It is also clear that the RoWS initiatives in themselves will not be enough to improve the representation of women across the ADF. For example, along with the recruiting targets set out in the RoWS, COSC had also agreed in 2007 that the Services would put in place aspirational targets for female participation rates as follows:

- Navy – 32% female participation by 2017
- Army – 12% female participation by 2010
- Air Force – 34% female participation by 2017.¹⁷³

The 2008 progress report on the RoWS estimated that, to achieve these participation targets (assuming female retention remained similar), female recruitment rates in 2008-09 would need to be significantly higher than the RoWS target (closer to 42% for Navy, 16.6% for Army and 45% for RAAF).¹⁷⁴ As the ADF has clearly fallen short of its target for recruiting women, its efforts will have to go far beyond the RoWS initiatives to impact on overall participation rates of women.

(iii) The ADF Gap Year Program

The ADF Gap Year program has had a very positive impact on recruitment of young women. The Gap Year program was announced in 2007 as a '\$306 million investment in the youth of Australia', as part of funding allocated to R2.¹⁷⁵ It was intended to provide 'an opportunity for young adults to experience military training and lifestyle within a 12-month program', targeting 17-24 year olds who have completed Year 12 (or equivalent).¹⁷⁶

On its introduction, the program provided for up to 1000 paid training, skills development and work experience positions for up to 12 months effective service, with no return of service obligation. Each Service developed its own program for participants, incorporating incentives and processes aimed at encouraging participants to transfer to the permanent or Reserve forces.¹⁷⁷

The program was progressively scaled back due to capacity and cost considerations, and Air Force suspended it altogether. In the 2012/13 Federal Budget, it was announced that the Navy and Army Gap Year programs had also ceased, saving \$91 million as part of the 're-prioritisation' of Defence expenditure.¹⁷⁸

Key lessons from the program

Despite its cancellation, the Gap Year program revealed some interesting findings in relation to attraction of young women to an ADF career. A three year evaluation after its commencement found:

- There were more qualified applicants than available places in the program and it was successful in providing young people with an experience of ADF service.
- Participants had positive experiences of the program, gained a better understanding of career opportunities available, and were more willing to recommend the ADF to their family and friends.
- Importantly, the report found that, in proportionate terms, 'the program attracts more women than normal methods of recruitment'.¹⁷⁹

In its first two years, the Gap Year attracted a higher proportion of female enlistees compared with other avenues of entry into the ADF:

- In 2007-08, women made up 28.1% of enlistments into the Gap Year Program but only 15% of General Entry enlistments.
- In 2008-09, women made up 28.2% of enlistments into the Gap Year Program but only 14.8% of General Entry enlistments.¹⁸⁰

The report suggested that the Program's attraction to female enlistees related to a perception that the shorter period of service provided an option with lower risk for those contemplating an ADF career. Army feedback into a review of the Gap Year program was that 'many females may be interested in an ADF career but are apprehensive serving four years in what could be perceived as a male dominated culture'. The option for Navy and Air Force to separate at short notice at any time during the Gap Year also provided a similar 'comfort factor'.¹⁸¹

Women also consistently form a greater proportion of transfers from the Gap Year program into the permanent forces than any other form of entry into the permanent forces. For example, women made up 33% of transfers from Gap Year to the permanent forces in 2010-11, whereas women made up around 21% of transfers from the Reserve into permanent forces, and only 15% of ab initio recruits.¹⁸²

This success was also conveyed to the Review. The Navy Gap Year program, for example, enhanced recruitment of women into the Navy by:

- offering a 'twelve month work experience with no strings'
- providing experience of the variety and challenges offered by a Navy career
- providing first hand observation of successful career women
- providing opportunities to experience employment in fields not normally available to women in the private sector
- providing the realisation that, as Year 12 graduates, they can apply for officer entry into the ADF
- first hand observation of people dealing with both family responsibilities and a Navy career
- engagement of families of participants.¹⁸³

Although it has now ceased, the Gap Year program was reported as being 'a significant new development through which to address the gender imbalance'.¹⁸⁴ As one senior leader observed during a parliamentary hearing in March 2012:

We went and targeted all women who would join the organisation through the gap year, because we had had a 50 per cent participation rate for women in their gap year, as opposed to what is a 14 per cent general participation rate. We asked them, 'Why is it that you wanted to come for the gap year?' and it then was, 'Because it's only a 12-month period and I can sign up to anything for 12 months.' So we have been looking at our trades to see whether or not we can reduce a four-to-six-year engagement period to maybe a two-year period and therefore attract more women...¹⁸⁵

Following this, Army implemented a trial enlistment program with a minimum service obligation of two years across five trades to encourage women interested in Gap Year to join the Army. Army has now rolled this out to a number of trades reducing the IMPS from a four year commitment to only one year.¹⁸⁶ Although there are cost considerations for some service categories where significant training investments are made (such as in the long training times for pilots and medical professionals), this initiative has significant promise, with scope for similar schemes to be considered in Navy and Air Force.

The Review recommends that the ADF retain the successful principles of the Gap Year program by exploring innovative strategies, such as implementing a 'try before you buy' recruitment model (eg initial commitment of 12 months) and/or removal of Initial Minimum Period of Service. This should not be limited only to ab initio recruits but target enlistment mid-career to appeal to women at different ages and stages of their careers. Clearly, there are benefits to initiatives tailored to appeal to a broader pool of talent for the ADF.

(e) The need for targets to address the recruitment of women

Currently, the ADF's recruiting targets are not gender-differentiated and recruiting processes are managed identically for men and women. International best practice on improving diversity in recruiting into the military suggests that human resource policies should set specific diversity targets and time frames that can be monitored for creating a more diverse defence force.¹⁸⁷

In line with this best practice, each Service would benefit from setting recruiting targets specifically for women. As noted in a submission to the Review, experiences in other fields show that targeted recruiting interventions, such as entry targets or supported entry pathways to increase 'feminisation' of non-traditional areas, have resulted in demographic shifts within these areas.¹⁸⁸

The Chief of Army has already endorsed a program to increase the participation of women in the Army which includes increasing the number of females recruited to 660 for the 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 financial years.¹⁸⁹ A targeted recruiting intervention through the introduction of targets specifically for women as a proportion of the overall target set for a particular intake or category, for example, would support this program. Where recruiting targets for women are not being achieved because of the barriers identified throughout this Chapter, such an intervention would also allow for the development of specific strategies to ensure that women only targets are achieved, including management of the recruiting process differently for women, as discussed above.

(i) Providing incentives for the recruitment of women

As well as the introduction of diversity targets, recommendations in the private sector have gone one step further by suggesting that achievement against targets needs to be linked to 'sanctions and rewards' to ensure accountability for achieving diversity outcomes.¹⁹⁰ Some have recommended that these sanctions and rewards 'be made explicit in performance contracts'.¹⁹¹

A submission to the Review suggests that initiatives to increase attraction of women into the ADF in general, and non-traditional roles in particular, needs to be accompanied by strategic ADF-wide incentive-based recruiting interventions:

Under the current contract, DFR are paid a set amount to fill a vacant job target, and there is simply no tangible incentive for them to spend time and resources attracting women into roles where there may be sufficient numbers of male candidates, or where their target audience is most likely to be men.¹⁹²

The Review agrees that targeted intervention through recruiting targets for women should be accompanied by financial incentives to DFR to achieve these targets. This could draw on the incentive framework currently used in relation to recruitment of 'high value' targets in DFR:

If DFR were paid more to source female and Indigenous candidates, noting they are already paid higher rates for 'harder to fill' or 'high value' employment roles, they would certainly be more inclined to apply further resources into those areas of the market.¹⁹³

Strengthening this approach, the Review also suggests that the ADF consider embedding diversity principles as part of its agreement with its recruiting provider. This would have the benefit of committing the provider to supporting the ADF's own diversity goals through all aspects of the recruiting process for which they have responsibility under the agreement. These principles could include providing gender metrics to track success as part of KPIs, such as reporting on the gender ratio at each critical point within the recruiting process.¹⁹⁴

(ii) Improving opportunities to recruit women at different points of entry

As under-performance in recruiting continues, separations of skilled personnel increase, and the traditional recruiting pool diminishes, the ADF's reliance on ab initio recruitment will be increasingly insufficient. As one senior leader stated, moving beyond the reliance on ab initio recruitment is vital for the ADF:

We have to slaughter that sacred cow and we have to be able to laterally recruit at different stages... We've done it in war time. We're doing it in our specialty areas right now.¹⁹⁵

Another senior member observed that 'lack of ability to laterally recruit to senior levels means small numbers of women to replace leadership'.¹⁹⁶

The longstanding emphasis on ab initio recruitment has meant that the potential for recruiting already skilled workers at later stages of their lives and careers has not been a focus and is under-utilised. One senior leader stated:

It's quite an unusual organisation, Defence, because the recruitment's ab initio and then we grow our own. Whereas most other organisations who've had this issue would be bringing them in mid-career.¹⁹⁷

The CDF Action Plan required that Defence examine opportunities for mid-career entry points for men and women. The Services initially reported this task as completed because the *Defence (Personnel) Regulations 2002* and existing personnel policies were viewed as providing a framework allowing for mid-career entry of personnel.

Yet, mid-career entry only appears to be available in limited categories for specialist officers or lateral transfer from within the ADF (or occasionally other militaries).¹⁹⁸ The ongoing belief in ab initio recruiting, and corresponding lack of value placed on attracting people mid-career, is a significant cultural barrier to facilitating this across other categories. Even the former CDF has commented that Defence is 'not a lateral recruiting organisation':

It all has to be grown from the bottom up, and that is one of the realities of our organisation, which is quite different from the corporate world or any other.¹⁹⁹

Similarly, another member explained that the ADF could 'laterally recruit anyone into the civilian positions to do those support mechanisms', but:

Those that are in uniform do actually need to grow through the system. We expect our people in uniform to have a wide breadth of experience and actually understand what it's like to be on operations.²⁰⁰

Arguments about the cost implications of recruiting people as military personnel were also made. ADF personnel told the Review that where a particular skill set was needed it would be less costly to 'purchase' a person with that skill set as a civilian, where possible (eg, as Defence APS or contractor personnel) rather than 'pay a premium' to bring them in as a military member.²⁰¹

The importance of maintaining the military command structure was also emphasised:

I can really see how civilian lateral rank hire would be such a conundrum... That order of respect and the need you have, at particular levels, to be able to tell other people what to do and they go out and do it, unquestioned... There has to be that building of those relationships over time.²⁰²

The CDF Action Plan focus on mid-career entry across all categories was described as 'culturally and structurally' an 'unsustainable proposition':

They'll arrive at that conclusion, except for certain trades so specialist trades like legal, medical... education can be done. But if you were to say bring in a combat officer or a logistics officer at a certain level because they're experienced, it is very difficult to acquire the sort of skill set required to do that piece of work.²⁰³

Other senior leaders agreed that the ADF needed to be more flexible and better facilitate lateral entry:

We have this shore blindness as to what's really required to support our organisation, and we need a huge body of skills that may not have anything to do with actually fighting, tactically fighting on the front line, at sea ... There's a huge body of people who require specialist engineering, logistics, medical skills. Why can't we laterally recruit into that?²⁰⁴

The reality is that 50% of ab initio recruited personnel leave the ADF after only a few years of Service. In contrast, retention data indicates that lateral recruits, on average, serve an additional three years in the ADF. With predicted shortfalls in the youth labour market, the trend for mature-aged Australians to continue working longer means it will be important to attract this broader talent pool. As many people pursue several careers in their lifetimes, there is also an opportunity for the ADF to attract people with a range of different work experiences. This includes women who may be re-entering the workforce after taking a break for family or other commitments.²⁰⁵

(iii) Facilitating re-entry of personnel

The cost of personnel turnover, both in financial terms and loss of expertise, is significant. In light of this, there is value in working with external industries to minimise 'poaching' and to facilitate the re-entry of personnel into the ADF after a time in the civilian workforce. The CDF has stated:

I am quite attracted to the idea that we have, if not sponsored positions, a deal that is struck with industry: 'We train them, we employ them and you guarantee them a job when they finish so that they can move into that,' or 'We bring them into your industry for a while, don't poach them and we give them back to you later on.' The issue is in getting to that bit about not poaching them when we have skilled them.²⁰⁶

To avoid continued loss of its most skilled personnel, the ADF needs to be more proactive about targeting eligible women and men with prior ADF experience for possible re-entry by ensuring that they are treated as valued candidates and that their prior experiences are recognised upon re-entry. This has also been recognised by the CDF:

Certainly, we need to continue the change in the message we send to our people in that if, for example, you go off and spend two or three years in the mining industry in north-western Australia, at the end of that time, when you may be sick of the fly-in-fly-out life and so forth, you are more than welcome back in the ADF. In the past we would have said, 'You've made your choice.' I think that message really has to change.²⁰⁷

(iv) Appealing to women at different ages and stages of their careers

Key to recruiting and retention is the provision of an environment in which personnel are willing to maintain a commitment to the ADF. The White Paper notes that increasing Defence's competitiveness in the recruitment marketplace means providing an employment offer package in which:

Defence will clearly articulate who it is, what it offers, how it fulfils its obligations, and why that should be attractive to its current and future workforce. Importantly, Defence must be clear about what it expects from the workforce in return, by clearly articulating the mutual responsibility of Defence and the individual employee or ADF member.²⁰⁸

The 'Defence Employment Offer' is described as the 'tangible and intangible benefits' offered to an individual as an ADF member, ranging from remuneration through to quality of leadership, though the RSP notes that the significance of these benefits for recruiting has not been properly explored:²⁰⁹

We think the way to target these particular skill sets into the future, for which we know we are going to struggle, is to try to differentiate that offer – to be able to ramp components of it up and down to motivate individuals to stay with us or to attract people to those particular trades.²¹⁰

ADF marketing and advertising also appears to show little consideration to providing an attractive offer to potential candidates outside the ADF's core target market. One person who had joined the ADF as a 'mature age entrant' commented that recruiting was almost exclusively geared towards young people:

They don't try to tap into the older marketplace...Older women who've had their kids are not going to go on maternity leave...So you're not going to have that gap created in the workplace by them not being available...They don't tend to aim towards the more mature [person], and older women don't feel that they're welcome.²¹¹

Defence has started collecting data to understand what its workforce values most in the Defence Employment Offer, and to provide an evidence-based approach as to where investments should be made to motivate people to stay longer and better deliver Defence's required capability.²¹²

The RSP states that increasing diversity in the recruiting pool requires research to identify the 'appeal of the ADF elements of the Defence [E]mployment [O]ffer' to groups which are under-represented, including women.²¹³ As one senior ADF member explained:

The offer that the services provide is not highly attractive to most women in society so increasing that recruitment base is quite difficult. How many women want to change locations every 12 months sometimes?...They'd like to be close to family. My job is dirty. Weeks at a time without showers if I'm out field, that's the reality of being in the Army. Deployment overseas in war torn countries, none of the amenities that you're used to in society so let's not forget the offer of what it is the services are trying to provide to recruit.²¹⁴

Clearly there needs to be better targeting and promotion of the Defence Employment Offer to women, taking into consideration the key findings of this report in relation to what appeals to women at different ages and stages of their careers. Despite the package of financial and other benefits, the current model in which a person is recruited at one location, trained at another and then posted to a third, makes it particularly unattractive to women in established partnerships.²¹⁵ As the primary care-givers in most families, they may be less likely to risk moving from a place where they have close support networks.

A 'recruit-to-area' model, whereby some women and men are recruited directly from the area where they will be posted for a set period (for example, for 3-6 years with the option to renegotiate this), may address this issue.²¹⁶ Such a model may have greater appeal to experienced women seeking to return to the workforce after having children. This could also be accompanied by more flexibility in the duration and locations of training, particularly for those undertaking lengthy technical training courses.²¹⁷ This model may result in cost savings for Defence in terms of funding removals and providing Defence housing, and sourcing personnel for 'hard to fill' regional positing locations.

(f) Conclusion

Rising separations of skilled personnel, increasing competition for young workers and changing demographics mean that the ADF's longstanding reliance on ab initio recruitment through its traditional talent pool is unsustainable. The ADF needs to draw on a broader talent pool or risk not meeting its future workforce needs.

Women are a critical part of this broader talent pool but the proportion of women enlisting ab initio has only made incremental improvements in the past decade. Although the ADF has implemented some strategies to increase the number of women being recruited, these are clearly not enough.

Specific intervention in the form of recruiting targets and strategies to support women within each Service is vital to enhance capability and operational effectiveness. The ADF needs to increase recruitment of experienced workers at later stages of their lives and careers, and consider innovative strategies to overcome the barriers to enlistment of women. In particular, the Review recommends consideration of a 'try before you buy' reduced minimum service obligation and 'recruit to area' model, as well as measures to reduce attrition of women through the recruiting pipeline, by allowing for a more flexible process which better accommodates their needs. Once women are in the pipeline, the further challenge is for the ADF to retain them.

4.3 Retention

In summary

- The attrition of women from the ADF has a negative impact on the ADF's ability to increase the representation of women overall, including within senior leadership positions.
- The ADF relies primarily on ab initio recruitment so failure to retain members has significant financial and sustainability costs for the ADF.
- The retention of women in the ADF is negatively affected by a series of factors including:
 - » lack of flexible and part-time work options
 - » lack of locational stability
 - » harassment and/or victimisation
 - » lack of mentoring and support for women, particularly in male-dominated occupations and as women enter senior leadership positions.
- Women leave the permanent forces and move to the Reserve seeking greater workplace flexibility and locational stability. However there are many drawbacks of moving to the Reserve including a negative impact on career progression.
- The ADF is losing a significant proportion of its workforce because it is failing to provide sufficient workplace and career flexibility to women (and men) who are trying to balance family and work commitments. The need to address the rigidity of the career continuum is paramount to the sustainability and competitiveness of the ADF workforce.

As discussed in the previous section, increasing the number of women recruited into the ADF is a critical challenge. Retaining them is another. This section examines the overall trends in men and women's retention in the ADF, the reasons men and women leave, and the key initiatives of the ADF to retain women.

The attrition of women from the ADF not only impacts on the ADF's efforts to increase the overall representation of women, but results in fewer women progressing through the pipeline. Further, as discussed in Chapter 1, the cost of turnover of personnel, both in terms of the financial cost and loss of expertise, is significant.

Women leave the ADF at a greater rate than men at particular stages of their careers, most notably, between 6-8 years of service in Army, 8-10 years of service in Air Force and between 10-11 and 12-14 of service in Navy. Qualitative data suggests that these attrition points align with times when women are seeking to establish and raise a family, resulting in their desire for greater workforce flexibility and locational stability. A significant proportion of women who take paid and unpaid maternity and parental leave separate from the ADF within 12 months of taking this leave. Many women, particularly in Navy and Air Force, also take an 'off-ramp' to the Reserve as a way of accessing workplace flexibility and location stability, yet figures show that only a small proportion of those who transfer from the permanent forces to the active Reserve then transfer back to the permanent forces.

This information points to the fact that the ADF is losing a significant proportion of its workforce by failing to provide sufficient workplace and career flexibility to women (and men) who are trying to combine family and work commitments. The need to address this rigidity is central to the sustainability and competitiveness of the ADF workforce.

(a) Trends in women's retention in the ADF

Overall, the number of women leaving the ADF is proportionate or slightly higher than their representation by Service compared to men.²¹⁸ When compared to representation per rank and length of service, some notable differences between men and women emerge.

(i) Separations of recruits

First, as noted earlier, the separation rate for recruits is higher for women than men, and is most noticeable in Army. For the period of financial years 2004/05 to 2010/11, separation rates for recruits by gender were:

- Army – women 17.8%, men 13.1%
- Navy – women 16.4%, men 14.5%
- Air Force – women 12.2%, men 11.2%.²¹⁹

(ii) Retention rates by Service

There are some minor differences between men and women's overall retention rates across the Services. For example, women in Navy and Air Force have a higher propensity to leave the Service than men while, in Army, female retention is slightly better than that of males after 5 years of service. The retention rates of men and women based on length of service are illustrated in Appendix H.1.²²⁰

However, the most significant finding to emerge from examination of this data is that all three Services lose 50% of their recruits after only a few years of Service (5-6 years in Navy, 4-5 years in Army and 8-10 years in Air Force, with women at the lower end of this scale in all Services). These figures point to a weighty financial and organisational loss for the ADF and calls into question the reliance on ab initio recruitment over lateral recruitment (including re-entry), which appears to provide greater return on investment for the ADF.²²¹

(iii) Differences in retention rates between officers, non-technical and technical²²²

Some noteworthy differences in the retention rate of men and women are evident when the retention of officers is compared to that of personnel in non-technical and technical trades in other ranks. As illustrated in the graphs below, across all Services, technical roles have a higher attrition rate following the completion of the Initial Minimum Period of Service obligations (IMPS) and this is higher again for women. For example, Navy and Army are only retaining approximately 35% of women in technical roles at 7 and 6 years of service respectively, with Air Force retaining only 22% of women in technical roles at 8 years of service. Further analysis of the differences in retention of personnel between officer, technical and non-technical roles, as well as between the Services, appears below.

Navy

Figure 4.22: Navy Retention Profiles (Male v Female) Officers²²³




Figure 4.23: Navy Retention Profiles (Male v Female) Other Ranks Non-technical²²⁴





Figure 4.24: Navy Retention Profile (Male v Female) Other Ranks Technical²²⁵



Women officers in Navy have a significantly higher attrition rate from the time they join until the 12 year mark. Another notable drop-off takes place in the technical trades between 5-7 years of service, with less than 35% of the original cohort of women in technical trades left at seven years of service. This is likely influenced by the completion of IMPS obligations.

Army

Figure 4.25: Army Retention Profiles (Male v Female) Officers²²⁶




Figure 4.26: Army Retention Profiles (Male v Female) Other Ranks Non-technical²²⁷





Figure 4.27: Army Retention Profiles (Male v Female) Other Ranks Technical²²⁸



Women officers in Army have a higher attrition rate throughout their careers than men. Most dramatically, women in technical trades have a significantly higher attrition rate than men – by six years of service, the Army is only retaining 35% of women in technical trades.

Air Force

Figure 4.28: Air Force Retention Profiles (Male v Female) Officers²²⁹




Figure 4.29: Air Force Retention Profiles (Male v Female) Other Ranks Non-technical²³⁰





Figure 4.30: Air Force Retention Profiles (Male v Female) Other Ranks Technical²³¹



Most dramatic in Air Force is the greater attrition rate of women in technical trades, with 40% more women in technical trades leaving at the eight year mark and only 22% of the original cohort remaining. Women officers are also significantly more likely to leave Air Force between 5-10 years of service than men.

(iv) Propensity to leave by Service

The following charts provide Propensity to Leave (PtL) data by year of completed service, reporting the percentage of attrition from the total in each year cohort. These demonstrate several notable differences in points at which men and women are more or less likely to leave each Service.

Figure 4.31: Navy Propensity to Leave Rates by Sex²³²




Figure 4.32: Army Propensity to Leave Rates by Sex²³³





Figure 4.33: Air Force Propensity to Leave Rates by Sex²³⁴



While a significant proportion of men and women leave after the first year of training in all Services, a significantly higher proportion of women leave the Navy after their first year (approximately 20% of women compared to 12% of men).

Trends in propensity of women to leave at the mid-career mark are also evident. For example, there is a notable spike in the propensity of women to leave Air Force between 8-10 years of Service (12% women and 6% men). Also notable, is the increased propensity of women to leave Army between 6-8 years of service (16% women and 13% men), and the propensity of both men and women to leave Navy after seven years of service (20%). These attrition points appear to coincide with a typical age when personnel, and particularly women, are starting a family.

They may also coincide with completion of Return of Service Obligations (ROSO) and Initial Minimum Periods of Service (IMPS)²³⁵ but, to date, the ADF has not conducted a detailed study of the relationship between ROSO and separation rates, meaning it is not possible to clearly distinguish which factor is at play in these findings.²³⁶

Qualitative and quantitative data suggests that a major reason for separations from the ADF is the desire for more stability and a greater balance between work and family commitments. The ADF should examine the implications for its workforce, as a finding that women's separation rate is predominantly related to establishing a family and not an alignment with ROSO and IMPS would enable the ADF to address women's separation more strategically. This would then result in a significantly higher return on investment and make a clear case for increasing women's representation in the ADF.

In Navy, another notable spike in women's propensity to leave takes place around the 10-11 year mark and 12-14 year marks. This corresponds to the time when personnel are around 30 years of age and have frequently reached a point in their career when they are asked to return to sea following time ashore.²³⁷

While there has been no specific research conducted by the ADF investigating the links between separations and ROSO, the ADF has conducted research into separations aligning with IMPS.²³⁸ Data demonstrates a notable drop-off of personnel following completion of IMPS. For example, Navy loses approximately 50% of men and women following completion of IMPS.²³⁹

The separation rate of personnel differs across the various categories of each Service. Appendix H.2 outlines data illustrating the percentage of personnel in other ranks who have completed their IMPS by category and shows some differences between men and women, as well as differences in retention across the Services for similar kinds of work.²⁴⁰ For instance, there is a lower completion rate for women in several occupational groups such as Communications, Intelligence and Surveillance in both Navy and Army, Health in Army, and Engineering, Construction and Maintenance, and Musician in Navy. The most significant variance in Air Force is in Aviation where 25% less women completed their first-term than men. The significant differences in retention between men and women, across occupations as well as differences between Services for similar occupations, suggest further investigation is warranted.

(v) Separation following paid and unpaid maternity and parental leave

A large proportion of women who take paid and unpaid maternity and parental leave do not return to work.²⁴¹ Overall, 9.7% of personnel separate from the ADF immediately or within a year of taking paid and unpaid maternity or parental leave. This figure is much higher for women, with 21% separating immediately or within one year of taking paid or unpaid maternity or parental leave compared to 7.4% of men. Additionally, an analysis by Service shows that the trend of women being significantly more likely than men to separate within a year of maternity or parental leave is more prevalent in Navy and Army than in Air Force:

- In Navy, 28.5% of women do not return to service following maternity or parental leave, compared to 7.4% of men.
- In Army, 19.1% of women do not return to service following maternity and parental leave compared to 8.2% of men.

- In Air Force, 16.2% of women do not return to service following maternity or parental leave compared to 6.2% of men.

These figures point to the heavy loss of women from the Services following maternity and parental leave, particularly in Navy and Army. Work and family issues, including maternity and parental leave, will be further discussed in Chapter 6.

(vi) Movement between Permanent Forces and the Active Reserve

Resoundingly, the Review observed the commitment of men and women in the ADF to their Service and to the ADF as a whole. This commitment was reflected again in the importance of being able to 'continue to contribute' in the motivations of men and women in joining the active Reserve.²⁴²

The ADF is seeking ways to make its workforce more adaptable, including facilitating the transfer of members between the permanent forces and the Reserve as members' life circumstances change. However, analysis of the movement between the permanent forces and the active Reserve between 2008/09 and 2010/11 indicates that personnel are much more likely to transfer from the permanent forces to the active Reserve, than from the active Reserve to the permanent forces.

In the period 2008/2009 to 2010/2011, 5,076 personnel moved from the permanent forces to the active Reserve²⁴³ and 1,791 personnel moved from the active Reserve to the permanent forces.²⁴⁴ This demonstrates that for every 100 members that move from permanent forces to the active Reserve, only 35 members move from the active Reserve to the permanent forces. Women are relatively equitably represented in these movements in comparison to their overall representation in each Service. Specifically:

- In Navy, 1619 (21.3% women) transferred from permanent forces to the active Reserve²⁴⁵ and 313 (20.1% women) transferred from the active Reserve to permanent forces.²⁴⁶
- In Army, 2834 (11.9% women) transferred from permanent forces to the active Reserve²⁴⁷ and 1263 (11% women) transferred from the active Reserve to permanent forces.²⁴⁸
- In Air Force, 626 (19.3% women) transferred from permanent forces to the active Reserve²⁴⁹ and 215 (16.7% women) transferred from the active Reserve to permanent forces.²⁵⁰

The average age when personnel move from the permanent forces to the active Reserve is 29 years for women and 32 years for men.²⁵¹ This suggests that the movement does not correlate to retirement age but rather is at the mid-career mark and appears to align with the age when many women (and men) are seeking to establish a family. This is reinforced by other qualitative and quantitative data, that shows that many women choose to leave the permanent forces and move to the active Reserve (particularly in Navy and Air Force), when seeking greater flexibility and stability to have a family:²⁵²

- In Navy, 28% of women and 38% of men in the permanent force have children, compared to 55% of women and 73% of men in the active Reserve. Furthermore, women in the active Navy Reserve are much younger than their male counterparts – 44% of women are between the ages of 25-34 compared to just 20% of men.
- In Air Force, 40% of women and 53% of men in the permanent force have children, compared to 65% of women and 80% of men in the active Reserve. Furthermore, women in the active Air Force Reserve are younger than their male counter-parts – 27% of women are between the ages of 25-34 compared to just 16% of men.

Women cited the desire for more flexible work arrangements as a key motivator in their decision to join the active Reserve.²⁵³ This was further reinforced by women from both the permanent forces and the Reserve in all three Services who told the Review that they see the Reserve as the only viable employment option within the ADF once they start a family as it gives them flexibility and locational stability:

[In the Reserves] you choose what you do and where you do it and how long you do it for.²⁵⁴

It's flexible, it allows you to still take care of your children and have a career at the same time.²⁵⁵

I actually ended up getting out again because of my daughter and the number of schools and postings and all that sort of stuff and then in 2006...I thought I'll come back and do 12 months Reserve work and here I am all these years later.²⁵⁶

Women in each of the Services stated that they would be more likely to stay in the permanent forces if they could move between the Reserve and full-time service as their circumstances change.²⁵⁷ Given the small number of people currently re-entering the permanent forces (after an average length of roughly 2.5 years), the ADF is suffering a weighty loss of personnel.²⁵⁸ It seems likely that this loss would be higher if the numbers of personnel moving to the standby Reserve were also examined.

(vii) The impact of movement into the Reserve

While service in the active Reserve offers greater flexibility, control over the number of days/hours worked and locational stability, it does have its disadvantages.²⁵⁹

Negative impact on career is a particularly significant issue encountered by members who transfer to the Reserve. Members spoke of the following concerns:

- For women seeking to move back to the permanent forces after a time in the active Reserve, promotional opportunities will be impacted due in part to difficulties in accessing necessary training and maintaining skill currency while in the Reserve.
- In Army, careers within the active Army Reserve run in parallel to the regular Army. A promotion within the Army Reserve may not translate into a comparable promotion within the regular Army therefore it is very difficult for active Reservists to move between the active Reserve and regular Army without severe detriment to their career, often demotion.

Other drawbacks include lack of certainty about tenure and guaranteed hours/days, lack of superannuation, negative attitudes towards Reservists by permanent members, menial/non-meaningful work, and little or no access to the Defence network and their Service.

Participants in focus groups confirmed many of these pitfalls:

I think a lot of the time Reserves feel like they're second class citizens.²⁶⁰

I asked to transfer back [to the permanent forces]... We had to negotiate my seniority and I said no, I was a warrant officer, I'm definitely not going back to a petty officer.²⁶¹

It's a long journey to join as a recruit reservist or even transfer as a kellick and be promoted and especially in technical rank, because no one would pay you to go and do courses for six months. No way in the world would the Navy pay for you to do that. Won't happen.²⁶²

For every promotion board there are certain things that you must have done, experience, courses, etc., etc., so again it comes back to the difficulty of a Reservist is getting that time to be able to do those courses.²⁶³

The Reserve is not a viable alternative to offering more flexible and stable employment options for men and women in the permanent forces. Other options that provide flexibility while enabling women to pursue a meaningful career are essential to retain men and women. Plan SUAKIN is an extensive study of the Reserve forces which has made recommendations for the reform of the ADF's workforce model. As discussed below under 'Defence initiatives aimed at retaining personnel', the implementation of these recommendations will see a greater number of part-time and full-time work options, as well as measures to address many of the other drawbacks of reserve service and will likely address many of the above mentioned concerns. Further issues related to flexible work will also be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 6.

(viii) Other factors affecting the attrition of women from the ADF

Women leave the ADF, and many more consider leaving, following experiences of harassment, sexual harassment or inappropriate behaviour and/or the mismanagement of complaints relating to such incidences. Many women who had such experiences told the Review they had left the ADF, or were intending to leave the ADF, for a variety of reasons including feeling insecure, unsupported and disillusioned with the organisation. One member, in response to experiencing and witnessing several incidences of sexual harassment and indecent behaviour, said:

The crap reaction of the base, the poor systematic failings, I'm really appalled with the organisation so I can't wait to leave, I'm counting down the months until I can get out.²⁶⁴

Others members told the Review:

To be educated on what is classed as abuse and being given a safe person to report that abuse to would have been the key to my retention in the Army and the key to feeling heard and understood.²⁶⁵

They found quite a few cigarette butts at most of the holes where the man had been smoking and semen stains next to the body imprints where the man had ejaculated whilst looking through the holes in the SAL's [showers and latrines] and my bedroom...The MPs [military police] came to my work place and interviewed everyone individually that worked there, after that no one wanted to be on shift with me, so I was made to work daytime, instead of shift work, and no one would speak to me. I felt isolated and alone for something that wasn't my fault...I was thinking of discharging at this point in time because this was not what I had signed up for...I firmly believe that this incident that occurred over an 11 month period shows that the effectiveness of a commander and retention of personnel are extremely closely linked. My situation was not well managed at all, and if I had have put my discharge in, then this would have all been swept under the carpet.²⁶⁶

Addressing the gaps in the ADF's current complaints model and the support offered to personnel who face incidences of sexual harassment, assault and other misconduct as outlined Chapter 7 ('Sexual Harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse') are essential to the retention of many women in the ADF.

Mentoring and support for women is also an important retention tool. As outlined in section 5.4. ('Mentoring, networking and sponsorship') there is a wide body of evidence that mentoring, networking, coaching and sponsorship are essential for women's progression in non-traditional workplaces. Personnel consulted during the Review affirmed the importance of mentoring and support to the retention of women.

In order to make female soldiers more likely to maintain a long term career in the Australian Army [especially Gap Year soldiers] believe that in-service females need to play a more active role in the mentoring/training phase of new female soldiers.²⁶⁷

I am actually discharging because of the negative attitudes towards women at this particular unit and lack of help and support.²⁶⁸

The Review also found that the ADF's posting and deployment cycle can have an impact on members' decisions to discharge from the ADF. This is discussed further in Chapter 8.

(b) Defence initiatives aimed at retaining personnel

The ADF has introduced several initiatives aimed at addressing the attrition of personnel from the ADF. Some of these have been ADF wide initiatives, while others have been Service specific. An overview of these initiatives and their varying success can be found at Appendix H.3.

Of significance are the initiatives under Plan SUAKIN that were recently approved by COSC.²⁶⁹ These are welcome reforms which, when implemented, will have significant positive benefits for both men and women and address several of the structural workforce model problems that currently plague the ADF. Particularly, the establishment of a spectrum of employment options including full-time, part-time and casual service across permanent and the Reserve will allow ADF members to move between different employment models as their

life circumstances change.²⁷⁰ Given the solutions and recommendations in Plan SUAKIN were not developed with a particular focus on women, it will be essential to establish a process for assessing the de facto impact of the reforms on women, particularly during the implementation stage.

Analysis of other ADF initiatives indicates the benefits some of these can have on retention of women (and men). For example, in Navy (where sea time can be between 18-24 months) the use of alternative crewing arrangements, such as the rotation of multiple crews between platforms/vessels, allows personnel to spend less time on-board. These arrangements have the advantage of not limiting platform availability while still providing much needed respite and locational stability for personnel. While some concerns were raised about the impact on team cohesiveness and ensuring equity in rotation, generally both men and women in Navy support alternative crewing arrangements and noted the positive impact on work and family balance.²⁷¹ Consequently, alternative crewing arrangements have been implemented on several vessels for over a decade. A portion of the additional financial and personnel costs required to implement these initiatives may be offset by reduced expenditure on relocation as well as longer-term cost efficiencies resulting from increased retention of personnel. Given the challenges faced by members in juggling work and family commitments, expansion of these initiatives to a larger number of vessels would have a positive effect on retention of men and women in Navy.

The Review recommends that Navy strengthen efforts to implement alternative crewing arrangements on a wider range of vessels to increase workforce flexibility, address the impact on work life balance of personnel, and increase locational stability. Ensuring strong guidance and leadership to address team building, handover and equity in rotation will be important to the success of these initiatives.

By contrast, retention bonuses and bonuses for critical categories and occupations (such as submariners) are less likely to have a long-term positive impact on women's retention in the ADF, as they do not address structural and systemic issues or the issues of most concern to women, such as the need for greater flexible work, career options and locational stability.

(c) Conclusion

The attrition of women from the ADF has a negative impact on its ability to increase the representation of women overall, including within senior leadership positions. As in any workplace, and particularly workplaces of the size and complexity of the ADF, there are a range of reasons that personnel leave. However, the unique ADF working environment gives rise to particular themes relating to the retention of personnel, especially women.

While women's overall retention rates are similar to men's, women leave the ADF in larger numbers at specific points in their career, including at the age when women are typically establishing a family. Further, women who have experienced harassment or victimisation or who feel they are not adequately supported also leave the ADF.

Many more women (and men) move to the Reserve seeking greater workplace flexibility and locational stability. While the Reserve provides much of the flexibility and control over hours and location that is lacking in the permanent ADF, the Reserve is not a viable alternative to providing greater flexibility within the permanent forces, given the many pit-falls of Reserve service including the impact on career progression.

Given the ADF reliance on ab initio recruitment, when personnel leave the ADF because they cannot balance their work and family commitments, it takes a long time and a great deal of investment to recruit and train replacements. This means that flexibility in working arrangements is an important retention tool and critical to ensure the ADF's capability. As the following section will outline, so is greater flexibility in the ADF pipeline's rigid requirements for career progression.

4.4 Career management and progression

In summary

- ADF career management is a vital part of ensuring the organisation's capability and developing the careers and talents of individual serving members.
- Regular posting, evaluation and promotions processes affect many aspects of the lives of ADF members, both women and men.
- Reforming certain career management practices will improve the career satisfaction of ADF members. Deregulating tight career continuums will not only provide ADF members with career progression options, it will also help the ADF develop and obtain the most value out of more personnel.
- Providing greater locational stability to personnel, reforming time in rank requirements, and providing longer term plans to personnel will assist the ADF achieve its goal of attracting and retaining the best talent.

Defence is one of the largest employers in Australia, with a diverse workforce comprised of about 60,000 permanent military staff, plus tens of thousands more reserves and civilian staff.²⁷² These individuals undertake the complex task of managing their careers with the assistance of ADF career management agencies. Regular posting, evaluation and promotions processes mean that personnel have an ongoing involvement with career management during their time in the ADF.

ADF career management is a vital part of ensuring the organisation's capability. It delivers people where they are needed within the organisation, and manages the needs and expectations of ADF personnel. As the Strategic Career Management Framework Report of 2007 notes, the ADF's career management agencies 'do good work within the constraints of their current systems,' though some structural reform of the system could lead to better outcomes for all stakeholders.²⁷³ Such reform would make the ADF a more attractive workplace for women, men and families, and would improve pathways for increased representation of women in the senior ranks of the ADF.

The Review's recommendations to this end include providing greater locational stability to personnel, reforming time in rank requirements, and building more flexibility into the entire career management system so that career managers are able to provide longer term advice and mentoring to personnel.

This section will examine the career management policies and practices within the ADF. It focuses on permanent ADF members, and how they are affected by the postings and promotions systems.²⁷⁴

(a) Career management agencies

The ADF currently has four career management agencies, two for Army, and one each for Navy and Air Force, namely:

- Directorate of Officer Career Management – Army (DOCM-A)
- Directorate of Soldier Career Management Agency (DSCMA)
- Navy People Career Management Agency (NPCMA)
- Directorate of Personnel – Air Force (DP-AF)²⁷⁵

Each agency has a number of career managers (sometimes referred to as careers advisors or personnel managers) who are the direct contact between individuals, their chains of command and their Service's leaders (Chiefs and/or career management executives as the case may be). Career managers liaise with

personnel about posting preferences and advise them about a range of career related matters. Career managers are ADF personnel who occupy these roles as part of the normal posting cycle.

Career managers undertake a difficult task, working long hours and balancing the sometimes divergent needs of the ADF and personnel. These challenges can be exacerbated by the fact that ADF career managers are not, in general, experts in human resources, and are liable to posting churn (i.e. spending a short period in the role before being moved onto another post) themselves.²⁷⁶ The appointment of generalist officers to career management positions reflects a desire to balance human resource expertise with a general knowledge of ADF operations and an ability to relate to personnel.²⁷⁷

All ADF career management agencies are mandated to undertake two broad tasks: to provide capability to their Service, and to manage the careers of ADF members.²⁷⁸ The *Strategic Career Management Framework Report* states:

[ADF career management] provides the right person, with the right skills, in the right place, at the right time to meet the Services' capability needs; and it touches every Service member – my posting, my career, my children's education, my spouse's career, and so on.²⁷⁹

Tasks undertaken by career management agencies include but are not limited to, the administration of postings, promotions, leave and career counselling and development.²⁸⁰

(b) Contact between career managers and personnel

Each Service's career management policy requires periodic contact between career managers and personnel. Generally, ADF policy recommends annual meetings with members, but many members in focus groups said that they were either unaware of who their manager was, or had met with them much less frequently. One member believed that they were 'not supposed to have direct access' to their career manager, and another said that they had found it difficult to attend annually planned meetings with their career managers on account of their postings and placements.²⁸¹ These were not isolated sentiments, and many personnel told the Review that they would appreciate more contact with their career manager. This is reinforced by the findings of the 2010 Defence Attitude Survey, which found that over 40% of all respondents did not agree that they had sufficient contact with their career management agency (32.1% disagreed, 11.8% were uncertain).²⁸²

Each career manager is responsible for, on average, over 300 individual members and sometimes many more. NPCMA currently has 58 career managers for 18,882 personnel, DOCMA has 21 career managers for 6,065 personnel, DSCMA has 47 career managers for 21,466 personnel, and DP-AF has 49 personnel managers for 16,159 personnel.²⁸³ The significant workloads that career managers have can lead to the impression among personnel that their interests are of secondary concern, and that they are just pieces in a larger puzzle. One member, who reflected the view of many, told the Review that:

it's very hard when you discuss [personal circumstances] with a career manager who's managing a hundred other individuals. They don't have the time to look very closely at your career.²⁸⁴

Under Navy policy, sailors are expected to meet with a career manager annually. Sailors should meet a career manager at their Local Career Management Centre 'at least once, but preferably twice' each year, and officers can meet with a career manager at the annual visits that career management officials make to all major posting localities in Australia.²⁸⁵ In Army, soldiers should meet with a career manager 'at least once in a 24-month period' while officers are expected to maintain 'appropriate contact' with their manager, defined as 'at least once per year, [and] preferably in person.'²⁸⁶ Air Force personnel can meet with personnel managers on planned annual occasions, or any other time they visit Canberra.²⁸⁷

These meetings are used to discuss future postings and career plans for personnel. Members expressed a range of views about the value of these meetings. One noted that they had established 'a good rapport through the interview process' and was assisted in making career choices; another submission said that career managers 'lack an understanding of inherent requirements of the professions they manage'; while others were more dismissive and hostile in their assessments of their career managers.²⁸⁸ Some female

members spoke of career managers they believed to be exceptional, who had helped them strategically think about balancing careers with families, while others felt that sharing their intention to start a family with their career manager would reduce their job opportunities, or even be 'career death'.²⁸⁹ This inconsistency is concerning.

(c) Postings

The ADF has jobs and billets that need filling all around Australia and internationally. The career management agencies post personnel to these positions in order to satisfy capability requirements, for reasons of career development, and for personal preferences (in that order of importance).²⁹⁰ Career managers are required to keep themselves informed of the personal preferences of those they manage through meetings and other dialogue and try to balance these with Service needs. However, survey data indicates that less than half of all respondents believed that 'the ADF considers [their] family circumstances when considering postings/deployment'.²⁹¹

Each Service aims to provide personnel with some level of stability by offering three year postings in each role and back-to-back postings in the same geographic location.²⁹² While this remains the aim, it does not always appear to be possible due to Service requirements. One fairly young member noted that he had experienced:

thirteen moves, never getting stability. Bought a house in Sydney thinking that would assist, I'm now on my second MWDU [member with dependent unaccompanied] posting out of three.²⁹³

Each Service aims to give personnel six months' notice prior to the date of posting by policy, but this also does not appear to always happen.²⁹⁴ In the case of deployments, notice can be extremely short. One member told the Review that

you can be given three days' notice...I have been told, on a Friday afternoon, pack your bags you're going to the Gulf on Monday.²⁹⁵

One senior Air Force member reflected on the movement required in an ADF career and argued that it was not a palatable model for many women with families, noting that 'it's hard for men too, but in Australian society women tend to be the primary caregiver' which created particular challenges.²⁹⁶ This member suggested that if the ADF committed to a model which guaranteed a longer period of stability in one area 'our participation rates of women would be through the roof'.²⁹⁷

For some time, it has been a goal of ADF career management to offer members guaranteed longer term career plans, but no Service has embedded these as standard practice.²⁹⁸ For a period, sailors' postings were based on formal Five Year Career Plans, but it seems that these are no longer used.²⁹⁹ The inability to be able to commit to longer term career plans is a deciding factor for many individuals with family and caring responsibilities considering their career prospects within the ADF. Exit surveys have consistently noted the desire for greater stability, including a desire for less separation from family and many younger serving women do not believe that they would be able to balance a family with a career in the ADF.³⁰⁰ The Review's recommendations in this area relate to the development of longer term career plans, and providing greater family support through the career management system.

(d) Compassionate postings/preferential treatment

If an ADF member is unable to take up a posting to which they have been assigned, he or she can apply for a 'compassionate posting' (or 'preferential treatment' in the Air Force) for a limited amount of time. Compassionate postings appear to be quite exceptional and generally relate to health or family reasons.

Compassionate postings in Navy and Army are generally for a period of one year, although personnel can apply for an extension beyond this time.³⁰¹ Preferential treatment in Air Force is available for up to two years.³⁰² If a member requires special consideration beyond these periods, they can be counselled and/or face discharge proceedings.³⁰³

Members seeking a compassionate posting are required to provide supporting documentation such as a doctor's, social worker's or psychologist's report.³⁰⁴ Being on a compassionate posting can be considered offering 'ineffective service' and members on compassionate postings are not normally considered for career development opportunities (e.g. postings, promotion, courses etc.).³⁰⁵

Most career management agencies do not keep detailed statistics about compassionate postings, however DSCMA noted that it had 1,072 total requests for 'retention or reposting' in the past year, and 181 of these were specifically for compassionate reasons. Of compassionate posting requests, 86.8% were for family or family health reasons, and 66.9% of all compassionate requests were approved.³⁰⁶

(e) Individual readiness

A basic condition of employment – and a requirement for career development, certain postings and deployment – is that members must maintain an appropriate level of 'individual readiness'. Each Service's policy is a slight variation on the same theme, and each lists six components to readiness.³⁰⁷ They are:

1. Individual availability
2. Employment proficiency
3. Weapons proficiency
4. Medical fitness
5. Dental fitness
6. Physical fitness

Extended inability to meet the requirements can lead to a review of ongoing employment.³⁰⁸

The individual availability component requires personnel to be available for unrestricted service on short notice regardless of any other personal circumstances.³⁰⁹ Personnel can request special consideration on account of personal or compassionate circumstances, but of course, the above mentioned career implications apply to this.³¹⁰

The Army and Air Force Individual Readiness Directives specifically mention pregnancy. The Air Force instruction notes that a pregnant member will be 'temporarily non-deployable' but must be ready for deployment 'not less than six months from the date of the birth of the child/children.'³¹¹ Army requires pregnant members to remove their readiness badge, and they are excused from readiness requirements for 12 months from the date of delivery, or 90 days after returning to work (whichever is later).³¹²

Health Directive 235 (*Management of pregnant members of the Australian Defence Force*) outlines the policy for pregnant women in the ADF and largely deals with safety issues and concerns.³¹³ It notes that members with low risk pregnancies are 'considered fit for new or routine posting within Australia up until 32 weeks gestation, as long as adequate access to medical and obstetric services can be assured' and they can then be posted after six weeks post-partum.³¹⁴ It also says that 'pregnant women are not to be deployed on operations either within Australia or overseas', and that pregnant women cannot serve at sea.³¹⁵

(f) Sea Service

The requirement for sea service is specific to Navy, but ties into compassionate postings and individual readiness issues. Personnel must spend periods at sea throughout their careers. Sea postings are generally 18-24 months long, but it should be noted that this does not equate to two straight years at sea, as all ships are subjected to a maximum number of days away from home port. NPCMA has informed the Review that sea postings can be negotiated 'to accommodate both individual desires and corporate needs.'³¹⁶

The sailors' career manual notes that 'an inherent requirement for all sailors serving in the RAN is their ability to serve at sea,' and the officers' career manual notes that officers who refuse sea service may be declared ineligible for promotion and may be subject to termination of appointment proceedings.³¹⁷ NPCMA notes that, while termination powers for refusal to go to sea do exist, this is not a 'standard process.'³¹⁸

As suggested in section 4.1, and further discussed in Chapter 6, sea service is an issue for many women who find it difficult (or perceive that they will find it difficult) to balance time at sea with their families, in turn affecting their progression to Navy's higher ranks. A senior Navy officer suggested that a rotational system, where personnel could serve three months at sea, then three on shore throughout a posting would be much more manageable for those with family responsibilities than two years away, and could help Navy address the stark drop-off in women's representation in Navy's higher ranks.³¹⁹

Sea service can present special difficulties for single parents. Sailors who are single parents are able to request a deferral of sea service obligations with the support of a Defence Social Worker's report for a period of not more than 12 months.³²⁰ If the sailor is unable to take up their posting after this time, discharge proceedings may be initiated.³²¹

The Review's recommendations about increasing workforce flexibility may assist Navy in addressing members' issues in this area.

(g) Families

All career management agencies have an awareness of the stresses that the posting process can have on family life. For example, NPCMA informed the Review that '[a]ll career management decisions should be cognisant of the member's family situation and the employment of the member's partner is a key factor'. DSCMA has noted that the majority of compassionate posting requests were for family or family health reasons and DP-AF allows family members to participate in meetings with personnel managers.³²²

The policy documents also acknowledge a desire to post Service couples to the same location, but note that this can be difficult to achieve.³²³ NPCMA suggests that most requests are able to be accommodated, and in the cases where they are not, there would often be 'large capability implications' involved in the co-location.³²⁴ Army notes that they attempt to organise co-location, but do not keep statistics in this area.³²⁵ Air Force has been able to accommodate nearly all personnel who have applied for co-location.³²⁶

Members of the same family may be posted to the same unit, but cannot serve in the same sub-unit or occupy positions in the same chain of command.

The simplification and formalisation of family support mechanisms, particularly at the time of posting, will help the career management agencies assist families dealing with the stresses of a move.

(h) Promotion and career progression

In addition to the postings system, a large part of career management and progression in the ADF is built around promotions. One member told the Review that the ADF

very heavily values promotion and there's this feeling that if you're doing a good job you get promoted and if you get overlooked for promotion a number of times, you start feeling like am I dead wood?³²⁷

In the ADF, promotion often equates to success. While this suits some, there are many members who add great value and continue to contribute within rank who do not wish to 'climb the ladder'. Their job satisfaction derives from their role or from the decisions they have made to balance work and family or other commitments. Success in these terms is rarely acknowledged or celebrated.

As illustrated in section 4.1, women do not progress through the ADF's ranks, in any Service, at the same rates as men. There are complex reasons for this, but one major factor is the rigidity of career structures. The ADF has strong and well understood organisational expectations about the age range within which certain promotional pathways and/or types of experience are to be attained. These unwritten expectations and assumptions need to be acknowledged and re-examined with a view to deregulation. Deregulating tight career continuums will provide ADF members with enhanced career progression options, while also helping the ADF develop and get the most value out of its people.

A discussion of several elements of the promotions process – (including time in rank provisions, annual performance appraisal reports (PAR), and promotions boards) and how these impact on the current workforce management follows.³²⁸

(i) Time in rank

A central plank of the promotions process is the time in rank system, which requires members to provide a certain amount of service in order to be considered for promotion. The standard time in rank requirements which must be served before being considered for promotion are listed in the tables below.

Table 4.3: Time in rank requirements, other ranks³²⁹

Rank	Navy	Army	Air Force
Seaman/ Private/ Aircraftman/woman	one year	one year	two years
Able Seaman/ Private (P)/ Leading Aircraftman/woman	two years	one year	two years
Leading Seaman/ Corporal/ Corporal	four years	two years	two years
Petty Officer/ Sergeant/ Sergeant	four years	three years	two years
Chief Petty Officer/ Warrant Officer Class 2/ Flight Sergeant	three years	four years	two years

Table 4.4: Time in rank requirements, officers³³⁰

Rank	Navy	Army	Air Force
Below Lieutenant (eg. ADFA+ASLT+SBLT)/ Lieutenant/ Flight Officer	six years (includes tertiary study pathway)	three years	two years
Lieutenant/ Captain/ Flight Lieutenant	five-and-a-half years	six years	two years
Lieutenant Commander/ Major/ Squadron Leader	four years	five years	two years
Commander/ Lieutenant Colonel/ Wing Commander	four years	six years	two years

At more senior levels, time in rank requirements become more flexible.³³¹

Time in rank requirements must be satisfied with periods of 'effective service'. This is defined in opposition to 'ineffective service' which can include various types of leave, compassionate postings, or other unsatisfactory service.³³² In Navy, ineffective service includes maternity leave without pay, and part-time leave without pay (on a pro-rata basis).³³³ In Army, it includes long service leave, maternity leave or leave without pay of over six months for officers, or twelve months for soldiers. In addition, any period of part-time leave without pay leads to a pro rata reduction in seniority for Army officers, and after twelve months for soldiers.³³⁴ Air Force's seniority provisions were reformed in 2007 so that, by policy, periods of leave (including part-time leave without pay) 'no longer impact upon seniority or act as a barrier to promotion for those in the merit based promotion system.'³³⁵

It is clear that current time in rank and seniority provisions impact on the ADF's ability to maximise value from its workforce, and remain a systemic barrier to the promotion of women.³³⁶ Women *and* men can – and do – have career breaks that may affect their progression, but the reality for many women is that they are more likely to need to access periods of leave and flexible working arrangements at different times of their careers. The Review heard that the way that time in rank rules and promotions currently worked meant that:

There are probably a lot of women out there who haven't progressed in their careers because they were looking after children and they get to a point where they don't really want to stick around because they don't want to be that career lieutenant.³³⁷

The ADF operates on a goals and outcomes basis. ADF members do not typically work to a standard 9 to 5 weekday model, but rather have goals and tasks that need to be met and accomplished, whatever amount of time this takes.³³⁸ This is part of the training for entering deployed environments, where personnel are not at a desk for a fixed amount of time. Current time in rank provisions are the opposite of this, being predicated on a member needing to occupy a post for a particular amount of time before being considered for promotion.

A strict adherence to time in rank provisions will inevitably disadvantage individuals who may have different, otherwise valuable, or even superior experience and achievements compared to those providing more traditional full-time, unbroken service.³³⁹ This assumed link between unbroken service, competitiveness and competence is held by many personnel. As one member told the Review in a focus group:

This gentlemen here has done six years in his current rank. I'm a female and I've done four because I've taken two off. Personally, I don't think I'm as competitive as him because he's been in the workplace, has performed well, done those jobs and I haven't.³⁴⁰

There is also a perception that successful personnel will be promoted near the minimum allowable times, in order to be able to progress as far as possible through the rank structure before they reach the ADF's mandatory retirement age.³⁴¹ This can have an ongoing effect for personnel who have missed one such 'career gate' and subsequently find themselves unfavourably compared to those who have more closely followed the strict traditional path. One Army officer outlined the pressure of meeting career gates in the following way:

You hit your Sub-Unit Command PAC [Personnel Advisory Committee], you need to be successful there. Twelve months later you're up for Command and Staff College PAC, you've got to be successful there. Once you're successful there, you've got two years before you go to your Lieutenant Colonel PAC and you can't miss time in between.³⁴²

The perception that narrow career gates exist was not limited to Army. Many women told the Review about their struggle in juggling these gates with planning breaks to have children and balance their family responsibilities generally.³⁴³

A deregulation and simplification of the time in rank and seniority provisions, similar to the Air Force model, may remove what has been a structural impediment for many women, and improve the outcomes of the promotions system. In addition to allowing career management agencies to consider a broader range of individuals, such a reform would also begin to decouple the notion that:

if you stay in the system you keep moving along with the current...and the minute you step off... you're being left behind.³⁴⁴

Given the reality that women (and increasingly men as well) will take time out of their careers at various ranks, a strict time in rank model predicated on traditional full-time unbroken service is an inefficient way for the ADF to develop and harness the potential of its entire workforce. Those taking career breaks will simply not have the ability to progress into senior leadership ranks, regardless of talent, because they will be precluded by time requirements. The Review recommends reforming time in rank requirements to decouple traditional career pathways and continuous service from promotions processes.

(j) Performance appraisal reports and promotions

Performance appraisal reports (PAR) are also a key part of monitoring performance and potential, leading to postings and promotions. A PAR should assess the member's performance over the reporting period to identify their strengths and weaknesses, provide feedback on performance and developmental needs, identify suitability for promotion courses and postings, and monitor performance levels.³⁴⁵ PARs are completed by a member's chain of command (usually a direct supervisor, and that assessor's supervisor) and submitted to the appropriate career management agency.

ADF members should typically receive one PAR each year, but must be observed for at least four months in the twelve month period for this to happen.³⁴⁶ A member accessing long service leave, maternity leave or leave without pay, undertaking courses, or being sick and absent from work for an extended period could lead to them forgoing a PAR, which can be a disadvantage in the highly competitive promotions process. As one member put it:

Someone whose got three PARs that are at exactly the same level as a person who had two, who was away for a year, it's up to a board to sit there and go and who's the most likely to be promoted?³⁴⁷

A member ineligible for a PAR can receive a supplementary report instead, but these are identified differently.

Promotions then occur for junior members (other ranks and officers) generally as they meet time in rank requirements, provided they satisfy appropriate training criteria and individual readiness levels.³⁴⁸ As indicated at the outset of this Chapter, the promotions process becomes competitive at more senior ranks and members are examined by a promotions board when they enter a promotion eligibility zone, rather than as they apply to an opportunity. This process is largely supply driven (as opposed to demand) and while this gives all members the opportunity to be assessed, it is resource intensive and reinforces the perception that there are certain promotion 'gates' that a typical, successful member must move through on their career continuum.

(k) Promotion boards

Senior members (other ranks and officers) are examined by promotion boards after they have served their time in rank and enter a 'promotion eligibility zone'. The boards are responsible for examining the history of a cohort of candidates, ranking them, and making recommendations for promotion, attendance at courses, and other career development.

The boards examine and review documentation for each candidate presented, and arrive at an ordering from most promotable candidate to least. The documentation includes several years' worth of PARs and supplementary reports (usually three) and other documentation such as Medical Employment Classification reports, ADF or civilian qualifications and conduct records, honours, awards and education for each candidate.³⁴⁹ At more senior levels, candidates are also able to submit personal biographies to the board, and to participate in interviews with board members.³⁵⁰ Once the ordering has been settled, recommendations about candidates to promote are forwarded to career management agency executives or senior Service leaders as appropriate for further examination and award of promotions. A more in depth reflection on three boards attended by the Review is available in Appendix I.

Promotion boards are the forum in which the core value of 'merit' is judged and assessed within the ADF. Much effort has gone into regulating these boards to ensure that they equitably and fairly assess those that they are examining. At the boards attended by the Review, members were keen to avoid any subjective

judgements, and quick to point out any conflicts of interest that they may have had (e.g. if they had worked with, socialised with or knew a candidate).³⁵¹ The transparency and fairness of the system will also be improved by the unconscious bias training that the ADF is currently providing to its senior leaders.³⁵²

Boards were advised in sessions that part-time leave without pay should not be an obstacle to promotion. The Review did not witness any obvious or direct discrimination in the boards it attended, but it was plainly difficult for personnel who had worked part-time to compete with those who had not. Members who had accessed part-time work were prominently noted through the reporting system – either by a PAR or its absence, or through a supplementary report. In a highly competitive process (each board attended by the Review was supply driven, examining over 100 candidates for just a handful of positions) issues like having taken a career break, missing a PAR, or being noted as a part-time worker do not reflect well in a review system that has not been designed to consider such complications.

While each Service's promotion board followed a broadly similar process, each also contained different innovative elements which may be of value to the other Services. These include Navy's attempt to incorporate an assessment of values and behaviours into its promotions process, Army's attempt to diversify leadership through its 'pathways strategy', and Air Force's attempt to examine a broad range of candidates with a deregulation of time in rank rules. Each of these initiatives is briefly examined below.

(i) Navy

Navy considered a candidate's performance in displaying Navy's signature behaviours and values.³⁵³ While this was a newer element of the process, and clearly not as well developed as other criteria, it stood out as the one moment in which the values and behaviours were overtly discussed as something against which members should be judged. Unfortunately, the board had little material for assessing candidates in this area other than attendance at mandatory courses and any conduct records.³⁵⁴ Further development of a means for assessing signature behaviours in Navy, and the adoption of similar elements in Army and Air Force, could be helpful in attaching more relevance to the meaningful practice of values and ethical behaviour for more personnel.

(ii) Army

Army's 'Pathways' strategy aims to provide alternative career pathways for personnel, and enable Army to identify and retain a broader range of skills than its traditional model allows.³⁵⁵ After considering candidates through its traditional 'command and leadership' stream, the board can consider candidates for promotion through a number of other streams, including logistics, aviation, information management, capability and project management, personnel, operations, plans and training, intelligence, and specialist.³⁵⁶ 'Pathways' requires more development – there were significant differences of opinion about its aims, outcomes and worth at the board attended by the Review – but it does have potential to aid diversity and development in the Army, as well as in other Services if they were to adopt a similar model.

(iii) Air Force

Air Force's deregulation of time in rank provisions has given it more scope than the other Services to consider a broad cross section of personnel for promotion. The Air Force board attended by the Review examined everyone who had achieved two years seniority in rank. Some further reforms of the system may improve its efficiency (for example, making promotions processes opt-in, and not listing seniority and service type in a way that can lead to an unconscious bias towards those who had served for what might have been considered optimal time lengths) but in its liberalisation of time in rank rules, Air Force is moving in a direction that may also be of use to the other Services.

(l) Career gates and the Australian Command and Staff College

ADF career plans are set out for different categories. These tend to be well detailed and planned, but can also reinforce the lack of flexibility in the career continuum. They broadly adhere to the time in rank requirements noted above, and at each stage of a career, there are courses and basic requirements that members must satisfy in order to advance.³⁵⁷ One career gate of particular importance, for which members are recommended or otherwise by their career managers and promotion boards, is attendance at the Australian Command and Staff College (ACSC).

ACSC is a pivotal experience that prepares mid-level officers for progression into the ADF's senior leadership ranks. A background briefing on ACSC notes that:

More than any other course or program of development...ACSC will determine the level of contribution [a member] will make to [their] Service and nation in the future.³⁵⁸

A particularly 'tight window' exists through which personnel need to pass at the O04/O05 level in order to navigate this career gate.³⁵⁹ This particular career gate often coincides with critical child-bearing years for women, and therefore poses a potential structural disadvantage to women's career prospects. One woman told of cutting her maternity leave short to take up a position at ACSC which she believed would otherwise have been lost, while another said that she had:

never seen a group of women who plan their conception down to the actual day in the way that Army women do...I've got to have the baby then, because if I don't have the baby then I'm not going to get into staff college.³⁶⁰

Once personnel have successfully graduated from Command and Staff College, there is a perception that contacts and networking become more important aspects for further career progression. One senior officer told the Review that:

Within the more senior ranks it becomes more akin to a system of patronage to what you would find say in the US system...Having been through staff college recently as well, all they talked about is the need to manage your profile, to which my question is well, what about performance?³⁶¹

Another senior officer similarly said that 'despite the fact that we all try and promote the right people a lot of it is who you know.'³⁶²

While the ACSC was a career gate that was often raised with the Review, there are other career gateways (such as Centre for Defence and Strategic Studies and various Service gateways to sergeant and equivalent) that also form barriers for women. The Review recommends that critical career gates for progression into the senior ranks gateways be identified, and that targets be developed with the aim of opening up the career gates for a more diverse range of codes.

(m) Conclusion

The ADF manages a large and diverse workforce. Dedicated career management agencies work hard in a difficult role to manage their workforces effectively. Policy changes would help the ADF get the most value out of its personnel, increase the representation of women in leadership roles, and increase the support of career management practices among many personnel.³⁶³

Providing guaranteed periods of locational stability would assist in more members being able to better balance their work and family responsibilities. While not all members will want to be a part of such a system, having a greater number of personnel who have guaranteed stability for at least two posting cycles could help counteract one of the major reasons given for separations in Exit Surveys.

Reforming time in rank requirements would also help to address the under-representation of women in leadership in the ADF.³⁶⁴ While some changes have occurred, the strictures of the career continuum and the current promotions process disadvantages those who take career breaks, and can potentially lead to conscious and unconscious bias against those who do not have a history of continuous full-time unbroken service. Decoupling traditional career pathways and continuous service from certain promotions processes may help the ADF discover and promote a broader range of talent within the organisation.

Reform of the ADF career management system will help the ADF operate at peak performance and achieve maximum capability.³⁶⁵ Reform will assist the ADF in its goals of promoting a diversity of talent, and improving pathways for increased representation of women in its senior ranks, as well as recognition of the value of those categories more frequently dominated by women.

1 P Hoglin, 'Why Ab Initio?' (2011) 8(2) *Australian Army Journal* 157, p 158.

2 See, for example, J A Conger and R M Fulmer, 'Developing your leadership pipeline' (2003) *Harvard Business Review* 76.

3 These ranks and their badges are listed in the Glossary.

4 The data used in this Chapter is end of financial year 2010/11 snapshot figures provided to the Review by the Workforce Planning Branch: 'ADO_PERSONNEL by Sex and Rank FY0405 to FY1011 v2' provided to the Review by E Chalker, 15 November 2011. At the time of publication, the Review received select 2011/12 data from each Service. Where appropriate, the 2011/12 data is included in endnotes that correspond with its 2010/11 data in the main body of the text. In 2011/12, the representation of women in Army was 10.1%. Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.

5 Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2010-11*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/Budget/10-11/dar/index.htm> (viewed 8 November 2011).

6 As at the end of 2010-11 there were eight women among the 178 Star ranks, and 111 women among the 1,435 WO/WO1/WOFFs. Figures from 'ADO_PERSONNEL by Sex and Rank FY0405 to FY1011 v2', note 4.

7 At the end of FY 2010-11, there were 2,435 women among the total of 13,961 officers, and 5,565 women among the total 44,169 other ranks: 'ADO_PERSONNEL by Sex and Rank FY0405 to FY1011 v2', note 4.

8 In 2011/12, the representation of women in Army had risen to 10.1%: Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.

9 'ADO_PERSONNEL by Sex and Rank FY0405 to FY1011 v2', note 4.

10 The entire pipelines are charted, but in three instances, ranks are combined where they are either specific to one Service, or part of the pipeline that not all personnel are required to move through. The ranks that have been combined for the purposes of analysis are SGT and SSGT in Army, CPL and NCO Officer Cadet in Air Force, and 2LT(E) and LT(E) across all Services.

11 In 2011/12 women made up 8.8% of Army other ranks (2,005 of 22,667): Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.

12 In 2011/12 women made up 10.3% of SGT+SSGT (280 women, 2,446 men); 8.8% of WO2 (169 women, 1,746 men); 8.7% of WO1+RSM-A (57 women, 597 men): Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.

13 The 2011/12 proportion of women in Army other ranks was 8.8%, up from 8.7% the previous year: Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.

14 As at 31 December 2011, Army had 185 categories, of which 85.4% were open to men and women. Of the 132 roles open to both men and women that are currently occupied by personnel, women are currently employed in only 119 (90%) of roles. Categories from which women were legislatively excluded include the Infantry Corp, the Armoured Corp, various specialisations within the Artillery Regiments, Explosive Ordnance Disposal Engineers, and certain trainee positions: Information from 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 202 – percentage of women in open roles' [BR 187] provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 1 February 2012.

15 Information from 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 202 – percentage of women in open roles' [BR 187], above, indicates that at the end of 2011, there were 7,673 Other Rank positions in these categories only available to men. Taking this number away from the total FY2011/12 figures gives a representation for women in the rest of Other Rank positions of just below 13%.

16 LTCOL P Conroy, *Presentation to Chief of Army Women's Networking Forum: Physical Employment Standards Implementation*, 5 December 2011. It was suggested that the ADF does not expect to see large numbers of women applying for, or entering combat categories when restrictions are lifted.

17 The 2011/12 figures are WO2 – 8.8%, WO1 – 8.7%, overall – 8.8%. Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.

18 2010/11 data from 'RFI 183 – Data for pipeline model – snapshot counts, ab initio recruitments, lateral entries per rank, promotions per rank, separations per rank' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 6 February 2012. In 2011/12 women made up 8.1% of the total separations (237 of 2,911) and 10.3% of the net movements (706 of 6,874). Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.

19 'RFI 183 – Data for pipeline model – snapshot counts, ab initio recruitments, lateral entries per rank, promotions per rank, separations per rank', above. In 2011/12 women made up 9.1% of the separations from corporal and 8.2% of the separations from sergeant; women also made up 11% of the promotions to lance corporal and 11.8% of the promotions to corporal. Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.

20 Meeting with Army career management representatives.

21 Between 2004/05 and 2010/11 women have been separating as Recruits at a proportionally higher rate than men. 18.4% of all female recruits were separating, compared with 13.7% of all male Recruits: see Appendix F.

22 For example, in a group of 50 recruits, there will be on average about 5 women. While the 45 men in this group will be able to move in and out of each other's living spaces, small groups of women will be placed together, and not have such an extensive support network. Strict fraternisation rules can also be isolating for the small numbers of women in a training group.

23 Meeting with Army career management representatives.

24 In 2011/12 women made up 14.8% of all Army officer personnel (911 of 6,168). Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.

25 In 2011/12 women made up 14% of majors (226 women, 1,391 men) 10.2% of lieutenant colonels (63 women, 556 men) 7.5% of colonels (12 women, 149 men) 9.3% of brigadiers (five women, 49 men). Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.

26 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 202 – percentage of women in open roles' [BR 187], note 14.

27 This proportion is derived by taking the figures quoted under Figure 5, and subtracting the 1,084 officer positions only available to men (as per 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 202 – percentage of women in open roles' [BR 187], note 14) from the total pool.

28 In 2011/12 women made up 18.5% of lieutenants and 7.5% of colonels. Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.

29 2010/11 data from 'RFI 183 – Data for pipeline model – snapshot counts, ab initio recruitments, lateral entries per rank, promotions per rank, separations per rank', note 18; In 2011/12 women made up 17.3% of separations (83 of 480) and 15.6% of promotions (128 of 822). Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.

30 'Separations by gender, calendar year and rank' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 15 November 2011.

- 31 2010/11 data from 'RFI 183 – Data for pipeline model – snapshot counts, ab initio recruitments, lateral entries per rank, promotions per rank, separations per rank', note 18; In 2011/12 women made up 24% of all movements to colonel and one of the five movements to brigadier. Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.
- 32 24 out of 81 (29.6%) are in categories women have been precluded from occupying. Information from BR Request 232, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 12 March 2012.
- 33 In 2011/12 women made up 17 of 215 colonels and brigadiers. Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.
- 34 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 202 – percentage of women in open roles' [BR 187], note 14.
- 35 This proportion is derived by taking the figures quoted under Figure 8, and subtracting the 310 other rank positions only available to men (as per 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 202 – percentage of women in open roles' [BR 187], note 14) from the total pool.
- 36 'RFI 183 – Data for pipeline model – snapshot counts, ab initio recruitments, lateral entries per rank, promotions per rank, separations per rank', note 18.
- 37 'RFI 183 – Data for pipeline model – snapshot counts, ab initio recruitments, lateral entries per rank, promotions per rank, separations per rank', note 18.
- 38 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 242 and 246 – Demographic data' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012.
- 39 At 1 July 2012 women made up 13% of all Captains (15 of 115): Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.
- 40 These figures rely on 2010/11 data, but at the time of writing, Navy does have one female Rear Admiral. Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.
- 41 Department of Defence, *Draft 2011 Census Public Report*, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, p 6, notes that 'In the Navy, there has been a progressive shift in the gender balance with a steady decrease in the proportion of males since 1991: 87% in 1991; 86% in 1995; 85% in 1999; 83% in 2003 and 2007; 81% in 2011.'
- 42 'RFI 183 – Data for pipeline model – snapshot counts, ab initio recruitments, lateral entries per rank, promotions per rank, separations per rank', note 18.
- 43 By calendar year the figures are 28.6% (2010), 22.8% (2009), 23.9% (2008), 17.4% (2007), 30.3% (2006), 28.4% (2005), 25.7% (2004): 'Separations by gender, calendar year and rank', note 30. This compares with an overall representation of between 21.3 and 24.8% at Lieutenant during this period.
- 44 'RFI 183 – Data for pipeline model – snapshot counts, ab initio recruitments, lateral entries per rank, promotions per rank, separations per rank', note 18.
- 45 'RFI 183 – Data for pipeline model – snapshot counts, ab initio recruitments, lateral entries per rank, promotions per rank, separations per rank', note 18.
- 46 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 242 and 246 – Demographic data', note 40.
- 47 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 242 and 246 – Demographic data', note 40. Note that in any instances where there are less than 20 respondents, data was not provided to the Review in order to protect the confidentiality of the respondents.
- 48 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 242 and 246 – Demographic data', note 40.
- 49 41.1% of all men in the permanent ADF are married, compared to 26.5% of women; and 39.2% of men have dependent children, compared to 27.9% of women: From 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 242 and 246 – Demographic data', note 40.
- 50 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 242 and 246 – Demographic data', note 40.
- 51 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 242 and 246 – Demographic data', note 40.
- 52 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 202 – percentage of women in open roles' [BR 187], note 14.
- 53 This proportion is derived by taking the figures quoted under Figure 15, and subtracting the 415 ADG positions only available to men in 2011 (as per 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 202 – percentage of women in open roles' [BR 187], note 14) from the total pool.
- 54 'RFI 183 – Data for pipeline model – snapshot counts, ab initio recruitments, lateral entries per rank, promotions per rank, separations per rank', note 18.
- 55 'RFI 183 – Data for pipeline model – snapshot counts, ab initio recruitments, lateral entries per rank, promotions per rank, separations per rank', note 18.
- 56 Meeting with Air Force career management and personnel representatives.
- 57 Occupational segregation is further examined in section 5.1.
- 58 In 2011/12 the proportional representation of women per officer ranks was: PLTOFF+FLGOFF 24.2%, FLTLT 19.5%, SQNLDR 18% WGCDR 12.7%, GPCAPT 8.1%, AIRCDRE 2.6%, AVM, 9.1%: Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.
- 59 This proportion is derived by subtracting the 63 GDOs (as per 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 202 – percentage of women in open roles' [BR 187], note 14) from the total pool.
- 60 'RFI 183 – Data for pipeline model – snapshot counts, ab initio recruitments, lateral entries per rank, promotions per rank, separations per rank', note 18.
- 61 'RFI 183 – Data for pipeline model – snapshot counts, ab initio recruitments, lateral entries per rank, promotions per rank, separations per rank', note 18.
- 62 Based on 'Separations by gender, calendar year and rank', note 30.
- 63 Department of Defence, *Defending Australia in the Asia-Pacific Century: Force 2030* (2009), p 113. At http://www.defence.gov.au/whitepaper/docs/defence_white_paper_2009.pdf (viewed 17 June 2012).

64 In May 2012, the Prime Minister and Defence Minister announced that a new Defence White Paper would be delivered in the first half of 2013. The new White Paper will adjust reform programs and will take account of Australia's emerging strategic and fiscal environment: Prime Minister, Minister for Defence, 'New Defence White Paper 2013' (Media Release, 3 May 2012). At <http://www.pm.gov.au/press-office/new-defence-white-paper-2013> (viewed 21 May 2012); Department of Defence, *Portfolio Budget Statements 2012-13*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/12-13/pbs/index.htm> (viewed 17 June 2012).

65 Department of Defence, *Defending Australia in the Asia-Pacific Century: Force 2030*, note 63, p 113.

66 This figure excluded those undertaking the ADF Gap Year: Department of Defence, *Annual Report 2010-11*, p 269. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/Budget/10-11/dar/index.htm> (viewed 17 June 2012).

67 Department of Defence, *Defending Australia in the Asia-Pacific Century: Force 2030*, note 63, p 113.

68 Historically, the single Services were responsible for recruitment and selection of their own personnel. In 2003, these arrangements were merged into a tri-service recruiting system under Defence Force Recruiting (DFR).

69 'Defence Force Recruiting Branch Background' provided to the Review by Defence Force Recruiting representatives, 16 November 2011.

70 The collaboration is defined by the terms of a 'Collaborative Contract for the Provision of Recruiting Services to the Australian Defence Force between the Commonwealth of Australia and Manpower Services (Australia) Pty Ltd' dated 14 November 2002: Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 29-1 'Defence Force Recruiting'*, 6 August 2003, para 1 ('DI(G) PERS 29-1').

71 The Review was advised that there are 221 full-time and 86 part-time ADF personnel, 28 Defence APS personnel and 365 contracted personnel (including psychology and medical personnel Defence Force Recruiting Branch Background', note 69.

72 'Defence Force Recruiting Branch Background', note 69.

73 'Paying Attention to More Numbers', *Sunday Times Perth*, Sunday 13 May 2012, p 58.

74 DI(G) PERS 29-1, note 70.

75 Australian National Audit Office, *Contracting for Defence Recruiting Services*, Audit Report No. 45 (2009-10), p 19. At www.anao.gov.au/Publications/Audit-Reports/2009-2010/Contracting-for-Defence-Force-Recruiting-Services (viewed 31 May 2012).

76 See Appendix G.1.

77 Hoglin, note 1, pp 162-266.

78 Note that in April 2011, Navy reported that 'NGN Culture Project 12 is addressing mid-career entry activities', and subsequently advised the Review that Nous Group has been engaged as part of Navy's NGN work to address this issue: 'Annex C (Navy)', input to CDF Action Plan April 2011 Quarterly report, COSC Agendum 99-11, provided to the Review by T WGCDR T Saunder, 2 May 2011; Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.

79 'ADF Enlistments by Classification FY0203 to FY1011v2.xls' provided to the Review by E Chalker, 15 November 2011.

80 See Chapter 1; Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2010-11*, note 5, vol 1, pp 282, 351; K Thomas and S Bell, 'Competing for the Best and Brightest: Recruitment and Retention in the Australian Defence Force' (2007) 3(1) *Security Challenges* 97.

81 For example, in May 2010, the separation rate was 7.1%, the lowest in its history (the 10 year rolling average is around 10%): Evidence to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Canberra, Friday 16 March 2012, p 22 (MAJGEN Fogarty).

82 Department of Defence, 'Incoming Government Brief', FOI Disclosure Log 101/10/11, 8 February 2011. At http://www.defence.gov.au/foi/disclosure_log_201011.cfm (viewed 15 May 2012).

83 For example, in 2008-09 the ADF achieved 76% of its ab initio target of 7,139. In 2009-10, the target was cut to 6,063 but the ADF achieved only 91%. In 2010-11, the recruiting target was cut further to 4,731 and again only 91% of this was achieved: Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2009-10*, p 351. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/Budget/09-10/dar/index.htm> (viewed 8 November 2011); Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2010-11*, note 5, p 282.

84 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version) provided to the Review by Defence Force Recruiting representatives, 16 November 2011.

85 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), above.

86 Evidence to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Canberra, Friday 16 March 2012, p 29 (MAJGEN Fogarty).

87 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 84.

88 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 84, p 17.

89 The rise in the 12 month rolling separation rate (e.g., from 7.1% in 2009-10 to 7.8% by 1 June 2011) has not necessitated a higher recruiting target being set yet, because it is a small increase and the ADF was 1376 over its Average Funded Strength (AFS) guidance in June 2011: 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 84, p 8.

90 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 84, pp 8-9.

91 Separations rose to 9.3% in March 2012: Evidence to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Canberra, Friday 16 March 2012, p 22 (MAJGEN Fogarty); Department of Defence, *Workforce Outlook* (March 2012), p 3, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 16 May 2012.

92 Department of Defence, *Workforce Outlook* (March 2012), above, p 5.

93 Department of Defence, *Workforce Outlook* (March 2011), p 2, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 6 December 2011.

94 Department of Defence, *Defending Australia in the Asia-Pacific Century: Force 2030* (2009), note 63, p 120.

- 95 Defence Force Recruiting, 'Background Brief: Defence Force Recruiting Expenditure and the Cost of ADF Recruiting, Attachment 2 to RFI 366' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 20 March 2012; Defence Force Recruiting, 'Attachment 1 to Defence response to RFI 366' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 20 March 2012. Appendix G.2 provides total direct expenditure for Defence Recruiting Branch (or Directorate prior to formation of the Branch). As DFR is a joint organisation that recruits for the ADF as a whole, the Review was advised that it was not possible to break down expenditure by Service.
- 96 Defence Force Recruiting, 'Attachment 1 to Defence response to RFI 366' above.
- 97 The RSP noted that the overall level of funding for ADF recruitment should remain at its current levels to 2012-13: 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 84, p 14.
- 98 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 84, p 14.
- 99 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 84, pp 15-16.
- 100 See Appendix G.1.
- 101 Defence Force Recruiting, 'Response to Request for Information (RFI) Numbers 301 and 302' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 7 March 2012.
- 102 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 84, p 17.
- 103 Department of Defence, *Workforce Outlook* (March 2011), note 93, p 5.
- 104 Defence Force Recruiting, 'Response to Request for Information (RFI) Numbers 301 and 302' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 7 March 2012.
- 105 Department of Defence, *People in Defence – Generating the Capability for the Future Force* (2009), p 10, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 12 December 2011. For example, the minimum age for voluntary recruitment in the ADF is 17 years, in line with Australia's international obligations. The maximum age at which a person can join the ADF is determined by the length of service required for a return on the investment made in their training (the Initial Minimum Period of Service (IMPS)). This varies between the Services and job categories: Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 33-5, 'Arrangements for Service in the ADF'*, 6 December 2005.
- 106 Department of Defence, *External Workforce Drivers 2030*, Defence People Discussion Paper 02/08 (2008) cited in 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 84, p 10.
- 107 Department of Defence, *Quarterly Workforce Outlook* (March 2012), note 91, p 5.
- 108 Department of Defence, *Quarterly Workforce Outlook* (March 2012), note 91, p 5.
- 109 Department of Defence, *People in Defence – Generating the Capability for the Future Force*, note 92, p 8.
- 110 See Appendix G.1.
- 111 In 2011/12, women represented 12.7% of Army enlistments; Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012; Appendix G.1.
- 112 Appendix G.1; Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.
- 113 Appendix G.1; Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.
- 114 Appendix G.1; Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.
- 115 Between 2002-03 and 2010-11, the highest percentage of women as ab initio enlistees was 16.8% (in 2002-03) and the lowest was 13.3% (in 2008-09). See Appendix G.1.
- 116 Department of Defence, *Workforce Outlook* (March 2012), note 91, pp 3, 6, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 16 May 2012.
- 117 Department of Defence, *People in Defence – Generating the Capability for the Future Force*, note 109, p 8.
- 118 Focus group 24D.
- 119 See sections 5.1 and 5.3.
- 120 Evidence to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Canberra, Friday 16 March 2012, p 27 (MAJGEN Fogarty).
- 121 The Open Mind Research Group, 'Attracting Women to the Defence Forces', Research Report, 21 November 2005, provided to the Review by Defence Force Recruiting representatives, 16 November 2011; GfK Bluemoon, 'Women and the ADF' (April 2010) provided to the Review by CMDR Alison Westwood, 15 November 2011.
- 122 The Recruitment of Women Strategy is discussed later in this section and in Appendix G.5.
- 123 Focus groups, 4B, 41A, 14A.
- 124 Focus groups 41C, 32B, 41A, 4B, 4D, 6A.
- 125 GfK Bluemoon, note 121, p 68.
- 126 Focus group 24D.
- 127 Focus group 10A.
- 128 Cited in L Williams, M LeBlanc, T Takas, *Canadian Forces Recruiting Survey: Results for the First Quarter of 2011*, Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis, Technical Memorandum, DGMPPRA TM 2012-003, February 2012, p 21, provided to the Review, 4 March 2012.
- 129 The Review was informed that recruiting staff have knowledge of jobs across different Services. Training for all DFR staff includes a mandatory one week basic Induction training program with additional training workshops for staff members whose job roles and duties require additional specific skills (e.g Defence Interviewer, Career Counsellors, Career Promotion Team): 'Response to RFI 365 – DFR Training' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 27 March 2012.
- 130 Thomas and Bell, note 80, p 109.
- 131 R Moelker and J Bolsch, *Hidden Women: Women in the Netherlands Armed Forces*, Publications of the Faculty of Military Science, No. 2008/01, Netherlands Defence Academy (2008), p 31. At hbo-kennisbank.uvt.nl/cgi/nda/show.cgi?fid=1721 (viewed 15 July 2011).
- 132 Focus group 4D.
- 133 Australian National Audit Office, *Contracting for Defence Recruiting Services*, note 75.

- 134 'Action Plan for Improving Recruitment and Retention of Women', Chiefs of Service Committee, Agendum Paper 04/09 (21 July 2009), Attachment 3, Enclosure 1, para 14, provided to the Review.
- 135 'Response to RFIs 182 & 183, February 2012 – Breakdown by gender of the data in Slide 10 of the DFR brief on 7 Dec 2011 (the ratio of conversions from enquiry to enlistment)' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 6 February 2012.
- 136 Department of Defence, *Defence Personnel Environment Scan 2025* (2006), p 29. At http://www.defence.gov.au/dpe/dpe_site/publications/DPES2025/index.htm (viewed 19 June 2012) citing N Barton, *The Australian Defence Force Entrant Opinion Survey: September 2004-August 2005 Reporting Period*, DSPPR Research Report 1/2006, Department of Defence (2006).
- 137 In the six months to December 2009, the average length of time taken to process applications for general enlistment was high (49 weeks from enquiry to enlistment although the target for 2009-10 had been 6 weeks). This delay had increased from an average of 30 weeks in 2006, although it was noted that there had been a substantial increase in enquiries prior to that period, extending processing times: Australian National Audit Office, *Contracting for Defence Recruiting Services*, note 75. In some cases, these delays were caused by factors outside of DFR's direct control (such as where a candidate delayed in following through with their application after making an enquiry, or where a candidate was required to wait for a training intake before enlisting). Focusing specifically on the period of recruitment processing activity between the YOU session and a letter of offer being sent to a candidate, however, there was still a 21% increase in recruitment processing times. Overall, the report considered a number of effectiveness and efficiency targets to measure the success of the new recruitment model from 2007 up to 2010, such as whether or not:
- there was an increase in the percentage of full time enlistments
 - the conversion ratio from enquiry to application to enlistment had improved
 - the cost per recruit was maintained
 - the time taken to process applications had been reduced.
- 138 The Review was told: 'the difficulty with the recruiting data is because we use a contractor to do our recruiting, they use multiple different systems to collect data so you could get recruit information by gender from the different ... training establishments but whether you can get it through Manpower or Defence Force Recruiting, I don't know that you can. To get that kind of information that actually means someone going back through scanned copies of applications forms.... A lot of that information won't be held in a database': Meeting with Defence Workforce Planning representatives.
- 139 'Response to Request for Information (RFI) Number 45 – Detailed data from each Service about enquiries, recruitment, performance in physical tests by gender last 5 years' provided to the Review by Defence Force Recruiting, 9 December 2011.
- 140 As has been noted, there is also a higher failure rate for female Army recruits in the early stages of recruit training. For example, Army reported in April 2011 that the Physical Fitness Test failure rate for female Army candidates was 30.34% (compared to 3.26% for males): 'Annex D (Army) input to CDF Action Plan April 2011 Quarterly report', COSC Agendum 99-11, provided to the Review by T WGCDR T Saunder, 2 May 2011; also see Department of Defence, 'Project LASER- Retention 2010 Cohort Results', Report 10/2011, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 16 March 2012.
- 141 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 11 April 2012.
- 142 Overall, the Review was advised that loss of candidates from the recruiting pipeline between enquiry to YOU session and assessment resulted in an overall conversion ratio from enquiry to enlistment of approximately 12:1 for women and approximately 7:1 for men. However, the data did not clearly show how these conversion rates may vary for different avenues of entry, or job preferences. The Review was advised that because of the numerous variables and 'cross flow factors' involved 'the confidence level associated with conclusions drawn from any analysis of individual avenues of entry is necessarily low': CMDR D Hardy, email to the Review, 13 March 2012.
- 143 Department of Defence, *Portfolio Budget Statements 2011-12, Budget Related Paper no 1.5A* (2011), p 38. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/11-12/pbs/index.htm> (viewed 25 June 2012).
- 144 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 84.
- 145 Department of Defence, People Strategies and Policy Group, *Review of the Australian Defence Force Retention and Recruitment (R2) Program* (2010) vol 2, p 4. At http://www.defence.gov.au/foi/docs/disclosures/234_110520_PSPG_Review_August_2010_V1andV2.pdf (viewed 27 October 2011).
- 146 At the commencement of R2, the enlistment target was increased from around 4,700 a year to around 6,500 and the target separation rate was set to reduce from 11% a year to below 10%: Department of Defence, *Defence Strategic Workforce Plan 2007 – 2017*, p 14, cited in Noetic Solutions, *Review of the Australian Defence Force Retention and Recruitment Strategy* (May 2010), p 13. At www.defence.gov.au/foi/docs/disclosures/234_110520_Noetic_Evaluation_Report_May_2010.pdf (viewed 17 June 2012).
- 147 Noetic Solutions, *Review of the Australian Defence Force Retention and Recruitment Strategy*, above, p 4.
- 148 Department of Defence, People Strategies and Policy Group, *Review of the Australian Defence Force Retention and Recruitment (R2) Program*, note 145, vol 2, p 8.
- 149 See generally: Department of Defence, People Strategies and Policy Group, *Review of the Australian Defence Force Retention and Recruitment (R2) Program*, note 145, vol 2.
- 150 These programs include the ADF Indigenous Recruitment Strategy (eg Defence Reconciliation Action Plan 2010-14) and the ADF Multicultural Recruitment Strategy (now Multicultural Recruitment and Retention Strategy).

- 151 Defence Force Recruiting, email to the Review, 14 March 2012; Department of Defence (Defence Force Recruiting Strategic Consultative Group), 'Recruitment of Women Strategy (ROWS) Fitness Initiatives', Agendum 04/2010, 16 November 2010, para 3, provided to the Review by Defence Force Recruiting representatives, 16 November 2011. Note that in a 2008 RoWS progress report, it was noted that: 'In November 2008, DFR was allocated \$0.240m of dedicated funding for the RoWS, for FY 2008/09. DFR intends to use this opportunity funding to increase Alumni Visits activity and trial an online tool for mentoring, during the current FY': Department of Defence (Personnel Steering Group), 'Progress Report on the ADF Recruitment of Women Strategy', Agendum Paper 37/2008, 28 November 2008, para 9, provided to the Review.
- 152 See Chapter 2.
- 153 Focus group 40A.
- 154 Focus group 40A.
- 155 Focus group 9A.
- 156 Focus group 40A.
- 157 Focus group 6A.
- 158 Focus group 6A.
- 159 Focus group 6A.
- 160 Focus group 40A.
- 161 Focus group 40A.
- 162 Public submission 32 Ward.
- 163 Department of Defence (Personnel Steering Group), 'Progress Report on the ADF Recruitment of Women Strategy', note 151; Defence Force Recruiting, 'Recruitment of Women Strategy (ROWS) Fitness Initiatives', 16 November 2010, Attachment A, provided to the Review.
- 164 The 2008 Personnel Steering Group Progress Report on the RoWS notes that the ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2007-17 aimed to 'increase the percentage of females recruited into the full-time ADF from 15% to 20% by FY 2009-10': Department of Defence (Personnel Steering Group), 'Progress Report on the ADF Recruitment of Women Strategy', note 151.
- 165 Navy had the greatest increase from 19.8% to 23.19%; Army had a minor increase from 8.1% to 8.43%; Air Force had an increase from 19.8% to 21.94%; recruitment into Reserves also achieved a higher rate of enlistments. Incorporating the Gap Year program, the percentage increase for each Service went up to 10% for Army, 23% for Air Force and 25% for Navy. There was an increase in part-time enlistees for Air Force and Navy, but recruitment in this area remained stagnant for Army: Department of Defence (Personnel Steering Group), 'Progress Report on the ADF Recruitment of Women Strategy', note 151.
- 166 Department of Defence (Personnel Steering Group), 'Progress Report on the ADF Recruitment of Women Strategy', note 151.
- 167 Department of Defence (Personnel Steering Group), 'Progress Report on the ADF Recruitment of Women Strategy', note 151.
- 168 'CDF Action Plan Quarterly Report', August 2010, Annex B, provided to the Review; 'ADF Enlistments by Classification FY0203 to FY1011v2.xls', note 79.
- 169 Department of Defence (Personnel Steering Group), 'Progress Report on the ADF Recruitment of Women Strategy', note 151, para 21.
- 170 As noted, despite anecdotal evidence that this was a significant contributor, DFR could not confirm that PFA failure was the only reason for the loss of candidates: Department of Defence (Personnel Steering Group), 'Progress Report on the ADF Recruitment of Women Strategy', note 151, para 22. Candidates can attempt the PFA numerous times and failure is not recorded as a reason for withdrawal. Rather, following failed attempts, candidates can remain in the recruiting system for months.
- 171 The 2008 Progress Report noted that the success of the fitness initiatives would be assessed by changes in enquiry, conversion, and enlistment rates. However, as several RoWS initiatives would be implemented at the same time, the report cautioned that results for individual initiatives 'may be difficult to determine': Department of Defence (Personnel Steering Group), 'Progress Report on the ADF Recruitment of Women Strategy', note 151; and see Defence Force Recruiting, 'Recruitment of Women Strategy (ROWS) Fitness Initiatives', 16 November 2010, Agendum 04/2010, Attachment A, para 26, provided to the Review.
- 172 The Review notes that a Research Fellowship is currently being conducted by MAJ Jenelle Lawson evaluating the RoWS: 'Achieving the Recruitment of Women Strategy: How to recruit the ideal ADF Service Woman'. The proposed research aims to identify key factors that influence women to join the ADF using social science research methodology and motivation theories to build the profile of the 'right' or most suitable prospective ADF Service woman. Additionally, the research will seek to review the Defence Employment Offer and its effect on the women as part of the target audience: MAJ J Lawson, email to the Review, 23 November 2011.
- 173 Agreement by COSC following DGFR's submission on Retention of Women in the Australian Defence Force, 23 July 2007, referred to in Department of Defence (Personnel Steering Group), 'Progress Report on the ADF Recruitment of Women Strategy', note 151, para 12.
- 174 Department of Defence (Personnel Steering Group), 'Progress Report on the ADF Recruitment of Women Strategy', note 151.
- 175 Department of Defence, People Strategies and Policy Group, *Review of the Australian Defence Force Retention and Recruitment (R2) Program*, note 145, vol 1, p 24; Department of Defence, 'ADF Gap Year Program', Fact Sheet, 9 August 2007. At http://www.defence.gov.au/media/download/2007/aug/20070809/Gap_Yearfactsheet.pdf (viewed 25 June 2012).
- 176 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 5-10, 'Australian Defence Force Gap Year'*, 27 May 2011.
- 177 As an incentive to rejoin the full-time ADF after completion of Gap Year service, participants will receive an educational bonus of \$10 000 if they attain a recognised civilian tertiary/trade qualification and rejoin the ADF within five years of completing their Gap Year. A description of each of the Services' Gap Year programs are in Appendix G.6.
- 178 'ADF Gap Year closed', ADF Education, *DefenceJobs* website, <http://www.defencejobs.gov.au/education/gapyear/> (viewed 5 July 2012).

- 179 Noetic Solutions, *Evaluation of the Australian Defence Force Gap Year Program* (2010), p 9. At www.defence.gov.au/foi/docs/disclosures/234_110520_Neotic_Evaluation_Report_April_2010.pdf (viewed 17 June 2012).
- 180 Department of Defence, *Annual Report 2007-08* (2008) vol 1, p 104 referred to in Noetic Solutions Pty Ltd, *Evaluation of the Australian Defence Force Gap Year Program* (2010), p 37. At www.defence.gov.au/foi/docs/disclosures/234_110520_Neotic_Evaluation_Report_April_2010.pdf (viewed 17 June 2012).
- 181 Noetic Solutions, *Evaluation of the Australian Defence Force Gap Year Program* (2010), note 179, p 39.
- 182 See Appendix G.1.
- 183 'Navy Gap Year Information' provided to the Review at HMAS Cerberus, 6 December 2011.
- 184 Evidence to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Canberra, Friday 16 March 2012, p 70 (MAJGEN Fogarty). At the time of the evaluation of the program, it was noted that data on Gap Year participants who return to enlist in the ADF after attaining qualifications would not be available until 2012 when the first cohort (from 2008) would have completed 3 years of study following Gap Year service. In addition, although a large proportion of respondents indicated they would not have joined the ADF if the ADF Gap Year had not been introduced (indicating the program's attraction to a broader recruitment pool), the report found 'the demographic of ADF Gap Year recruits remains relatively homogeneous (in terms of country of birth) with 91 percent of all ADF Gap Year applicants born in Australia': Noetic Solutions, *Evaluation of the Australian Defence Force Gap Year Program*, note 179, p 36.
- 185 Evidence to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Canberra, Friday 16 March 2012, p 27 (MAJGEN Fogarty).
- 186 The trades include drivers, operators, military police, cooks, clerks and dental assistants, among others: Director General Personnel – Army, Minute, 'Trial of 12 months IMPS for selected ARA trades', 12 April 2012, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 18 April 2012.
- 187 C Hendricks and L Hutton, *Defence Reform and Gender, Gender and Security Reform Toolkit* (2008), p 13. At <http://www.osce.org/odihr/30669> (viewed 5 June 2012).
- 188 Confidential submission 25.
- 189 Director General Personnel – Army, Minute, 'Trial of 12 months IMPS for selected ARA trades', note 186.
- 190 Department of Defence, 'Implementing Cultural Change to Improve Retention of Servicewomen' (2008), p 12, provided to the Review.
- 191 Department of Defence, 'Implementing Cultural Change to Improve Retention of Servicewomen', above.
- 192 Confidential submission 25.
- 193 Confidential submission 25.
- 194 Australian Human Rights Commission, 'Our experiences in elevating the representation of women in leadership. A letter from business leaders' (October 2011), pp 20-21. At http://www.humanrights.gov.au/sex_discrimination/publication/mcc/index.html (viewed 2 May 2012).
- 195 Focus group 1A.
- 196 Meeting with career management representatives.
- 197 Focus group 1A.
- 198 For example, for Navy, mid-career entry points are available for specialist (Dental, Legal, Medical) and non-specialist officers (Seaman, Pilot, Observer, Supply) up to the rank of LEUT determined on assessment of academic and post graduate work experience. For sailors, civilian trade qualifications are recognised but enlistment is mainly at Seaman/Able Seaman ranks: 'Annex C (Navy)', input to CDF Action Plan April 2011 Quarterly report, COSC Agendum 99-11, provided to the Review by T WGCDR T Saunder, 2 May 2011. Army allows mid-career entry points as an Army Officer Graduate for personnel with professional or technical qualifications in a wide range of disciplines including IT, Science, Medicine, Law and Engineering. Within Army, some of these occupations have higher than average female representation: 'Annex D (Army)', input to CDF Action Plan April 2011 Quarterly report, COSC Agendum 99-11, provided to the Review by T WGCDR T Saunder, 2 May 2011. Air Force reported that it has a 'mid-career recruitment policy in place' and 'has avoided a punitive structure that reduces rank on return and recognises skills and knowledge acquired in outside employment': 'Annex E (Air Force)', input to CDF Action Plan April 2011 Quarterly report, COSC Agendum 99-11, provided to the Review by T WGCDR T Saunder, 2 May 2011.
- 199 Evidence to the Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade (Defence Subcommittee), Canberra, 25 March 2011, p 32 (ACM Houston).
- 200 Focus group 1A.
- 201 Meeting with Plan SUAKIN representatives.
- 202 Meeting with Plan SUAKIN representatives.
- 203 Meeting with Plan SUAKIN representatives.
- 204 Focus group 1A.
- 205 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2007-2017', p 17, provided to the Review by Defence Force Recruiting representatives, 16 November 2011.
- 206 Evidence to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Canberra, Friday 16 March 2012, p 30 (GEN Hurley).
- 207 Evidence to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Canberra, Friday 16 March 2012, p 30 (GEN Hurley).
- 208 Department of Defence, *People in Defence – Generating the Capability for the Future Force*, note 92.
- 209 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 84, p 8.
- 210 Evidence to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Canberra, Friday 16 March 2012, p 29 (MAJGEN Fogarty).

- 211 Focus group 7A.
- 212 Evidence to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Canberra, Friday 16 March 2012, p 29 (MAJGEN Fogarty); Department of Defence, *Workforce Outlook* (March 2012), note 91, p v.
- 213 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), note 84, p 9.
- 214 Meeting with career management representatives.
- 215 Confidential submission 25.
- 216 Confidential submission 25.
- 217 It was suggested that 'some components of training (initial and/or post graduate) might be done locally or in shorter 'blocks components' (eg two weeks at a time), much in the same manner as we currently train our reserve forces': Confidential submission 25.
- 218 2011 separation rates show that 9% of separations in Army were women, while 20% of separations in Air Force and Navy were women: 'RFI 383 CY2003 – 2011 Seps Profile' provided to the Review by SQLNDR F James, 10 April 2012.
- 219 These conversion rates are calculated from annual ab initio enlistment and 12 month rolling separation figures provided to the Review by the Workforce Planning Branch: 'ADF Enlistments by Classification FY2003 to FY1011v2.xls', note 80; 'ADF Separations by Rank' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 4 December 2011.
- 220 'PTS Males v Females 1 May 2012' provided to the Review by SQLNDR F James, 30 May 2012.
- 221 'Broderick 400 v4' provided to the review by SQLNDR F James, 7 June 2012.
- 222 The below figures are based on how each Service classifies the various occupations within the Service. Therefore there are some differences in how occupations are classified. For example, Electrician is classified as Technical in Army and Navy but non-technical in Air Force
- 223 'PTS By Gender 1 May 2012 – Full Breakdown' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 1 June 2012.
- 224 'PTS By Gender 1 May 2012 – Full Breakdown', above.
- 225 'PTS By Gender 1 May 2012 – Full Breakdown', above.
- 226 'PTS By Gender 1 May 2012 – Full Breakdown', above.
- 227 'PTS By Gender 1 May 2012 – Full Breakdown', above.
- 228 'PTS By Gender 1 May 2012 – Full Breakdown', above.
- 229 'PTS By Gender 1 May 2012 – Full Breakdown', above.
- 230 'PTS By Gender 1 May 2012 – Full Breakdown', above.
- 231 'PTS By Gender 1 May 2012 – Full Breakdown', above.
- 232 'PTL as at 1Jan12' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 18 January 2012.
- 233 'PTL as at 1Jan12', above.
- 234 'PTL as at 1Jan12', above.
- 235 The term Return Of Service Obligation (ROSO) is generally used with reference to Officer ranks and refers to a period of time that a member is contractually required to serve in return for receiving training or qualifications from the ADF. The term Initial Mandatory Period of Service (IMPS) is used to refer to the same period of service for Other Ranks personnel. BR Request 345, 'RESPONSE TO BRODERICK REVIEW PHASE 2 TASK 383 – PART 3' provided to the Review by SQLNDR F James, 10 April 2012.
- 236 The ADF has informed the Review that at present, there is no data available regarding the completion of ROSO for Officers. ROSO for Officers varies by avenue of entry, mode of study and qualification received therefore data collation and analysis for Officers would be a major undertaking. 'Response to Broderick Review Phase 2 task 428' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 1 June 2012; 'RESPONSE TO BRODERICK REVIEW PHASE 2 TASK 383 – PART 3', note 235.
- 237 Meeting with career management representatives.
- 238 In response to a key challenge identified in the Defence Strategic Workforce Plan 2007-17, the Directorate of Workforce Intelligence (DWIntel) initiated a project to investigate the relationship between demographic and psychological test variables on IMPS completion. The DWIntel ADF IMPS Attrition Project aims to utilise existing data to evaluate attrition in the ADF during the first term of service and to assist the relevant Defence training and policy agencies to develop and implement policies and programs to reduce these losses and thereby improve the return on investment in ADF recruitment and training: 'RESPONSE TO BRODERICK REVIEW PHASE 2 TASK 383 – PART 3', note 235; 'Project LASER-Retention 2010 Cohort Results', provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 16 March 2012.
- 239 Meeting with career management representatives.
- 240 'Response to Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 428', note 236.
- 241 These figures are based on separation on return from leave or within the 12 months following paid or unpaid maternity or parental leave. 'Broderick 438 Response' provided to the review by SQLNDR F James, 4 June 2012. It is noted that there were some errors in the data provided by the ADF, as several men were identified as accessing paid maternity leave (for which they are not entitled). The Review was advised that this is due to errors in the inputting of data into the personnel management system: R Philbey, email to the Review, 22 November 2011; CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 31 May 2012.
- 242 'Plan SUAKIN Data' provided to the Review by Ernst and Young, 3 April 2012.
- 243 'RFI 324' provided to the Review by SQLNDR F James, 5 April 2012; 'RFI 324 Follow Up' provided to the Review by SQLNDR F James, 15 June 2012.
- 244 'RFI 39 – ADF Enlistments by Classification FY0203 to FY1011.xls' provided to the Review by SQLNDR F James, 13 April 2012.
- 245 'RFI 324', note 243.
- 246 RFI 39 – ADF Enlistments by Classification FY0203 to FY1011.xls', note 244.
- 247 'RFI 324', note 243.
- 248 'RFI 39 – ADF Enlistments by Classification FY0203 to FY1011.xls', note 244.

- 249 'RFI 324', note 243; 'RFI 324 Follow Up', note 244.
- 250 RFI 39 – ADF Enlistments by Classification FY0203 to FY1011.xls', note 231.
- 251 'RFI 324', note 243; 'RFI 324 Follow Up', note 244.
- 252 79% of women in Active Navy reserves and 46% of women in the Active Air force Reserves transferred from the permanent forces. 'Plan SUAKIN Data' provided to the Review by Ernst and Young, 3 April 2012.
- 253 'Plan SUAKIN Data', above. In Navy, 37% of women compared to 27% of men in the Active Naval Reserves cited their desire for more flexible work arrangements as a motivation for joining the Active Reserves. A 'change in personal circumstances' was also cited by 23% of women and 16% of men. In Air Force, 56% of women compared to 32% of men in the Active Air Force Reserves cited their desire for more flexible work arrangements as a motivation for joining the Active Reserves. A 'change in personal circumstances' was also cited by 32% of women compared to 11% of men. In Army, 41% of women compared to 25% of men cited their desire for more flexible work arrangements as a motivation for joining the Active Reserves.
- 254 Focus group 26A.
- 255 Focus group 25A.
- 256 Focus group 25A.
- 257 In Navy, 88% of women compared to 81% of men, in Air Force, 87% of women compared to 79% of men, and in Army, 86% of women compared to 79% of men. Men and women in the Active Reserves of all three Services also stated that flexibility to move between permanent and part-time service would be a key factor in retention. 'Plan SUAKIN Data', note 252.
- 258 An analysis of the number of personnel that have moved from Permanent Forces to Reserves (Stand-By and Active) and back again, for the last 10 years, demonstrates that 1972 personnel that previously had been in the Permanent Forces, moved back to the Permanent Forces from the Reserves after an average period of roughly 2.5 years. Women make up 11.9% of this number which is just below their overall proportion in the ADF: SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 6 June 2012.
- 259 'Section 2 Case for Change and Future Vision FINAL' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 14 February 2012; Meeting with Plan SUAKIN Representatives; Focus group 13A; Focus group 13B; Focus group 25A; Focus group 25B; Focus group 26A.
- 260 Focus group 25A.
- 261 Focus group 26A.
- 262 Focus group 26A.
- 263 Focus group 26A.
- 264 Focus group 16B.
- 265 Public submission 9 Lang.
- 266 Public submission 23 Smith.
- 267 Public submission 32 Ward.
- 268 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 269 Plan SUAKIN is part of a body of work called Rethink Reserves. Rethink Reserves also encompasses other work being undertaken including Army's work on Project Beersheba, Navy's whole of capability workforce review, Air Force One Team, and PSP with the Defence Employment Offer: Meeting with Plan SUAKIN Representatives.
- 270 'Section 1 Executive Summary 111223', 'Section 2 Case for Change and Future Vision FINAL', 'Section 3 Change Overview FINAL' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 14 February 2012; Meeting with Plan SUAKIN representatives.
- 271 Meeting with Senior Leadership; Focus group 9B; Focus group 17C.
- 272 In 2010/11 there were 59,084 Permanent Force members, 21,339 Reserves, and 21,253 civilian staff. See Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2010-11*, note 5, pp 43-4.
- 273 Department of Defence, *Strategic Career Management Framework Report: Creating a high performance career management system* (2007), p 1.
- 274 A wide range of sources have been consulted in compiling this overview, including the Department of Defence, *Strategic Career Management Framework Report*, above, key Defence Instructions, memos and advice provided to the Review by each career management agency, ADF research about career management, as well as the Review's own primary research in the form of focus groups and consultations.
- 275 Navy and Air Force reserves are managed by their Service's respective career management agencies, and Army reserves are managed by two newly formed reserve directorates (DRSCM-A and DROCM-A) which operate under the same business roles as DSCMA and DOCM-A: 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for DOCM-A (BR advice request 199)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 8 February 2012. NPCMA has its headquarters in Canberra, and Navy also has five Local Career Management Centres which provide 'shop front' advice to sailors, divisional staff and commands located at Fleet Base East, Fleet Base West, HMAS CAIRNS, HMAS COONAWARRA and in Canberra. DSCMA has its headquarters in Queenscliff, Victoria, and DOCM-A has its headquarters in Canberra. Army also has reserve career advisor groups in Townsville, Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne, Hobart, Adelaide, Perth and Darwin. DP-AF has its headquarters in Canberra.
- 276 Confidential meeting; Department of Defence, *Strategic Career Management Framework Report*, note 273, pp 65, 68.
- 277 Meeting with Army career management representatives.
- 278 ABR 10 notes that the sailor division is required '[i]t]o deliver employment and advancement opportunities that balance the career aspirations of our sailors with the operational requirements of the Service.' ABR 6289 says that the officer division 'is charged with facilitating the career management of officers' while satisfying the 'corporate requirements of the Navy'. See Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 4 December 2011, Chapter 4, 4.3; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 4 December 2011, Chapter 2, 2.1; 2.6; Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (Army) PERS 47-11*, 'Career management of soldiers in the Australian Regular Army and Army Reserve', 20 December 2005, p 3 (DI(A) PERS-47-11'); Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (Army) PERS 47-1*, 'Career Management of Australian Army Officers', 31 July 2008,

- p 1, ('DI(A) PERS 47-1'); DP-AF posting guidelines, in 'RAAF Officer Personnel Management System – Career Planning Guide (BR Advice request 197)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 23 January 2012.
- 279 Department of Defence, *Strategic Career Management Framework Report*, note 273: *Creating a high performance career management system* (2007), p 1.
- 280 There are more complete but still not exhaustive lists of responsibilities at Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 4, 4.7, 4.10; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 2, 2.3; DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278, p 2; DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, p 1. Current list of DP-AF personnel manager tasks in 'Information about the role of career managers in each Service and the ADF's career management service (BR advice request 33)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 29 November 2011.
- 281 Focus group 20A; Focus group 12B.
- 282 58.9% of women and 55.6% of men agreed with the statement that 'I have sufficient contact with the Navy/Army/Air Force career management agency'. 32.1% of all respondents disagreed and 11.8% were uncertain. From 2010 DAS, in DSPPR Brief 04/2011, *Brief for Review Teams: Culture of the ADF and Defence*, Department of Defence, 2011, p 3.
- 283 NPCMA currently has 58 career managers for 18,882 personnel (including 4,709 reserves), at a ratio of one career manager for every 309 sailors, and one career manager for every 383 officers. The Strategic Reform Program requirements could soon push this ratio higher. DOCM-A has 21 career advisors managing 6,065 personnel (including 460 reserves) at a ratio of one career manager for every 312 officers. DSCMA has 47 career managers for 21,466 personnel (the Review has no number for the reserve component among this) at a ratio of one career manager for every 457 soldiers. DP-AF has 49 personnel managers (three of whom are part-time) for 16,159 personnel (including 2,820 active reserves and 473 specialist reserves) at a ratio of one personnel manager for the pool of permanent and reserve personnel. The three part time personnel managers are responsible for the 473 specialist reserves. Averages based on breakdowns from 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 160 & 161- svcs by gender, CMA, service type' Provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 8 February 2012;
- 284 Focus group 23B.
- 285 Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 4, 4.21; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 7, 7.5.
- 286 DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278, p 4; DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, p 4.
- 287 DP-AF advice in 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 384' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 2 April 2012.
- 288 Focus group women 33A; Confidential submission 3; Focus group 20B.
- 289 Focus group 27C; Focus group 23B; Focus group 18E; Focus group 30A.
- 290 See Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 4, 4.44; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, 4 December 2011, Chapter 7, 7.2; DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278, p 7; DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, p 14; Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (Air Force) PERS 3-1, 'Postings, Attachment and Temporary Duty – Permanent Air Force'*, 20 November 1997, Annex B, p B-1 ('DI(AF) PERS 3-1'). Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (Air Force) PERS 3-9, 'Airman Career Management System – Management of Postings'*, 1 August 2000, pp 3-4 ('DI(AF) PERS 3-9').
- 291 The *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey* found that 49% of women and 46% of men believed that the ADF considered their family when considering postings (electronic sample). Among the paper sample 49% of women and 41% of men believed that their family was considered.
- 292 See Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 4, 4.28-4.30; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 7, 7.6, 7.7; DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278, p 9; DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, p 15; 'RAAF Officer Personnel Management System – Career Planning Guide (BR Advice request 197)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 23 January 2012.
- 293 Focus group 23B.
- 294 The Review heard of a number of examples of posting churn and short notice postings. For example, Confidential submission 15; Public submission 34 Close; Focus group 27C.
- 295 Focus group 4B.
- 296 Meeting with Air Force career management representatives.
- 297 Meeting with Air Force career management representatives.
- 298 Department of Defence, *Strategic Career Management Framework Report*, note 273, p 60; 'Career management questions' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 30 January 2011.
- 299 ABR 10 says that Five Year Career Plans are 'the foundation document utilised for all sailors' career management': Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 4, 4.17-4.20; Navy focus group 4A.
- 300 Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research, *2010 Australian Defence Force Exit Survey Report Reasons for Leaving*, DSPPR Report 14/2011, January 2012, p v; Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research, *2009 Australian Defence Force Exit Survey Report Reasons for Leaving*, DSPPR Report 59/2010, Oct 2010, p xi; Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research, *2008 Australian Defence Force Exit Survey Report Reasons for Leaving*, DSPPR Report 4/2009, July 2009, p xi.
- 301 Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 4, Annex F; DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278, p 7; DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, p 16.
- 302 DI(AF) PERS 3-1, note 290, Annex B.
- 303 Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 4, Annex F; DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278, p 9; DI(AF) PERS 3-1, note 290, Annex B.

- 304 See Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 4, 4.71; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 7, 7.45; DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278, p 7; DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, p 16; DI(AF) PERS 3-1, note 290, p 7; 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for DP-AF (BR advice request 199)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 30 January 2011.
- 305 See Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, chapter 4; DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278, p 7; DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, p 16; DI(AF) PERS 3-1, note 290, Annex B.
- 306 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for SCMA (BR advice request 199)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 8 February 2012.
- 307 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (Navy) PERS 31-46, 'Royal Australian Navy Policy on Individual Readiness'*, 17 September 2009 ('DI(N) PERS 31-46'); Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (Army) OPS 80-1, 'Army Individual Readiness Notice'*, 14 December 2008 ('DI(A) OPS 80-1'); Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (Air Force) OPS 4-8, 'Individual Readiness'*, 27 April 2000 ('DI(AF) OPS 4-8').
- 308 DI(N) PERS 31-46, note 307, p 3; DI(AF) OPS 4-8, note 307, p 5.
- 309 DI(N) PERS 31-46, note 307, p 3; DI(N) PERS 31-46, note 307, p 3; DI(AF) OPS 4-8, note 307, p 3.
- 310 DI(N) PERS 31-46, note 307, p 3; DI(N) PERS 31-46, note 307, p 3.
- 311 DI(AF) OPS 4-8, note 307, p 6.
- 312 DI(N) PERS 31-46, note 307, Annex C, p C-2.
- 313 Department of Defence, *Health Directive No 235, 'Management of Pregnant Members in the Australian Defence Force'*, 29 November 2011.
- 314 Department of Defence, *Health Directive No 235, 'Management of Pregnant Members in the Australian Defence Force'*, above, p 3.
- 315 Department of Defence, *Health Directive No 235, 'Management of Pregnant Members in the Australian Defence Force'*, above, pp 3, 6-7.
- 316 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for NPCMA (BR advice request 199)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 14 February 2012.
- 317 Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, chapter 4, 4.43; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, chapter 4, 4.18.
- 318 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for NPCMA (BR advice request 199)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 14 February 2012.
- 319 Confidential meeting; Also see earlier in this Chapter for discussion of women's representation in Navy.
- 320 Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, chapter 4, Annex F; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, chapter 7, 7.43.
- 321 Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, chapter 4, Annex F; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, chapter 7, 7.43.
- 322 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for NPCMA (BR advice request 199)' Provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 14 February 2012; 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for SCMA (BR advice request 199)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 8 February 2012; 'Career Management questions – refer to Word doc for DP-AF (BR advice request 199)', provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 30 January 2012.
- 323 Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, chapter 7, 7.42; DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278, p 10; DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, p. 16, note 89; DI(AF) PERS 3-1, note 290, p 4.
- 324 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for NPCMA (BR advice request 199)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 14 February 2012
- 325 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for SCMA (BR advice request 199)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 8 February 2012; 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for DOCMA-A (BR advice request 199)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 8 February 2012.
- 326 Of 1,379 permanent members who are married or in an interdependent relationship with another serving member, they have been able to co-locate 1,338, with the other 41 on Leave Without Pay Accompanying Serving Member. From 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for DP-AF (BR advice request 199)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 30 January 2011.
- 327 Focus group 23B.
- 328 Discussion of basic elements of promotion policy in Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, chapter 4, 4.16; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, chapter 8, 8.3; DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278DI(A) PERS-47-11, note 278, p 14; DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, pp 6-7; Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (Air Force) PERS 5-1, 'Airman and Airwoman Promotion System'*, 31 August 2001, p 1 ('DI(AF) PERS 5-1'); Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (Air Force) PERS 5-9, 'Substantive Promotion Policy – Officers'*, 17 November 2000 ('DI(AF) PERS 5-9'), p 1.
- 329 Information from Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, provided to the Review by email, 4 December 2011, Chapter 5, 5.10, Chapter 6, 6.19, Chapter 8, 8.13; LTGEN P F Leahy, CA Directive 06/08, *Army Standard Minimum Time in Rank*, 2008, p 2; 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for DP-AF (BR advice request 199)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 30 January 2011.
- 330 Information from Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 13, Annex A; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 13, 13.18; DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, p 10; 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for DP-AF (BR advice request 199)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 30 January 2011.

- 331 In Navy, time in rank provisions do not apply for promotion beyond Captain. In Army, time in rank for star ranks is four years, although this is subject to capability need and can be shortened. Air Force's two year seniority rule applies to all ranks: 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 384', note 287.
- 332 Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, Annex A to Chapter 4; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 13, 13.13; DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, p 9; DI(A) PERS-47-11, note 278, p 16.
- 333 'Career management questions – refer to Word doc for NPCMA (BR advice request 199)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 14 February 2012.
- 334 DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, p 9 refers to DI(G) PERS 49-3. DI(G) PERS 49-3 has been superseded by DI(G) PERS 49-4, which says that 'For members on PTLWOP, seniority/time in rank will be calculated on a pro rata basis (10 days worked equates to 14 days).' See Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 49-4, 'Flexible Work Arrangements for Members of the ADF'*, 25 June 2008, p 5, note 26; DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278, p 16.
- 335 For reduction in seniority provisions, see DI(AF) PERS 5-9, note 328, p 9; DP-AF's current policy as related to the Review from 'Policies and practices regarding promotion of members for all 3 services. (Broderick Review advice request No.3). Selection criteria for promotion and appointments for each service' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 2 November 2011.
- 336 This issue has previously been discussed in other reviews and forums, including by Clare Burton and Vicki McConachie. See V McConachie, *The Military and Motherhood – the Effects of the Unstated Norm*, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 1 May 2012.
- 337 Focus group 23B.
- 338 Confidential meeting.
- 339 As Commodore Vicki McConachie noted 'the system of time in rank is predicated upon assuming that those who did not take leave without pay have developmental experiences while those that take leave without pay do not.' V McConachie, *The Military and Motherhood – the Effects of the Unstated Norm*, p 17, provided to the Review by CMDR Alison Westwood 1 May 2012.
- 340 Focus group 28B.
- 341 See C Burton, *Women in the Australian Defence Force* (1996), p 110; Meeting with Air Force career management representatives.
- 342 Focus group 34C.
- 343 Focus group 17A.
- 344 Focus group 27C.
- 345 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 10-8, 'Performance Appraisal Reporting in the Australian Defence Force'*, 21 November 2005, p 1.
- 346 'Career management questions' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 8 February 2012.
- 347 Focus group 24E.
- 348 Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 5, 5.5-5.10; DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278, p 22; DI(AF) PERS 5-1, note 328, p 1.
- 349 Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 5, 5.5-5.10; DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278, p 22; DI(AF) PERS 5-1, note 328, p 1; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 278, Chapter 13; DI(A) PERS 47-11, note 278, pp 14-15; DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, p 7; DI(AF) PERS 5-9, note 328, p 3; DP-AF advice in 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 384', note 287.
- 350 DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 278, Annex B, p B-1.
- 351 The Review observed a promotion board from each Service. All boards were for promotion to mid-to-senior officer ranks – the Navy board was for promotion to Lieutenant Commander, the Army board for promotion to Colonel, and the Air Force board for promotion to Squadron Leader.
- 352 Department of Defence, *Pathway to Change: Evolving Defence Culture* (2012), p 16. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/culturereviews/docs/120302%20Pathway%20to%20Change%20-%20Evolving%20Defence%20Culture%20-%20web%20version%20with%20covers.pdf> (viewed 31 May 2012).
- 353 RAN A/CN RADM T N Jones, *2012 Promotion Board Guidance*, 29 March 2012, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 3 April 2012.
- 354 There were four ranking categories. Number 2 signified 'An officer who has satisfactorily demonstrated Navy signature behaviours and is rated among the majority of their peers'. Category 1 was for those ranked 'among the best' and category 3 for those 'below the majority'.
- 355 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 378 and 380 – questions IRT Army Promotion Board visit' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 4 April 2012.
- 356 COL G J Reynolds, CCM-A, *Army Officer Career Pathway Strategy – Foundation Career Management Group*, 23 Oct 2009, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 4 April 2012.
- 357 Select courses and materials provided to the Review include: 'Leading Seaman Promotion Course (LSPC) – 208450' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012; 'Petty Officer Promotion Course (POPC) – 208456' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012; 'Chief Petty Officers Promotion Course (CPOPC) – 208889' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012; 'Warrant Officers Promotion Course (WOPC) – 208890' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012; 'Junior Officers Leadership Course (JOLC) – 101574' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012; 'Lieutenant Commanders Promotion Course (LCPC) – 101574' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012; 'JLC – ARA Leadership TMP' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 28 March 2012; 'S1SA – ARA Leadership' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 28 March 2012; 'S1WA Lead' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 28 March 2012; 'ARA GSO FAC CLO 3.1 Define the Army Leadership Model (Level 3)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 28 March 2012; 'ARA All Corps CAPT Cse 2-1 Lead a Command Support Team' provided to the Review

by SQNLDR F James, 28 March 2012; 'ARA All Corps MAJ Cse 1-2 Carry out the Leadership Responsibilities of an All Corps MAJ (Level 4)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 28 March 2012; 'Internal Evaluation Requirements and Post-Course Reporting for AFTG Units (AFTG si admin_2-4)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'Training Evaluation (PERS_33-03_Training_Evaluation)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'AF Professional Military Education and Training (PMET_09) AC-SQNLDR (PMET-2009 DRAFT DI – with Info Mngt comments cleared DDPMET 03 Feb 2012)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'Air Force Professional Military Education and Training (PMET Brief for GBK 01 Feb 12)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'Principles for PMET 2009 Delivery Model AC – SQNLDR (Principles Overview PMET 2009 Delivery Model AC-SNLDR Nov 09)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'FLTLT Distance Course 2012 Leadership Module Study Guide- Officer Education Flight – Distance (FLDC Leadership Module Study Guide – 2012)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'WOFF Distance Course 2011 Leadership Module Study Guide – Officer Distance Learning Flight (WOFF Distance Course Leadership Module Study Guide – 2011)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'SQNLDR Distance Course 2011 – Leadership Module Study Guide – Officer Distance Learning Flight (SQNLDR Distance Course Leadership Module Study Guide – 2011)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'Royal Australian Air Force Australian Air Publication – Manual of Training – Policy and Procedures (aap 2002.001 AM1)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012.

358 Australian Defence College, *Australian Command and Staff College*, <http://www.defence.gov.au/adccentres/acsc/acsc.html> (viewed 5 July 2012).

359 Focus group 6A.

360 Focus group 9B; Focus group 34C.

361 Focus group 27C.

362 Focus group 3A.

363 50% of female respondents and 45.3% of male respondents agreed that 'I am satisfied with the Navy/Army/Air Force career management process'. The level of respondent agreement for females in the 2010 DAS Survey has increased 9.7 percentage points from 1999 to 2008. From 2010 DAS, in Department of Defence, *Brief for Review Teams: Culture of the ADF and Defence*, DSPPR Brief 04/2011(2011), p 3.

364 As early as 1996, Clare Burton noted in her report that 'women are discriminated against by the effect of the time-in-rank rules': Burton, note 341, p 109.

365 As per the goal noted in Department of Defence, *Pathway to Change: Evolving Defence Culture* note 352, p 16.



“Women are significantly under-represented in certain occupations, (especially those fields that remain inherently masculine, our war fighting roles) and still face a range of gender-based barriers that limit their progress, impact their inclination to remain in the ADF and in the worse cases, destroy souls.”

**ADF member
(Confidential Submission)**



Chapter 5:

The ADF Workforce
Structure: Opportunities,
Pathways and Barriers

Building on the examination of women's representation in the ADF workforce pipeline, this Chapter turns to the barriers and opportunities that women encounter as they progress through it. In particular, it examines the way in which women are largely concentrated in particular roles within the Services, and the effect that this and other factors, such as the promotions process, have on women's opportunities to reach positions of leadership. It also examines the effect that the removal of gender restrictions on combat roles may have on increasing opportunities for women, as well as how access to support, through mentoring, networks, and sponsorship can make a significant difference to women's ADF career.

5.1 Occupational Segregation

In summary

- Women in the ADF are heavily concentrated in non-technical and support roles, including administrative, clerical, logistical and health service roles. Conversely, women are under-represented in technical and war-fighting/combat roles.
- There are many factors contributing to occupational segregation including: the impact of social norms relating to 'appropriate' employment for men and women, opportunities offered to women, women's reluctance to enter and previous exclusion from categories dominated by men, and women choosing occupations that afford greater flexibility and locational stability.
- Occupational segregation has a significant impact on women's career progression and their ability to reach leadership positions in the ADF. Traditionally, senior leadership is drawn from categories that have no women or where there are very small numbers of women, particularly in Army and Air Force.
- Several complementary measures are needed to attract and retain women in a greater diversity of roles and increase women's representation in leadership positions. This includes creating greater workplace flexibility and locational stability; re-evaluating the skills and experience needed for leadership roles; and simultaneously strengthening efforts to increase the representation of women in a diversity of categories.
- The 'civilianisation' and centralisation of many military support roles will have a disproportionate impact on women.

As explored in the previous Chapter, women make up 13.8% of the total ADF Permanent workforce: 9.9% of Army, 17.1% of Air Force and 18.5% of Navy.¹ These figures mask the uneven distribution of women across the different occupations within the ADF. The actual occupations women pursue within the three Services are starkly segregated, with most women serving in support roles, particularly administrative, clerical, logistical or health service roles. In fact, women significantly outnumber men in some of these categories. As one female member told the Review:

I'm a clerk, so I haven't worked with very many males.²

Concurrently, women are under-represented in many categories across the three Services, particularly in war-fighting/combat roles and technical roles.

This delineation of roles may reflect similar patterns of women's employment in the civilian workforce, but in the ADF context it poses a significant impediment to the number of women in leadership positions. Particularly in Army and Air Force, the categories that have no women or very small numbers of women are the categories that progress to senior leadership. Re-evaluating the skills and experience needed for leadership roles while simultaneously strengthening efforts to increase the representation of women in a diversity of categories is critical to addressing the under-representation of women in ADF leadership. Additionally, as the ADF continues

to civilianise non war-fighting roles in attempts to increase efficiency, the overall representation of women in the ADF will decrease unless renewed efforts are made to attract and retain women in male-dominated occupations (i.e. 'non-traditional' occupations for women).

(a) Statistical overview³

Until recently, not all roles in each of the Services have been open to women.⁴ While these restrictions have now been lifted and each Service is seeking to integrate women into these roles over the next five years, the current impact of the restrictions remain with 2.2% of roles in Navy,⁵ 14.6% of roles in Army,⁶ and 2.4% of roles in Air Force⁷ currently in transition (see section 5.3).

Even when these restrictions are accounted for, women are not represented in all of the roles currently available to them within each Service:

- In Navy, of the 145 roles open to both men and women that are currently occupied by personnel, women are currently employed in only 118 (81.3%) of roles.⁸
- In Army, of the 132 roles open to both men and women that are currently occupied by personnel, women are currently employed in only 119 (90%) of roles.⁹
- In Air Force, of the 117 roles open to both men and women that are currently occupied by personnel, women are currently employed in 100 (85.4%) of roles.¹⁰

Across all three Services, as Figures 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 show, women are concentrated in officer and non-technical trades and under-represented in technical trades.¹¹

There are many likely factors accounting for women's absence from several roles. These include:

- the impact of social norms relating to 'appropriate' employment for men and women
- opportunities offered to women
- women's reluctance to enter and previous exclusion from categories dominated by men
- women's choice around occupations that offer more locational stability and flexibility.

Figure 5.1: Percentage of Men and Women in Navy by Officer, Technical (OR) and Non-Technical (OR)¹²




Figure 5.2: Percentage of Men and Women in Army by Officer, Technical (OR) and Non-Technical (OR)¹³





Figure 5.3: Percentage of Men and Women in Air Force by Officer, Technical (OR) and Non-Technical (OR)¹⁴



The low representation of women in technical trades is particularly significant in Navy and Air Force, where personnel in technical roles make up around a third of the personnel in the Service.¹⁵

The following graphs show the percentage of women in each category by Service, and illustrate the disproportionate representation of men and women in each category:

Figure 5.4: Percentage of women and men in Navy categories¹⁶




Figure 5.5: Percentage of women and men in Army categories¹⁷





Figure 5.6: Percentage of women and men in Air Force categories¹⁸



Figures 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 show marked segregation of women into particular categories as well as similarity in the kinds of categories in which women are concentrated. For example women’s representation in each of the categories below is above 30% of all personnel in that category:

- In Navy, Administration, Management Executive, Health Services, Instructor, Legal, Supply, Training Systems and Communications.¹⁹
- In Army, Nursing, Dental, Psychology, Education, Pay and Medical Corps.²⁰
- In Air Force, Dental, Clerical, Health Services, Medical, Support Operations and Supply.²¹

The graphs also demonstrate that, particularly in Navy and Air Force, women significantly outnumber men in some of these categories.

In Army and Air Force the proportion of women in each category has been fairly static over the last six years (see Appendix J.2 for graphs illustrating these trends).²² In Navy, there has been far more fluctuation in the proportion of women in some categories.²³ This is particularly prominent in the categories with smaller numbers of personnel (see Appendix J.2). There have also been changes in the establishment and discontinuation of categories in Navy. The most significant among these is the creation of a ‘Management Executive’ category. Since its creation in 2010, this category has been dominated by women and appears to be attractive for the additional career progression it offers women in many support roles (such as human resource roles) and the locational stability it affords.²⁴

Within some categories, there is even further segregation of women’s roles. For example:

- In Army, women represent 22.3% of the Ordnance Corps – the category with the largest number of women, at 836 women out of 3752. Of the 22.3% of women, they are over-represented in administrative roles (50.6%), Supply roles (35.4% in total) and Officer roles (11.4%).²⁵
- In Air Force, 64% of women in Engineering and Logistics are ‘Logistics Officers’ (rather than Aeronautical Engineer, Airfield Engineer or Armament Engineer, Electronics Engineer) despite ‘Logistics Officers’ representing only 27% of personnel in this category overall. Furthermore, in the Airmen Aircrew category, of the 69 women in this category (representing 17.3%), 54 (78%) are in the Crew Attendant specialisation.²⁶

- By contrast, within the categories in Navy in which women are employed, they appear to be more evenly spread across the range of specialisations. The exception to this is Maritime Warfare Officers. This is a large category with 157 women out of a total of 967 personnel, yet women are heavily concentrated in just 15 of the 36 specialisations currently filled by permanent members in this category.²⁷

The categories in which women are well represented tend to be the ‘smaller categories’ in each of the Services (see Appendix J.1). For example:²⁸

- In Navy, there are 22 women in Legal but there are only 50 people in Legal in the whole Service.
- In Army, there are 66 women in Psychology but there are only 119 people in Psychology in the whole Service.
- In Air Force, there are 32 women in Dental but there are only 36 people in Dental in the whole Service.

This has implications for career progression and leadership opportunities which will be discussed in section 5.2.

The Review recommends a specific program to recruit and build a critical mass of women in areas that currently have a low representation of women. Importantly, women entering these roles need to be supported and their retention and career progression monitored, to enable the ADF to respond more effectively to their needs.

(b) Causes of Occupational Segregation

(i) Reflecting broader social norms

To some extent, the segregation of women in ‘traditional’ occupations is symptomatic of broader social norms regarding ‘appropriate’ work for men and women. The gender-based division of labour in the ADF and the wider Australian community reflects, in part, stereotypes and norms regarding women’s and men’s perceived varying competencies, and ‘appropriate’ gender-roles and behaviour.²⁹

In the ADF context, as in many other workplaces, these norms have been institutionalised through formal and informal restrictions on women’s employment options (such as the exclusion, until recently, of women from combat roles), selection criteria that prioritise skills typically held by men (such as the prioritisation of war-fighting and operational experience in the appointment of the Chiefs of Services), and, as discussed in previous Chapters, conscious and unconscious bias of those that recruit men and women. Reinforcing this segregation is the fact that, through the process of socialisation, women will often choose categories that conform to these norms.³⁰

Many men and women with whom the Review spoke explained the concentration of women in traditionally female roles as merely reflecting the occupational segregation that occurs in the broader community. For instance:

By virtue of cultural differences between males and females in Australia, nursing [in the ADF] will probably always have, no matter what they do, more females than males.³¹

It’s a particular character for a female to want to become a mechanic or an engineer. I don’t think every girl grows up and thinks her dream job is going to be covered in grease and oil.³²

While the representation of women in ‘non-traditional’ roles in the ADF is generally higher than in the civilian workforce,³³ as will be explored in section 5.2, this does not alter the fact that Defence career progression models accord greater prestige to those roles that men dominate, rather than the support roles in which women have traditionally been represented. This preserves gendered assumptions about the division of labour and perpetuates the under-valuing of traditional female occupations, as well as of women’s contribution to the ADF.³⁴ Occupational segregation also impacts on women’s ability to shape the culture of the ADF. The lack of

senior appointments from traditionally female-dominated occupations means that women are unable to attain positions through which they can shape the culture of the ADF.

It is critical that the ADF renew efforts to diversify the categories in which women are employed, and conversely, encourage more men into currently feminised job categories.

(ii) Recruitment

The importance of the recruitment process in attracting or discouraging women from certain occupations within the ADF was highlighted in many focus groups and examined in section 4.2. Given that there are sometimes difficulties in transferring categories once personnel are in the ADF, the recruitment process (including ADF advertising, information sessions, interviews with recruitment staff and aptitudes assessments) largely determines the occupation an individual will undertake for the duration of their career in the ADF.³⁵

The ADF has made concerted efforts to attract women to non-traditional occupations, including through targeted advertising campaigns (see Appendix J.4), in part because of an imperative to fill critical and under-capacity categories. While the reportedly higher representation of women in non-traditional occupations in the ADF compared to similar civilian workforces/industries points to the relative success of these initiatives,³⁶ the consistently low representation of women in many male-dominated categories (particularly for a workforce that is dominated by these roles) indicates the need for renewed and strengthened initiatives.

Certainly, some female focus group participants, particularly in Air Force, recounted experiences of being steered away from non-traditional categories and into more conventional categories for women during the recruitment process:

I walked into recruiting and I said I wanted to be a metal machinist, this is going back five years ago, they went no, we're not going to let you do that because it's a male dominated environment.³⁷

I went in and my first mustering was fire fighter, but they said they weren't recruiting for another two years. They put me into another one, yet on my recruit [course] there were about six male fire fighters.³⁸

Two females have been told by recruiting that women can't be fast jet pilots because of the G-forces.³⁹

As discussed in section 4.2, the current recruitment model of filling quotas for jobs with the first eligible candidate that meets requirements will not address the under-representation of women in non-traditional employment. Recruitment initiatives need to target and encourage women and girls to look beyond stereotypical jobs towards technical and combat roles. Initiatives such as those outlined in section 4.2 show that targeted recruitment of women into non-traditional roles is essential and may require targets as well as initiatives such as a 'recruit to trade' model and removal of the 'Initial Minimum Period of Service' for key categories.

Studies suggest that 'women act more distinctively once their numbers reach a certain threshold'.⁴⁰ While the percentage which women must obtain in order to function as a critical mass differs in relevant literature, studies show that when representation rises above a token number, women are able to have an impact on the environment in which they work.⁴¹ It is important to ensure that women are not isolated where they choose to work in categories newly opened to women or that have very small numbers of women. Furthermore, effective leadership and support mechanisms (such as mentoring) must be in place.

(iii) Re-categorising into traditional occupations

Focus group participants stated that it was common for women to enter a category and then move across to an administrative role for a range of reasons. These include because they were 'broken' by the training or the pressures of working in a male dominated environment, or because they were seeking more flexible work and locational stability:

A lot of us get broken from early on in training and then we come across [to pay corps]. It's very common.⁴²

Once [members] get kids... they want the ground jobs.⁴³

[I]t's been said in jest to me a couple of times... that the common expansion of MX, which is 'Management Executive' is 'males excluded' because there is a big perception out there that it's being offered to people like mewho want to get back in but don't want to go back to sea because they're mums now.⁴⁴

As discussed in section 4.3 and Chapter 6, the Review also heard that many women discharge when they establish a family. They may re-enter the Services later in life into a category that offers them greater workplace flexibility and locational stability. Offering women in non-traditional occupations further opportunities for flexible work and locational stability is critical to retain women in non-traditional roles.

(iv) Choosing occupations with more flexibility and stability

Some women in focus groups stated that they chose occupations that provide greater flexibility and stability such as less sea-going time or fewer deployments and operations. The categories that provide the greatest flexibility and stability are in the non-technical support roles, such as administration, human resources and legal – all roles dominated by women. Both women and men in focus groups also stated that they recommend these occupations to other women because of the flexibility and stability they afford, presumably on the assumption that women may need to juggle family responsibilities in the future:

I recommend a lot of ladies to be in the Supply Branch who want to be officers because there's a good balance between sea-time and shore-time.⁴⁵

At this point in time there is no female who has kids and is flying in this mustering. There's a couple of men that have children that manage to be crew attendants still because their wives must be obviously doing the role of caregiver most of the time but at this point in time there's no female that can have kids and go on a flight because you just can't. You can go away for a trip but it ends up being three weeks.⁴⁶

We've got another member that comes in only four days a week...But again it's a clerk trade not a technical trade, so it's a lot harder for a technical trade where they've got certain jobs they've got to achieve every day with limited capability.⁴⁷

The concentration of women who access flexible work in particular categories may have further consequences, with some categories becoming increasingly accustomed to implementing these arrangements while others have no experience. This means that both men and women seeking flexibility in technical and war-fighting roles, for example, may face perpetual resistance. Further, as one member stated in relation to job sharing:

It works when there are multiple females in the squadron...I'm the only female. Who am I going to job share with?⁴⁸

The perception of many women is that it is more difficult to balance a career and family commitments in non-traditional occupations. This results in some women choosing traditional roles that assure them of greater stability.

(v) Women's reluctance to enter categories/trades dominated by men

Some women in focus groups expressed reluctance to enter categories and trades that were dominated by men because of the culture within these categories rather than the job function. As outlined in Chapter 3, women face significant challenges entering and working in a male-dominated environment and culture. This is exacerbated for women in non-traditional occupations, where women's experience as a small minority is compounded by their inability to influence the culture even within their own unit or section. The Review found that this leads some women to choose occupations that have a larger number of women:

She said she wanted to be a pilot, and I said "why don't you try?" She goes, "well you're *allowed* to be, but it's a boy's club you need to get through."⁴⁹

I even know pilots that find it difficult to cope with the boy's club thing. So I can only imagine what the female would have to deal with in that sort of environment, purely because [she is] female.⁵⁰

I do have one girl in my workplace now and I love working with her. She's the first one that I've worked directly with, and she's disgusted with all the stuff that I've been through... Today she heard the stuff about apparently the two troops I slept with, and she squashed it straight away, told them to shut up. So that's been really great.⁵¹

From my environment, because it's logistics and females can do pretty much anything in logistics, we're treated just the same as everyone else.⁵²

Usually, the majority of the bad [supervisors] I've come across [are from] engineers and stuff like that that are a male dominated. Whereas ones that work in admin I've found have been fine.⁵³

Attracting and retaining women in non-traditional occupations will require concerted efforts to shift the culture of male dominated categories.

(c) Challenges faced by women in roles dominated by men

As the ADF makes efforts to attract and recruit women to non-traditional occupations, there is a significant burden on women who are 'trail-blazers' and enter non-traditional occupations within the Services. Women in this situation must contend with discriminatory gender stereotypes about their capacity to fulfil the role, as well as their 'rightful' place within the ADF, 'proving themselves' as worthy. This is most visible in fierce resistance by some personnel to opening combat roles to women in Army (see section 5.3). Members from other categories also told the Review of the challenges faced by women working in categories dominated by men:

There's only 18 female pilots out of about 700. The spotlight is going to be on you no matter what you do, whether you're good or bad or whatever and you need to probably step up and act in a more mature way. They'll learn in their own way but it was learning on your feet unfortunately.⁵⁴

I'm in a corps that's just introduced women in the past couple of years and if you want my perspective, I don't think the majority of those women have done our corps any favours and I think what they do is looked at very very critically ...Whereas similar behaviour by a male isn't looked at as anywhere near as significant by a female. Now, that's fundamentally unfair.⁵⁵

If you had a pilots course, which had half guys, half girls, the girls would perform better than if there was just one girl on the course. That's just I think normal.⁵⁶

Measures must be put in place to support women entering these roles and imbue a culture that will facilitate the integration of women. As detailed in the recommendations, this must include ensuring adequate numbers of women in categories (critical mass), positive leadership, mentoring and support.

(d) The impact of workforce reforms on women

The Strategic Reform Program has mandated the civilianisation and centralisation of military support roles (such as human resources, administration, finance, and health).⁵⁷ This will see the transfer of many non-technical support roles to the Australian Public Service. This will have a disproportionate impact on women who dominate these positions and will likely result in a significant decline in women's representation within the Services. To date, the ADF has been unable to provide the Review with a clear indication of which and how many positions will be affected.⁵⁸ However, given the previous analysis of women's concentration in many of the support roles targeted for civilianisation, the impact seems clear.

Members reflected an awareness of these reforms, and an appreciation of the specific impact they will have on women:

I'm in a very small corps. There's not a lot of positions anyway and we're currently privatising it anyway, we're going to civilians... So it's getting harder and harder for us to move around.⁵⁹

Certainly we're trying to save our jobs by proving that you can't live without us so we've got probably about a year to go and step up and make sure that we've got roles to either fulfil or make sure that it gets given away properly.⁶⁰

Some participants also expressed frustration at the way in which the reforms were being implemented:

I've seen my career manager to try and get out of that job. He told me I can't leave 'til 2014. I said to him why is this? He said honestly, it's the Navy's way of trying to make 31 junior sailor writers⁶¹ as unhappy as possible to get them out because they need to lose 31 people out of our branch by 2015.⁶²

Their way of not offering redundancy is trying to keep people as unhappy as they can so that they just get out.⁶³

Swift action is necessary to diversify the categories which women occupy within the three Services to ensure that women's overall representation in the ADF does not decrease significantly as a result of these reforms. As stated by a member of the ADF:

The only way we will see real increase in [women's] participation rate is to find creative ways of attracting women into those ... fields that ... remain unattractive to women.⁶⁴

(e) Defence Force Initiatives to Address Occupational Segregation

The ADF has made efforts to attract and recruit women into non-traditional. These initiatives are outlined in Appendix J.4 and include marketing strategies, profiling women role models and offering increased support. As outlined above, the ability of the ADF to attract more women into non-traditional occupations when compared with similar civilian workplaces demonstrates the relative success of some of these initiatives. Given the large number of non-traditional occupations in the ADF and the importance of occupational segregation as a structural barrier to women's representation in leadership positions, efforts must continue if the ADF is to have a sustainable workforce in the future.

(f) Conclusion

Women in the ADF are heavily concentrated in non-technical and support roles, including administrative, clerical, logistical and health service roles. Concurrently, women are under-represented in war-fighting/combat roles and technical roles. This division has a significant impact on women's career progression and ability to reach leadership positions in the ADF, as it is the categories that have no or very small numbers of women that progress to senior leadership positions, particularly in Army and Air Force (discussed further below in section 5.2). Current reforms aimed at civilianising support roles will only decrease the overall representation of women in the ADF. On a broader level, occupational segregation inhibits women's ability to influence the culture in the ADF and perpetuates gender stereotypes about women's roles and capacity.

Several complementary measures are needed to attract and retain women in a greater diversity of roles and to increase women's representation in leadership positions. This includes renewed efforts to recruit women to non-traditional occupations (including through offering greater workplace flexibility and locational stability), supporting women who do enter these occupations, opening avenues for transfer across occupations, and creating pathways for women to progress to leadership positions.

Re-evaluating the skills and experience needed for leadership roles while simultaneously strengthening efforts to increase the representation of women in a diversity of categories (including those categories that obtain the highest positions), will be critical to addressing the under-representation of women in the ADF generally, and in leadership positions particularly. The next section examines these issues in depth.

5.2 The Under-representation of Women in Leadership

In summary

- Leadership sets the culture and direction of an organisation.
- Where operational leadership is deficient, there is a greater possibility of unacceptable behaviour occurring.
- Leadership training should include material on the link between diversity and capability in order to embed cultural change throughout the ADF.
- Currently, the ADF's senior leaders are overwhelmingly male with most drawn from male dominated categories. This applies also to developmental opportunities such as unit command and deployment.
- Work and family balance issues and the rigid career continuum also contribute to the under-representation of women in leadership roles.

Leadership shapes organisations. It sets the tone, embeds the culture and establishes the direction of any organisation. Currently, the ADF's senior leaders are overwhelmingly male, and drawn from a narrow band of categories. This means that few women have the opportunity to shape the culture of the ADF.

Several issues contribute to the under-representation of women in leadership roles, including occupational segregation, work and family balance issues, and a rigid career continuum. In the context of an increasingly complex, ever-changing and fast-paced workplace, harnessing a more diverse mix of backgrounds and skills in leadership will help the ADF make the most of its existing talent.

This section begins with an examination of organisational culture and how it intersects with concepts of strategic leadership and operational leadership. It then discusses the benefits of diversity in leadership, before examining the under-representation of women in leadership positions in the ADF.

(a) Leadership and culture

Strong leadership, and the values, principles and behaviours that inform and flow from it, are an essential part of any large organisation, particularly one with the unique mission of the ADF. Leaders give explicit and implicit cues to individual members about the conduct and values expected of them.

Leadership and organisational culture are closely related. The ADF's leadership doctrine notes that 'an organisation's culture will determine who will lead and what leadership styles and behaviours are acceptable,' but also that strategic leadership shapes ADF culture.⁶⁵ For this reason, a brief examination of the cultural norms associated with ADF leadership is required.

The ADF's values and beliefs draw on Australian civic ideas, like 'a fair go' and 'understanding, tolerance and inclusion'.⁶⁶ These values are complemented by a broad concept of military culture, a 'largely rules-based, conservative and traditional' system that relies on discipline and structure.⁶⁷ The ADF leadership doctrine notes that military culture can encourage cohesiveness and organisational commitment, but it can also stifle initiative and lead to exclusion.⁶⁸ This can create challenges for those leading an organisation undergoing dynamic cultural change.

The recent Review of Personal Conduct undertaken by MAJGEN Craig Orme found that:

[a]t the root cause of some of the failures in personal conduct has been a failure of a predominantly male culture to respond appropriately to women in the work environment...Where leaders do not condemn or eradicate this behaviour it is taken to be acceptable conduct. Women are positioned as the 'Other.'⁶⁹

Implicit in this observation is the need for the culture of the ADF to evolve to become more inclusive of women.

As discussed in Chapter 1, maintaining a relevant and ready force in an increasingly complex and fast-paced workplace will require the ADF to draw upon all of the diversity of talent and skill present in the Australian community.⁷⁰ The challenge for the ADF's leaders will be to create a culture in which this talent is widely valued, and can contribute to performance and capability.

(b) Operational leadership

While strategic leadership sets organisational direction and culture, operational leadership embeds this culture in everyday practice. This in turn shapes the experience of individual members of the ADF and the public with whom they interact. If there is dissonance between strategic and organisational leadership, this can result in less than optimum performance from both individuals and the organisation.⁷¹

The Review had the opportunity to observe some of the very best of operational leadership in the ADF. Where good leadership was evident, units functioned well, workplace culture was healthy, and the experience of personnel was positive. Many environments the Review visited exemplified all the best elements of professionalism, loyalty, integrity, courage, innovation and teamwork.⁷² This was particularly so in the deployed environment where the sense of pride, shared endeavour and mission focus demonstrated a high functioning, respectful and harmonious culture.

The Review is also aware of less than optimal and deficient leadership. Where this was evident morale was impacted, workplace conditions were compromised, and there was an increased danger of unacceptable behaviour occurring. In fact, where the Review encountered incidents, or was told of unacceptable behaviour occurring, poor leadership was almost always a factor. Submissions also described examples of leadership that was inconsistent, hostile or aggressive, not consultative, or unable or unwilling to deal with unacceptable behaviour.⁷³

The ADF seeks to avoid inconsistencies in leadership practice by providing a broad range of leadership education and training materials to personnel throughout their careers.⁷⁴ This could be enhanced by incorporating some of the compelling arguments made by the organisation's most senior leaders about the links between diversity and improved organisational performance.⁷⁵ An increased focus on the benefits of diversity in the ADF would help align operational leadership with the organisation's strategic objectives.

(c) The strategic corporal

The Review encountered many examples in the ADF where junior leaders held roles of great influence over organisational outcomes and culture. This is in line with the U.S. General Charles Krulak's influential work about the importance of low-level leaders – or 'strategic corporals' – within contemporary military forces.⁷⁶

In these instances junior officers and NCOs play a critical role in shaping the attitudes and thinking of their subordinates, and transmitting 'ADF culture' to the next generation of personnel. This was particularly so in recruit and training environments where the desire of recruits/trainees to 'fit in' and model success was most evident. In fact, it is difficult to overestimate the impact of personnel at this level of the organisation in shaping acceptable attitudes and modelling behaviour. Senior leaders at every training environment visited by the Review understood the importance of having the best people in these positions, because of their role as 'cultural ambassadors'.

Given the influential positions held by junior leaders, greater engagement and dialogue up and down the chain of command has the potential to increase collaboration and offer leaders the information they need to lead cohesive and high functioning teams. The Review encountered a number of instances where leadership had been grappling for some time with the integration of women into combat roles in a training environment, but had not consulted with subordinates on these matters, many of whom believed that they had useful suggestions to contribute, or were thinking in different ways.⁷⁷ Though the ADF's command environment relies on a rank structure and hierarchy which does not always naturally lead to dialogue between leaders and followers, such dialogue can provide more information and viewpoints to leaders, be a forum to stress-test ideas and positions, and improve leadership outcomes.⁷⁸

In a workforce where lower-level leaders hold positions of strategic significance, greater interaction between senior and junior leaders will help to better align strategic and organisational leadership goals, and improve organisational performance.

(d) Leadership and diversity

The ADF has the opportunity to lead Australia and its military peers in creating more inclusive environments, and improved leadership outcomes.

The Review examined the volumes of leadership training material provided across the ADF. This material is detailed and well-structured, but is silent on developing, monitoring and evaluating the specific skills of managing diversity and flexibility. There should be a broad organisational understanding of diversity as a core defence value and an operational imperative, linked to capability and effectiveness.

The ADF's leadership doctrine addresses the issue of diversity as a 'contemporary issue for leaders'.⁷⁹ The doctrine also acknowledges that women are under-represented in leadership positions and suggests the ADF 'still has some way to go in terms of valuing the perspective offered by females'.⁸⁰ However, it is only at the most senior ranks that there is a requirement to 'communicate the value of harnessing diversity for the organisation',⁸¹ a message that is not necessarily being heard across all ranks of the organisation. A special focus is required to build the particular skills, knowledge and attitudes required to lead a diverse and flexible workforce.

(e) The Impact of Occupational Segregation on Women in Leadership Positions

In civilian environments, occupational segregation can result in more women attaining the highest positions within their occupations as a larger number of women competing for appointments leads to a greater likelihood that they will be promoted.⁸² This does not necessarily operate in the same way in the ADF, resulting from several factors. First, appointments to senior officer positions – generalist executive positions for which personnel can be drawn from any category – appear to favour skills and experience obtained by working in male dominated categories.⁸³ Second, there are limited opportunities in many of these categories for appointment to career advancing jobs, command positions, deployment and operational experience, all of which have an impact on women's competitiveness for promotions.

Below is an analysis of the Review's key findings in relation to the impact of occupational segregation on women's ability to attain leadership positions.

(i) Underrepresentation of women in leadership positions

An analysis of appointments to the most senior officer roles in the ADF over the past ten years confirms that these positions are being sourced from male dominated categories. For example:⁸⁴

- The CDF has either been from Infantry (a category from which women have been precluded) or a Pilot (2.5% of whom are women).

- The position of Chief of Navy has been filled by a Maritime Warfare Officer. Women make up 16% of this category, but remain vastly under-represented in senior officer appointments drawn from it.
- The position of Chief of Army has been filled from Infantry, or Engineering (3% of whom are women).
- The position of Chief of Air Force has been filled by a Pilot since 1921.⁸⁵

The impact of occupational segregation on women in leadership is further evidenced by an analysis of the categories from which generalist star ranked officers are appointed.⁸⁶ Not all officers are General Service Officers (GSO). There are also Specialist Service Officers (SSO), who are professionally qualified personnel appointed as officers in order to practice their specialisations in the Services. SSOs are a minority among the entire officer corps, are not subject to the same general ab initio training, and follow different career paths to GSOs. For these reasons, GSOs and SSOs are examined separately below.

In Army, 40% of generalist star ranked officers are drawn from the Infantry Corps and Armoured Corps from which women are currently precluded. There are no generalist star ranked officers from many of the categories in which women are concentrated such as Nursing, Dental, Psychology, Education, Pay, Medical, Public Relations and Band.⁸⁷

In Air Force, 58% of the generalist star ranked officers are currently drawn from personnel in the Aircrew category, yet women represent only 5.2% of the permanent forces in this category. A further 34.6% of generalist star ranked officers are currently drawn from personnel in Engineering and Logistics yet women represent only 15% of this category. There are no generalist star ranked officers from some of the categories in which women are concentrated, such as Intelligence.⁸⁸

In Navy, there are no generalist star ranked officers originating from categories in which women are highly represented, such as Administration, Instructor, Health Services, Training Systems and Intelligence.⁸⁹

Unsurprisingly, these facts lead to a vast under-representation of women across all the star ranks. Currently:

- Navy has 52 generalist star ranked officers, and only one (1.9%) is a woman.⁹⁰ Additionally, out of three specialist star ranked officers, there are currently two women from the Health Services category.⁹¹
- Army has 71 generalist star ranked officers, and four (5.6%) are women.⁹² Additionally, out of the three specialist star ranked officers there is currently one woman from the Legal category.⁹³
- Air Force has 53 generalist star ranked officers, and one (1.9%) is a woman.⁹⁴ Additionally, out of the two specialist star ranked officers, there is currently one woman from the Health Services category.⁹⁵

Even among this senior group, women tend to be more lowly ranked senior officers. In Navy, one woman is a rear admiral and the other two are at the commodore rank.⁹⁶ In Army, the five women are all brigadiers.⁹⁷ In Air Force, one woman is an air vice-marshal and the other is an air commodore.⁹⁸

The impact of occupational segregation on women in leadership is not only an issue in the officer ranks. Within the trained forces in other ranks, women are not represented in warrant officer positions at a number proportionate to their percentage in other ranks. For example, in Navy, women make up 18% of other ranks, but only 6.4% of warrant officers.⁹⁹ In Army, women make up 8.7% of other ranks and 8.4% of warrant officer class 1.¹⁰⁰ In Air Force, women make up 16% of other ranks but only 8% of warrant officers.¹⁰¹ Likely factors contributing to this under-representation include the small size of many of the categories that women dominate, resulting in fewer warrant officer positions, the legacy of formal exclusions and the time it takes to climb the ranks.¹⁰²

The fact that personnel occupying the most senior ranks in each Service are often drawn from male dominated roles, particularly war-fighting roles, has resulted in very few women in leadership positions.

(ii) Occupational segregation and command

One of the key career gateways for progression to a ‘senior officer’ position is assuming command of a unit.¹⁰³ Women are currently under-represented in command positions, and this has implications for addressing the under-representation of women among senior officers in the near future. An analysis of the categories from which those in command roles are drawn bears similarities to the senior officer breakdown. In Army, 29.6% of command positions are in categories from which women have been precluded,¹⁰⁴ and in Air Force 22% of command positions are in the Aircrew category that has a representation of only 5.2% women.¹⁰⁵

- In Navy, out of a total of 91 command positions currently occupied, women occupy only six (6.6%).¹⁰⁶ Four women currently occupy shore command positions, and they are from Marine Engineering, Administration and Supply. Two women hold minor sea command positions, both of whom are Maritime Warfare Officers.¹⁰⁷
- In Army, out of a total of 81 command positions, women currently occupy four (4.9%). The positions currently occupied by women are within the Signals Corps, Education Corps, Medical Corps and Psychology Corps.¹⁰⁸
- In Air Force, of the 127 command positions, women currently occupy 16 of (12.5%).¹⁰⁹ This figure is slightly lower than the percentage of women in eligible ranks (squadron leaders, wing commanders and group captains) – 14.9%.¹¹⁰ The categories of the 16 women currently serving in command positions are Support Operations, Aircrew, Engineering and Logistics, Electronics Engineer, Operations, and Health Services.

A gender breakdown of key leadership positions throughout the workforce pipeline indicates that women remain under-represented in developmental roles that currently act as gateways to senior leadership. The skills and experiences that women bring to the ADF are not being fully exploited within the current workforce model. The ADF should create pathways through non-warfighting categories in order to increase diversity in leadership. With an increasingly complex workplace requiring an agile and diverse leadership, the ADF should better exploit the leadership talent of both men and women.

(iii) Deployment and operational experience

Deployment and operational experience are also important gateways for career advancement in many categories and promotion gateways.¹¹¹ In relation to promotional prospects, one member told the Review that:

If you don't have operational service compared to someone who does and everything else was the same the one with the operational service would get it.¹¹²

Another member similarly noted that:

[Deployment] obviously makes me more competitive.¹¹³

Women are deployed in slightly lower numbers than their representation in each Service. Women represent 14.4% of deployed Navy personnel, 8% of the deployed Army personnel and 15% of deployed Air Force personnel, the proportion of women from each category deployed being fairly equal to their representation in that category.¹¹⁴ Yet, the Review heard from personnel during focus groups, particularly in Army, that many of the categories with higher proportions of women are infrequently deployed:

I've never been deployed [and] the only time I've been offered was last year. So nearly 14 years I've never been given the opportunity.¹¹⁵

You've got young nurses and medics here who are not getting those opportunities and they should be.¹¹⁶

A clear picture was not available regarding the categories that are more or less likely to deploy and the resulting impact on women. The type of deployment will largely determine the skills and qualifications, and thus categories that are required to deploy. The frequency with which women may need to deploy in Navy is also affected by the number of bunks on vessels that are designated for women. In some cases this leads to women being deployed more frequently than they wish and, in other cases, missing opportunities to deploy:

It all comes down to bunk allocation at sea and so sometimes they need four women versus six blokes and you can't just post another guy because then your cabin is not right or your space is not right, so I think as a female you're sort of disadvantaged.¹¹⁷

Some women are in categories that are less likely to be deployed and sent on operations, which can leave them at a disadvantage in terms of the critical skills currently valued among senior leadership positions.

Addressing the impacts of occupational segregation on women's career progression will require reviewing the custom and practice of selecting the most senior strategic leadership positions in the ADF from combat corps codes. The promotions process should be redesigned with the object of selecting leadership positions from a broader group of meritorious candidates, particularly women.

It will also require establishing targets for personnel from non war-fighting corps for key promotional gateways such as Australian Command and Staff College (ACSC), the Centre for Defence and Strategic Studies (CDSS) and other equivalent gateways. A senior officer has suggested that certain strategic roles that do not require combat and/or operational experience should be quarantined for personnel from other categories.¹¹⁸ This would facilitate bringing a diversity of skills and experience into the ADF's senior leadership, while expanding the promotional pathways for personnel in a range of categories. The Review suggests the ADF examines this further, including how it could be implemented in a way to ensure it does not create further delineation and hierarchy between war-fighting and other roles.

(iv) Rank ceilings and other structural barriers

Officer and other rank focus group participants also revealed a perception that there are 'rank ceilings' in many of the categories dominated by women that precludes them from advancing their careers:

We're pretty much sealed at Corporal, because once you go above that you don't have the skill sets required for it, especially in my trade. I can't be a troop sergeant. I don't do what these guys do so I can't tell a bunch of guys who can do more than I can how to do it! So you know why would I want to go and grab a bunch of chicks in my corps and go this is a really cool place, come over here, and be rank sealed.¹¹⁹

Most of our women are employed in fields like training, nursing, administration and health support – and in these non-operational fields, neither men or women in the Air Force can rise above the rank of Group Captain.¹²⁰

The Review was informed that where rank ceilings exist, there are pathways for personnel to re-skill and change specialisations/categories to enable them to progress further in their careers.¹²¹ This may require some time and also depend on the availability of positions within those categories. The Review considers that there would be benefit in examining the impact that any rank ceilings may have on its workforce, and its ability to draw on a diverse range of skills and talents for senior leadership positions.

In Army, two further structural barriers appear to impede the ability of women to progress to senior leadership positions. First, given women are disproportionately represented in categories with a very small number of personnel, there are fewer positions in higher ranks into which women can move. For example, while the percentage of positions at lieutenant rank in Nursing is much higher than in Engineers, there are far fewer posts in higher ranks in Nursing. In fact, there are generally only one or two colonel/warrant office class 1 posts in the majority of the categories that women dominate.¹²² Within the Dental Corps (the category with the highest representation of women), there are only two lieutenant colonel positions (currently filled by women) and no colonel positions.¹²³ By contrast, Engineers have 16 colonel and 67 lieutenant colonel positions (of which women presently only occupy one colonel post).¹²⁴

While women's progression to the higher ranks within these categories is more assured given their large numbers, their concentration in small categories negatively impacts the number of women in leadership positions overall. This means that the proportion of women in leadership positions in the Army will remain low while women are entering categories that have limited opportunities for progression. Appendix J.3 illustrates the distribution of ranks in each category.¹²⁵

The second structural barrier to women's progression in Army appears to lie in the practice of 'corps coding' jobs – designating which categories can work in particular jobs based on a determination of which categories foster the skills necessary. The impact of corps coding is that many of the categories dominated by men (such as Infantry, Armoured and Artillery) are identified for particular roles, many of which are strategic jobs for career advancement (such as staff officer positions).¹²⁶ This precludes talented personnel from other categories – both men and women – from competing for these positions. As one member stated:

Jobs are 'Corps coded' as a way of identifying and managing the required skillset, but this can be unduly limiting and is a blunt form of management. With modern databases, matching specific skillsets with personnel could be achieved with greater precision and less traditional forms of identification and discrimination.¹²⁷

The ADF should review the current prioritisation of male-dominated skills for key jobs, and examine the possibility of quarantining strategic jobs for personnel from non war-fighting/operational categories to provide pathways to higher ranks for these personnel.¹²⁸

(v) Gender Pay Gap

The gender pay gap is the difference between male and female earnings expressed as a percentage of male earnings.¹²⁹ Given the analysis above, it is likely that occupational segregation contributes to a gender pay gap in the ADF.

Since the ADF has a regulated salary scheme, women are not vulnerable to inequitable pay scales for doing the same job as men. However, as illustrated in section 4.1 women's representation gradually reduces as rank increases. As discussed above, women are also concentrated in occupations that have fewer opportunities for promotion and are under-represented in senior ranks. This may correlate with a lower average pay for women than men in the ADF. It may be useful for the ADF to examine the potential existence of a gender pay gap, as well as its implications for women in the ADF.

(f) Conclusion

Leadership is central to the ADF. The concept of leadership is more than command and control, and setting rules. Rather, it sets the tone of the organisation, impacts on the experiences of personnel, and shapes the Australian public's perceptions.

The ADF is served by skilful and committed senior leadership which reflects the monocultural nature of the ADF's past, rather than the more diverse future that it faces. Given that greater representation of women in leadership has been shown to correlate with better performance in a range of industries, a greater representation of women in leadership positions will help the ADF's evolution to a more inclusive and gender equal culture and assist the ADF in engaging the workforce that it needs, an imperative that the ADF acknowledges.¹³⁰

Many members of the ADF told the Review that, in general, men and women are treated identically, and that promotion is based on merit, not gender. Many also said that, as more women entered the ADF there would be a 'trickle up' effect over time as an increased number of women move through the pipeline into leadership positions. The Review does not agree. This Chapter and Chapter 4 have highlighted the occupational segregation that currently exists and the opportunities that flow from certain jobs; the work and family issues that impact differentially on women (as also discussed in Chapter 6); the career management structures that are predicated on full-time unbroken service; and the patchy mentoring and support services (discussed below). For these reasons, increased numbers of women and time will not, by themselves, lead to more women in leadership.

Instead, structural impediments require interventions – namely, targets – which must be directed specifically to women, despite inevitable organisational resistance.

Given the barriers identified and the lack of success to date, targets are required to drive the cultural change that will benefit women, men, and the ADF as an organisation – a message which must be carried by the ADF's leaders. Demonstrated commitment to retaining and promoting the best talent, regardless of gender, will maintain ADF leadership in this area.

5.3 Women in Combat: Removal of Gender Restrictions

In summary

- The removal of gender restrictions from combat roles is an important step in providing women in the ADF equal opportunity in their work and career progression. Women will be able to compete for all positions on the basis of merit and ability, rather than being excluded from some because of their gender.
- There is opposition towards the policy shift in some areas of the ADF and strong criticism from ADF members of the messaging and communication so far.
- The ADF has developed an implementation plan and communication strategy to explain the removal of gender restrictions and each Service is developing its own plan to align with this.
- The emphasis to date has been on the Physical Employment Standards Review. Implementation should also address the significant cultural and attitudinal barriers which exist to women taking up these roles, particularly in Army, which has the largest proportion of jobs from which women have previously been excluded.
- The responsibility for a successful transition to mixed gender teams must lay with the leadership of the team and all team members, not just the women entering these roles.
- The implementation plan must ensure that leaders and teams are engaged and educated about how they can contribute to effective performance in mixed gender environments.
- Given the small numbers of women likely to consider corps transfer in the initial transition phase, a minimum cohort of women in each mixed gender team is needed to ensure a safe and supportive environment for women choosing these roles.
- There is learning to be shared by Navy and Air Force who have had women in 'combat' roles for some time.

In 2011, the Minister for Defence, the Hon Stephen Smith, and Minister for Defence Science and Personnel, the Hon Warren Snowdon, announced the Government had formally agreed 'to the removal of gender restrictions from ADF combat roles'.¹³¹

Until this announcement, women were precluded from employment in certain roles involving 'direct combat duties'. At the time of the announcement, these restricted roles made up around 2.2% of roles in Navy,¹³² 2.4% of roles in Air Force,¹³³ and 14.6% of roles in Army.¹³⁴ The current impact of the restrictions on women is outlined in Appendix K.2.

However, women have long been involved in combat operations in the ADF, across the Navy, the Army and the Air Force. Since the 1990s, a considerable number of combat positions have become open to women. It is important to note that the significance of allowing women into formerly restricted categories will be

greater for Army than in Navy or Air Force. In Navy, for example, the Clearance Diver category – the only remaining category from which women have been excluded – comprises a very small proportion of the Navy workforce. In Army, on the other hand, Infantry, Artillery and Armoured Corps make up almost a third of the Regular Army.¹³⁵ The existing policy on the ‘Direct Combat exclusion’ is outlined in Appendix K.1. This Defence Instruction will be reviewed in light of the 2011 announcement. Although this measure alone will not significantly increase the representation and leadership of women in the ADF in the short term, this policy change is a welcome step in providing women with equal opportunity to men in their work and career progression. Women who aspire to work in a combat position that was previously excluded will now be able to compete for those positions on the basis of merit and ability. The announcement also paves the way for Australia to remove a reservation against full ratification of the *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women* and an existing exemption for Defence under the *Sex Discrimination Act* which allows discrimination against women in relation to combat duties.¹³⁶

It is important to note that in opening up units which have been exclusively male-dominated the onus for women to succeed in formerly restricted roles should not rest solely on the shoulders of the women who choose them. The responsibility for a successful transition to mixed gender teams is shared by their male counterparts and by leadership. The ADF must articulate and address the cultural and attitudinal barriers which exist to women taking up these roles.

As noted above, it must be recognised that, despite the formal lifting of combat restrictions on women being a recent development, women have already been serving ‘on the frontline’. For example, in Navy, women have served on ships and submarines in combat roles on operational (active) service at sea since the Gulf War, in ‘frontline’ roles, and have been pilots in deployed environments in Air Force. In Army, women are also serving in operational land environments, and can operate unmanned aerial vehicles in artillery, surface-to-air missiles and ground-based air defence systems.¹³⁷

Traditional ideas of the ‘frontline’ and delineation of the combat zone have been blurred in recent operational deployments, such as Afghanistan. The changing nature of combat means that the risks may be equal to both men and women in any roles. As one writer notes:

The myth that soldiers in combat roles face more danger than those...far removed from the theatre of operations must be dispelled because new advances in military technology...have made all areas of duty equally dangerous. In low-intensity conflict there is no ‘front’ in the conventional sense, or rather the front is everywhere and all soldiers are equally at risk.¹³⁸

In recognition of the changing nature of combat and the fact that women are frequently serving in roles on the ‘frontline’ (though not currently in those roles which are designated ‘direct combat’ roles), for the purposes of this Report, this policy shift will be referred to as the ‘Removal of Gender Restrictions’, rather than ‘women in combat’. Given that the biggest potential impact of the most recent policy announcement will be on Army, this was most often the focus of discussion in consultations for this Review. The following discussion in the Report reflects this focus.

(a) Implementation plan

The removal of gender restrictions was announced with a staged implementation over five years. A key component of the implementation plan is a review of the physical standards required for employment in ADF roles. This is discussed further below.

The ADF has advised that the initial focus of implementation will be on the in-service transfer of currently serving ADF members into those restricted categories from January 2013. Direct civilian recruitment into these roles is unlikely to commence until 2016.

The ADF’s intention is that this initial focus on in-Service transfers will help to address the challenges associated with transitioning to mixed gender teams. The aim is to build a critical mass of experienced women who can provide a strong mentoring framework over the three years for ab initio recruits entering into those roles.¹³⁹ The Review agrees with this approach.

As well as allowing time to establish women in these categories, this transition phase will allow the Services to consider other aspects of implementation such as:

- changes to training and equipment (for example, whether changes need to be made to body armour)
- whether suitable infrastructure and facilities are available for women in training establishments, squadrons, headquarters and accommodation in areas where only men were traditionally serving
- ensuring that a consistent message is communicated across the whole implementation period both within Defence and in the community
- ensuring that the recruiting model brings in people with adequate physical standards at the outset so their training continuum is not broken up 'sitting in holding platoons' while they achieve required physical standards
- drawing on knowledge and experience from other countries such as Canada and New Zealand
- dealing with cultural change, education and social and psychological impacts of the change in policy.

Each of the Services is developing its own implementation plan to align with this.¹⁴⁰

(b) Physical Employment Standards Review (PES Review)

A key component of the implementation plan for the Removal of Gender Restrictions is the Physical Employment Standards (PES) Review Project currently being conducted by the Defence, Science and Technology Organisation (DSTO) in partnership with the University of Wollongong.¹⁴¹

The PES Review is an ongoing project within Defence looking at identifying occupationally-specific physical standards (ie the physical capacity required to perform a particular occupation). Its aim is to establish benchmarks for aerobic and anaerobic performance, muscle endurance and strength, based on essential tasks of particular trades and to develop occupationally relevant physical fitness tests.¹⁴²

This research project was originally endorsed in November 2001 and has been an active work in progress since 2006. Although its original focus was on reduction of injury and rehabilitation in particular Army trades, it became apparent that the research could support the identification of objective criteria for physical standards across every trade.

Momentum developed to advance this work in relation to combat trade categories, to support a change in policy to remove gender restrictions and allow for the enlistment of individuals with appropriate physical capacity to perform essential tasks of that category safely and effectively, irrespective of gender. Funding was accordingly allocated in the 2009 Defence White Paper.¹⁴³

The PES review may also have potential benefits in:

- helping to guide recruits to occupations for which they are most physically suited
- facilitating access to occupations traditionally closed to particular groups on the basis of physical readiness for tasks
- contributing to significant savings for Defence as a result of lower healthcare and compensation costs by reducing trade related injuries.¹⁴⁴

The ADF has advised that the assessment of standards will be 'based on core baseline standards (for combat arms and combat support) and specific standards to each trade (trade specific)'.¹⁴⁵ In the meantime, the Basic Fitness Assessment (which accommodates different standards for men and women) will remain the basic entry benchmark:

We might know for example if you want to be a combat diver in Navy that this is exactly the physical requirements you need but we don't yet know if you want to join off the street to be a Navy diver what the physical entry standards should be here when you've got an 18 month training regime. So what sort of physical continuum can be accommodated.¹⁴⁶

DSTO released an interim report in September 2011 on the outcomes of research and consultation with training and trade staff and 'employment category sponsors' to identify the most physically demanding trades and tasks. A second report released in December 2011 outlined recommendations for physical standards and relevant assessments for review by the ADF. DSTO noted that before a 'fitness-for-duty' regime could be formally implemented across the ADF:

Any potential adverse impacts associated with the adoption of PES to assess employment suitability would need to be evaluated. This work is critical if sex based restrictions are to be removed and physical standards and assessments are used as the basis to determine entry into ADF employment categories.¹⁴⁷

Defence has also advised that there has been preliminary testing of the new physical standards in some locations. This is discussed further below.

The PES Review does not focus on non-physical attributes which may be required for particular roles, such as psychological fitness or intelligence testing. To assess a person's suitability for a role in relation to these non-physical factors, the ADF is relying on mechanisms that it already has in place, such as initial entry psychometric testing and ongoing performance reporting.¹⁴⁸

Although these methods of testing are 'tinkered with routinely',¹⁴⁹ it is unclear whether these existing measures will sufficiently address issues for women entering into those restricted roles for the first time. It is critical that the impact of the policy change be evaluated in relation to non-physical aspects, such as resilience and psychological suitability.

The PES Review is also looking at developing a model to change the current physical training and conditioning regime so that it better aligns with the new physical standards.¹⁵⁰ This will allow people time to condition their physical ability to the new standards and plan for transfer of trade if they are unable to meet the standards.¹⁵¹ Again, it is important to consider non-physical standards as part of the implementation plan.

(i) Views on the review of physical standards

Senior leaders responsible for implementation of the removal of gender restrictions have advised that the primary message communicated to ADF personnel frames the removal of gender restrictions/PES review in terms of 'capability', rather than as a gender equality or diversity issue:

It's not about an extension of our equity & diversity campaign, you know, this is purely about generating capability. And if we're going to sustain the numbers and the quality of individuals that we need to staff our Defence Force into the future, then we have to be doing this. That's the business case.¹⁵²

It was noted that 'to a certain degree' this message was 'either accepted or not'.¹⁵³

The second message communicated is that only physical and overall ability to do a particular job should restrict opportunities and that the PES review provides the 'framework that enables us to make those objective assessments'.¹⁵⁴ Some views in focus groups accepted the validity of the policy change in those terms:

The vast majority of men in our Defence Force, like all of us, are just looking for critical parts of the team, and you bring a critical skill to my team that I need. I think [physical employment standards are] more about an evolution about Defence Force acknowledging that our soldiers have to be physically competent. It will be a far reaching change for everyone, not just for females. Will we have women driving tanks and women on the frontline with infantry? Well absolutely, if they choose to do it.¹⁵⁵

Army has conducted some trials (including with women) of the new physical standards. These have been viewed positively with 'encouraging' results:

There was a big test that was done to validate during a mission rehearsal exercise up in Townsville. Everybody who was going over to the Middle East area of operation was run through the, the new testing regime. It was interesting, I think there was about a 70% pass rate.¹⁵⁶

Overall, the ADF reports that feedback on the introduction of new PES from personnel is positive and members accept that the new PES will be more relevant to specific job requirements.

In consultations, however, members expressed mixed views about the changes. In one focus group, it was noted that an improvement in fitness standards would be welcomed and that 'there are a lot of men who aren't going to be able to pass that as well as women':¹⁵⁷

There's currently a lot of people in infantry that are real slugs and aren't really achieving the mark but because they're there, they're going to stay there.¹⁵⁸

Some noted that the standards may be too high for women to achieve, risking injuries:

I think from literature that I've read, women are more likely to experience injuries during the course of training due to perhaps their [Body Mass Index], due to their height, due to their pelvis shape. We're going to be putting those women at high risk of injury right from the start. My concern is that the bar is being set so high with the PES standards that we're automatically going to be excluding women from achieving that.¹⁵⁹

Others agreed that because the ADF had a 'duty of care to not injure people' and that women were coming in with a greater risk of injury, implementation of PES needed to be monitored.¹⁶⁰

In several focus groups, participants commented on the disconnect between awareness and expectations about the requirements of recruit training, and actual experiences, particularly for Army. The Review also heard that this led to injuries and recruits getting 'broken'. Some participants noted that PES could be useful if incorporated into a functional screening process at the recruitment stage, appropriate to the duties a person will undertake:

I've had one guy who had just recently come to us with six months of shin pain prior to enlistment, was in rehab for eight weeks ...He's short and overweight and they pushed him through to the challenge... he doesn't want to be in Infantry, and it creates an administrative nightmare for us... So, if someone like that is identified at recruitment that's a lot of cost saving benefits to Defence¹⁶¹

In many focus groups, there were concerns expressed that standards would be lowered. For example, one participant was critical of a 'watering down' of standards in infantry:

With the infantry corp, we've watered down things for people that are overweight, we've watered down things for people that are having mental issues. We've watered down everything for males right now and if there's another watering down on top of that because there are females, it's just untenable for people to think that's acceptable.¹⁶²

With the process, I don't think they should change it for females and males. So say you've got to do 100 push-ups, you've got to do 100 push-ups; you can't say alright, you've got to do 100, you can do 50. They've got to keep it the same scale throughout the whole thing.¹⁶³

(c) International experiences of gender restrictions on combat roles

(i) The impact of gender restrictions on participation rates

In Chapter 9, this Report examines the situation of women in international defence forces with cultural and historical similarities to Australia. Canada, the Netherlands, Norway and New Zealand have all officially removed restrictions on women's participation in combat roles, albeit with some initial qualifications.¹⁶⁴

Formally removing restrictions on women does not automatically lead to women occupying these roles or to other cultural barriers being removed. A brief examination of comparable countries shows that, despite the vast majority formally opening combat roles to women, the levels of participation in the forces overall plays a role in the lower representation of women in senior positions.

For example, the table below shows comparative participation of women in some overseas defence forces in 2008-09 (i.e. prior to the removal of gender restrictions in the ADF):

Table 5.1: Comparative Participation of Women in Overseas Defence Forces

Country ¹⁶⁵	Women in Permanent Force	Combat duties restriction
Australia (as at August 2009)	13.5%	Yes
New Zealand (as at June 2009)	17.0%	No
United States (as at 2007)	12.0%	Yes
France (as at June 2008)	13.9%	No
Canada (as at March 2009)	17.0%	No
United Kingdom (as at June 2008)	9.3%	Yes
Germany (as at September 2009)	13.7%	No

International research appears to show that the greater the presence of women as Defence personnel – both in terms of the breadth of the roles they occupy, as well as their presence in leadership positions – the more likely their acceptance by their male colleagues. This research strongly indicates that the prohibition on women serving in combat roles is a major barrier to their successful integration across all aspects of the services, whether combat related or not; as well as to their access to leadership positions.¹⁶⁶

The Review met with a Canadian Forces delegation that included women who had served in combat roles to discuss their experiences. Canada removed almost all restrictions on employment of women following a Canadian Human Rights Tribunal decision in 1989.¹⁶⁷ The Tribunal’s decision allowed a phased implementation process, with the goal of completely integrating women into all roles by 1999.

Participation rates of women following the decision changed little for most of the 1990s, because of a downsizing of the Regular Force in early 1990, with the highest rates of women continuing to remain in traditionally feminised occupations.¹⁶⁸

(ii) The importance of strong leadership

The Canadian delegation told the Review that, during its first ten years, Canada’s integration of women into combat roles faced serious problems relating to leadership:

When we did the research the leaders at the unit level, where effectiveness is very important, that’s where it happens, they felt that they couldn’t lead effectively. They didn’t think they had the right skills to motivate and train women and they weren’t convinced that women were there for the right reasons.¹⁶⁹

For the Canadian Army, the transition to mixed gender combat arms units was a leadership challenge and a breakdown in unit cohesion occurred where there was:

- inequitable leadership and discipline
- favouritism or harassment of distinct groups
- fraternisation (especially within the chain of command)
- isolation and segregation of distinct groups.¹⁷⁰

The Canadian delegation reported that having a minimum cohort of women did not necessarily guarantee that a mixed gender team would be successful. Where minimum cohorts of women were kept together for support through training, in initial trials, if unit leaders were not 'on board' the result was a unit culture which was unsupportive of women:

We had other cases where one or two were in an environment where the leadership was on board – not a problem. So for us it wasn't the issue of numbers and critical amounts, it was leadership and culture.¹⁷¹

The Canadian experience showed that knowledgeable, proactive and effective leadership, particularly at the levels where integration was occurring, was fundamental to success of the initiative.¹⁷² A key component of this was the building of confidence within leadership to deal with the complexity of issues in the transition to mixed gender teams. To this end, a mixed gender leadership education package was rolled out through each Service, the effectiveness of which varied based on the commitment of leadership in delivering it.¹⁷³

Alongside strong leadership, support from the chain of command and peers and strong messaging, was seen as critical for women to be 'working as a team'.

Since the late 1990s, the participation rate of women in the Canadian Forces has increased:

- in 2001 – 1.9% of women were employed in combat arms occupations
- in 2006 – there were 13% women in the regular force, with 3.8% of combat arms posts occupied by women
- in 2009 – 15.1% of Canadian Forces members were women. Despite these efforts towards full integration of women, the percentage of women in combat arms roles only increased from 0.3% in 1989 to 3.8% in 2006.

The introduction of mixed gender teams in the Canadian Forces, despite some resistance, appears to have provided the opportunity for women to contribute to the evolution of culture across the organization and to operational effectiveness.¹⁷⁴

(iii) Other international experiences

The Netherlands and Scandinavian forces have also integrated women in combat teams.¹⁷⁵ In 2009, the Netherlands deployed the first all-female foot patrol in Afghanistan and have actively sought to deploy more women to crisis-response operations and focus more attention on gender aspects and their effects before, during and after the operations.¹⁷⁶

The US currently continues to exclude women from serving in combat roles, defined as 'assignments to units and positions below the brigade level whose primary mission is to engage in direct combat on the ground.'¹⁷⁷ The Pentagon recently announced its decision to open *support* roles to women permanently assigned to combat units, with a promise to 'continue to open as many positions as possible to women'. It is estimated that this will open over 14,000 active-duty and reserve jobs previously off-limits, including combat medic, artillery mechanic, communications expert and other critical warfare posts.¹⁷⁸ It is reported that the Marine Corps Infantry Officers Course has also been recently opened to women, with 'new functional fitness tests' being developed to establish 'gender-neutral standards'.¹⁷⁹

In practice, despite formal restrictions, the demand for troops during the decade of war in Iraq and Afghanistan has meant that women already serve in many of these roles as temporary 'attachments' to combat units and ground battalions – often receiving the same combat training and being exposed to the same risks as men.¹⁸⁰

As some commentators have observed, even though women are serving in these 'frontline' roles, the full extent of their contribution and capabilities is not recognised by formal policy, meaning that 'their service and suffering remain ignored by or invisible to the Pentagon and the public'.¹⁸¹

Following the recent decision, formal restrictions continue to operate on women serving in the infantry, in combat tank units and in Special Operations commando units, subject to further review as implementation of the changes progresses.¹⁸²

A 2011 US Report made a number of recommendations in relation to opening up roles to women that included, appropriate physical standards and training, visible support of leaders, a phased in approach to integration of mixed gender teams and recruitment policies. Further discussion on these recommendations is contained in Chapter 9.¹⁸³

(d) Attitudes to lifting gender restrictions in the ADF

(i) Opposition and misperceptions

It is clear that there continues to be significant opposition towards the ADF's policy shift in some areas. One survey respondent made the following comment:

No women should be in combat roles within the army. This is a joke and a disgrace to previous men who have served this country.¹⁸⁴

Members in focus groups expressed similar opinions:

A woman may be able to physically do the job; she may be mentally tough to do the job; she may be able to continue and do all that stuff, but a female in a platoon of 30 guys is not going to work.¹⁸⁵

My fear is that the women who are actually physically capable enough to do this job, it's going to be 5% so out of a hundred blokes if you've got 5 women there, you have to change completely you know the way the blokes do things just for this small portion of women where it's easy just to not have them.¹⁸⁶

There's going to be women out there that can achieve what needs to be achieved, but my issue is for how long, women's bodies do break down.¹⁸⁷

At the end of the day Army's not the place for equality. If you want equality maybe you should look elsewhere. Maybe not the right attitude, but I think I've been around long enough to be able to have a very valid opinion of what I think women should be in and what women shouldn't do.¹⁸⁸

I think it's equality verses practicality. I think you'd struggle to find a person who genuinely believes a female would be as competent in those roles. I think that's a given. Their anatomy, they're not as strong.¹⁸⁹

This is not about equality, it's about equity. I will always send a strong man in to fight a fire before a woman. He will have more endurance. I will use a woman to examine an outgoing mission report. She will pay more attention to detail.¹⁹⁰

This opposition within the ADF speaks to a lack of communication within the ADF about the implementation of the Removal of Gender Restrictions. It was noted that some of the hostility was a way of expressing frustration at not having input into 'this huge policy change'.¹⁹¹ In an Army focus group, one person observed:

NCO's down to even corporals...are massively insulted by this decision that they're being used as a political experiment. It's going to have ramifications...every corporal I've spoken to is 100% against the idea.¹⁹²

Strong criticism emerged in focus groups that ADF members had not been consulted sufficiently prior to the policy change and that communication around the new policy was poor. Many focus group participants were ill or misinformed about the changes. For example, one participant observed:

We had a forum with all the staff and our boss could not answer the questions about lowering standards because they hadn't finalised the PES review. How can you inform people when we don't have all of the supporting policy to back up the fact that 1) we're not going to lower the standards, 2) it's going to be voluntary? We don't have any of those mechanisms in place yet we're briefing the whole Army, in fact the whole Defence Force that this is going ahead but wait, we'll tell you later about the details.¹⁹³

For some participants, the Review's focus groups were the first time the issue had been discussed in an open forum.

Most significantly, there was little understanding in focus groups of the importance of the future capability of the ADF as a rationale for the change in policy. One person questioned whether there had been enough consideration of the impact on capability at all:

I don't agree with women being in infantry. They have a job to do and they have a group dynamic at the lowest level that works to achieve that job. If you put a female into that group, any group, it changes that group dynamic. This isn't about equity in the workplace. They have a tactical job to do and if adding women does not have a negative impact on achieving that mission, then great let's make it work but if it does and it's not a good effect, then I don't think you can justify it.¹⁹⁴

(ii) Facilitating cultural acceptance of mixed gender teams in the ADF

Reasons commonly given for women's exclusion from the military tend to focus on:

- women's fitness to serve, physiological difference and physical weakness
- women's specific health and 'hygiene' issues
- the likelihood of female casualties and beliefs that the Australian community will not tolerate women dying
- the detrimental effect of women on male bonding and team cohesion
- other cultural beliefs and attitudes, such as the emotive argument that women will be raped and that it is the role of government and men to protect women.¹⁹⁵

Studies have shown that it is when women seek to enter non-traditional, 'war-fighting' positions that these types of arguments are frequently raised, while there is much greater acceptance of women being employed in more traditional support roles under operational conditions.¹⁹⁶

These same concerns were frequently raised in consultations. One focus group participant said:

I don't think it's just about a death though. I'm a strong girl and I'm fit but I'm still not at the level of the lowest man, so is the Australian public ready for all these women who are going to get injured because it's not about passing a course, it's about maintaining that level and they're going to be hurt and it's going to be in big numbers.¹⁹⁷

Others also noted the perception that women were seen as needing protection and the risk that this could be a distraction in battle situations:

In a way men have in their minds they're the protector of other people. They'd worry about themselves first and they'd put their mates second but if there's a woman there, it's more 'is she okay?' It's just natural instinct to look after women.¹⁹⁸

Another focus group participant did not consider this 'protective' attitude as being gender specific:

I've also noticed that we have some members who may be slightly weaker than me, they'll actually help them first so it's not so much about protecting the female, it is protecting somebody or assisting someone who is physically weaker than you.¹⁹⁹

In other focus groups, participants thought women may have problems coping with the psychological requirements of combat:

I think it will have an impact mentally. You get in a gun battle and then you get in a gun fight and it's either kill or be killed. Then you've got to do a clearance of that battlefield and then you're going [to find] blokes with their head missing and you've got to physically search their body for intelligence. A lot of females out there, that probably wouldn't worry them, but I think it would play on a large part of their mind.²⁰⁰

Some male soldiers felt that a woman's capability was not the main issue in relation to women in combat roles but rather their ability to fit in socially with the men, resulting in social exclusion or isolation. For example:

I've trained women in shooting and most of the time they shoot better than the blokes because they listen. That's not the point. The point is that fitting in socially within that testosterone environment is not going to work.²⁰¹

When the guys go out and they start to play up...and there's a little bit of that camaraderie that goes with that, it seems to me that some of the women find that difficult to maintain...It's just guys being guys and that's all it is and the girls seem to have this issue where they either try too hard and it makes them unpopular and they don't fit in.²⁰²

Some members considered that their wives would not like them working so closely with women. One soldier told the Review:

My wife hates it. She hates the thought of me coming here and the person that's going to be watching my back is a female. Her group of friends feel exactly the same.²⁰³

These attitudes highlight the limitations of framing the messaging around the physical standards review – although women may be 'accepted' within units where they meet the physical standards, this does not necessarily extend to acceptance in the social sphere.

A report by Christine McLoughlin, referred to in earlier Chapters, considered the Navy experience of integrating women into submarines in order to understand requirements for facilitating cultural acceptance of mixed gender teams in the Clearance Diver category.²⁰⁴ The report concluded that the following factors would impact on cultural acceptance:

- achieving a critical mass of women (at least 10% of that category)
- addressing the capability requirements and the implications for women (the physical capability aspect of this will be set by the PES standards for the category, however, it is unclear whether non-physical attributes will need further consideration when women enter into these categories)
- behavioural factors to be addressed (eg considerations of health, safety, privacy, team cohesion and educating men in those categories).²⁰⁵

Drawing on the submarine integration experience, the report argued that critical consideration must be given to ensuring strength of leadership, maturity and objectivity in management, the quality of instructors at entry level in creating a level playing field, encouraging an environment of inclusion, and dealing with resentment towards differential treatment.²⁰⁶

(iii) Transitioning from male-dominated units to mixed gender teams

As noted earlier, Army has the largest proportion of jobs from which women have previously been excluded. In considering cultural and attitudinal barriers, the significance of allowing women into formerly restricted categories will inevitably be greater for Army than the other Services. In focus groups, the Review spoke to people in Army who had simply never had the experience of working with women before, and were unaware of what sort of challenges or issues might arise. One survey response observed:

Many men in the [Army] have little real world interaction with women in the work place or in their personal lives and therefore find it difficult to relate to them on a personal or professional level.²⁰⁷

In another focus group, one of the participants, referring to their experience in Armoured Corps, observed 'they don't like having girls in their regiment either'.²⁰⁸

In one focus group, members noted that these sorts of issues would inevitably arise where women were introduced into units for the first time:

You've gotta look at a male's natural reaction. They're either gonna flirt with the chick or they're gonna try and protect her, or both. Infantry work in a nine men section that has great cohesion, great teamwork, mateship, all of that, and they work together so well. Put a female in that mix, it ain't gonna be brilliant.²⁰⁹

I don't think that women should go into infantry. I think genetically they lack the aggression and physical strength to perform the role. And also it's a massive, massive distraction for the males.²¹⁰

Some women expressed views that it would create unnecessary problems to introduce women into the close 'group dynamic' of the male dominated infantry units, in particular:

Eight blokes going out to go on patrol get dirty and grubby and messy [and] they don't want to have to consider female cycles, female showering. We've got all these other entitlements that come with being a female, which are quite embarrassing if you ever want to try and enforce them. We "don't carry as much", all these other things. "You smell us before you see us", all sorts of stuff. Why should the guys have to deal with that? When it ain't broke, don't fix it.²¹¹

In other focus groups, members were concerned about the potential for issues to arise relating to sexual harassment or fraternisation:

I think that one or two women in a platoon full of infantry blokes is only bound to cause trouble when it comes to things like sexual harassment.²¹²

I think fraternisation is just inevitable.²¹³

Units transitioning to mixed gender teams for the first time may not understand the potential issues or problems which might arise and, as a consequence, lack strategies in how to deal with them. As one focus group participant observed:

My biggest suggestion is we need to educate the males. They don't mean harm, they're just not used to it, they have to adapt, they have to learn how to adapt into working in an environment where there are females. You know, a few years ago they didn't even have females at the unit. You weren't allowed to go there. It's just a culture that they have had, and that's just something that maybe we need to put something in place to help them adapt as well.²¹⁴

Many women considered that the introduction of women into these roles should 'just happen' and that the transition would be smoother than anticipated. A female Canadian artillery officer with whom the Review spoke in Afghanistan commented:

Whether it's about capability or hygiene issues or other issues that concern people, [those selected for combat] will be the right women who will be able to deal with all of that.²¹⁵

Others were also optimistic about women being accepted in these roles over time:

I worked with soldiers who had corps transferred from infantry straight in and a lot of the times I was the first female they'd ever worked with, let alone their first female boss, and after an initial period of adjustment they all said, it's fine. It's no different to, anything I've experienced before. Some of them admitted they were initially hesitant, but you prove that you're capable and professional.²¹⁶

You will find in five years' time, the people that have a problem with female in combat roles, will be well and truly in the minority because we've all gone through Kapooka and Duntroon and we've lived and worked with females in our units.²¹⁷

(iv) Experiences of deployed personnel

The Review observed significant differences between the attitudes of ADF members posted throughout Australia, and those of deployed personnel in relation to removal of gender restrictions. Having experienced mixed gender teams in a combat environment, many deployed members saw the issue as essentially one of leadership:

It goes against all logic that we don't allow females in combat roles. Take yourself as a field gunner. Why would you let a medic move forward with an infantry combat team in combat but not allow her to sit 20km back and load bombs? We've had females in our units, our combat units, for nearly a decade with zero problems really associated with it. So, there are females in Afghanistan now rolling out with combat teams every day. So to suggest they're not in combat roles just because they are the medic, they are still, effectively, combat soldiers now because the modern battlefield doesn't distinguish.²¹⁸

In other focus groups, reflecting on experiences of women on overseas deployments, there was recognition of the valuable contributions which women could bring to the capability of a group:

We can't discount the value of women in Defence. I think there is a huge potential for women to bring something very different, whatever that might be, it might be intuition, it might be a different way of looking at a combat situation, it could be the way that she is integrated into a platoon, I think there is value.²¹⁹

Others found that where women were in specialist roles which did not directly compete with men, there was more acceptance:

You're accepted if you've got a specialist skill. You can go out on a patrol as a female with those same infantry that say we don't want females in our infantry and yet you go out on a patrol with them. There's no issue because you are that specialist so you're not actually threatening their trade and they're happy and you know you're doing exactly the same thing going on the same patrol with them.²²⁰

These specialist skills were particularly highlighted in the role of the 'Female Engagement Teams' (FETs). These are usually deployed teams of three female personnel (a team leader, a scribe and preferably a female interpreter) who conduct engagements with the local female population in a 'culturally respectful manner'.²²¹ One focus group participant observed in relation to FET teams in Afghanistan:

The guys were really impressed. They didn't expect them to be able to do it so well and things like that. So I mean just that little act there, even though it was only a handful of guys, it's a start.²²²

The Review heard overwhelmingly that ADF women wanted more opportunities to 'go outside the wire' (i.e. on patrol), including opportunities to be involved in FETs. Nevertheless, many felt this was being denied to them, unless accompanied by a man to 'protect' them, in part because of paternalistic attitudes of commanding officers and a reluctance to be the first to have a woman in their unit killed on patrol.²²³

Most deployed women with whom the Review spoke reported positive experiences of working in mixed gender teams:

I haven't really had any issues being in all of those combat situations, I've been out field with the boys[and] if you conduct yourself in a professional manner and you demand respect and you don't expect to be treated any differently then it is, all really great.²²⁴

Each of the deployments have been good. Working with lots of different people, sharing living accommodation with the guys and girls in a very close environment and being fortunate we haven't had any incidents, just professional people doing their job properly.²²⁵

Every single deployment and every single job I've had has been excellent. I've had such good jobs. I've had so many command positions and in the area I work in I'm nearly always one of very, very few females.²²⁶

I was the only female, but these guys, infantry in the New Zealand Army, actually have females already, so they already had that built into their culture. So they actually built me a toilet, they built me a hessian shower. So they were willing to do that stuff for me because they'd already been introduced to it.²²⁷

Other women said that although there was a generally supportive environment on deployment, it was sometimes a challenge to deal with gender-specific issues (for example, poorly fitting uniforms²²⁸ or a lack of facilities):

I really only had one issue with that patrol base and that was the lack of a female sanitary bin. You find other ways of disposing of things but it's quite awkward and it's not really something that you can kind of talk to anyone about because there's nobody there to help you so yeah. The guys were great, like you just work with them you know and there's really no issue.²²⁹

In some cases, members also drew on their overseas experiences working with women on operational deployments to show that issues could be reasonably accommodated. One participant noted that 'management of time and space' (for example, by allocating a time for men and women to shower), commenting that 'it's not a big hassle, and I think most people have that approach to it'.²³⁰

(v) Attitudes of unit leaders

Despite this, during the course of the Review, comments from focus groups and discussions with leadership at local unit levels or training schools – some of whom have had little if any experience working with women – show that there appears to be a lack of sensitivity to the possible gender issues which might arise.

Instead, there is a tendency to focus only on the physical aspects of the transition, such as the structure of accommodation arrangements, or a rigid, rule bound focus on conduct requirements, such as minimum dress requirements or fraternisation.

The message from senior leadership is that existing mechanisms (such as equity and diversity policies and complaints processes, codes of conduct, existing leadership and chain of command, female role models, coaching and mentoring), as well as the new physical employment standards, will be sufficient to ensure the transition for women into newly opened up roles is successful.²³¹

A prevailing attitude appears to be that training courses will largely remain the same, with the concern being how women would be able to fit into this structure, and that little would need to change except for facilities or accommodation. In one meeting with senior leadership, for example, the Review was told that the 'key risk' in relation to integrating women was the 'physical nature of the job' and that special treatment for women and separate living arrangements risked their not being accepted by the 'team' and may potentially lead to 'isolation':

Basic privacy, basic security is almost the mantra that we are focusing on because they are the big issues. Making sure that our physical training, our accommodation etc, doesn't start from an isolated point because as we move through the training course here where the stress, the hard training kicks in, it will exacerbate any isolation significantly.²³²

Despite these concerns, during some visits the Review observed that even newly constructed buildings had not taken into account use of facilities by women.²³³

(e) Ensuring effective performance of mixed gender teams

Views from focus groups appear to place the onus on women as bearing the responsibility for 'fitting in' and for making mixed gender teams work. Yet this responsibility should be shared by leadership and their male counterparts, a lesson from the success of the Canadian experience is that integration must be about the 'team':

Integration is not about women, it's about the team. So I think we may have philosophically, and again with all good intentions, we may have put the emphasis too much on the women and not looked at the team.²³⁴

To this end, it is worrying that women reported experiences of working in male-dominated units which ranged from extreme exclusion to bullying and sexual harassment. One woman reported that as the only woman in a training course:

There was a competition in my course about who could go the longest without speaking to [me]. Even a guy who was my friend said he couldn't talk to me because of what the other guys in the course would do to him.²³⁵

Another told the Review:

I thought I could change the crusty old warrant officers but in the end they broke me. There were so many rumours about me – I was supposed to have slept with everyone. Soldiers would do what they could to sleep with me. I was constantly pulled into the boss' office to answer the false rumours. I was constantly subjected to harassment, bullying and intimidation. People would talk behind my back.²³⁶

It is clear that it must not be left to individual units to 'make it work', but that leadership at the local unit level must be supported in creating the conditions for effective mixed gender teams.

In successfully implementing the removal of gender restrictions for combat roles, the focus should be on ensuring that leaders and teams as a whole are engaged and educated about how they can contribute to effective performance in mixed gender environments. The Review recommends a structured transition program which creates a supportive environment and which is monitored, reviewed and evaluated.

(i) The need for a critical mass of women in mixed gender teams

As noted earlier, the implementation plan for the Removal of Gender Restrictions has as its initial focus in-service corps transfers of women into newly mixed gender teams. In some of the Review's focus groups, participants commented on the benefits of having experienced women established in leadership roles for young women joining these categories:

Females in command positions would help stabilise things [rather than] just having female diggers. Female section commanders, female platoon, even female company commanders... would help even things out.²³⁷

There was some support in focus groups for the idea that it would be beneficial to have a number of women entering a group together from the early training stage:

I think maybe not five, but there's two or three women to start with, and maybe give them some training together so they have a bit of a support network among themselves, and then going in it would be preferable to put them in with a group of people who were just coming in, rather than putting them into a unit that had a lot of experience and trying to break in.²³⁸

However, the need for careful monitoring of these women was also emphasised:

Women are always going to be the minority in those roles, so you're going to have maybe one female in a platoon of 40 males. You'll have to monitor that situation to make sure that the females needs are catered for, emotionally that they're okay.²³⁹

It is unclear how the implementation plan will address a number of issues. Particular challenges may arise from the focus on in-service corps transfer of women into formerly restricted categories, rather than ab initio recruiting of women into those roles. In Canada, serving women were offered transfers into formerly restricted roles at the same time they were opened to women being recruited 'off the street'. The Canadian experience was that there was no large uptake of internal transfers within Defence into those roles and that 'most of the first women came off the street'.²⁴⁰

In part, this was because women coming into roles through corps transfer would lose their rank as a result, or have to go through basic training (for example in infantry) and 'start from the bottom'. It was emphasised that this progression from the bottom up would be necessary for the credibility of those women in leadership roles:

There's no point trying to force it another way, because it'll present problems anyway. So you've got to have credibility in this extremely tough environment, otherwise you're setting them up for failure anyway. There's a lot of guys out there that are worried that women are going to get a free pass and get into these leadership positions without earning their spot.²⁴¹

In the course of the Review's consultations, only a very small number of women indicated interest in corps transfers into formerly restricted roles. This may mean that relying on corps transfers alone to increase women's representation in combat roles will take a long time. As one focus group participant noted, particularly in the context of infantry:

There's nothing to say that a woman wouldn't be able to perform those roles but not in the numbers that men are. I think the desire of women to perform those roles would be lacking compared to men. They don't glorify those positions in their minds.²⁴²

Another female Army focus group participant remarked that:

[given there were] 200 other trades I can do, why do I want to go dig a hole?²⁴³

Another person made the following observation from an Army Women's Networking Forum:

I think out of that whole room of about 80 or 100 females, there was only about two that said that they would have liked to have joined at day one being infantry but they would no longer consider that as a career path now.²⁴⁴

For this reason, the Review emphasises the importance of putting clear principles in place in relation to corps transfers of women into combat units, which appropriately recognise prior competencies and non-reduction of rank and pay.

Another major concern, identified by Clare Burton in her report, *Women in the ADF*, in relation to women pilots, is the pressure on women entering formerly restricted categories, because of their visibility and status as 'trailblazers' or 'gender pioneers'.²⁴⁵ In the Canadian experience it was found that otherwise well qualified women might be reluctant to pursue those roles because of the pressure or stigma of being the first female officer in their regiment.²⁴⁶

The particular pressure on individual women to succeed may be a reason women choose not to enter, or subsequently not continue, with careers in these categories. Burton recommended that strategies need to be developed so that a 'collective spirit of support and collegiality is generated' among both men and women. Burton also suggested, as well as establishing a collective of experienced women mentors, a 'low-key but structured program of mentoring support from senior men to each woman'.²⁴⁷ The Review supports this approach.

Research also indicates that greater success of mixed gender workgroups will be achieved if leaders are also women, with clustering of women within their command. The Review supports consideration of the approach recommended by the Committee for Women in NATO Forces (CWINF), as outlined in Chapter 9, that junior female personnel have senior women in command.

As discussed in section 5.1, studies show that when representation rises above a token number, women are able to have an impact on the environment in which they work. There is also research showing that, where there is a minority of 15% or less within a group, differences between the 'token' or minority members and the dominant members are often exaggerated, with the minority group often excluded or stereotyped, rather than valued for their contribution to group functioning and success.²⁴⁸ The key task lies in recruiting sufficient women into these roles to achieve such numbers.

The Canadian experience was that there was no research evidence to support the view that success is dependent on a minimum cohort of women in such roles/units.²⁴⁹ In light of what the Review has heard in its consultations, however, there remain major concerns about the inherent risks of women becoming isolated and unsupported on entering these roles.

Given the small numbers of women who are likely to consider corps transfer in the initial stages of the transition, the Review recommends that the ADF focus on one combat unit/work section/platoon/company in each Service, in which specifically selected leaders and teams are appropriately skilled and fully engaged in creating the conditions for mixed gender teams to perform effectively, to build leadership and preparedness.

In the first instance, the Review recommends that the ADF ensure that in mixed gender work sections of ten or less ADF personnel there should be no less than two women. Importantly, women entering roles should be clustered within that category to achieve as close to a critical mass as possible. The ADF should ensure that vital lessons are communicated and shared between the Services, particularly lessons learned from high-performing mixed gender teams and their leaders.

(f) Conclusion

The removal of gender restrictions from combat roles is a significant reform towards providing women equal opportunity in their work and career progression, though there is opposition towards the policy shift in some areas. The ADF must ensure that leaders and teams are engaged and educated about how they can contribute to effective performance in mixed gender environments as part of their implementation plan.

To successfully implement this change in policy, there are certain obstacles to overcome. Given the small numbers of women who are likely to consider corps transfer in the initial transition phase, there should be a focus on one combat unit/work section/platoon/company in each Service, to ensure a supportive environment for women choosing these roles, and unnecessary barriers should be removed by recognising non-reduction in pay and rank. In mixed gender work sections of ten or less ADF personnel, there should be no less than two women, and within categories, women should be clustered to achieve as close to a critical mass as possible.

5.4 Mentoring, Networking and Sponsorship

In summary

- Mentoring, networking and sponsorship can be beneficial for women and men, as well as to organisations as a whole, and important for women's progression in non-traditional workplaces.
- In the ADF, in common with other organisations where men traditionally dominate, women are mentored less frequently than men.
- Current initiatives implemented across the Services show that there is recognition within the ADF of the value of mentoring, networking and sponsorship. However, these programs have different aims and objectives, are inconsistent in their implementation and many are difficult to access.
- Mentoring should be a strategic priority for developing leaders in the ADF. The ADF should take steps to redress the gap between men and women's access to quality mentoring and sponsorship opportunities and continue to build and support women's networks.

(a) What is mentoring, networking and sponsorship?

A wide body of research shows that mentoring, networking and sponsorship can be beneficial for women and men, as well as their wider organisations. Despite this, in male-dominated environments, women tend to receive less mentorship and they are often left out of critical networks that help build their counterparts careers.

Mentoring in a work context is the relationship that develops when a senior, more experienced person takes a substantial personal and professional interest in a junior person's career, stimulating and supporting their personal and professional development.²⁵⁰ A mentor can provide a 'safe and constructive environment for the mentee to develop and to act as a positive leadership role model'.²⁵¹

Networks, meanwhile, provide a means to navigate career paths in an organisation and to improve career prospects. In a male-dominated organisation such as the ADF, women should be encouraged to network and improve their access to information and advice.²⁵²

Sponsoring relationships go beyond ordinary mentoring relationships, where sponsors look for and create opportunities because they want their protégées to succeed.²⁵³ Effective sponsorship can accelerate a woman's career through ensuring she is visible and considered for more senior roles.

Sponsorship is often considered the most effective form of supporting women through their professional development. It is observed that:

A mentor might tell you generic advice [but] a sponsor will advocate on your behalf to help secure work projects that will be more likely to help you advance...Crucially the sponsor is someone who wields power in your firm.²⁵⁴

Research suggests that men and women are equally effective sponsors:

If the people holding power are men, women would be not doing themselves justice if they were to choose just women as sponsors.²⁵⁵

(b) Benefits of mentoring, networking and sponsorship

Mentoring, networking, and sponsorship provide useful strategies to create an inclusive workplace in which women can develop their full potential.

Several of the CDF Action Plan's key initiatives relate to the development of a range of 'mentoring, networking, coaching and shadowing' frameworks, in order to improve opportunities for women to reach higher ranks and provide role models for others.²⁵⁶ Overseas militaries have also developed mentoring initiatives to various degrees.

Those who receive quality mentorship may develop greater confidence and resilience, as well as integrating more quickly into the organisational culture, improving skills and knowledge, and developing greater insights into career opportunities and pathways.²⁵⁷

Equally, mentors and sponsors can benefit from exposure to new perspectives as well as increasing their own interpersonal and leadership skills, and their value to the organisation. Those who understand the value of a mentoring relationship are also more likely to encourage this in others.²⁵⁸

Similarly, organisations benefit from greater engagement of junior and senior employees and improved teamwork, fostering an environment to which employees are more likely to remain committed. Long-term mentoring programs can encourage effective organisational change, and break down barriers faced by women in the workplace.²⁵⁹

(c) Moving from mentoring to sponsorship

There is growing recognition that traditional approaches to mentoring are not enough. Rather than providing only general guidance to women, the idea of sponsorship emphasises the provision of support that helps women get promoted. This much more 'pro-active' and targeted approach may be beneficial in light of the low representation of women at higher ranks within Defence.

In the report 'Our experiences in elevating the representation of women in leadership' (the 'Male Champions of Change Report') business leaders observe that sponsorship is 'particularly important in the first 3-5 years of a woman's career, not just when they are close to achieving a senior role'.²⁶⁰ The report refers to McKinsey & Company interviews with female leaders globally which found that:

For many female leaders there was a key individual who believed in them. This sponsor shaped their professional destiny by pushing them hard, opening the right doors, and giving them honest feedback when they were veering off track.²⁶¹

One 2009 study found that high-performing women faced barriers in reaching the top because they were not receiving the sponsorship and male advocacy needed.²⁶² The study found that women tended to underestimate the role that sponsorship played in career advancement, or did not cultivate it because of a reluctance to rely on 'connections' rather than 'hard work'. It observed that many leading companies were fostering sponsorship by promoting 'safe and transparent' relationships between sponsors and protégés.

The Male Champions of Change Report provides a case study of a formal sponsorship program rolled out by Goldman Sachs (see Appendix L).²⁶³ The program was developed in the context of acknowledgement by leaders that promotion rates of senior women were lagging behind their male counterparts, partly due to the perception that they had a lower profile and fewer advocates from outside their business.

The program helped 'close the gap' in terms of the contribution of these women and their broader recognition and visibility within the organisation. The Male Champions of Change Report also found that sponsorship programs were beneficial in providing leaders with exposure to employees that they might not have otherwise met, as well as building their own leadership skills.²⁶⁴

(d) Women's access to mentoring, networking and sponsorship in the ADF

Appendix L details the range of mentoring and networking programs that are available across the ADF.

In common with other organisations where men traditionally dominate, women in the ADF are mentored less frequently than men. In roundtable meetings with ADF and Defence APS women in 2008,²⁶⁵ participants commented on the lack of access women felt that they had to support networks and mentoring opportunities, in contrast to the informal mentoring relationships and networks that flourished for men in male dominated workplaces. For example, men socialise and play sport together, building networks that extend throughout their careers and allowing them to better navigate the 'unstated rules' of the organisation.²⁶⁶

Participants also commented on perceptions that men who utilised their own networks and resources were socially skilled and 'career-savvy'. For women this type of 'self-care' was perceived as selfish or self-serving and a 'weakness'.²⁶⁷ The roundtable participants observed that, although some formal mentoring schemes did exist in the ADF, these were often focused on Officers, with the assumption that the chain of command or Divisional system would look after junior ranks.²⁶⁸

Other barriers to mentoring include time and workload pressures, unclear expectations, lack of or unclear goals for the mentoring, and deference or lack of confidence to ask for mentoring. There was also a view that many women felt that they needed to act more like their male counterparts to succeed.²⁶⁹

In fact, while the *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey* indicated that over 80% of all respondents agreed they had 'sufficient access to learning and development opportunities', smaller numbers believed that 'mentoring and networking opportunities are available to provide role models, information and advice for women progressing through their careers' (50% of female respondents, 60% of male respondents).²⁷⁰ Further, women were much more likely than men to believe that mentoring and networking opportunities are not available to women.

The responses indicate that a sizeable minority of women would be receptive to increased mentoring and networking opportunities, and another large minority is uncertain about the resources that exist in this area. The Review's consultations also showed inconsistent awareness of and access to mentoring and networking opportunities. For example, one member noted:

I don't know if there are mentoring programs. I've not been made aware of any.²⁷¹

This indicates that the messaging and promotion of such opportunities could be improved, and information about existing initiatives may be helpful to the large numbers of women (and men) who were uncertain about the existing opportunities.

(e) Experiences of ADF members

Focus groups revealed many positive responses to ADF initiatives in this area. One Army member, for example, observed that opportunities for women to be mentored had increased significantly over a short time:

I've only been [in] the ADF for four years but I've actually seen in my short time where women actually have had that opportunity. You're always going to see the more dominant percentage being male because they're the higher percentage, that's not to say that women don't get the opportunity, I think women do get the opportunity and that's probably more prevalent now than ever.²⁷²

Navy focus group participants considered the introduction of Navy leadership and mentoring programs had been a good development:

It's something that our category in particular has improved upon definitely because we have a mentoring program now for our Training System officers. But back when I joined they [asked if] you considered getting a mentor, but apart from that, it was left at that.²⁷³

However, availability and promotion of Navy mentoring programs were inconsistent. For example, in some categories (such as the training unit, referred to in the quote above) 'mandatory mentoring' (characterising a formal mentoring program) was working successfully. In other categories, no formal arrangements appeared to be in place. One participant noted that support and advice are available, but that this requires a person to know what they want and seek it out for themselves:

Say you wanted to become a dentist on board the ship, well you would probably start by speaking to your Divisional Officer. You might come to the ship's office and ask how do I do that? And they might point you in the direction of going to do that or civilian schooling ... So there are people on board the ship who can help you achieve your goals but obviously it's up to you to recognise what you want to do.²⁷⁴

Formalised arrangements were seen as having benefits such as allowing a prescribed time for junior officers to speak to mentors. One member noted that 'because it's sanctioned you [can] be released to actually go talk to a mentor'.²⁷⁵

In some cases, a 'mandatory system' resulted in some unwilling/badly matched participants.²⁷⁶ It is clear that selection of both mentors and mentees in a mentoring program is of critical importance. As one person commented:

You've got to really respect the person that's going to talk to you.²⁷⁷

(i) Resistance to formal mentoring and sponsorship

The Review heard some resistance to the idea that formal mentoring programs were needed at all. Focus groups revealed a strong perception that the chain of command is the first stop for junior ranks seeking a 'mentor'. As one member observed:

Our structure is that the people above us, the rank above us, they are always in our command chain and our mentors and sponsors, and they are the people we seek advice from ... We have the divisional system which is there to support most of the junior guys. So we already have that system very much in place.²⁷⁸

In one focus group, participants agreed that it was easy to 'just figure it out'.²⁷⁹ Many saw mentoring as being expected as part of leadership development, rather than a formalised arrangement:

Mentoring is a very personal thing and you've got to want to be a mentor and on the flipside, you've got to want to be a mentee as well. I think in the ADF there's such a focus on leadership that as you go up the ranks you should be mentoring more people, you should be looking to do that as well and I think it's made up on an informal basis, that's my point of view.²⁸⁰

In the Air Force, for example, the Squadron Leader Leadership Module includes components on coaching and mentoring with reference to the *Air Force Mentoring Handbook*.²⁸¹ As one member noted:

I'm meant to be mentoring these people and teaching them the correct rights and wrongs. Like a parent you teach them the way of the Air Force.²⁸²

There are limitations to mentoring within these established arrangements. Some participants commented on the difficulty of maintaining these connections in light of posting cycles.²⁸³

Meanwhile, one member reflected on the different relationships involved in their experience of formal mentoring as a career manager and in a more informal mentoring relationship:

It was informal, and I wouldn't ever give that advice in my role as senior career adviser [about] family planning. I think you just inform people [about] what Army requires of you [such as] if your professional milestone in five years is to be a lieutenant colonel well here are some key things that need to occur in roughly these 12-month windows.²⁸⁴

Another group of new recruits expressed dissatisfaction with senior/junior divisional mentoring arrangements:

I know with the division just gone we absolutely hated each other. And the notion that they could be our mentors [is the] entire opposite. We avoided them like the plague.²⁸⁵

There was also some resistance to the idea of 'sponsorship' as a more developed form of mentoring. For example, one senior leader expressed concern about the possibility of close mentoring relationships being seen as showing favouritism:

You've got to be very careful about perceptions of bias or jealousy or favouritism so you'd have to structure a programme in such a way as well. I'm a CO, I have 300 people who work for me. I can't be seen to favour particular people but I could work with a group, say all the lieutenants in my regiment and do some group activities with them.²⁸⁶

Others noted that it was those more meaningful and developed mentoring relationships, closer to sponsorship than more traditional mentoring, which contributed to success:

When you look at males who climb the ladder the common theme is that generally you've got to have somebody in your corner battling for you, so you have a mentor, somebody who knows you and then when there's a promotion board sitting, that person happens to be sitting on the board and he happens to know you. Because he knows you, he can talk about your strengths and weaknesses. And that relationship is built up over time serving under that officer and often a number of times.²⁸⁷

A formal mentoring/sponsorship program which is 'sanctioned' can be useful in overcoming these barriers.

There is research which shows that within organisations, human resources can play an important role not only in shaping the conditions for informal mentoring to occur, but in structuring formal programs effectively.²⁸⁸ The focus of this research has been on how human resource departments can use strategies to help 'formal programs produce the same quality of mentoring present in naturally emerging relationships'.²⁸⁹ This would overcome the problem of inconsistency in the ability and capacity of people to seek support on their own:

The proactive people go forward and get somebody or identify someone, but the people that perhaps need the support the most are a little bit shy or don't know where to go, and you often don't when you come straight from initial training. Then they're not supported in finding that person.²⁹⁰

Ideally, as some experts argue, formal mentoring programs should provide a platform for informal mentoring to develop.²⁹¹

(ii) Gender-specific programs

Providing access to gender-specific networks or mentorship can allow participants to understand gender-specific challenges as well as provide examples of responses to these challenges. Some members expressed resistance to the idea of women-specific mentoring programs. For example, one member said:

It wouldn't matter to me if I was the only female in the Defence Force because you're there to learn your trade. I don't need a female to give me advice, I'd go to the person that has the most experience and the most knowledge and will benefit me the most, not just 'cause she's the same sex.²⁹²

There was acceptance of the value of gender-specific mentorship for women which may not be possible through the chain of command, given that representation of women in leadership positions is still limited:

You can't be what you can't see. So if women aren't seeing other women succeeding at senior levels and being supported by them, it's very hard to think that you can aspire to that as well.²⁹³

Some senior women reflected on the value of mentorship to the success of their careers:

I've worked with very highly professional, motivated, very knowledgeable people who've continually mentored me the whole way through my career and so I feel very supported by my community, and respected as well which is important.²⁹⁴

Another participant commented that a 'good mentoring programme is lacking especially for the young girls in dealing with the squadron environment':²⁹⁵

I was the only female at my unit, so I don't have the sergeants or anything like that. They are meant to be my mentors, but they don't want to provide the support up here.²⁹⁶

It may be more difficult for women on deployment who, in even more diminished numbers, risk becoming isolated, especially if not involved in male social activities. For some women, surviving isolation on operational deployment may present a greater challenge than dealing with the military duties of the deployment. Women may need to provide support to each other in the field, while there were suggestions that women returning from operations would make good mentors for those preparing for deployment.²⁹⁷

Certainly, in terms of career progression, research suggests that career support through mentoring, sponsoring and coaching was of more use to women than psychosocial support (such as emotional support or counselling).²⁹⁸ In a male dominated organisation, the lack of women in leadership to provide quality mentorship is significant:

It's more common for a male to have a mate or a mentor who's a male and so, until you start to get women into those leadership roles, they won't necessarily mentor or because of the... less population of women in the workforce means there is less opportunity to form those mentoring roles.²⁹⁹

Although gender-specific arrangements must be made available there is a need to recognise that this should be part of a range of supports and strategies to ensure the development and progression of women. Quality mentoring and sponsorship is a key role of senior male leaders who should emphasise its importance for women.

(f) Limitations of established initiatives

Certainly, initiatives implemented across the Services show that there is recognition within the ADF of the value of mentoring, though these initiatives are inconsistent in implementation and how they are accessed. When speaking to personnel deployed overseas, for example, the Review heard the following observations from junior members:

They put those things out there but to apply for it and be able to go are two different things, because we've got local mentors but then there's also mentors that may be based in Canberra or [there] might be travel required. I've only seen officers usually take advantages of those opportunities.³⁰⁰

In another focus group, it was noted that, while some personnel had been assigned mentors, those selected as mentors did not receive training.³⁰¹ In other cases, participants had only very limited and fixed views about the role of a mentor, without seeing it as a two-way relationship:

I think we pass on the information and give them guidance. That's all I see mentoring as.³⁰²

As the RAAF experience of adding to the 'My Mentor program' with their 'Women's Integrated Networking Groups' ('WINGs') trial shows (see Appendix L), the organisation is learning from previous attempts at establishing mentoring programs. The Services are starting to tailor programs to better meet individuals' needs. Over time these programs will improve and deliver results, but these lessons are not yet being shared across the Services. The result is that currently, an incoherent mix of initiatives exists, with different aims and objectives and taking different forms, under the broad umbrella of 'mentoring programs'.

The ADF should redress the gap between men and women's access to quality mentorship and sponsorship opportunities, integrating the suite of available programs and rationalising them based on best practice principles.

The ADF should specify the goals and objectives of different types of programs, taking into consideration the program's intent and the audience being targeted.

Gaps in availability should be explored, so that members at any stages of their career have access to an appropriate mentor or sponsor. Mentors and sponsors might be men or women, from within the Service, another Service or outside the ADF. The purpose, objectives and duration of mentoring/sponsorship relationship should be determined by the member and the mentor or sponsor.

A particular focus should be on making the shift from providing general guidance for women, as with traditional approaches to mentorship, to sponsorship and providing support that helps them get promoted. This includes building an expectation that sponsorship is a key role of senior leaders and emphasising its importance for women. For example, currently, sponsorship and coaching is limited to one executive level program in Navy.³⁰³ Nothing comparable is available for other ranks.

Availability of these supports should be communicated at all levels, and feedback should be incorporated into monitoring of the programs to build an evidence base and ensure they continue to meet the needs of people through different stages of life and their careers.

(g) Conclusion

Research shows that mentoring, networking and sponsorship are important features to improving women's progression in non-traditional workplaces. There exists an imbalance between men and women in access to such opportunities. The current ADF initiatives which have been implemented have good intent but operate with different aims and objectives, take different forms and are inconsistently implemented and accessed.

Mentoring and sponsorship should be strategic priorities for developing leaders in the ADF. The ADF should implement measures to improve the availability of mentoring, sponsorship and networking appropriate to the needs of members, both men and women, at any stage of her/his career. The solution is not a 'one-size fits all' program. It will take time to build an environment which sustains and supports quality mentoring and sponsorship.

Having examined the systemic and structural processes at play in the ADF workforce pipeline, the next Chapter of this Report turns to an examination of the way in which women (and men) in the ADF combine these responsibilities with their career – many of them feeling that one must come at the expense of the other.

1 Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2010-11*, p 273. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/Budget/10-11/dar/index.htm>
 (viewed 19 June 2012).

2 Focus group 16D.

3 A note on terminology: Each of the three Services use slightly different language to describe the different occupations within its Service. All three Services cluster occupations under broad groupings (e.g. Corps in Army). These clusters are referred to in the Report as 'categories'. The actual occupations/specialisations personnel fill within these categories are referred to as 'roles'.

4 Minister for Defence, 'Removal of Restrictions on Combat Roles for Women' (Media Release, 27 September 2011). At <http://www.minister.defence.gov.au/2011/09/27/minister-for-defence-removal-of-restrictions-on-combat-roles-for-women/> (viewed 19 June 2012).

5 These are Clearance Diver roles within the Maritime Warfare Officer category and Seaman NS category: 'RFI 202 – Categories.xls' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 1 February 2012.

6 These roles are within the Armoured Corps, Artillery Regiment and Infantry Corp, as well as Explosive Ordnance Disposal Engineers: 'RFI 202 – Categories.xls', above.

7 These roles are Airfield Defence Guard and Ground Defence Officer: 'RFI 202 – Categories.xls', above.

8 'RFI 202 – Categories.xls', above.

9 'RFI 202 – Categories.xls', above.

10 'RFI 202 – Categories.xls', above.

11 The below figures are based on how each Service classifies the various occupations within the Service. Therefore there are some differences in how occupations are classified. For example, Electrician is classified as Technical in Army and Navy but non-technical in Air Force.

12 'RFI 417 Headcount by Tech Non Tech etc' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 29 May 2012.

13 'RFI 417 Headcount by Tech Non Tech etc', above.

14 'RFI 417 Headcount by Tech Non Tech etc', above.

15 Personnel in technical trades represent 32% of personnel in Navy, and 33% in Air Force, but only 12.6% in Army. 'RFI 417 Headcount by Tech Non-Tech etc', above.

16 This figure includes permanent non-training personnel only. 'ADO High Level v.1.xls' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 30 January 2012. Note, 'Administration' is a closed category accounting for the low number of personnel in this category: CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 14 March 2012.

17 This figure includes permanent non-training personnel only: 'ADO High Level v.1.xls', above.

18 This figure includes permanent non-training personnel only: 'ADO High Level v.1.xls', above.

19 Several other categories fall just below the 30% including Musician and Intelligence.

20 Several other categories fall just below the 30% mark, including the Legal Corps, Public Relations Corps, Band Corps and Ordnance Corps.

21 Several other categories fall just below the 30% including Intelligence and Communications and Information Systems.

22 'ADF Specialisation RFI 155.xls' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 24 January 2012.

23 'ADF Specialisation RFI 155.xls', above.

24 'Broderick Review – MXPQ Summary_22Mar 12.doc' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 23 March 2012; Focus group 26A.

25 'RFI 202 – Categories.xls', note 5. At the time of publication, Army provided the Review with updated figures for financial year 2011/2012 – women represent 22.8% of the Ordnance Corps – the category with the largest number of women at 842 women out of 3,685. However, of the 22.8% of women, women are over-represented in administrative roles (50.7%), Supply roles (35.6% in total) and Officer roles (11.2%). Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012

26 'RFI 202 – Categories.xls', note 5.

27 'RFI 202 – Categories.xls', note 5.

28 'ADO High Level v.1.xls', note 16. At the time of publication, Army provided the Review with updated figures for financial year 2011/2012 in which there are 7- women in Psychology out of a totally of 120 people in Psychology in the whole Service. Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012

29 See for example, P N Cohen, 'The Gender Division of Labor: "Keeping House" and Occupational Segregation in the United States' (2004) 18(2) *Gender and Society* 239; C Ridgeway and S Correll, 'Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations' (2004) 18(4) *Gender & Society* 510.

30 See for example, Ridgeway and Correll, above, pp 510-531.

31 Focus group 6A.

32 Focus group 17D.

33 '111101 DGPERS-AF Presentation – Broderick' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 2 November 2011; 'Information Paper 30_2008 Female participation rates in ADF.DOC' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 7 February 2012.

34 See for example, Ridgeway and Correll, note 29.

35 The challenges involved in transferring categories are explored in section 4.2. ('Recruitment').

36 '111101 DGPERS-AF Presentation – Broderick', note 33; 'Information Paper 30_2008 Female participation rates in ADF.DOC', note 33.

37 Focus group 10A.

38 Focus group 10A. 'Mustering' refers to occupational categories in Air Force.

39 'G-Forces' refers to the gravitational pull felt during acceleration; Focus group 31C.

40 K Dolan et al. 'Are all women state legislators alike?' in S Thomas and C Wilcox (eds), *Women and elective office* (1998), p 77.

- 41 D Studlar and I McAllister, 'Does a critical mass exist? A comparative analysis of women's legislative representation since 1950' (2002) 41 *European Journal of Political Research* 233.
- 42 Focus group 11A.
- 43 Focus group 31B.
- 44 Focus group 26A.
- 45 Focus group 3A.
- 46 Focus group 31C.
- 47 Focus group 16D.
- 48 Focus group 31C.
- 49 Focus group 16D.
- 50 Focus group 16D.
- 51 Focus group 16B.
- 52 Focus group 29A.
- 53 Focus group 7A.
- 54 Focus group 31C.
- 55 Focus group 28B.
- 56 Focus group 31D.
- 57 Department of Defence, *Strategic Reform Program: Delivering Force 2030* (2009). At www.defence.gov.au/publications/reformBooklet.pdf (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 58 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 11 January 2012; SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 16 March 2012.
- 59 Focus group 11A.
- 60 Focus group 11A.
- 61 'Writer' is an occupational in Navy within the Supply NS category.
- 62 Focus group 4A.
- 63 Focus group 4A.
- 64 Confidential submission 25.
- 65 Centre for Defence Leadership Studies, *Executive Series ADDP 00.6: Leadership in the Australian Defence Force* (2007), 1.18; 4.14. At www.defence.gov.au/adc/docs/Publications/ADDP%2000.6-Leadership.pdf (viewed 21 May 2012).
- 66 Centre for Defence Leadership Studies, above, 3.12, 1.19.
- 67 Centre for Defence Leadership Studies, above, 2.38.
- 68 Centre for Defence Leadership Studies, above, 2.39, 2.40 www.defence.gov.au/adc/docs/Publications/ADDP%2000.6-Leadership.pdf (viewed 21 May 2012).
- 69 MAJGEN C Orme, 'Beyond Compliance; An Operations Focussed Culture and the Australian Profession of Arms', draft discussion paper, 2 June 2011, p 11, provided to the Review.
- 70 The Defence White Paper 2009 notes a key priority is 'ensuring Defence reflects the make up of the broader Australian community': Department of Defence, *Defending Australia in the Asia Pacific Century: Force 2030*, Defence White Paper 2009 (2009), p 114. At http://www.defence.gov.au/whitepaper/docs/defence_white_paper_2009.pdf (viewed 22 May 2012).
- 71 Centre for Defence Leadership Studies, note 65, 1.18.
- 72 Centre for Defence Leadership Studies, note 65, 1.18, ADF values, 3-4 to 3-6.
- 73 For example, Confidential submission 5; Navy focus group 23A.
- 74 See Centre for Defence Leadership Studies, note 65, 1.18, Chapter 6, Annex B for a description of the ADF continuum of leadership courses. Select courses and materials provided to the Review include: 'Leading Seaman Promotion Course (LSPC) – 208450' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012; 'Petty Officer Promotion Course (POPC) – 208456' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012; 'Chief Petty Officers Promotion Course (CPOPC) – 208889' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012; 'Warrant Officers Promotion Course (WOPC) – 208890' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012; 'Junior Officers Leadership Course (JOLC) – 101574' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012; 'Lieutenant Commanders Promotion Course (LCPC) – 101574' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012; 'JLC – ARA Leadership TMP' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 28 March 2012; 'S1SA – ARA Leadership' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 28 March 2012; 'S1WA Lead' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 28 March 2012; 'ARA GSO FAC CLO 3.1 Define the Army Leadership Model (Level 3)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 28 March 2012; 'ARA All Corps CAPT Cse 2-1 Lead a Command Support Team' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 28 March 2012; 'ARA All Corps MAJ Cse 1-2 Carry out the Leadership Responsibilities of an All Corps MAJ (Level 4)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 28 March 2012; 'Internal Evaluation Requirements and Post-Course Reporting for AFTG Units (AFTG si admin_2-4)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'Training Evaluation (PERS_33-03_Training_Evaluation)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'AF Professional Military Education and Training (PMET_09) AC-SQNLDR (PMET-2009 DRAFT DI – with Info Mngt comments cleared DDPMET 03 Feb 2012)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'Air Force Professional Military Education and Training (PMET Brief for GBK 01 Feb 12)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'Principles for PMET 2009 Delivery Model AC – SQNLDR (Principles Overview PMET 2009 Delivery Model AC-SNLDR Nov 09)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'FLTLT Distance Course 2012 Leadership Module Study Guide- Officer Education Flight – Distance (FLDC Leadership Module Study Guide – 2012)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'WOFF Distance Course 2011 Leadership Module Study Guide – Officer Distance Learning Flight (WOFF Distance Course Leadership Module Study Guide – 2011)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'SQNLDR Distance Course 2011 – Leadership Module Study Guide – Officer Distance

- Learning Flight (SQNLDR Distance Course Leadership Module Study Guide – 2011)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012; 'Royal Australian Air Force Australian Air Publication – Manual of Training – Policy and Procedures (aap 2002.001 AM1)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012.
- 75 For example, Chief of Army, LTGEN David Morrison said that 'harnessing the full potential of our workforce is a capability issue rather than a diversity issue ... and I want to remove any artificial impediments to the best use of all our people': LTGEN D Morrison, *Address* (Speech delivered at the Australian Strategic Policy Institute, Canberra, 11 April 2012). At <http://www.army.gov.au/Our-work/Speeches-and-transcripts/Australian-Strategic-Policy-Institute> (viewed 5 July 2012).
- 76 GEN C Krulak, 'The Strategic Corporal: Leadership in the Three Block War,' *Marines Magazine* (January 1999). At <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA399413> (viewed 5 July 2012).
- 77 For example, Focus groups 34G, 34C.
- 78 Meeting with Simon Longstaff.
- 79 Centre for Defence Leadership Studies, note 65, 5.22, pp 5-9.
- 80 Centre for Defence Leadership Studies, note 65, pp 5-9 to 5-11.
- 81 Department of Defence, *Defence Leadership Framework: Growing Leaders at all Levels* (2010), p 15. At www.defence.gov.au/publications/DLFBooklet.pdf (viewed 23 May 2012).
- 82 R M Blackburn, J Jarman and B Brooks 'The Puzzle of Gender Segregation and Inequality: A Cross-National Analysis' (2000) 16(2) *European Sociological Review* 119, p 131; M J Watts 'On the Conceptualisation and Measurement of Horizontal and Vertical Occupational Gender Segregation' (2005) 21(5) *European Sociological Review* 481, p 482.
- 83 Each Service has a senior leadership group comprised of senior officers. These generalist senior officers are appointed into positions within the senior officers pool once they reach the rank of Captain (Navy), Colonel (Army), Group Captain (Air Force). Upon entering the generalist senior officer pool, these officers take on general management/executive/leadership positions rather than category specific roles. While some categories enable officers to advance to high ranks within their category, these officers retain their specialisation and manage only within their specialisation. They are therefore distinct from the leadership pool referred to as senior officers.
- 84 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 30 May 2012. The percentage of women in each category was calculated based on 'RFI 202 – Categories.xls', note 5.
- 85 From 31 March 1921 until March 1975 the Chief of Air Force (CAF) was always a pilot. In March 1975 Sir James Rowlands AC KBE DFC AFC, took over from Air Marshal Charles Read, becoming the first engineering officer to lead the RAAF. However he was required to be a member of the Air Force's aircrew stream so, although already a qualified pilot (he flew Lancasters in WWII), he had to transfer from the Technical Branch (Engineering) to the General Duties Branch (Aircrew). Soon afterwards, the stipulation for the CAF to be a member of the General Duties Branch was removed. That said, every CAF since then has been a pilot: SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 30 May 2012.
- 86 Generalist senior officers (general service officers) are appointed from any category and take on general management/executive/leadership positions rather than category specific roles. They are distinct from Specialist Service officers who follow a different career path within their area of specialisation. Note, the below figures are calculated based on Star Ranked Officers (07 – 10) that are listed as being a General Service Officers (entry via General Service Officer). Senior Officers with a specialisation are included separately. 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer categories' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James 26 March 2012; 'ARA SENOFF entry method' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 13 June 2012.
- 87 'ARA SENOFF entry method', above.
- 88 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer categories', note 86.
- 89 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer categories', note 86.
- 90 Current senior officers originate from the following categories: Maritime Warfare Officer (32) = 61.5% (this includes Seaman NO that was replaced by Maritime Warfare Officer); Engineer (9) = 17.3%; Supply NO (5) = 9.6%; Aviation NO (4) = 7.69%; Legal (2) = 3.8%. WO of Navy is also man. The one woman generalist star ranked officer is from the Legal category. 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer categories', note 86.
- 91 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer', note 86.
- 92 The number of star ranked officers excludes officers who joined through the specialist service officers. The Review was unable to ascertain the entry path of two of the star ranked officers serving within Special Forces and high level intelligence positions – they have been included in the number of star ranked officers in the general service officer pool. Of the 71 star ranked officers who entered via general service officer, they originate from the following categories: Infantry (21) = 29.5%; Ordnance (5) = 7%; Armoured Corp (8) = 11.2%; Artillery (10) = 14%; Engineers (7) = 9.8%; Signals (5) = 7%; Intelligence (5) = 7%; Electrical and Mechanical Engineers (2) = 2.8%; Transport (5) = 7%; Aviation (2) = 2.8%. Note, the category of one of the Senior Officers is not provided. RSM is also a man. The four women generalist star ranked officer is from the Ordnance category and Signals category. Figures from 'ARA SENOFF entry method', note 86.
- 93 'ARA SENOFF entry method', note 86.
- 94 The categories from which the Senior Officers originated from are: Aircrew (32) = 60.3%; Engineering and Logistics (18) = 33.9%; Support Operations (2) = 3.7%; Operations (1) = 1.8%. Exec WOFF is also man. The one woman generalist star ranked officer is from the Engineering and Logistics category. Figures from 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer categories', note 86.
- 95 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer categories', note 86.
- 96 There are four senior officer ranks in Navy: commodore, rear admiral, vice admiral and admiral (in order of lowest to highest rank). The one woman generalist star ranked officer in Navy is at commodore rank and is from the Legal category. 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer categories', note 86.

- 97 There are four Senior Officer ranks: brigadier, major general, lieutenant general and general (in order of lowest to highest rank). The four women generalist star ranked officers in Army are at the brigadier rank and from the Ordnance and Signals Corps: 'ARA SENOFF entry method', note 86.
- 98 There are four Star Ranks: air commodore, air vice-marshal, air marshal, air chief marshal (in order of lowest to highest rank). The one woman generalist star ranked officer in Air Force is at air vice-marshal rank and is from Engineering and Logistics: 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 259 and 371 – Senior Officer categories', note 86.
- 99 'ADO High Level v.1.xls', note 16.
- 100 'ADO High Level v.1.xls', note 16.
- 101 'ADO High Level v.1.xls', note 16.
- 102 For example, even in categories dominated by women, with few exceptions, women are not occupying warrant officer positions at a number proportionate to their percentage in the category. 'ADO High Level v.1.xls', note 16.
- 103 See Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (Army) PERS 47-1, 'Career Management of Australian Army Officers', 31 July 2008*, p 11 ('DI(A) PERS 47-1'); Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 4 December 2011, ch 11, pp 11-12; 'RFI 262 – RAAF COMMAND SELECTION OVERVIEW and FAQs' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 1 March 2012.
- 104 'Army Commanding Officer Positions' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 23 April 2012.
- 105 'BRT RFI 232 – Command List data' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 14 March 2012. Note, the definition of 'Command' within Air Force appears to be slightly different from that used in Army and Navy as it extends beyond Command of bases and fighting forces to include positions within DMO.
- 106 As of March 2012: 'Command and Minor Command Positions 19JUL12' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 19 July 2012. Note that these figures are accurate as of March 2012.
- 107 As of March 2012: 'Command and Minor Command Positions 19JUL12' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 19 July 2012. Note that these figures are accurate as of March 2012.
- 108 As of April 2012: 'Army Commanding Officer Positions' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 23 April 2012.
- 109 As of March 2012: 'BRT RFI 232 – Command List data' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 14 March 2012. Note, the definition of 'Command' within Air Force appears to be slightly different from that used in Army and Navy as it extends beyond Command of bases and fighting forces to include positions within DMO.
- 110 'ADO High Level v.1.xls', note 16.
- 111 See DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 103, p 11; Department of Defence, ABR 6289, *Navy Officers Career Management Manual*, note 103, ch 11, pp 11-12; 'RFI 262 – RAAF COMMAND SELECTION OVERVIEW and FAQs', note 103.
- 112 Focus group 35F.
- 113 Focus group 9B.
- 114 Small differences are likely a result of the very small numbers in the sample. '120101_Broderick Review_MasterFile' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012. Note, this includes permanent and Reserve Forces on CFTS.
- 115 Focus group 35F.
- 116 Focus group 35F.
- 117 Focus group 26A.
- 118 Confidential submission 25.
- 119 Focus group 20B.
- 120 Confidential submission 25.
- 121 'DGCMA BRT RFI RESPONSE' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 2 April 2012; 'RFI 250' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 16 March 2012; Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.
- 122 This is likely a result of the small number of personnel in many of the categories that women dominate and thus less senior positions are needed.
- 123 Both these positions are currently occupied by women. 'ADO High Level v.1.xls', note 16.
- 124 'ADO High Level v.1.xls', note 16.
- 125 As a result of the small number of personnel at each rank in categories with a high representation of women, there are dramatic peaks and troughs in women's progression through the ranks in these categories. Conversely in categories with a low representation of women, there is less variance in women's career trajectory. Given there are only a small number of positions at higher ranks, the presence or absence of one or two women will have a marked difference on the percentages. For example there are generally only 1 or 2 Colonel positions in the majority of the categories that women dominate. Within the Officer Ranks, the categories characterised by large peaks and troughs are those categories where there is a higher proportion of women typically in categories with a relatively small number of total personnel – the Pay Corps, Psychology Corps, Dental Corps, Nursing Corps, Public Relations Corps, Catering Corps. A similar picture is found in Other Ranks, with the greatest variance found in the categories with a small number of personnel and a high representation of women. 'ADO High Level v.1.xls', note 16.
- 126 The importance of Staff Officer positions, particularly for promotion of Lieutenant Colonel and above ranks, is highlighted in the Career Management Guide for Officer: DI(A) PERS 47-1, note 103, para 101. See also, 'GOPS courtbook – Revised Army Taxonomy Submission (part of ADF #15)' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 8 June 2012.
- 127 Public submission 1 Sorial.
- 128 Confidential submission 25.
- 129 Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Agency, *Understanding the Gender Pay Gap: Key Factors that Contribute to the Gap in Women's and Men's Earnings*. At http://www.eowa.gov.au/Pay_Equity/Files/Understandinggap.pdf (viewed 21 June 2012).

- 130 Department of Defence, *Defending Australia in the Asia Pacific Century: Force 2030*, Defence White Paper 2009 (2009), p 114. At http://www.defence.gov.au/whitepaper/docs/defence_white_paper_2009.pdf (viewed 22 May 2012).
- 131 Minister for Defence, 'Removal of Restrictions on Combat Roles for Women' (Media Release, 27 September 2011). At <http://www.minister.defence.gov.au/2011/09/27/minister-for-defence-removal-of-restrictions-on-combat-roles-for-women/> (viewed 3 May 2012).
- 132 These positions are Clearance Diver roles within various categories: 'RFI 202 – Categories.xls', note 5. A note on terminology: Each of the three Services use slightly different language to describe the different occupations within its Service. All three Services cluster occupations under broad groupings (e.g. Corps in Army). These clusters are referred to in the Report as 'categories'. The actual occupations/specialisations personnel fill within these categories are referred to as 'roles'.
- 133 These positions are Airfield Defence Guards and Ground Defence roles: 'RFI 202 – Categories.xls', note 5.
- 134 These positions are within the Armoured Corps, Artillery Regiment, Infantry Corp and Explosive Ordnance Disposal Engineers: 'RFI 202 – Categories.xls', note 5.
- 135 See section 5.1.
- 136 See Appendix K.1.
- 137 Minister for Defence, 'Removal of Restrictions on Combat Roles for Women' (Media Release, 27 September 2011). At <http://www.minister.defence.gov.au/2011/09/27/minister-for-defence-removal-of-restrictions-on-combat-roles-for-women/> (viewed 3 May 2012).
- 138 M S Hay and C G Middlestead, *Women in combat: An overview of the implications for recruiting*, Research Report 1568, US Army Research Institute for the Behavioural and Social Sciences (1990), p 23 quoted in S Chapman, 'Increasing the Operational Effectiveness of Women in the Australian Defence Force' (1999) 139 *Australian Defence Force Journal* 25, p 26.
- 139 Meeting with HPC.
- 140 Information provided to the Review by AIRCDRE H Ehlers, email to the Review, 20 June 2012.
- 141 The research is being conducted through the Centre of Expertise for the Physical Employment Standards Project, a partnership between the Defence Science and Technology Organisation and University of Wollongong: Minister for Defence Personnel, Materiel and Science, 'Physical Standards for Military Service to be Benchmarked' (Media Release, 21 August 2009). At <http://www.dsto.defence.gov.au/news/5839/> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 142 'ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan 2011-21', 11 November 2011 (draft version), para 25, provided to the Review by Defence Force Recruiting representatives, 16 November 2011.
- 143 Meeting with HPC.
- 144 Commonwealth, *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Representatives, 8 September 2009, p 8897, (The Hon Greg Combet, Minister for Defence Science).
- 145 LTCOL P Conroy, *Presentation to Chief of Army Women's Networking Forum: Physical Employment Standards Implementation*, 5 December 2011.
- 146 Meeting with HPC.
- 147 Information provided by DSTO: CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 7 December 2011.
- 148 Meeting with HPC.
- 149 Meeting with HPC.
- 150 Meeting with HPC.
- 151 Meeting with HPC; LTCOL P Conroy, *Presentation to Chief of Army Women's Networking Forum: Physical Employment Standards Implementation*, 5 December 2011.
- 152 Meeting with HPC.
- 153 Meeting with HPC.
- 154 Meeting with HPC.
- 155 Focus group 11B.
- 156 Meeting with HPC.
- 157 Focus group 33A.
- 158 Focus group 33A.
- 159 Focus group 41C.
- 160 Focus group 41C.
- 161 Focus group 41C.
- 162 Focus group 41D.
- 163 Focus group 20B.
- 164 See Chapter 9: Norway was the first NATO state to open all combat positions to women, including submarine service, in 1985. Canada removed combat restrictions in 1989, while keeping the restriction on women serving in submarines until 2001. New Zealand has removed all restrictions. The Netherlands retains restrictions on submarine and Marine Corps duty, citing 'practical considerations': R Moelker and J Bosch, *Hidden Women: Women in the Netherlands Armed Forces*, Publications of the Faculty of Military Science, No. 2008/01, Netherlands Defence Academy (2008), p 24. At hbo-kennisbank.uvt.nl/cgi/nda/show.cgi?fid=1721 (viewed 15 July 2011).
- 165 Figures drawn from: P Cawkill, A Rogers, S Knight and L Spear, *Women in Ground Close Combat Roles: The Experiences of other Nations and a Review of the Academic Literature* (2009), pp 16-17, 23, 27, 30. At http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/7A18C2A3-C25B-4FA1-B8CB-49204A109105/0/women_combat_experiences_literature.pdf (viewed 17 June 2012). Note that the US has recently opened up more roles to women and as at February 2012, representation was 14.5%: Department of Defense, *Report to Congress on the Review of Laws, Policies and Regulations Restricting the Service of Female Members in the U.S. Armed Forces* (February 2012), p 3. At www.defense.gov/news/WISR_Report_to_Congress.pdf (viewed 18 May 2012).

- 166 See Chapter 9.
- 167 The only exception remained in submarine service until 2001, with the purchase of submarines allowing for more privacy in accommodation: Cawkill, et al, note 165, p 18.
- 168 Minister for Veterans Affairs, 'Background Information Paper – When will the ADF have 10,000 Women?', 5 September 2011, para 6, provided to the Review.
- 169 Meeting with Canadian Commanders delegation.
- 170 For example, one report noted: 'women still tended to join or migrate to traditional employment areas and that in the combat arms problems remained in selection, training, physical standards, sexual harassment and fraternisation. Physical standards were seen as a mask for much more complex issues, and were applied erratically. The majority of women who had attempted to enter the combat arms reported mainly negative experiences, and those reporting positive experiences were still more likely to have left the CF or transferred to another Arm': Employment of Women in the Armed Forces Steering Group, *Women in the Armed Forces* (2002), pp 12-13. At http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/A9925990-82C2-420F-AB04-7003768CEC02/0/womenaf_fullreport.pdf (viewed 21 June 2012); Cawkill, et al, note 165, p 18.
- 171 Meeting with Canadian Commanders delegation.
- 172 Cawkill, et al, note 165, p 18.
- 173 Meeting with Canadian Commanders delegation.
- 174 Canadian Forces, *National Report to the Committee for Women in NATO Forces* (2009). At http://www.nato.int/issues/women_nato/meeting-records/2009/national-reports/canada-national-report-2009.pdf (viewed 21 June 2012).
- 175 E van Middelkoop, Dutch Minister of Defence, (Paper for the Women in War Zones Conference, The Hague, 3 December 2009), p 6. At <http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/bestanden/documenten-en-publicaties/toespraken/2009/12/03/toespraak-minister-tijdens-conferentie-women-in-warzones/speech-women-in-warzones-op-geel-def.pdf> (viewed 22 June 2011).
- 176 E van den Heuvel and M Meijer, *Gender Force in the Netherlands Armed Forces*. At <http://ftp.rta.nato.int/public//PubFullText/RTO/MP/RTO-MP-HFM-158//MP-HFM-158-02.doc> (viewed 16 July 2011).
- 177 Defence Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS), *Annual Report* (2010), p 10. At <http://dacowits.defense.gov/Reports/2010/> (viewed 14 January 2012); Service Women's Action Network, 'Women in Combat – The Facts', Fact Sheet, February 2011, pp 3-4. At <http://servicewomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/97-WIC-fact-sheet.pdf> (viewed 14 January 2012).
- 178 L Shane, 'More Combat Roles for Women, but still no infantry', *Stars and Stripes*, 8 February 2012. At <http://www.stripes.com/news/more-combat-opportunities-for-women-but-still-no-infantry-1.168074> (viewed 26 June 2012); E Bumiller, 'Pentagon allows women closer to combat, but not close enough for some', *New York Times*, 9 February 2012. At <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/10/us/pentagon-to-loosen-restrictions-on-women-in-combat.html> (viewed 14 May 2012).
- 179 Spencer Ackerman, 'A Few Good Women: Marines Open Infantry to Females', *Wired*, 19 April 2012. At www.wired.com/dangerroom/2012/04/marine-women-infantry/ (viewed 15 May 2012).
- 180 For example, in 2003, the US Army established all-female 'Lioness' teams to accompany all-male Marine combat units into areas populated by insurgents in Iraq. Designed as a 'calming' presence and to search Iraqi women for weapons or explosives, they routinely engaged in combat. Female Engagement Teams (FETs) were originally used by US Marine Corps in Iraq to engage the total population, with an emphasis on female search. In 2009-10, this was extended to Afghanistan. In 2010, women officers began to be integrated to assignment on guide-missile attack and ballistic-missile submarines: DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2010), note 177, p 12; Service Women's Action Network, note 177, pp 3-4.
- 181 M O'Toole, 'Unseen: Trailblazing Military Women Forced To Fight For Recognition, Equal Treatment', *Huffington Post*, 14 May 2012. At www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/05/14/women-at-war-unseen_n_1498291.html?ref=women&ir=Women (viewed 18 May 2012).
- 182 L Shane, note 178.
- 183 DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2011), pp ii, 21. At <http://dacowits.defense.gov/Reports/2011/> (viewed 14 January 2012). The Committee recommended that the integration should occur in the combat engineers, artillery, and armor, followed by the infantry. The Committee also suggested learning from the experience of the US Navy who, in 2011, opened submarine service to the first class of female submariners.
- 184 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 185 Focus group 38B.
- 186 Focus group 11C.
- 187 Focus group 20C.
- 188 Focus group 20C.
- 189 Focus group 35A.
- 190 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 191 Focus group 40A.
- 192 Focus group 41D.
- 193 Focus group 40A.
- 194 Focus group 33A.
- 195 A Summers, 'Women's business in men's business: women's health in military service in Australia' (1999) 1 *ADF Health* 9, p 11; Chapman, note 138, p 26.
- 196 A Summers, above.
- 197 Focus group 38B.
- 198 Focus group 33A.
- 199 Focus group 33A.

- 200 Focus group 35D.
- 201 Focus group 38B.
- 202 Focus group 38B.
- 203 Focus group 38C
- 204 C McLoughlin, *Women's Participation in the Navy*, Report of the Participation of Women in New Generation Navy Review, 7 October 2009, provided to the Review. The CDF appointed McLoughlin to conduct a review into the participation of women in the Royal Australian Navy in response to a request by Senator the Hon J Faulkner, Minister for Defence.
- 205 McLoughlin, above, p 13.
- 206 McLoughlin, above, p 13.
- 207 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 208 Focus group 11E.
- 209 Focus group 11E.
- 210 Focus group 34F.
- 211 Focus group 20B.
- 212 Focus group 41B.
- 213 Focus group 41B.
- 214 Focus group 11E.
- 215 Focus group 40A.
- 216 Focus group 39E.
- 217 Focus group 34G.
- 218 Focus group 34G.
- 219 Focus group 41C.
- 220 Focus group 3A.
- 221 Department of Defence, 'Minute – Female Engagement Teams (FET)', March 2012, provided to the Review by MAJ ML Dare, 27 April 2012.
- 222 Focus group 11E.
- 223 Confidential meeting 65.
- 224 Focus group 39E.
- 225 Focus group 38B.
- 226 Focus group 39D.
- 227 Focus group 39D.
- 228 For example, Focus group 34E in which women trainees complained about clothing size and equipment.
- 229 Focus group 33A.
- 230 Focus group 20C.
- 231 Confidential meeting.
- 232 Meeting with Senior Leadership Group, Singleton.
- 233 Confidential meeting.
- 234 Meeting with Canadian Commanders delegation.
- 235 Confidential meeting.
- 236 Confidential meeting.
- 237 Focus group 41B.
- 238 Focus group 39D.
- 239 Focus group 35A.
- 240 Meeting with Canadian Commanders delegation.
- 241 Meeting with Canadian Commanders delegation.
- 242 Focus group 35A.
- 243 Focus group 20B.
- 244 Focus group 33A.
- 245 C Burton, *Women in the Australian Defence Force: Two Studies* (1996), p 145 (discussing women pilots).
- 246 K Davis (ed), *Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Perspectives and Experience* (2009), p 7.
- 247 C Burton, note 245, p 147.
- 248 Chapman, note 138, p 28; K Quinn, *Group Dynamics: An Organisational Framework for Understanding Mixed Gender Interaction and Sexual Harassment in the Military* (1992).
- 249 Meeting with Canadian Commanders delegation.
- 250 D Smith, 'Mentoring in the Australian Defence Organisation: Issues of Definition and Design', Discussion Paper, Centre for Defence Leadership and Management Studies (November 2010), p 5. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/adc/cdclms/Mentoring%20Paper.doc> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 251 RAAF, 'SQNLDR Distance Course 2011 Leadership Module Study Guide' (June 2011), Professional Military Education and Training, Directorate of Personnel – Air Force, p 38, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 17 February 2012.
- 252 Department of Defence, 'Implementing Cultural Change to Improve Retention of Servicewomen' (2008), p 18, provided to the Review.
- 253 Australian Human Rights Commission, 'Our experiences in elevating the representation of women in leadership. A letter from business leaders' (October 2011), pp 17-18. At http://www.humanrights.gov.au/sex_discrimination/publication/mcc/index.html (viewed 2 May 2012).

- 254 F Klotz, 'Why Women Need Sponsors Not Mentors, Forbes Woman' (February 2012). At <http://www.forbes.com/sites/friedaklotz/2012/02/24/why-women-need-sponsors-not-mentors/> (viewed on 2 July 2012).
- 255 Klotz, above.
- 256 See Chapter 2 and Appendix L.
- 257 Smith, note 250, p 4.
- 258 Minister for Defence Science and Personnel, *Report of the Roundtable Meetings Held Between Defence Women and the Minister for Defence Science and Personnel* (December 2008). At www.defence.gov.au/fr/RR/Womenindefence/Progress.html (viewed 13 June 2012).
- 259 J de Vries, C Webb and J Eveline, 'Mentoring for gender equality and organisational change' (2006) 28(6) *Employee Relations* 572.
- 260 Australian Human Rights Commission, note 253, p 20.
- 261 Australian Human Rights Commission, note 253, p 20.
- 262 S A Hewlett, K Peraino, L Sherbin and K Sumberg, *The Sponsor Effect: Breaking Through the Last Glass Ceiling*, Harvard Business Review Research Report (2011).
- 263 Australian Human Rights Commission, note 253, p 19.
- 264 Australian Human Rights Commission, note 253, p 19.
- 265 Minister for Defence Science and Personnel, note 258.
- 266 Department of Defence, 'Implementing Cultural Change to Improve Retention of Servicewomen' (2008), p 18, provided to the Review.
- 267 Minister for Defence Science and Personnel, note 258.
- 268 Minister for Defence Science and Personnel, note 258.
- 269 De Vries, et al, note 259.
- 270 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*. All figures quoted are from the electronic sample.
- 271 Focus group 10A.
- 272 Focus group 13B.
- 273 Focus group 3B.
- 274 Focus group 17A.
- 275 Focus group 3B.
- 276 Focus group 3B.
- 277 Focus group 18D.
- 278 Focus group 3A.
- 279 Focus group 15B.
- 280 Focus group 37B.
- 281 RAAF, 'SQNLDR Distance Course 2011 Leadership Module Study Guide', note 251, p 38.
- 282 Focus group 10A.
- 283 Focus group 37A.
- 284 Meeting with career management representatives.
- 285 Focus group 15A.
- 286 Focus group 37A.
- 287 Focus group 13B.
- 288 D E Chandler, 'The Maven of Mentoring Speaks: Kathy E. Kram Reflects on Her Career and the Field' (2011) 20(1) *Journal of Management Inquiry* 24, p 25.
- 289 Chandler, above, p 25.
- 290 Focus group 3B.
- 291 Chandler, note 288, p 25.
- 292 Focus group 14D.
- 293 Focus group 13B.
- 294 Focus group 2A.
- 295 Focus group 16B.
- 296 Focus group 10A.
- 297 Minister for Defence Science and Personnel, note 258, p 17.
- 298 P Tharenou, 'Does mentor support increase women's career advancement more than men's? The differential effects of career and psychosocial support' (2005) 30(1) *Australian Journal of Management* 77, p 77.
- 299 Focus group 13B.
- 300 Focus group 37D.
- 301 Focus group 37A.
- 302 Focus group 37A.
- 303 See Appendix L.



“My friends in the civilian industry are amazed by the flexibility offered by my organisation, the excellent benefits, my ability to attend school swimming carnivals and undertake occasional school drop offs, our maternity benefits and option to work part time, and wish their employers were as magnanimous and trusting.”

**ADF member
(Confidential Submission)**



Chapter 6:

Combining a Military
Career with Family

In summary

- Enabling members to balance work and family is a critical retention tool and will increase the diversity of the ADF workforce and leadership. In an environment where ab initio (entry level) recruitment dominates, flexibility will increase retention and strengthen the ADF.
- A widespread belief exists that women in the ADF must choose between career and family. This is reflected in data showing that 88.9% of men in the star ranks have children, compared to only 22.2% of women.
- Decisions regarding workplace restrictions during pregnancy should be based on contemporary research and best practice.
- A perceived inability to backfill maternity leave positions encourages negative perceptions of this form of leave and influences the choices of those who may need to take it.
- Extended leave, such as maternity leave, can negatively impact career progression.
- Breastfeeding facilities in ADF workplaces could be improved to support women upon return from maternity leave, as currently exists in a range of businesses and organisations.
- Structural and cultural constraints impede many members' access to flexible work practices. These include entrenched beliefs about the types of roles that are suitable for flexible work, a belief that flexible work is only for women, inconsistent implementation by middle managers, workforce planning difficulties and a negative stigma that is attached to flexible work.
- ADF members experience problems in accessing child care in locations and within the hours that are suitable for their needs. Access to appropriate, affordable quality child care in regional and remote areas can be especially difficult.

The challenge of combining work and family is not unique to the ADF environment. Certainly, Australians across all sectors of the workforce negotiate a balance of these obligations. However, this juggle is a particular challenge for members of the ADF who work in posting cycles, have operational commitments and undergo deployments to sea or overseas. This means that, for women especially, the need to combine work with family disproportionately impacts on career progress and hinders leadership opportunities. It is not possible to increase the representation of women and the diversity of the ADF workforce and leadership without better enabling members to balance work and family.

Many women in the ADF feel they face a stark and mutually exclusive choice in respect of career or family. The decision to start a family is constrained by a number of issues, including the management of pregnancy within the ADF, access to and return from maternity and parental leave, availability of flexible working arrangements, accessibility of child care and the impact of postings and deployments. The ADF's policies regarding these issues are generally comprehensive, but their implementation is inconsistent and requires improvement. The Review will explore these issues in more detail throughout this Chapter.

Through the *Treatment of Women in the ADF Survey*, the Review sought the views of ADF members on their work/family/life balance.¹ About three-quarters of respondents to the Review's online survey agreed that their workplace encourages a healthy balance between 'work, home and family life' and that they are able to maintain this balance.² However, over half of all female respondents (57%) and 36% of all male respondents believed that their career was impacted by caring/family responsibilities. More than half of all female respondents (56%) and 39% of male respondents also agreed that family responsibilities affected their ability to go on deployment.

At senior officer level, 65% of female respondents and 33% of male respondents agreed that family responsibilities affected their ability to go on deployment. Among respondents with dependents, 71% of female respondents and 42% of male respondents agreed that family responsibilities affected their ability to go on deployment. The fact that a larger proportion of female respondents reported difficulties in balancing work and family indicates that it is one of the fundamental structural impediments leading to the under-representation of women in leadership in the ADF.

The relationship between work and family was also frequently raised in the Review's focus groups. A common theme was the perception that female ADF members make a 'choice' between their career and family, and indeed, many feel that it is not possible to have both. For example, the Review heard:

We accept that that's the choice you make. And I'm making a choice not to have children at the moment because I want to be promoted but as soon as I'm promoted I'll make a decision about children.³

I chose not to have children because this is my career. This is what I wanted. That's my choice.⁴

I know plenty of people that are happy not to promote because they want the family life, but there's still good job security and still a career. But then you get the people who want the career, who want to strive and go further. It's the same in any job, if you want to choose a family or a career.⁵

It was noted by some consultation participants that male ADF members do not have to make the same 'choice':

The ADF is a different type of employer ... by nature of the work we do and the loyalty and commitment expected of our members. If one has to choose between one's family and the ADF, it is normal that it is often [the] female Defence member in the relationship that leaves the fulltime ARA [Australian Regular Army] to care for children while the male ADF member remains working fulltime.⁶

These qualitative reports of a choice between family and career are supported by quantitative and survey data. As noted in section 4.1, in all three Services women in senior ranks (Captain or Equivalent and higher) are significantly less likely to be married or have dependents than their male counterparts.⁷ While 88.9% of men in the star ranks have children, only 22.2% of women do.⁸ This data suggests that the choice between family and career is starker for female officers than for women in other ranks.

As section 4.3 discussed, there is an apparent link between difficulty in balancing work and family and discharge from the permanent ADF. In all three Services there is an increased propensity for women to leave the ADF at points that coincide with a typical point where personnel, particularly women, are starting families. Furthermore, the 2010 ADF Exit Survey found that the key reasons cited by women for leaving the ADF related to the impact of ADF service on their family and personal life.⁹

The choice of career or family can be particularly pronounced for women in the Navy, due to sea service requirements which place additional pressures on family life. The Review heard numerous reports of this resulting in female members choosing to discharge from Navy:

She's one of the cleverest girls in the organisation. She's discharging in a month's time. She's been at sea for the last five years and...the Navy just hasn't come to her aid with regard to saying 'Yes, we'll guarantee you two years in that position so at least you can pop out one child', so that's why she's going.¹⁰

I transferred to the [Navy Reserve] as there was no guarantee that with both of us in the [permanent Navy], there would always be one of us posted ashore to care for our children. After nine years of service, I would have remained in the [permanent Navy] if there was a guarantee that my spouse and I would not serve concurrent sea postings so that we could care for our children.¹¹

Again, this is supported by quantitative data. As outlined in section 4.1, the rank of leading seaman in Navy's other ranks, and lieutenant in Navy's officer ranks, appears to be a typical point where more personnel are starting families, and it is also the point at which women fail to progress through the rank structure.¹² Army and Air Force do not appear to have the same stark decline at this point as represented in ADF workforce data.

Strategies need to be implemented to ensure that ADF members, particularly women, can have a career *and* a family, rather than having to choose one or the other. Until this occurs, there will not be an increased representation of women in the ADF. The remainder of this Chapter will discuss key issues that constrain women's ability to balance their ADF career with their family lives, and identify ways that this situation could be improved.

6.1 Pregnancy

The Review heard that the treatment of women who are pregnant can have broader implications for their career. This section will discuss the working restrictions imposed on pregnant women and issues regarding deployment of women who have undergone a pregnancy termination.

The ADF's policy on how pregnancy is to be managed in the ADF environment is set out in Health Directive No 235 'Management of Pregnant Members in the Australian Defence Force' ('Health Directive No 235'). A draft of this document was approved by the Defence Health Policy Steering Group on 29 November 2011, but has not yet been issued. Health Directive No 235 notes that:

Defence members with an uncomplicated pregnancy should, in principle, continue to undertake their normal Service duties to the extent that such work is consistent with the safety and protection of the fetus and the mother. However, these considerations do pose limitations in some areas on employment and preclude pregnant women from deployable operations.¹³

A member who believes she is pregnant must report to an ADF health facility for assessment. When pregnancy is confirmed, the member is issued with a medical certificate 'that details proposed workplace restrictions' and Command is to be notified of the pregnancy when it 'can be reasonably assured of continuing'.¹⁴ This normally occurs at a Unit Medical Employment Classification Review (UMECR) but can be initiated earlier by the member and her medical officer.

A list of 'more commonly used employment restrictions' for members who are pregnant is set out in annexure A to Health Directive No 235, but the document notes that additional employment restrictions may be required depending on the nature of the member's workplace whilst they are pregnant.¹⁵

(a) Workplace restrictions

Women told the Review about the impact of being required to notify Command of pregnancy and the associated restrictions on day to day work:

Once a woman becomes pregnant, I can only speak about the Army here, it's bam!...'You can't do this, you can't do that'. Whereas in the outside job force, in that time that you are pregnant and still at work you're still effective, you're employed effectively.¹⁶

I actually felt that I was blacklisted because they have...blanket restrictions. They go 'you're pregnant, these are the things you can't do'. [I was] now only allowed to go for a walk...[I was] not allowed to lift certain weights and [the restrictions] really stuffed me up on getting back because I found my fitness dropped so much because I was so restricted.¹⁷

Pregnant members may not render sea service¹⁸ or air crew duties¹⁹ from the time that they provide advice of their pregnancy. Some members reported a supportive working environment despite being 'grounded' although work pressures, if anything, increased with a change of duties. An Air Force member told the Review:

During my...pregnancy I was working as an instructor, and found the workplace to be reasonably supportive of my situation...I found however, that as I progressed through the pregnancy my executive staff were less able to understand and facilitate the changes that pregnancy brings – for example, fatigue...I certainly felt the pressure to continue to 'uphold my end of the bargain' i.e. in order to make up for not flying I would take on a larger non-flying load.²⁰

The Review heard from another RAAF member that, given the very small number of female pilots:

...the Chain of Command does not know how to 'handle' a pregnant pilot. Adopting a model that Virgin use would be a start (i.e. you can continue flying while pregnant; programming is conducted a month in advance etc.). If the RAAF does not get the career/life balance right with female pilots, they will not be able to retain them.²¹

While the management of pregnancy should be considered in the context of an employer's general obligation to ensure a healthy and safe work environment for all staff, risks to pregnant members should be assessed objectively, free from discriminatory assumptions and/or stereotypes.²² Much depends on the evidence upon which an employer relies to justify the need for workplace restrictions. The soundness of this evidence has an impact on whether an employer may be acting in a discriminatory manner under the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth) ('SDA').

The question of what amounts to less favourable treatment on the ground of pregnancy is one of fact. If a restriction is imposed upon pregnant members because medical evidence indicates a serious and not remote risk to a woman or her unborn child as a result of engaging in particular conduct, it is unlikely that such a restriction would constitute less favourable treatment on the ground of pregnancy within the meaning of the SDA,²³ particularly given that work health and safety laws require employers to do what is reasonably practicable to ensure the health and safety of workers.²⁴

However, the Review notes that the risk attached to an employee undertaking a particular activity may be different at different stages of pregnancy. Caution should therefore be exercised against imposing restrictions for the entirety of a member's pregnancy unless the activity is contraindicated for the duration of the pregnancy.

Conversely, if medical opinion indicates that there is only a remote risk to a member or her unborn child in performing a particular function, preventing the member from performing that function because she is pregnant is more likely to amount to less favourable treatment on the ground of pregnancy.²⁵

The Review requested access to the information upon which the Defence Health Policy Steering Group based its decision to provide approval for Health Directive No 235 on 29 November 2011. In response, the Review was provided with a new draft version of Health Directive No 235 dated May 2012.²⁶ In addition to the list of employment restrictions contained in the current policy document, the new draft Annexure A also includes, next to each restriction, a reference to the material upon which the ADF has relied to justify the restriction.

The Review commends the ADF on its intention to make transparent the basis upon which it imposes workplace restrictions on pregnant members. In doing so, it must ensure that any decisions regarding restrictions imposed during pregnancy are based on contemporary research and best practice.

(b) Deployment of members who undergo elective termination

Paragraph 47 of Health Directive No 235 states that:

Redeployment or future deployment of members who undergo elective termination of pregnancy requires upgrade to a deployable MEC [Medical Employment Classification] in accordance with the Health Support Order for the operation and is dependent on their medical and psychological fitness at the time. Once cleared, redeployment remains a Command decision.²⁷

This provision may be read as suggesting that undergoing an elective termination of pregnancy can impact on an ADF member's career progression, though it is difficult to be certain and it may be that the paragraph is simply worded clumsily. The Review notes that if a member who has terminated a pregnancy and who meets the relevant health standard is not deployed because she has had a termination, this may amount to sex discrimination.²⁸ Further, if a member was not deployed because of concerns about her mental or physical health and such concerns cannot be substantiated based on medical evidence, then this may amount to unlawful disability discrimination.²⁹

6.2 Maternity and Parental Leave

The impact of maternity and parental leave on career progression emerged as a key theme throughout the Review. The Review heard in focus groups that many members have had positive experiences with maternity leave:

I personally feel given my current experience with working flexible hours and three days a week and having had 14 months off instead of the normal sort of three...Defence has bent over backwards to accommodate my family.³⁰

Navy's got some good policies with regards to...the ability to manage your career...I have children and I've been able to maintain my career and have time away from work as well. We've got excellent maternity provisions which are available to all of us, and also the ability to return to the workforce and continue on.³¹

The Review also identified a number of areas where conditions could be improved for members accessing and returning from maternity and parental leave. These include the need for increased backfilling of maternity and parental leave positions, addressing the impact on career progression of taking this leave, increasing workplace support for breastfeeding and ensuring that the ADF's policies appropriately reflect members' choices. These are explored in further detail throughout this section.

(a) Access to maternity and parental leave

The ADF offers two types of leave to assist eligible members in the latter stages of their pregnancy, to allow recovery time following birth and to provide an opportunity for members to care for newborn children.

Maternity leave is granted to 'a member who is pregnant or has recently given birth'. A total of 52 weeks is available to members, up to 14 weeks of which is paid. Members are able to take recreation leave or long service leave instead of unpaid leave.³² Maternity leave may be taken at half pay (to extend the period of paid maternity leave) if approved by the CDF.³³ If a member returns to work early, she is entitled to take maternity leave again during the 52 week period.³⁴ An application for maternity leave submitted by an eligible member must be approved.³⁵ All members who are pregnant 20 weeks before the expected date of birth are entitled to a maternity leave absence.³⁶ ADF members are entitled to **paid maternity leave** if they have completed 12 months' 'qualifying service', which is a continuous period of 12 months of:

- full-time service in the ADF
or
- any other employment recognised for the purpose of the *Maternity Leave (Commonwealth Employees) Act 1973*.³⁷

Reservists not on continuous full-time service are not eligible for paid or unpaid maternity leave from the ADF; however they are entitled to a 52-week break from their minimum training service obligation.³⁸

Parental leave is available to members on continuous full-time service who become the parent of a 'newborn or adopted dependent child'.³⁹ Eligible members may be granted two weeks of paid parental leave and may also access up to 64 weeks of additional unpaid parental leave.⁴⁰ Members are entitled to paid parental leave if they:

- are on continuous full-time service
- become 'the parent of, or takes full parental responsibility for, a newborn or adopted dependent child'
- 'are not entitled to paid maternity leave'.⁴¹

Similar eligibility conditions apply to unpaid parental leave, although a member who has taken 52 weeks maternity leave may then take up to 14 weeks unpaid parental leave.⁴² ADF authorities are not obliged to approve applications for parental leave.⁴³ Reservists are not eligible for parental leave unless they are on continuous full-time service, however they can be granted 'up to 66 weeks' break in their service obligations if they become the parent of a newborn or adopted dependent child.⁴⁴

Further details on the ADF's policy on maternity and parental leave are at Appendix M.1.⁴⁵

(b) Use of maternity and parental leave

Despite these policies, a relatively small proportion of the ADF are using paid maternity and parental leave. In 2011, about 4% of women in the ADF accessed paid maternity leave, while almost 4% of men and less than 1% of women accessed paid parental leave. An even smaller proportion used unpaid maternity and parental leave in 2011. Almost 2% of women in the ADF accessed unpaid maternity leave and less than 1% of women and men in the ADF accessed unpaid parental leave.⁴⁶ The low numbers of members taking unpaid maternity or parental leave suggests that the ADF's culture is not receptive to those who take longer breaks.

It is noted that there were some errors in the data provided by the ADF, as a number of men were identified as accessing paid maternity leave (for which they are not entitled).⁴⁷ The Review was told that this was due to errors in the inputting of data into the ADF's personnel management system.⁴⁸ While the numbers of men identified as taking paid maternity leave in recent years are relatively small, correct data is important to ensure that the use of maternity and parental leave by ADF members can be accurately monitored and appropriate workplace planning measures put in place. Entry and use of data on maternity and parental leave should be improved to ensure accuracy and as a way of monitoring uptake and other related issues.

(c) Backfilling of maternity/parental leave positions

While policies to provide maternity or parental leave are clearly in place, it is less clear whether the use of these forms of leave is supported in implementation. A critical issue frequently raised during the Review's consultations was whether a position left vacant by a member on maternity or parental leave can be 'backfilled' (that is, whether it can be filled by another member during the period of leave). The ADF's policies on this issue are not easily accessible and lack clarity.⁴⁹

Based on advice provided by the ADF it seems that backfilling is possible in some circumstances, although the specific arrangements vary by Service.⁵⁰ Despite this, the widespread organisational practice and belief presented to the Review was that backfilling rarely occurs, 'because it can't'. The Review heard:

I'll be on maternity leave, so my job will be backfilled by one person doing two days a week, the other position won't be filled at all. So we're actually looking at robbing another section... even if [the Directorate of Personnel] were kind enough and said 'alright, we're gonna give you people', then we're just taking that hurt from another unit.⁵¹

Members have noted that in some areas, it can be difficult to backfill positions because of the limited trained staff that are available:

We've got unique qualifications... We've got a female working for us who just went on maternity leave, you can't just grab another tiger pilot and go 'yeah, fill this job for ten months' because there's not that many of them.⁵²

An inability to backfill encourages negative perceptions of maternity/parental leave. Members told the Review that colleagues and supervisors can feel some resentment towards women taking maternity leave, due to the personnel shortages it creates in teams:

One of the girls that works for me, she's just gone on mat leave... She's got a year off and somebody else has got to do her job and they're getting paid no more for it, they're working extra hours to do two people's work.⁵³

Commanding Officers automatically resent women coming to the workforce, because every one of them is a potential pregnancy.⁵⁴

Supervisors have also raised some reluctance to have multiple female members employed in their units, due to the likelihood of their positions not being filled if they become pregnant:

I looked at employing females down in the XXX Squadron last year, and in the analysis of that you know we can do two females at the most at any one time because of the risk of any more than one of them being on maternity leave, which would then put us below the capability threshold.⁵⁵

One supervisor has noted that this system requires change:

As a supervisor I would not welcome having to bear a manning shortfall because one or more of my key workers (man or woman) took an extended time off to have a child or care for a child...It does not help the case for equal opportunities and family caring when the section has to bear the loss of key members on maternity or carer's leave.⁵⁶

It can also affect the choices and feelings of members intending to take maternity leave:

I delayed having a second child because I didn't want to hurt the organisation at that time...It depends on your command. If you've got a very supportive Commanding Officer you'll probably find that they wouldn't have an issue.⁵⁷

The Review recognises the complexity of workforce planning in the ADF. However, the impact that current arrangements have on both unit capability and individuals means that further work should be undertaken to facilitate increased backfilling of maternity and parental leave positions, while also ensuring that members are able to return to an appropriate position following their period of leave. Given the widespread belief within the ADF that backfilling is not possible because of funding or policy issues and that in practice it rarely occurs, clarification and communication of the backfilling process to key personnel must also occur. Workforce planning issues will be discussed further in the 'Flexible Working Arrangements' section in this Chapter.

(d) Impact on career progression

The Review often heard about the impact of periods of maternity and parental leave on members' career progression.

The ADF's Pay and Conditions Manual states that periods of paid maternity and parental leave are considered 'effective' service, and therefore contribute to a member's 'time in rank' for the purposes of promotion.⁵⁸ Periods of unpaid leave including unpaid maternity and parental leave are considered 'ineffective' service, a term which carries negative connotations and should be changed to eliminate the adverse perceptions associated with this leave.⁵⁹ A period of 'ineffective service' will affect accrual of certain entitlements. In addition, 'ineffective service' is not counted for the purposes of 'time in rank' calculations which, as discussed in section 4.4, can factor into promotions considerations.

Members vary in their opinions as to the extent to which maternity and parental leave absences impact on career progression. Some suggest that it delays promotion: '...you might get there in time, it might just take you a little bit longer'.⁶⁰ Others suggested that these absences can have a more negative impact. For example, in response to a question about the impact on career of having a family and taking time off to have children, there was consensus in one focus group with Navy women that it was 'career death'.⁶¹

The Review also heard of a perception that some impact on career progression is inevitable:

You are stagnant in your progression in your career when you have kids.⁶²

If you have children at major level, you can pretty much write your career off.⁶³

We can't really sacrifice capability in order to necessarily overly compensate for mothers... Sometimes there are going to be situations where a female might not have the same career opportunities and it may be due to the fact that they have had children and they are raising a family. It's not something that

necessarily is going to be completely avoidable...In some instances, it's just the way it's going to have to be, so we can ensure that we are prepared for the next war.⁶⁴

Focus group and survey participants cited a number of specific ways in which maternity leave absences can impact on women's career progression. These will be highlighted in the rest of this section.

(i) Reduced competitiveness

Perceived and actual reduced competitiveness was reiterated by members in focus groups:

Before you had children you might have been gunning for a particular job that you wanted and if you've taken time out to care for some children, you might not be as competitive for that job anymore. So, it is difficult to argue against that if your counterpart has been doing all of the things that's making them a more rounded individual to go to that job.⁶⁵

I know for a fact that a lot of career advisors pressure women to come back from maternity leave to make sure they get a [performance appraisal report]...I have also been told that I have suffered because I'm missing a [performance appraisal report] for a year.⁶⁶

While someone should not be discriminated against by taking time away from work to have a family, the fact that they have not achieved the same career milestones in that time period will make them less competitive... An alternate view would be that someone who has prioritised their career in the defence force above having a family should not be denied career progression opportunities in favour of someone who is less experienced and qualified in order to compensate the second person for having a family.⁶⁷

Similarly, focus group participants noted that members taking service breaks, such as women who take breaks to have a family, can fall 'behind their cohort' in regards to seniority:

There are people at captain and major level and lieutenant colonel level who do decide that their priority is to go off and have children. So they do fall out of their seniority, out of their cohort, and they do get passed by more junior up and comers, and therefore get passed over...⁶⁸

To suggest a woman who has not completed the right courses or completed requisite postings should be able to be viewed as competitively as her male and female counterparts who did not just take 12 months away from their career is grossly unfair to those who did do the work.⁶⁹

In addition, others have noted the difficulty of re-establishing contact with superiors:

It's not so much you are catching up with your peers, I think part of it would be they have lost their reporting stream. So they have to re-establish their reporting stream...with people that don't know them anymore.⁷⁰

(ii) Career gates

As noted in section 4.4, periods of maternity leave and rearing of children can coincide with critical 'career gates' – promotional gates such as selection for and completion of a command course at the Australian Command and Staff College or taking a command position being just two examples:

If you miss those gates...that's pretty much it for you.⁷¹

I was offered and told I was competitive for sub-unit command in my first two years as a major but I had two children very close together so, first of all, I asked 'Would it be acceptable for me to march in late to a sub-unit command?' and I was told 'No'. So, essentially I knocked back sub-unit command for two years. As a result, I haven't met the traditional model... I guess people could say 'Well, you still got here'. I've got here later and that does affect your credibility 'cause it's assumed that there was something wrong with me and therefore I wasn't good enough to get there at the start.⁷²

As outlined in section 4.4, the ADF has a rigid career structure and missing these key gates can have a major impact on women's future career prospects.

(iii) Currency of skills

A further concern raised by focus group participants is the loss of currency of skills during periods of maternity leave:

In the technical field if you're away from the equipment for 12 months...you lose trade skills. So when she does come back to work, she can't just jump straight into the job [with] current authorisation in the same experience.⁷³

They've lost currency particularly for those who haven't seagoing currency for promotion...They need to be current to actually be eligible for promotion.⁷⁴

However, not all ADF members agree with these concerns regarding loss of currency of skills. One senior Navy male told the Review:

There's no way people lose their skill sets in two years.⁷⁵

(iv) Options to reduce career impact

The ADF is pursuing options to address some of these issues, although this varies by Service.⁷⁶ Greater efforts should be made to reduce the negative impact on career of maternity and parental leave.

The Review recommends that the flexibility of the ADF's career model be increased. This includes developing options that would allow people on leave to access training and career gate courses online, if they wish to do so, to enable the currency of their role to be maintained. The ADF could also offer opportunities for other members on extended breaks to register their interest in undertaking short projects or other appropriate work, if they wished to do so. This could assist members in maintaining their currency of skills and would also provide an opportunity for them to receive a performance report during their period of leave. Senior Navy and Air Force members have indicated support for such an initiative.⁷⁷ The ADF could also improve mechanisms to facilitate ongoing communication with women on maternity leave.

The ADF could also investigate offering 'career intermissions' to allow both men and women to 'change lanes' for periods during their ADF service, rather than taking an 'off ramp' from their career. This could be modelled on the structured Career Intermission Pilot Program being undertaken by the United States Navy. Recognising the need to retain experience and trained members who might otherwise permanently separate, this program allows eligible Navy members to apply for a break from active military service of up to three years for 'personal or professional growth'.⁷⁸ It is intended that these career breaks will not have a penalty on the member's career, although it is noted that promotions data is not yet available to demonstrate whether that is the outcome in reality.⁷⁹ A career intermission program would be particularly effective in driving change if a high percentage of men took advantage of it. To the extent that a member used his or her career break to gain valuable experience in another organisation, it could be an excellent method of developing talented ADF members, who would return to the ADF with an enhanced understanding of other organisational cultures.

While not all ADF members that the Review spoke to about this initiative supported the suggestion, a senior Australian Navy member was very positive about the possibility of implementing such a strategy in the ADF. He noted that under such a system, ADF members should not necessarily have to drop a cohort. Rather, this could be considered on a case-by-case basis to recognise the experience (such as non-ADF professional experience) that a member could gain during a career intermission.⁸⁰

(e) Breastfeeding

A further issue identified is the extent to which the ADF supports breastfeeding upon women's return from maternity leave.

Research suggests that an optimum duration of exclusive breastfeeding for newborn children is six months.⁸¹ Breast milk has also been recommended as part of an infant's diet until they are around 12 months old.⁸² However, available data from the ADF suggests that many women who have taken a period of maternity leave

return to work prior to six months after the birth. In total, 505 women in the ADF took paid maternity leave in 2011, with an average duration of approximately 96 days; in comparison, only 223 women took a period of unpaid maternity leave, which would presumably be taken following the completion of paid leave.⁸³ The seemingly small number of women taking extended periods of leave following the birth of a child suggests there may be a need for the ADF to accommodate breastfeeding in the workplace. Other major organisations are doing likewise.⁸⁴

The Review has heard that following return to work from maternity leave, women can experience difficulty in accessing breastfeeding facilities at work:

I was reduced to expressing milk in either the toilets or taking someone else's office...I took my lunchtimes and I went and fed her directly at the childcare centre, which is about 15 kilometres away. So I would drive, sit and eat my lunch while she was having her feed and then drive all the way back.⁸⁵

The unit accepted the fact that I was going to take six months leave even though we were low manned but when I came back that was the hardest because obviously you're still trying to express and/or breastfeed...There's nowhere that's really a locked room that you could sit there and feel comfortable and do those sort of things that you needed to do for your child.⁸⁶

Prior to returning to work, I approached my boss...and explained to him...that I was intending [to express] and if it would be possible to have access to a clean, private area. He informed me that because...there were a shortage of offices that I would not be able to have access to an office, and perhaps I could use the disabled toilet. He was happy to support my release for work to express though (twice a day for about 20 minutes, around lunch and afternoon smoko time)...it can be very difficult and confronting, trying to explain to a male dominated hierarchy why I don't need my child present while expressing milk and what expressing involves. I feel as though there is very little support at times.⁸⁷

The ADF has released a policy on supporting breastfeeding in the workplace, which includes guidance to managers on options to accommodate breastfeeding and the provision of breastfeeding-friendly facilities in the workplace.⁸⁸ It is also understood that members are able to take lactation breaks as a form of 'variable working hours' under the ADF's policy on flexible working arrangements, although this is not explicitly stated in that policy.⁸⁹ Given the difficulties discussed by a number of consultation participants, the ADF's work on breastfeeding should be actively implemented. Air Force is seeking to be accredited by the Australian Breastfeeding Association as a breastfeeding friendly organisation.⁹⁰ While the Review recognises that not all ADF facilities may be able to accommodate breastfeeding facilities, Army and Navy could also pursue this accreditation.

(f) Support for women's choices

Based on an analysis of the ADF's maternity and parental leave policy, elements of the policy may not realistically support the choices women make regarding maternity leave.

One issue is the period of 'required absence' for pregnant women, which forms part of the maternity leave period. Generally this period commences six weeks prior to the expected date of birth until six weeks after the actual date of birth, although this can vary in cases where the member has a birth or the pregnancy ends earlier than six weeks before the expected date of birth.⁹¹ While a member can apply for permission to work later than six weeks prior to the expected date of birth, with support from a medical certificate, it is possible that this may not provide sufficient flexibility for women who wish to commence their maternity leave later than six weeks prior to the expected date of birth.⁹²

A further issue is that the ADF recognises maternity leave as being associated with pregnancy and childbirth, and as such, it is not available to members who become parents through measures such as adoption.⁹³ Currently, an ADF member who adopts a child must apply for parental leave, rather than maternity leave. ADF authorities are not obliged to approve applications for parental leave. This has implications for whether adoptive parents will be guaranteed access to leave, and the duration for which they will be paid for that

leave. The current policies do not adequately recognise the various ways in which ADF members may become parents, and the subsequent care that is required for any child.

In comparison, the Commonwealth Paid Parental Leave scheme provides the same paid leave entitlements to the primary carer of an adopted child as to parents by birth.⁹⁴ In its 2009 report on its *Inquiry Into Improved Support For Parents With Newborn Children*, the Productivity Commission provided a number of justifications for providing an extended period of paid leave to adoptive parents of young children. For example, it noted that where children are adopted from overseas, the Australian Government requires that one adoptive parent be at home for six months to one year.⁹⁵ It also noted that while adoptive parents do not require time for physical recovery from birth or breastfeeding, time is required to develop a relationship with the adopted child.⁹⁶ The Review therefore considers that adoptive parents in the ADF should be eligible for maternity leave. The ADF could also consider any parallel issues that may exist for members who become parents through surrogacy arrangements. The ADF's maternity and parental leave policies should be reviewed to ensure that they realistically support women's choices.

6.3 Flexible Working Arrangements

The need for flexible working arrangements emerged as a central issue throughout the Review. Such arrangements are critical not only to enable members with caring responsibilities to continue their careers, but have benefits for all members.

A broad range of structural and cultural barriers impede the implementation of flexible working arrangements within the ADF. These include limited coordination and data collection, entrenched beliefs about the types of roles that are suitable for flexible work, gendered norms about flexible work, inconsistent implementation by middle managers, workforce planning difficulties and a negative stigma that is attached to flexible work. These issues will be explored throughout this section.

The ADF's policy on flexible working arrangements is set out in *Defence Instruction (General) Personnel 49-4 Flexible work arrangements for members of the Australian Defence Force*. An updated version of this policy was released in May 2012 and recognises flexible working arrangements as an important tool for the retention of ADF members.⁹⁷ Under the Policy, the following flexible working arrangements are available to ADF members:

- Temporary home located work, which can be used 'in a temporary or occasional arrangement, or as an ongoing arrangement for a specified time, on a part-time or full-time basis.' All ADF members may apply for temporary home-located work.⁹⁸
- Variable working hours, under which members may 'vary their start and finish times and periods of absence from the workplace to suit their individual circumstances. This may be used in one-off cases or as an ongoing arrangement.' All ADF members may apply for temporary home-located work.⁹⁹
- Part-time leave without pay (PTLWOP), which enables members to work a reduced number of days in any fortnightly pay period. PTLWOP is generally only available to permanent members and reservists already performing continuous full-time service. Members returning from maternity or parental leave 'are entitled to PTLWOP in the two-year period immediately following the birth, or in the case of adoption, the date of placement, of a child or children'; where applications for PTLWOP are made in these circumstances, they are 'to be recommended and approved, unless genuine operation requirements exist.' The minimum period for a PTLWOP arrangement is usually three months. Under the Policy, PTLWOP includes job sharing.¹⁰⁰ (Further details on the ADF's policy on flexible work are at Appendix M.2).

Where a member has a flexible working arrangement agreement in place, this will not necessarily follow them if they are re-posted; rather, these agreements generally have to be re-negotiated.¹⁰¹

Data on use of PTLWOP is limited and the ADF was not able to provide data on the total number of ADF members who took PTLWOP in a given year. However, based on the monthly snapshot data available, it is clear that PTLWOP is not widely used. The available 2011 data suggests that:

- Significantly more women than men are likely to take PTLWOP. In 2011, between 1.79% and 3.03% of female permanent and Gap Year members and members on continuous full-time service took PTLWOP per month, compared to around only 0.06-0.11% of men.
- In 2011, RAAF female permanent and Gap Year members and members on continuous full-time service were more likely than their counterparts in Army and Navy to take PTLWOP. Between 2.76% and 5.79% of female RAAF members were on PTLWOP arrangements each month in 2011, compared to only around 0.98-1.81% of female Army members and 1.78-2.21% of female Navy members.
- The use of PTLWOP arrangements appears to have increased since 2006, although numbers are still very small. In 2006, between 1.16-1.87% of female permanent and Gap Year members and members on continuous full-time service took PTLWOP, compared to 1.79-3.03% in 2011. For men, 0.04-0.08% were on PTLWOP in 2006 compared to 0.06-0.11% in 2011.¹⁰²

Formal data on use of temporary home-located work and variable working hours by ADF members is not available, although in focus group discussions the Review heard many anecdotal reports of 'informal' arrangements being used by ADF members. For example:

If he needs to go, yes, he's able to do it...It's just an informal agreement.¹⁰³

There's inherent flexibility in the way we train...in that you can cover the 'out of cycle' stuff, the once off, once every couple of weeks and drop the kids at school 'cause their wife is doing [something]... That's fine, that happens all the time and we do that right across Army.¹⁰⁴

While there is value in informal arrangements, it is also important that members have certainty about their access to flexible work.

Temporary home-located work, variable working hours and PTLWOP are not the only ways in which ADF members may work flexibly. As discussed in section 4.3, permanent members, particularly women, often choose to transfer to the Reserve in order to balance their work and family lives more effectively and to access flexibility not otherwise available to them as a permanent member. While section 4.3 noted that moving to the Reserve has some drawbacks, this may at least partially account for the relatively small numbers of ADF members who are on a PTLWOP arrangement.

Members told the Review about positive experiences accessing flexible working arrangements. For example:

I have been very privileged to work for bosses who have supported my need for PTLWOP and flexible work arrangements. I am very grateful for the flexibility and support shown during the different stages of motherhood.¹⁰⁵

I have felt strongly supported by my command chain in the past few years. I had approved informal flexible working arrangements to enable me to manage my family circumstances during a challenging period, and am I grateful to my command chain (including operational personnel) for supporting me over this time. I also feel that I was still able to contribute to the workplace through the use of alternate mechanisms such as [the Defence Remote Electronic Access and Mobility Service] even though I wasn't working the normal working hours of my unit.¹⁰⁶

Despite these accounts, a number of issues remain with the implementation of the ADF's flexible working arrangements policy. Flexible working arrangements are an essential retention tool, particularly in an environment where the principal recruiting model is ab initio and lateral recruitment occurs only in very limited areas. Flexible working arrangements allow talent to be retained thereby strengthening the ADF. For this reason, it is critical that the availability of flexible working arrangements in the permanent ADF be increased. The Review recommends that each Service Chief set an annual growth target to increase the number of flexible work arrangements.

Specific issues that impede the implementation of flexible working arrangements policy, and how they can be addressed, will be further discussed throughout the remainder of this section.

(a) Coordination and data collection

There has generally been limited central oversight of the implementation of the ADF's flexible working arrangements policy to date, particularly in regards to the approval of applications. In some areas, lack of oversight is being addressed. For example, Air Force is implementing a policy to ensure that all applications for flexible work are submitted to its Directorate of Personnel, regardless of whether they are approved locally. This allows the Directorate of Personnel to develop solutions to flexible work issues that may not be apparent at base level.¹⁰⁷ Army is also implementing measures so that unit commanders, rather than lower levels, have greater responsibility for approving applications.¹⁰⁸

The updated ADF flexible working arrangements policy also provides for oversight of flexible working arrangements applications. It notes that, where applications for flexible work are not approved or recommended, they will be subject to further 'external' review. Career management agencies are also specified as the 'approving authority' for PTLWOP applications.¹⁰⁹

However, the limited oversight to date not only appears to have influenced inconsistent application across Services (to be discussed further below); there has also been a lack of central data collection on use of flexible work arrangements. Data on the number of members using variable working hours or working from home has not been collected centrally, as these arrangements are usually implemented at unit level. The Review was only able to access limited data on the number of staff on PTLWOP. While some data was provided, it was not possible to access a figure for the total number of men or women on part-time leave without pay in a given year.

Data collection should improve under the recently revised flexible working arrangements policy, which requires that career management agencies maintain statistics on 'all types of FWA [flexible working arrangements] formally applied for, and approved/declined or recommended/not recommended'.¹¹⁰ This is a positive development, as limited data collection has implications for the extent to which the uptake of flexible working arrangements can be monitored and appropriate workplace planning measures put in place. Without data, it remains an 'invisible practice' and one that is not broadly acknowledged throughout the ADF.

Despite these recent developments, there is further scope for centralised oversight of the implementation of flexible working arrangements. The Review recommends that a central ADF Flexible Work Directorate be established within the Defence People Group. Its responsibilities would include monitoring progress against the flexible working arrangements growth targets, and collecting tri-Service data on all applications for flexible work arrangements. This will ensure a more strategic understanding and assessment of flexible work arrangements across the ADF. Responsibilities of Service personnel agencies would include reviewing all flexible work arrangement applications in consultation with the relevant commanding officer, and maintaining a register to assist with the application process and better enable the matching of applicants for job sharing and flexible working arrangements. Unsuccessful applications would be further reviewed. Both the ADF Flexible Work Directorate and Service personnel agencies would be responsible for reporting on progress.

(b) Inconsistent implementation of flexible working arrangements

There are three key factors that influence the implementation of flexible working arrangements in the ADF, and which have led to inconsistency in the availability of these arrangements to members:

1. type of role
2. gender of applicant
3. views of supervisors and commanders.

(i) Type of role

Work within the military is not confined to the traditional image of members as soldiers, pilots and sailors. The ADF has many trades, occupations and specialisations, including but not limited to clerks, cooks, musicians, medical and legal officers and engineers.

Members consistently told the Review that some roles are not suitable for flexible working arrangements. While members employed in a 'stable' position, such as an office, may have access to flexible work, other roles were frequently cited as being inappropriate due to the type or hours of the work and in some cases, for security reasons. For example, members stated:

There's at least three or four of us that have flexible working hours and it's never been an issue...but our working environment is fairly stable, completely the opposite of seaman officers.¹¹¹

It's a lot for harder for a technical trade where they've got certain jobs they've got to achieve every day with limited capability.¹¹²

...in my experience, flexible arrangements are better suited to simpler/transactional type duties.

Command, leadership and more complex appointments (which are often a necessary precursor to command and leadership) are often untenable for flexible arrangements.¹¹³

The Review acknowledges that flexible working arrangements may be unsuitable for some roles, particularly in deployed environments, on ships or when 'outfield'.¹¹⁴ Sea postings, for example, involve extended periods away from home which make it difficult to implement flexible working arrangements such as part-time work or variable working hours. The Review heard comments such as:

...family flexible work arrangements and service on a ship or an operational deployment is mutually exclusive.¹¹⁵

Flexible working hours should be tailored to positions, not to the ADF as a whole. [It is] difficult to arrange flex working hours at sea or in fleet supportive roles.¹¹⁶

I know they're talking about job sharing but that's pretty hard to do at sea.¹¹⁷

These beliefs are reinforced in the Defence Instruction on flexible working arrangements. The Instruction specifically notes that the sea component of a sea-shore roster can only be undertaken full-time.¹¹⁸

The Instruction also notes that members 'deployed overseas on warlike and non-warlike (operational) deployments, on overseas representational duties, overseas exchange programs or on secondment are not eligible for PTLWOP.'¹¹⁹ More broadly, the Instruction outlines that a range of other work areas may not be suitable for flexible working arrangements. These include:

- seagoing or field postings
- jobs that require daily direct customer face to face contact
- situations where regular, face to face contact with other team Defence Members is an integral part of the job
- jobs where access to specialised requirements or classified information is required
- where supervisory or divisional responsibilities may conflict with FWA
- where the Defence Member is posted to a training establishment
- where equipment or services required to undertake the proposed work cannot be reasonably provided by the Commonwealth.¹²⁰

In addition to these issues, the Review also heard that there is a lack of flexibility in the delivery of some courses that are required for career progression. For example, some consultation participants told the Review that a program at the Australian Defence College which forms a significant career gate could not be undertaken part-time and that courses required for the completion of that program were not available online.¹²¹ A member outlined the potential career implications if the course were offered part-time:

It's great to offer flexibility... but it comes back to the 'gate'. So, I know for Army, doing this course part-time, then you won't be getting promoted to lieutenant colonel, maybe you might get promoted in five or six years' time but you won't go in line with your cohort, you will get delayed.¹²²

One member noted that it would be useful if the course could be offered more flexibly to enable work/life balance:

It would be nice to go, 'Well, I'm struggling. I need to drop a subject and I'll pick it up next year' and maybe pick up one or two subjects in the first six months of next year. This would've...put the workload at a level where I'm not going to have some sort of mental health crisis.¹²³

Flexible working arrangements could be successfully implemented in a broader range of roles than currently appear to be available. Other industries have previously encountered entrenched ideas, such as rostering norms and perceptions about the suitability of particular roles, when implementing flexible work and have identified innovative strategies to facilitate flexible work.¹²⁴ The Review recommends that the personnel agencies of each Service should conduct a broad review of job design, statements of duty and team work allocation to identify where full-time work is the only sensible model. All other roles in the ADF should be identified as potentially available in flexible working arrangements.

It is understood that Navy is already undertaking a review of how its shore positions can accommodate formal flexible work practices.¹²⁵ As discussed in section 4.3, Navy is also implementing alternative crewing arrangements on several vessels to increase flexibility and locational stability. Workforce models and personnel arrangements should be further strengthened to increase workforce flexibility and improve work/life balance. Service personnel agencies should be responsible for this work.

'Defence Remote Electronic Access and Mobility Service' (DREAMS) tokens are already available to some members and this has facilitated some remote working. The ADF could also trial other technologies that will enable more flexible work practices. For example, the use of technology such as Secure Mobile Environment Personal Electronic Devices (SMEPED) which enable personnel to make classified telephone calls and access classified networks may facilitate secure working from home arrangements.¹²⁶ This will provide greater capacity for members to achieve what they need to achieve in different locations, different times or different ways.

(ii) Gender of applicant

Both male and female members are entitled to apply for flexible working arrangements and carer's leave. However, gender differences exist in access to these arrangements.

Certainly, the Review has heard some reports of male ADF members being able to access flexible work. For example, in one focus group it was stated:

We had a member last year whose partner was deployed and he was given the opportunity to start work at eight thirty, because our normal day is seven thirty to four thirty and he got the opportunity to start an hour later and knock off an hour earlier to drop the kid off, pick the kid up, that sort of stuff.¹²⁷

The Review is also aware that other men are interested in working flexibly. One male member stated:

Males are taking an interest and becoming stay at home dads and that sort of thing. I've got a baby due in April and I'd love to be able to stay home and look after the bub and let my girlfriend go to work.¹²⁸

A number of members have identified that men can encounter particular difficulties in accessing these arrangements. As one Reserve member stated:

I believe that getting flex work is easy for women, but for men it is largely unavailable.¹²⁹

At times, it is clear that these difficulties are underpinned by gendered assumptions about caring responsibilities. For example, one RAAF member recalled:

When we get carer's leave [applications] in at work and we have to get them approved, the supervisor always asks 'well, where's the wife?'¹³⁰

The Review has also heard that there can be some stigma attached to men accessing flexible work:

If a man was to try to access flexible work practices...then there may be some animosity there or some reluctance, which there shouldn't be.¹³¹

He's looking at options for him to actually be the primary caregiver earlier and me going back to work earlier. However at this point he's looking outside of Defence, because a male spouse taking that supporting role is not as accepted.¹³²

As well as being inequitable, this can place additional pressures on female ADF members whose partner is also in the ADF:

His chain of command said we really don't want to let you have time off to look after your child...you can only get a certain amount of time for carer's leave. I will have used up all my carer's leave, and next year if they turned around and said the same thing I will have had to start using my actual leave for looking after my daughter, where he'd still have all his carer's leave sitting there.¹³³

I have asked for leave without pay three times and been denied three times due to my 'importance' and had it explained that if I did, my promotion would be delayed to the same amount of time. Far from affecting my career the result was [that] after much consultation, my wife who did have access to flexible work packages resigned to look after the children full-time and to concentrate on one career within the family...With no flexibility offered to me as a male, this was not possible and my wife's career paid the price.¹³⁴

In a male-dominated culture, the use of flexible work practices by men sends a powerful message to others that this is a legitimate working arrangement and that it is possible to be a serious worker and an engaged parent. Opportunities to access flexible working arrangements should be available to all ADF members, regardless of gender. This view was consistently supported by ADF members involved in the Review's consultations.

(iii) Views of supervisors and managers

'Middle management' can be a particular sticking point in the implementation of the ADF's flexible working arrangements policy. As one member stated:

I think the senior sirs and people making decisions and policy up here have got the right idea with those sorts of things, however getting that message down to the middle managers is difficult.¹³⁵

The views of individual supervisors and commanding officers have significant influence on whether members are able to access flexible working arrangements and other family friendly provisions, such as carer's leave. The Defence Instruction on flexible working arrangements states that 'Arrangements to utilise [flexible working arrangements] are to be negotiated in the first instance between the Defence Member and their supervisor.'¹³⁶ Unit supervisors and commanders are responsible for approving applications for variable working hours and temporary work from home arrangements, and commanding officers are also involved in considering applications for PTLWOP prior to further action by career management agencies.¹³⁷

Due to the ADF's stringent chain of command system, it is possible that a member may not feel comfortable challenging decisions by their supervisor or commanding officer not to approve an application for flexible working arrangements.

Respondents to the Review's online survey were generally positive about their commanders' views towards flexible work and work/family balance.¹³⁸ A majority of respondents agreed that the ADF is a family friendly employer (62% female respondents, 64% male respondents). Over three-quarters of respondents also agreed that their commanding officer/manager was a family friendly employer (75% female respondents, 77% male respondents). A majority of respondents believed that the ADF supports the use of a range of flexible work practices (60% female respondents, 56% male respondents) and also that their commanding officer/manager supports the use of a range of flexible work practices (61% female respondents, 61% male respondents). Across these items, senior members were more likely than junior members to feel that the ADF and their commanding officer/manager was supportive of flexible work practices.

The Review has heard reports of managers embracing flexible working arrangements. For example, the commanding officer of one Army brigade has released a directive to improve acceptance and understanding of work-life balance, which includes statements in support of flexible working arrangements.¹³⁹ In some cases, senior figures act as positive role models in this regard for members they supervise:

We have a commanding officer who's very family oriented. In fact, the whole command team is pretty much family oriented...It is the culture of this [base] at this time that family comes first, regardless of anything else...I know that there are numerous other units within [this base], certainly departments in the greater Navy, where family does not come first.¹⁴⁰

However, in other cases senior figures have modelled behaviour that emphasises personal sacrifice in favour of ADF commitments. One female member stated:

At the end of the day all of my commanding officers have worked really, really hard and they've all sacrificed time with their families and I guess that that's the example that you're provided.¹⁴¹

Throughout the Review's consultations, many members also recalled instances where supervisors have not supported flexible work, or where approval between units would vary depending on the management. When asked whether someone could feel confident applying for flexible working arrangements, one member responded 'It depends on who's looking after you, it depends on your divisional staff.'¹⁴² Others stated:

If the supervisor has kids they're more sympathetic than the ones that don't have kids. My last supervisor that I had, her son was sick a few times and she would ring up the commanding officer and say 'I can't come in, he's not well', and he would go 'yes, that's fine, we'll see you tomorrow'. If it was the same case for her supervisor here, they would go 'Why? Why can't your husband do it?' They wouldn't understand.¹⁴³

And you've got that really old, crusty warrant officer that you work under, and ...his wife didn't work, she raised the kids and she stayed at home. He didn't take carer's leave, he didn't take sick leave, he didn't have to leave early to go to the kid's parade. You come in, new age soldier, trying to be a mum, ask to take a bit of time off, 'oh, never happened in my day!¹⁴⁴

It appears to be 'who you know', and if this is not the case you have to prove your worth in applications for flexible workplace practices.¹⁴⁵

I asked for variable work hours as I was unable to find before school care for my 5 year old daughter (I am a single parent and was [posted to] Darwin at the time with no family support). I was openly accused of [not] providing 'unrestricted service' because I applied for what I consider to be an ADF endorsed policy.¹⁴⁶

In any organisation, employees' access to flexible working arrangements is at the discretion of supervisors. As will be discussed further in the next section, the Review also recognises that, in seeking to implement flexible work, supervisors and commanding officers in the ADF have to balance the sometimes competing demands of looking after members' welfare while also maintaining ADF capability and operational readiness.¹⁴⁷ This does not mean, however, that these flexible arrangements should not be applied. Rather, supervisors require practical support to assist them in managing flexible work, especially as some members have identified lack of knowledge on the part of managers as a particular barrier to the implementation of flexible working arrangements:

Speaking to my counterparts in companies, they know how to manage these part-time workforces. Our systems just make it really hard. Most commanding officers or other people don't know how to do it.¹⁴⁸

I was expected by my sergeant and flight sergeant to carry out the entire duties of what would normally be expected of a member working full-time...My sergeant had not managed a member on [part-time leave without pay] previously; neither had he dealt with a member with alternate working arrangements.¹⁴⁹

These issues also appear in other organisations. Researchers have previously identified the difficulties that managers can encounter in the implementation of flexible work initiatives, and have identified the need for training and other appropriate support.¹⁵⁰ Some information, particularly regarding the types of issues that should be considered when negotiating flexible work, is already provided as guidance for members and supervisors in the Defence Instruction on flexible working arrangements.¹⁵¹

The Review is also aware of advice being provided to managers, which varies by Service. Within Air Force, for example, targeted training is delivered to personnel managers in the Personnel Branch, and flexible working arrangements awareness training is delivered to participants in the Commander's Course. Air Force personnel staff are also producing information to improve understanding of the new Defence Instruction on flexible working arrangements. In contrast, Navy and Army appear to rely primarily on self-reading of the relevant Defence policies by personnel, although Army is also planning to produce a guide for commanders.¹⁵² Despite this existing work, an increased and more consistent approach is required to educate managers on the implementation of flexible working arrangements. This should be undertaken by the proposed ADF Flexible Work Directorate. Potential measures could include provision of information online to enable managers and members to access most frequently asked questions and how to respond.

Researchers have also suggested that managers be held accountable for the implementation of diversity initiatives. One way of achieving this is to include diversity issues, such as management of flexibility, in supervisors' performance reviews. This could include members providing feedback to their supervisors on these issues.¹⁵³ The ADF should therefore increase the accountability of commanding officers and supervisors for the implementation and management of flexible working arrangements.

(c) Workforce planning issues

As already discussed in relation to maternity and parental leave, the ADF has complex workforce planning systems. Workforce planning issues have also arisen as an impediment to the implementation of flexible working arrangements in the ADF.

The ADF has a multitude of complex systems which govern workforce planning.¹⁵⁴ 'Average funded strength' is a 'budgetary measure used to count the average number of ADF members paid on a full-time equivalent basis during a financial year'.¹⁵⁵ 'Establishment' refers to the number of positions that exist, and 'headcount' is used to describe the total number of ADF members at a particular point in time. There are also variations between each Service in relation to language used to describe the systems and elements thereof, and how they operate. These variations and complexities inhibit a clear understanding, even within the ADF, of whether positions can be filled to full capability.

Nevertheless, many ADF personnel feel there is a tension between flexible working arrangements and providing adequate capability. A widespread belief exists of 'one position, one person' in the ADF. As stated by a member:

ADF systems are not set up to allow for part-time employment, for example if a unit supports part-time employment for a staff member that unit has to suffer the burden of the vacant position, there is no easy system to employ two staff members on part-time work against the same position.¹⁵⁶

The apparent difficulty of filling positions to achieve full capability has a significant impact on the willingness of supervisors to approve applications. For example, the Review heard:

There's all these options out there, flexible working hours, part-time leave without pay, but when you've got someone who is going to [take] their part-time leave without pay [and] you've got no one to cover that job because [the Directorate of Personnel] won't post someone else in there...If there aren't people to do the job the planes don't fly.¹⁵⁷

It can also create resentment from other members who may have to undertake additional work due to the reduced hours of their colleagues, or create an unrealistic workload for individuals on PTLWOP:

If I put in for flexible work arrangements, what does that mean to the rest of my colleagues? And there's an element of resentment there.¹⁵⁸

You've either got a unit that is wearing hurt or a person that is trying to take on board more than what they need to.¹⁵⁹

I have heard many cases where females have ended back at work full-time after doing a short part-time stint realising that they were working full-time but being paid a part-time wage.¹⁶⁰

Given the widespread confusion about how workforce planning operates, and the impact this has on the implementation of flexible work practices, it is clear that significant change is required to improve this situation. Baird, Charlesworth, and Heron have noted that resourcing managers to implement part-time work can reduce the chance of either excessive work for the part-timer, or resentment from colleagues who are allocated additional work.¹⁶¹

Throughout the Review, ADF members suggested that a pool of additional positions could be allocated to facilitate the filling of units to full capability where members are using flexible working arrangements. The Review is aware that Army is implementing such a system, whereby a member on a flexible working arrangement can be held against a 'pool position' in the relevant unit, and another member could fill the position left vacant. As such, rather than having just the individual on flexible working arrangements, the unit has that member and a full-time member.¹⁶² Air Force has also examined the introduction of 'management margins' and additional resourcing to accommodate flexible employment.¹⁶³ It has already made available a pool of 60 'temporary vacant' positions to facilitate flexible employment, but these positions were 'soaked up' for other purposes as soon as they were approved.¹⁶⁴ While these initiatives are worth exploring, it is not clear that this is the most effective solution to this issue. Further, the use of extra resources for 'pools' or 'management margins' does not resolve the complexity that currently exists in the ADF's workforce planning system.

The difficulty in filling the remainder of a position when an individual works part-time, or holding more than one member against one position in a job sharing arrangement, is a fundamental obstacle to the effective adoption of flexible work practices. Without significant change, the ADF will continue to struggle to retain people with caring responsibilities. The Review is not aware of any structural impediments to implementing a system such as the 'full-time equivalent' system used in many other organisations.

The Review recommends that the ADF introduce a workforce management system that enables more than one member to be posted to the same position. This would enable the provision of additional staffing to facilitate flexible work practices, such as job sharing. The Review recognises that additional resources may be required to achieve this objective, but views this as fundamental to increasing the availability and number of flexible working arrangements within the ADF. The reform must be widely communicated and effectively explained to all ADF members. This could increase the flexibility of the ADF's workforce planning arrangements, and embed effective flexible work arrangements in its culture. This will also be an important retention tool to address the stark decline in women's participation in the ADF at these critical milestones in life. Increasingly, the availability of flexible working arrangements and family friendly policies will be a crucial recruitment and retention tool for all personnel.

(d) Impact on career

Members on flexible working arrangements remain eligible for promotion, although the Defence Instruction notes that the 'time in rank' of members on PTLWOP may be calculated on a pro rata basis depending on the number of days they work.¹⁶⁵ As outlined in section 4.4, arrangements on this issue vary by Service. PTLWOP does not affect a member's seniority in Air Force. However, pro rata calculations are used in Army (although the situation varies depending on whether the member is an officer or a soldier) and Navy to determine the member's effective service, which is the basis of 'time in rank' calculations. These variations may impact on

the length of time it takes for a member to become eligible for promotion. In addition, if a member is using a flexible working arrangement, their performance appraisal report must include reference to this arrangement.¹⁶⁶ Information on whether a member is on a flexible working arrangement is provided to promotion boards.

The ADF suggested to the Review that inclusion of a flexible working arrangement on a performance appraisal report can be beneficial for a member:

This is important not only for promotion consideration (may show the member can work without constant supervision, is self-directed and self-disciplined) but may also help identify suitable candidates for positions where members are required to work independent of their chain of command or need to be able to make decisions with limited direction. It may also show that a member has the capacity to manage a heavy workload under significant time restrictions. On the whole, it can positively prove a member's capabilities and capacity for positions of greater responsibility.¹⁶⁷

However, similar to the views raised in relation to maternity and parental leave, there is a widespread acceptance within the ADF that working part-time should have an impact on career progression in comparison to full-time members:

If a man decides to take a leave of absence or work part-time so as to pursue other priorities his ADF career progression should suffer. A woman is no different...For the situation to be otherwise, punishes those who chose to focus on building their careers.¹⁶⁸

The Review also heard the perception that ADF members working part-time can be viewed less competitively and are seen as less 'committed' than their full-time colleagues by promotion boards, which reinforces a culture of 'presenteeism'. For example, one member stated:

I was on part-time leave without pay when I was coming to board for [promotion] and my career manager rang me and said 'can you just come back to full-time, just in the lead up to the Board... I had to be full-time, to go to Board to be seen as committed and the real deal.'¹⁶⁹

Some members thought this attitude should change:

It shouldn't matter whether it is two days a week or five days a week if you are meeting the goals and outcomes of that job.¹⁷⁰

One potential way of overcoming these issues could be to look at achievement 'relative to opportunity', so that someone who is working part-time would be assessed for promotions based on what they have achieved and the skills they have developed in the time they are at work, rather than necessarily being compared to the expectations of a full-time employee. Similarly, assessments for promotion could be made on an outcomes-based model, rather than a time-based model; that is, focusing on the outcomes achieved, rather than the time spent in a particular role.

(e) Perceptions and attitudes to flexible working arrangements

It is clear that there can be a negative perception of and resentment towards those who use flexible work arrangements. As already explored, this is partly because such arrangements can result in additional work for other team members. The Review has also heard other reports of negative views directed towards members working flexibly:

We've got a guy at work at the moment who shows up to work between 8 and 8.30 every day because his wife is at sea and he takes their daughter to day care. The bitching that goes on in the office about him coming to work at 8, 8.30.¹⁷¹

I've had people take their five second snapshot of me. Like I'm not at my desk at 7.30 in the morning and they have that perception that I'm slacking off but they don't see me there at 5 o'clock in the afternoon.¹⁷²

In some cases, it is possible that the stigma may be attributable, at least partially, to the use of the term 'part-time leave without pay'. One member raised concerns about this terminology with the Review:

You know that funny saying, when you're in a flexible working arrangement here we say you're on leave without pay...that's as if you're...sitting back with a glass of champagne ...There's a language I think that needs to change.¹⁷³

This type of imagery suggests there is a perception of a member who is not 'pulling their weight' in an ADF environment that strongly emphasises the value of teamwork. This is reinforced by another member:

I was seen as being a team player only after I had returned to duty full-time.¹⁷⁴

At times it seems that this resentment and stigma may also be underpinned by a lack of understanding about flexible working arrangements. This is certainly clear in the following statement from one ADF member:

I know a lady that has kids, who works here, and she only does...a three day a week thing, which obviously works really well but then I think, are you compromising your job like that?¹⁷⁵

There is scope to improve this situation. One measure would be to change descriptions of part-time work to simply a form of flexible work. Terms such as 'part-time leave without pay' and 'part-time' carry negative connotations of a member only being 'part committed' to the organisation.¹⁷⁶

A further option could include increasing information available to all ADF personnel about the availability and intent of flexible working arrangements, and how effectively they can function. Baird, Charlesworth and Heron have identified the dissemination of information about 'how well part-timers were performing' in a number of male-dominated workplaces as one practice that helped to move the part-time and flexible work agenda forward in those organisations.¹⁷⁷ Services are already undertaking a range of initiatives to inform members about flexible work.¹⁷⁸ However, given the lack of knowledge identified in consultations, increased and more consistent educative work should be undertaken.

Baird, Charlesworth and Heron also noted that support of senior management 'provided an important signal that the work culture should change towards acceptance of part-timers' in the male-dominated organisations they examined.¹⁷⁹ In recent years, the former Chiefs of Army and Air Force have circulated directives in support of flexible working arrangements.¹⁸⁰ Within the ADF, the CDF and Commanding Officers must give a visible commitment to flexible work practices to demonstrate that it is a positive, rather than a negative, work option. Consideration could be given to whether any existing leadership positions currently held by men could be performed effectively in a flexible work arrangement. As noted earlier in this Chapter, one focus group participant told the Review about the positive influence of a particular leader's views towards work/family balance on the culture of the whole school.¹⁸¹ This is a constructive example that other ADF bases could replicate.

6.4 Child care

Access to child care is an important factor in facilitating women's workforce participation and the need for quality, accessible child care emerged as a consistent theme throughout the Review. Particular issues include the need for flexible child care options, increased availability of child care at the hours and locations required by ADF members, and the manner in which priority of access is allocated to ADF members. These issues will be explored throughout this section.

(a) ADF Program and Policy

The ADF has a 'Defence Child Care Program' which is intended to 'facilitate priority access to early childhood education and care for Defence families upon arrival in a new posting location, where the local community cannot meet the demand.'¹⁸² Defence supports long day care and out of school hours care centres, as well as facilitating access to family day care, under this program.¹⁸³ Defence also provides limited funding to Defence families for day care. Further information on the ADF's practical support for child care is at Appendix M.3.

The ADF also has a child care policy, released in 1992, which is intended to guide the support provided by Defence for child care. It is intended to be read in conjunction with the *Defence Childcare Guidelines*, however Defence has advised that these Guidelines are out-of-date and no longer used. Defence has further informed the Review that Defence Instruction (General) Personnel 42-2 *Defence Child-care Policy* and associated *Defence Childcare Guidelines* are being revised.¹⁸⁴

There is an incongruity between figures provided by the ADF on recent use of Defence child care centres, and other evidence presented to the Review regarding demand for child care. Figures provided by the ADF suggest that Defence child care centres may be under-utilised. As at February 2012, the average daily occupancy compared to licenced capacity was 69% across all Defence child care locations. This figure varied between 37% and 93% depending on location.¹⁸⁵ Defence has advised that reasons for this may include varying demand due to posting cycles; the location of some of the Defence child care centres, which are often on or near Defence establishments and may not be close to residential areas; as well as 'difficulty in attracting community enrolments because of Defences '[Priority of Access] guidelines and the "one month's notice to vacate" may be a deterrent to community families'.¹⁸⁶

Qualitative evidence gathered by the Review suggests that there remains considerable demand for quality child care. The Review has heard:

You'd think they would [provide child care] because we're a major base and it's supposed to be family friendly. It's amazing. It would be so much easier to just come to work, here's my kid, take my kid... An on-base childcare would be amazing.¹⁸⁷

There definitely needs to be better access to child care centres for Defence members, or perhaps a subsidy to use civilian centres.¹⁸⁸

Some focus group participants also identified provision of child care as a tool for increased retention of ADF members.¹⁸⁹

Responses to the Review's online survey suggest that Defence's current provision of child care is inadequate.¹⁹⁰ The responses to the items dealing with childcare suggest a large degree of uncertainty about childcare arrangements for ADF members. Among members with dependents, only 30% believed that there was adequate access to childcare. Nearly half of all female respondents with dependents (46%) and 36% of male respondents with dependents did not believe that access to childcare was adequate. A slightly higher percentage of women (38%) than men (31%) agreed that better access to childcare would improve their career progression opportunities.¹⁹¹

While the data provided to the Review suggests that some Defence child care centres may be under-utilised, the Review is aware that many Defence members are accessing some form of child care for their dependent children. Defence Census figures suggest that a proportionately low number of dependent children aged 0-6 years of permanent ADF members are utilising Defence employer-sponsored childcare.¹⁹² Greater numbers were identified as using long day care and/or occasional care at other child care centres, which suggests that there is some demand for child care facilities with the hours and location required by ADF members.¹⁹³ Apart from childcare provided by a spouse or other family member, childcare used by children aged 0-6 years of permanent ADF members includes family day care, nannies, paid babysitters, vacation care and respite care.¹⁹⁴ This may suggest that traditional child care centres do not always meet the needs of ADF members, and that there is a need for Defence to consider the provision of more flexible child care options for ADF members.

(b) Availability and accessibility of child care

There are a number of specific areas where the provision of child care support to ADF personnel could be improved. A particular issue cited by Defence personnel is the location of available child care centres:

There are child care centres that I guess put Defence families first...but it still takes twenty, twenty five minutes to drive in on some mornings...You can't get in there too. It's full...The only other place that opens that would fit in with the time that we work is all the way over the other side of Darwin.¹⁹⁵

There are no child care facilities within 25 minutes of [my workplace]. My work hours also limit child care locations. There must be a child care facility established at [this location] if it is to be an equal opportunity employment location for the ADF.¹⁹⁶

The Review also frequently heard that child care centres are often not open at the times they are required, due to the irregular hours worked by many ADF personnel:

We joke in the Military that we're employed 24 hours a day...There are...jobs that either have very long work hours like those who work for Admirals, or very crappy work hours when you are on duty and you are overnight, or when you come in at midday and you finish at midnight because something's going on. Childcare centres don't open those hours.¹⁹⁷

[The] ADF should be trying to provide child care that mirrors ADF work hours of that base. I found it quite difficult at the last base I worked at had work hours of 0700 – 1700 but the day care was only open from 0730 – 1630. Instead of using ADF day care, we've had to use private day care operator due to the longer hours.¹⁹⁸

The Review also heard that members can encounter particular difficulties in accessing appropriate, quality child care in regional and remote areas. For example, in one remote area visited by the Review, a member stated:

I've got some young soldiers that have problems with child care – there's not enough up here and basically they can't get to work on time because of the fact that the child care centre doesn't open on time for them to get here by seven thirty.¹⁹⁹

To address these issues, Defence should examine the operation and accessibility of its child care services, including in remote and regional locations, to ensure that they effectively meet the needs of ADF personnel. Given the range of child care types accessed by ADF personnel, this could include supporting a range of flexible options for child care, such as support for in home care, in addition to traditional child care centres. This may also help to address barriers leading to the under-utilisation of ADF child care facilities evident in figures provided to the Review.

The Review also heard concerns about Defence's 'Priority of Access Guidelines'. Since July 2005, the Defence Priority of Access Guidelines have applied to manage the application of placements in all Defence child care centres. Points are allocated as outlined in the table at Appendix M.4. This point system was 'introduced to assist "mobile" Defence families access Defence employer sponsored child care within six months of arriving in a new posting locality'.²⁰⁰ However, the Priority of Access Guidelines do not appear to adequately prioritise return from maternity leave in relation to points allocation. The allocation of points has also been raised as an issue by focus group participants:

The personnel that are moving from Darwin have a wife, for example, that might not even work but wants to pursue other interests... [they] actually ended up with more points than me as a serving member with a serving spouse coming back from maternity leave. So that system...definitely needs review.²⁰¹

As this is a critical point at which families require child care, this point system should be reviewed to ensure that it appropriately reflects the needs of ADF families.

The Review also heard concerns about child care needs at the time of postings and deployment. Unlike civilian families, ADF families may be required to move every three years (or less) and must continually make new child care and out of school hours care arrangements. This is often in areas where they have little or no family support.

6.5 Conclusion

Improving support for work and family balance is crucial to ensuring women's recruitment, retention and career progression in the ADF. The stresses of combining work, life and family and the perceived need to choose between family or career were issues of great concern to ADF members.

It is clear that there are a number of areas where the ADF can better support members to combine their family lives with their careers. These include consideration of how pregnancy of ADF personnel is 'managed'; facilitating access to maternity and parental leave and flexible working arrangements, including through improved workforce planning systems and more consistent policy implementation, without detriment to members' careers; and improving access to appropriate, affordable, quality child care. Throughout this Chapter, the Review has identified specific actions that will assist the ADF to address these issues. The ADF must implement measures to allow women to have a family and a career, rather than being forced to choose. This is a critical issue that goes to the very heart of the sustainability and capability of the ADF.

1 The figures in the following paragraphs are taken from results of the online *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*. Paper survey responses and further discussion are in Appendix B.

2 Similar results were found in the 2011 Defence Attitudes Survey, in which around 65% of surveyed ADF members agreed with the question 'My workplace encourages a healthy balance between work, home and family life': 'HRMeS Extract 13 Feb 12' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 15 February 2012.

3 Focus group 4B.

4 Focus group 14A.

5 Focus group 11E.

6 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*; See also Focus group 23B.

7 Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 242 and 246 – Demographic data' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 10 February 2012.

8 154 of 174 of men at Star rank have children, whereas only 2 of the 9 women at Star rank have children, Defence Workforce Information, 1 June 2012.

9 Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research, *2010 Australian Defence Force Exit Survey Report: Reasons for Leaving*, DSPPR Report 14/2011 (January 2012), pp 51-52.

10 Focus group 12A.

11 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.

12 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 242 and 246 – Demographic data', note 7.

13 Department of Defence, *Health Directive No 235, Management of Pregnant Members in the Australian Defence Force*, draft approved by Defence Health Policy Steering Group 29 November 2011 provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 6 December 2011, para 1.

14 Department of Defence, *Health Directive No 235, Management of Pregnant Members in the Australian Defence Force*, draft approved by Defence Health Policy Steering Group 29 November 2011, above, para 6.

15 Department of Defence, *Health Directive No 235, Management of Pregnant Members in the Australian Defence Force*, draft approved by Defence Health Policy Steering Group 29 November 2011, above, para 33.

16 Focus group 11E.

17 Focus group 11E.

18 Department of Defence, *Health Directive No 235, Management of Pregnant Members in the Australian Defence Force*, draft approved by Defence Health Policy Steering Group 29 November 2011, note 13, para 32(d).

19 Department of Defence, *Health Directive No 235, Management of Pregnant Members in the Australian Defence Force*, draft approved by Defence Health Policy Steering Group 29 November 2011, note 13, para 36 and Annexure A, para 4.

20 Confidential submission 24.

21 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.

22 Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, *Pregnant and Productive, Report of the National Pregnancy and Work Inquiry* (1999), p 117.

23 *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth), s 7(1).

24 *Work Health and Safety Act 2011* (Cth), s 19.

25 The Review acknowledges that restrictions may be placed on pregnant ADF members for reasons other than danger to the pregnant worker or her unborn child. Limitations may be placed on pregnant members because, for example, there would be difficulty in obtaining appropriate medical care in a particular location, the member may give birth before a deployment is scheduled to end or a pregnant member may not be able to meet the physical demands of the role. In all cases, the reason for the imposition of a particular restriction will be relevant to determining whether the restriction constitutes less favourable treatment.

26 'Health Directive No 235 Management of Pregnant Members in the Australian Defence Force May 2012' (draft) provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 8 June 2012.

27 Department of Defence, *Health Directive No 235, Management of Pregnant Members in the Australian Defence Force*, draft approved by Defence Health Policy Steering Group 29 November 2011, note 13, para 47.

28 *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth), s 7(2).

29 *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* (Cth), s 15.

30 Focus group 6A.

31 Focus group 9B.

32 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, Department of Defence. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/dpe/pac/> (viewed 12 June 2012), Divisions 5.4.3 and 5.4.18.

33 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Division 5.4.15.

34 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Division 5.4.12.

35 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Division 5.4.12.

36 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Division 5.4.12; SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 16 March 2012.

37 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Divisions 5.4.14 and 5.4.4.

38 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Division 5.4.16.

39 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Divisions 5.5.3 and 5.5.4.

40 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Divisions 5.5.3 and 5.5.4. It is noted that the duration of the total leave period is longer for parental leave than for maternity leave. The ADF has advised the Review that this is based on previous legislative and industrial relations decisions: 'The *Maternity Leave (Commonwealth Employees) Act 1973* (Cth) provides

- for 52 weeks of unpaid leave. The ADF has adopted this level of assistance in the [Pay and Conditions Manual (PACMAN)]. In line with [the Defence Enterprise Collective Agreement], 14 weeks of this period can be paid leave. The 66 weeks of unpaid parental leave was put in place by the Australian Industrial Relations Commission (now Fair Work Australia) in about 1990 through a negotiation process as a result of a parental leave test case. This 66 week period was placed into the General Employment Conditions Award and subsequently into the Australian Public Service Award. This 66 week period was adopted as the appropriate level of assistance for ADF members through the PACMAN. Two weeks of this period of leave can be paid.' SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 16 March 2012.
- 41 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Division 5.5.3.
- 42 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Divisions 5.5.4 and 5.5.6.
- 43 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 16 March 2012.
- 44 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 32, Division 5.5.5.
- 45 Members can also access the Commonwealth Government's Paid Parental Leave scheme, subject to meeting the eligibility criteria for that scheme. It provides up to 18 weeks parental leave, paid at the national minimum wage, to eligible working parents who are the primary carer of a child born or adopted after 1 January 2011. This pay is in addition to any paid maternity or parental leave provided by Defence but is not an extra leave provision. People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 32, Parts 4A and 5; Family Assistance Office, 'Paid Parental Leave scheme for working parents', <http://www.familyassist.gov.au/payments/family-assistance-payments/paid-parental-leave-scheme/> (viewed 31 May 2012).
- 46 Calculations based on data from 'RFI 441 2011 Maternity and Parental Leave' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 6 June 2012; Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2010-11*, pp 273-274. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/Budget/10-11/dar/index.htm> (viewed 6 June 2012). The number of members accessing paid and unpaid maternity and parental leave in 2011 is compared to the total number of ADF personnel (including Permanent, Gap Year, members of the active Reserve, and Reservists on continuous full time service) as at 30 June 2011. It is noted that Reservists generally are not eligible for maternity/parental leave unless they are on continuous full time service but may access a 12 month break from training obligations. As the Review does not have data on the number of Reservists who have taken a break from training obligations for this purpose, they are not included in the percentages provided.
- 47 'ADF MAT PAT Leave 2003 to 2010 V2' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 6 November 2011; 'RFI 441 2011 Maternity and Parental Leave', above. Data provided to the Review suggested that the following numbers of men have accessed paid maternity leave in recent years: 2003 - 24; 2004 - 3; 2005 - 1; 2006 - 4; 2007 - 2; 2008 - 1; 2009 - 2; 2010 - 3; 2011 - 2. The two men identified as accessing paid maternity leave in 2011 have not been included in the Review's calculations of the percentage of ADF members accessing maternity and parental leave in 2011.
- 48 R Philbey, email to the Review, 22 November 2011; CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 31 May 2012.
- 49 The Review was referred to three policies for advice on whether maternity and parental leave positions can be backfilled. Navy's policy is contained in an annex to the Sailor's Career Management Manual. While it provides relatively clear guidance that a position can be filled, this document is not easily accessible and does not provide a policy position on Navy officers. Army advised that it does not have a specific policy on this issue, but that such a posting would be managed through the policy 'Career management of soldiers in the Australian Regular Army and Army Reserve'. This document does not provide clear advice on procedures for backfilling, nor is it clear how backfilling of officers' positions would occur. Air Force's relevant policy, 'Posting, Attachment and Temporary Duty - Permanent Air Force' does not appear to clearly articulate whether backfilling can occur. For further information, refer to: Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 12 January 2011, Annex A to Chapter 4; Department of Defence, *Defence Instructions (Army) PERS 47-11, 'Career management of soldiers in the Australian Regular Army and Army Reserve'*, 20 December 2005; Department of Defence, *Defence Instructions (Air Force) PERS 3-1, 'Postings, Attachment and Temporary Duty - Permanent Air Force'*, 20 November 1997.
- 50 Navy has advised that maternity/parental leave positions can be backfilled, depending on the duration of leave. In this instance, members would generally be posted to a 'pool position' during their leave, which would allow another member to be posted into that position. However, '...provision of a relief may result in there being no suitable vacancy in the same locality when the sailor returns from MATLVE [maternity leave].' RAAF members remain posted to their position during their leave period. In exceptional and extenuating circumstances, a position can be temporarily backfilled. A Reservist may also be employed to do the duties but not be posted against the position. Army has advised that maternity/parental leave positions can be backfilled if a suitable replacement is available, although this is often not possible in a Posting Year. Army further advised that: 'The use of pool positions although not a preferred approach would be considered if it was appropriate to the circumstance.' The member going on leave would be posted into the pool position, and an individual providing backfill would be posted to the unit establishment position. Reservists may only 'fill' a vacancy by being posted to another active or pool position: SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 8 February 2012; Department of Defence, ABR 10, *Navy Sailors Career Management Manual*, Chapter 4, Annex H, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 12 January 2012; SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 17 February 2012; SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 27 February 2012.
- 51 Focus group 7A.
- 52 Focus group 32B.
- 53 Focus group 16D.
- 54 Focus group 1A.
- 55 Focus group 20C.
- 56 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 57 Focus group 7A.
- 58 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 32, Divisions 5.4.19 and 5.5.3.

- 59 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 32, Divisions 5.4.19 and 5.5.4.
- 60 Focus group 2A.
- 61 Focus group 23A.
- 62 Focus group 8C.
- 63 Confidential meeting.
- 64 Focus group 11D.
- 65 Focus group 2A.
- 66 Focus group 28A.
- 67 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 68 Focus group 6A.
- 69 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 70 Focus group 3A.
- 71 Meeting with Defence representatives on CDF Action Plan.
- 72 Focus group 28A.
- 73 Focus group 24E.
- 74 Focus group 3A.
- 75 Confidential interview.
- 76 For example, RAAF has an 'Air Force Connect' program which is intended to provide a mechanism for members on extended leave to keep in touch with the organisation. Within Navy, members are expected to keep in touch with their career manager and the Unit Personnel Officer of the unit to which they are posted, while Army does not have any specific 'keep in touch' policies and the extent to which Army members keep in touch is based on individual choice. Members on leave may access some forms of training (mainly online but in Navy, also training supported through the Defence Assisted Study Scheme or remote project work) at their own discretion. SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 1 March 2012; SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 2 March 2012.
- 77 Confidential meetings.
- 78 Department of the Navy (United States), 'OPNAV Instruction 1330.2A: Navy Career Intermission Pilot Program Guidelines', 30 August 2010. At <http://www.public.navy.mil/bupers-npc/support/tflw/Pages/CIPP.aspx> (viewed 1 June 2012).
- 79 A L Daniel, 'Career Intermission Pilot Program Renewed for Three Years' (Media Release, 16 March 2012). At http://www.navy.mil/search/display.asp?story_id=65933 (viewed 1 June 2012); Department of the Navy (United States), 'OPNAV Instruction 1330.2A: Navy Career Intermission Pilot Program Guidelines', above; meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 80 Daniel, above; Department of the Navy (United States), 'OPNAV Instruction 1330.2A: Navy Career Intermission Pilot Program Guidelines', above; Confidential meeting.
- 81 Productivity Commission, *Paid Parental Leave: Support for Parents with Newborn Children*, Report No. 47 (2009), p 4.22.
- 82 Australian National Health and Medical Research Council cited in Productivity Commission, above, p 4.22; Australian National Health and Medical Research Council, 'Infant Feeding Guidelines for Health Workers' (Draft for public consultation), October 2011. At http://consultations.nhmrc.gov.au/public_consultations/public-consultation-draft-inf (viewed 18 June 2012); Department of Defence, 'Supporting Breastfeeding in the Workplace', Annex B, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 19 June 2012.
- 83 'RFI 441 2011 Maternity and Parental Leave', note 46. It is noted that members may choose to use other forms of leave, such as long service or recreation leave, instead of unpaid maternity leave. However, the Review does not have data on how many women use these options.
- 84 For example, BHP Billiton – Nickel West Kwinana, NSW Police Force, National Australian Bank Limited and IBM, among others, have become accredited by the Australian Breastfeeding Association as 'breastfeeding friendly workplaces'. Australian Breastfeeding Association, *Listing of current accredited breastfeeding friendly workplaces*, http://www.breastfeedingfriendly.com.au/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=32&Itemid=46 (viewed 25 June 2012).
- 85 Focus group 11E.
- 86 Focus group 35B.
- 87 Confidential submission 19.
- 88 Department of Defence, 'Supporting Breastfeeding in the Workplace', Annex B, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 19 June 2012.
- 89 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 2 April 2012; Department of Defence, 'Supporting Breastfeeding in the Workplace', above, p 5.
- 90 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 2 April 2012.
- 91 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 32, Divisions 5.4.24.
- 92 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 32, Divisions 5.4.24.
- 93 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 16 March 2012.
- 94 Family Assistance Office, *Paid Parental Leave scheme eligibility*, <http://www.familyassist.gov.au/payments/family-assistance-payments/paid-parental-leave-scheme/working-parents---eligibility.php> (viewed 19 June 2012).
- 95 Productivity Commission, note 81, p 2.27.
- 96 Productivity Commission, note 81, p 4.57.
- 97 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 49-4, 'Flexible work arrangements for members of the Australian Defence Force'*, 8 May 2012 ('DI(G) PERS 49-4'), p 1.
- 98 DI(G) PERS 49-4, above, pp 2, 5.
- 99 DI(G) PERS 49-4, above, pp 2, 5.

- 100 DI(G) PERS 49-4, above, pp 2, 3, 5-6.
- 101 The ADF's policy on flexible working arrangements notes that the duration of a flexible working arrangement is to be 'no longer than two years per application or *the remaining tenure of the current posting*' (emphasis added). See DI(G) PERS 49-4, above, p 6. The Review also heard in focus groups that flexible working arrangements have to be renegotiated at new locations (for example, Focus group 16D).
- 102 'ADF PTLWOP 2006 and 2011' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 18 January 2012. Figures based on Regulars, Gap Year and continuous full time service personnel.
- 103 Focus group 10A.
- 104 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 105 Focus group 6A.
- 106 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 107 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 30 November 2011.
- 108 Meeting with Army career management representatives.
- 109 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 97, Annex A.
- 110 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 97, p 4.
- 111 Focus group 3B.
- 112 Focus group 16B.
- 113 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 114 Meeting with Navy career management representatives.
- 115 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 116 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 117 Focus group 23B.
- 118 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 97, p 10.
- 119 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 97, p 5.
- 120 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 97, p 5.
- 121 Focus group 28A.
- 122 Focus group 28A.
- 123 Focus group 28A.
- 124 For example, Charlesworth, Keen and Whittenbury discussed these issues and the use of innovative rostering practices in Victorian Police: S Charlesworth, M Keen and K Whittenbury, 'Integrating part-time work in policing services: policy, practice, and potential' (2009) 10(1) *Police Practice and Research* 31, pp 40-41.
- 125 CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 23 May 2012.
- 126 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 2 April 2012.
- 127 For example, Focus group 10C.
- 128 Focus group 12A.
- 129 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 130 Focus group 10A.
- 131 Focus group 11B.
- 132 Focus group 11B.
- 133 Focus group 11E.
- 134 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 135 Focus group 9B.
- 136 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 97, p 5.
- 137 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 97, p 5.
- 138 Figures in this paragraph are from the results of the online *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 139 '17 CSS Bde Directive 1.15 – Work/Life Balance' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 16 May 2012.
- 140 Focus group 15B.
- 141 Focus group 27A.
- 142 Focus group 4C.
- 143 Focus group 4C.
- 144 Focus group 11B.
- 145 Confidential submission 12.
- 146 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 147 Confidential meeting.
- 148 Focus group 1A.
- 149 Confidential submission 19.
- 150 Particular training and support initiatives that have been suggested include: highlighting case studies of successful initiatives; creating an application system/checklist that provides advice on the types of issues employees should consider when proposing and discuss alternative working arrangements; providing sample application and response forms; identifying specific training needs; incorporating flexibility into all training, particularly for managers; and providing opportunities for employees to discuss issues, such as through seminars. E Drew and E M Murtagh, 'Work/life balance: senior management champions or laggards' (2005) 20(4) *Women in Employment Review* 262, p 264; M B Kropf, 'Flexibility initiatives: current approaches and effective strategies' (1999) 14(5) *Women in Management Review* 177, pp 180,182.

- 151 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 97.
- 152 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 1 March 2012; meeting with Army career management representatives.
- 153 M B Kropf, 'Flexibility initiatives: current approaches and effective strategies' (1999) 14(5) *Women in Management Review* 177, p 185; M C Mattis, 'Advancing women in business organizations: Key leadership roles and behaviors of senior leaders and managers' (2001) 20(4) *Journal of Management Development* 371, pp 379-280; R J Recardo, 'Overcoming resistance to change' (1995) 14(2) *National Productivity Review* 5, p 9; Diversity Council of Australia, *Get Flexible! Mainstreaming Flexible Work in Australian Business* (2012), p 27. At <http://www.dca.org.au/News/News/Get-flexible-or-get-real%3A-It%E2%80%99s-time-to-make-flexible-working-a-legitimate-career-choice/245> (viewed 28 June 2012).
- 154 The Review received advice from each Service and the Department of Defence about workforce planning systems: SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 3 April 2012; SQNLDR F James, emails to the Review, 27 April 2012; SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 18 May 2012; SQNLDR F James, emails to the Review, 21 May 2012; 'Workforce structure components', provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 27 May 2012.
- 155 Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2010-11*, p 471. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/10-11/dar/index.htm> (viewed 5 June 2012).
- 156 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 157 Focus group 16B.
- 158 Focus group 11B.
- 159 Focus group 20C.
- 160 Confidential submission 12.
- 161 M Baird, S Charlesworth and A Heron, *Flexible and part time work in Australia: some responses to the need for worklife balance* (English version of a paper to the 'Egalite homes/femmes et articulation travail/famille: vers un nouveau modele?' Conference, Paris, 30 September-1 October 2010).
- 162 Meeting with Army career management representatives.
- 163 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 30 November 2011; SQNLDR J Deveney, *Improving Flexible Employment in Air Force* (2010) pp.27-30, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James on 30 November 2011 and 23 January 2012.
- 164 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 30 November 2011.
- 165 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 97, p 8.
- 166 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 97, p 8.
- 167 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 27 February 2012.
- 168 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 169 Meeting with Defence representatives on CDF Action Plan.
- 170 Focus group 2A.
- 171 Focus group 4C.
- 172 Focus group 23C.
- 173 Focus group 9B.
- 174 Confidential submission 19.
- 175 Focus group 9A.
- 176 The negative perception of part time employees as only 'part committed' has been discussed in relation to other industries such as policing. See Charlesworth, et al, note 124, 39-40.
- 177 Baird, et al, note 161. See also Diversity Council of Australia, *Get Flexible! Mainstreaming Flexible Work in Australian Business*, (2012), p 28. At <http://www.dca.org.au/News/News/Get-flexible-or-get-real%3A-It%E2%80%99s-time-to-make-flexible-working-a-legitimate-career-choice/245> (viewed 28 June 2012).
- 178 For example, Air Force has developed a website on types of flexible working arrangements available to members (and how to apply) and information for members on how to develop a business case for flexible work, and included information on flexible working arrangements in *Air Force News*. Navy has included information in its newsletter *Sea Talk* and through the New Generation Navy webpages. Army has provided some information to its members. SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 30 November 2011; SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 23 January 2012; SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 16 February 2012; 'BR Phase 2 Task 349 – CP13 5_Communication of FWP' and 'NGN Web Page_Flexible Work Practices in the Navy' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 23 May 2012.
- 179 Baird, et al, note 161. See also Diversity Council of Australia, note 177, p 28.
- 180 'CAF_16-08 Work-Life Balance In The Royal Australian Air Forces' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 30 November 2011; 'Chief of Army Intent for Work-Life Balance' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 23 January 2012.
- 181 Focus group 15B.
- 182 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 24 January 2012.
- 183 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 24 January 2012.
- 184 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 20 January 2012.
- 185 Figures taken from '120120 DCCB Input for Broderick Review RFI' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 19 April 2012.
- 186 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 1 March 2012.
- 187 Focus group 4C.
- 188 Figures in this paragraph are from the online *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 189 Focus group 17A.
- 190 Figures in the paragraph are taken from the *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 191 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.

- 192 Based on Census data provided, only around 2.2% of dependent children of ADF Permanent members aged 0-6 years were identified as using a Defence employer-sponsored childcare centre (373 out of a total of 16,973 dependent children aged 0-6 years). Other data provided by Defence suggests that a total of 4,107 children were using Defence child care centres as at February 2012, however: a) it was not possible for the Review to reconcile how this statistic reconciles with the Census figures, and b) it is possible that some of those 4,107 children accessing the Defence child care centres are the children of community members, rather than Defence personnel. '19_2012 Broderick Review Phase 2_RFI 318' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 26 April 2012; 'Copy of 120120 DCCB Input for Broderick Review RFI' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James on 19 April 2012.
- 193 4,021 dependent children were identified as using 'childcare centre – long day care'; 1,111 were identified as using 'childcare centre – occasional care'; 921 were identified as using 'before-school care'; 1,336 were identified as using 'after-school care'; and 86 were identified as using 'other employer-sponsored childcare centre': '19_2012 Broderick Review Phase 2_RFI 318', above.
- 194 '19_2012 Broderick Review Phase 2_RFI 318', above.
- 195 Focus group 11A.
- 196 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 197 Focus group 3A.
- 198 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 199 Focus group 11A.
- 200 From Department of Defence, 'Defence Priority of Access Guidelines', Defence Personnel Executive Minute. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/dco/childcare.htm> (viewed 30 April 2012).
- 201 Focus group 28A.



“Men who are the type who are going to be bullies or sexual harassers of women are generally bullies of men as well. It’s a power thing.”

ADF member (Focus Group)

Chapter 7:

Sexual harassment,^{*}
sex discrimination and
sexual abuse^{**}

In summary

- For many men and women, the ADF is a positive work place but on occasion incidents of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse occur. There are a number of policies that address these issues but their implementation can be inconsistent and in some cases, deficient.
- An independent survey conducted for the Review found that sexual harassment prevalence rates for women in the ADF are similar to those in Australian workplaces, and for men in the ADF, they are lower. One in four women and one in ten men experienced sexual harassment in the ADF in the last five years.
- Perpetrators should be held to account and their suitability to remain in the ADF should be considered in any action taken against them.
- Under-reporting of incidents of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse is a significant issue in the ADF. An option that allows complainants to make confidential (restricted) reports could address this issue and should be investigated by the ADF as a matter of urgency.
- A complete picture of the reported number of complaints within the ADF and their outcomes is difficult to obtain because of inadequate and inconsistent data collection and analysis. This undermines the ADF's capacity to respond to sexual harassment and sexual abuse and to accurately identify the number of sexual offenders or repeat offenders in each of the Services.
- Good leadership is important to discourage abusive behaviour but leaders need to be supported by effective systems and practices that prevent the behaviour from the outset and hold perpetrators to account. Poor leadership is a common element when instances of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse occur.
- To be effective, any preventative education must be embedded in existing education and support processes and should be accompanied by other strategies, such as the promotion of strong messages about gender equality and the unacceptability of violence against women.

* Sexual harassment takes many forms. It can be defined as an unwelcome sexual advance, unwelcome request for sexual favours or other unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature which in the circumstances, a reasonable person, aware of those circumstances, would anticipate the possibility that the person would feel offended, humiliated or intimidated. This is a simplified legal definition that accords with the definition under the *Sex Discrimination Act* (Cth) 1984. Behaviours that constitute sexual harassment include unwelcome hugging, touching or kissing, sexual gestures, sexually suggestive comments, sexually explicit emails or SMS messages or inappropriate advances on email, social networking sites or internet chat rooms by a work colleague.

** For the purposes of the Report, the terms sexual abuse and sexual offences includes acts of indecency¹ and sexual assaults/rapes.²

7.1 Introduction

The prevalence of, attitudes towards and responses to sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse, including indecent assault and sexual assault or rape, were raised during consultations and through submissions to the Review. Incidents of such behaviours and offences were also raised in confidential individual interviews with ADF members. The deep distress and trauma experienced by the women who disclosed incidents makes change across the ADF in its treatment of women both critical and urgent.

This Chapter outlines the Review's findings in this area, identifies a number of systemic areas of concern and makes a number of proposals for reform. Drawing on data provided by the ADF, the Review's considerable quantitative data gathered from focus groups, one on one interviews and submissions, and the Review's specific surveys, the Chapter specifically examines incidents and prevalence of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse. This Chapter also examines the effectiveness of the ADF's complaints policy framework. The ADF has had some success in recent times in addressing unacceptable behaviours although it

is clear that the existing structures and systems that monitor and respond to issues of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse have failed some ADF members and the organisation, at a fundamental level. The Chapter concludes with proposals for reform that will help the ADF address the shortcomings identified.

7.2 Incidents of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse

(a) ADF Data

The Review was provided with a considerable amount of data about the numbers of complaints of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse made in recent years by ADF members. In particular, the Review was provided with information extracted from the database maintained by the ADF Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch (formerly known as the Fairness and Resolution Branch) – an important centralised source of data capture.

There are a number of mechanisms through which ADF members can report unacceptable conduct. These include through their chain of command, or via staff members, such as equity and diversity advisors, medical personnel and padres. They can also make reports under the Defence Whistleblower Scheme, or where sexual harassment or sex discrimination is involved, to the Australian Human Rights Commission or state Equal Opportunity Commissions. Formal complaint mechanisms are also available under *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-3, 'Management and Reporting of Unacceptable Behaviour'*³ and *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-4, 'Management and Reporting of Sexual Offences'*.⁴ In relation to criminal behaviour, reports can also be made to the civilian police.

The Review received figures for the numbers of sexual harassment complaints recorded by the then Fairness and Resolution Branch for the years 2008-2011. Figures were also provided for discrimination complaints over the same period, but the Review was not advised which of these discrimination complaints were on the ground of sex. Quarterly updates provided by the then Fairness and Resolution Branch for the year 2010 provided statistical information to the Chief of the Defence Force about complaints of unacceptable behaviour and sexual abuse. However, these updates have not been prepared since 2010 and a replacement report is yet to be developed.⁵

It was difficult to ascertain with certainty the number of sexual assault and other sexual offences reported by ADF members in recent years. Different figures were provided by different areas within the ADF. This is detailed further below. As a result, the Review could not readily obtain a comprehensive overview of the volume of complaints made in relation to these matters.

(i) Sexual harassment and sex discrimination

Complaints about sexual harassment and sex discrimination are included as part of the discussion of the unacceptable behaviour complaints process in Defence's Annual Reports. The 2010-2011 Annual Report notes, for example, that there are, on average, between 700 and 900 complaints of unacceptable behaviour lodged across Defence each year and that in 2010-11, 720 complaints regarding this behaviour were received.⁶ This figure was noted to represent complaints from less than one per cent of the Defence workforce.⁷ In addition, during the same reporting period, 792 complaints were finalised, with 59.7 per cent being substantiated.⁸ The Annual Reports do not break down these figures into the type of complaints made, such as sexual harassment or sex discrimination.

The relevant Instructions relating to reporting and managing unacceptable behaviour and sexual abuse require various reports to be submitted to the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch for each complaint. This Branch is required to record all reported unacceptable behaviour complaints and outcomes⁹ and this data is used to measure reporting trends across Defence.

Defence categorises unacceptable behaviour into the following groups:

- bullying
- harassment
- inappropriate workplace relationship and conflict of interest
- sexual harassment
- sexual offences
- abuse of power
- discrimination.

Information from the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch indicates that the following figures represent the volume of sexual harassment complaints made in the following years:

Table 7.1: Number of sexual harassment complaints by year, Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch¹⁰

Year	Number of complaints
2008	86
2009	74
2010	79
2011	82

The following figures are also provided for discrimination complaints:

Table 7.2: Number of discrimination complaints by year Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch¹¹

Year	Number of complaints
2008	26
2009	20
2010	18
2011	23

It was not possible to ascertain the numbers of complaints of discrimination that were made on the ground of sex, as these figures are not categorised into the alleged ground of discrimination.

(ii) Sexual Abuse

In addition to the information recorded about unacceptable behaviour complaints, the database maintained by the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch is designed to record all sexual offence complaints.¹²

Information provided by this Branch indicates that the following figures represent the volume of sexual offence complaints made in the corresponding years:

Table 7.3: Number of all sexual offence complaints by year, Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch¹³

Year	Number of complaints
2008	87
2009	74
2010	50 ¹⁴
2011	42

As previously noted, quarterly updates have not been prepared since 2010. As a result, there is no formalised reporting process to the CDF about complaint numbers.

Meanwhile, a recent report prepared by the Inspector General Australian Defence Force (IGADF) in September 2011 entitled 'Review of the Management of Incidents and Complaints in Defence including Civil and Military Jurisdiction' ('IGADF 2011 report') noted that, based on data provided by Service Police, in any given year, there are approximately 75 sexual offence complaints by ADF personnel to ADF authorities.¹⁵

Data provided to the Review by the Service Police Central Records Office of the Australian Defence Force Investigative Service ('ADFIS') provided the following figures for initial reports to ADFIS of sexual assault and related offences:

Table 7.4: Number of initial reports to ADFIS of sexual assault and related offences by year, Service Police Central Records Office of the Australian Defence Force Investigative Service¹⁶

Year	Number of reports
2008	87
2009	74
2010	50 ¹⁷
2011	42

It is difficult to reconcile the data provided by the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch, ADFIS and the IGADF 2011 report. This is concerning, as it means that trends cannot be followed, offenders and repeat offenders cannot be tracked and areas in which sexual abuse are occurring cannot be identified with accuracy. It also means that targeted preventative strategies cannot be properly put in place. Of considerable concern is that the failure to capture incidents of sexual abuse accurately can place ADF members at risk of harm from undetected or untracked offenders.

The Review also sought information from State and Territory Police Forces concerning the numbers of reports and charges in relation to sexual and indecent assault (or the equivalent in the particular jurisdiction) involving ADF members, as well as the numbers of convictions for these offences for the period 2000 to early 2012. Most jurisdictions were unable to provide this information as they do not record whether an offender or victim is a member of the ADF.¹⁸ Some jurisdictions were able to provide relevant information.¹⁹ Others provided the requested data but cautioned against reliance on the figures on the basis that recording the occupation of alleged offenders and victims is not mandatory and that the data may not accurately reflect the number of ADF members who have been in contact with the relevant police force concerning these types of offences.²⁰

Without consistent data collection across all jurisdictions, this information is of limited value.

(b) The Review's data

(i) Focus Groups, Interviews and Submissions

It is important to acknowledge that, during focus groups and through written submissions, the Review heard from many members whose experiences at the ADF were positive and rewarding. Many commented that they felt safe on the bases to which they were posted and did not experience any sex discrimination, sexual harassment or sexual abuse. Comments included:

I have been in the Army for 17 years and started as a soldier. I have never been directly exposed to any harassment or discrimination nor have I directly witnessed any. Any report of harassment or discrimination has been promptly investigated and, in my opinion, appropriate corrective action [taken]. I am proud to be working in a mature, progressive and inclusive organisation.²¹

I've got no issues at all. I've got a very good working relationship with the [commanding officer] and the [executive officer].²²

I have three sisters all in civilian employment in country Victoria and the way they're treated by their male colleagues and bosses I would never put up with that. I've never been treated like that in all of my time in Defence.²³

It is equally important to acknowledge the personal accounts of inappropriate and criminal sexual behaviour from women across the three Services. The Review was told of certain environments that were highly sexualised and demeaning to women, individual instances of sexual harassment that were either one off or repeated over time, instances of inappropriate uses of technology, and instances of stalking and sexual abuse, including sexual assault. Instances of sexual misconduct were alleged, on occasion, to have been perpetrated by both peers and supervisors, including instructors.

Whilst many women considered some of the sexualised environments they worked in to be "harmless" and the behaviour simply childish and trivial, others found their environments degrading and demeaning. In one interview, a sailor spoke of her supervisor using sexually explicit terms to identify each team member which, understandably, she found demeaning. One woman also told the Review:

My partner is a combat engineer and he actually confided in me about what the guys talk about at the bases. They like to smell all the females when they walk past. If you're not looking they'll smell behind you and that type of stuff.²⁴

Another woman stated:

Sitting in the mess...one guy has his scrotum out and they've got a torch underneath it so you can see all the veins through it. They call that a 'roadmap' and they're doing that in the mess.²⁵

Some women commented on the impact of degrading behaviour on their effectiveness at work. According to one:

You walk into the [workplace] and people are slagging females out, it makes you feel like shit, it ruins your day. We're in a working environment and we're meant to be comfortable where we work. We go [live and work] with these [men] for months at a time, and it's really hard.²⁶

Cases concerning sexual harassment over many years have recognised that an environment or culture that is sexualised or hostile to women also amounts to sexual harassment.²⁷ This was typified in the 2007 decision in *Lee v Smith*²⁸ in which the Commonwealth (Department of Defence) was held vicariously liable for the actions of its employees who subjected Ms Lee, a civilian administrator, to sexual harassment, discrimination, victimisation and ultimately rape by an ADF member. The Court found that Defence had not taken 'all reasonable steps' to avoid the harassment and discrimination and that the display of pornographic material 'may well create an impression regarding the prevailing workplace culture and thereby diminish...the confidence in the formal complaint procedures and policies'.²⁹

Direct experiences of sexual harassment were also related to the Review:

When I was at [training school] I was sexually harassed by an instructor who would place his hands on my legs under the table when we were in training.³⁰

In 2008 I was sexually harassed on four occasions over a weekend by the Corps Commandant (twice), a WO1 (once) and a male corporal who told me we would fuck before I left the unit.³¹

I would go on [specific work trips] and the boys would bash on my door at 2am going, "let us in, we just want a hug". It was pretty scary really.³²

The inappropriate use of technology continues to be a challenge in the ADF. The Review heard on occasions of instances where sexual acts were recorded without the women's knowledge and consent, and later distributed to other people. In one instance the woman involved was threatened with being charged with fraternisation by her supervisors:

Not once was the other member spoken to about the incident and at the time I was too scared to take it any further as I didn't want to have a charge on my record for fraternisation even though course instructors said what happens behind closed doors stays behind closed doors. It upset me that I was humiliated and threatened when the other member who I believe should have suffered some sort of punishment was not even approached even though they knew who he was.³³

Women also spoke of experiences of being stalked by other ADF members:

I had another stalker, he used to follow me where I went, took videos of me where I used to go to blackmail and entrap me, used to sit outside my block and watch where I went. I couldn't leave Base without (him) following me. I went insane, like I had to go and see a psych, I was borderline suicidal.³⁴

Another woman disclosed:

I get a different stalker every time I go to the boozier on base.³⁵

Of deep concern were the occasional but distressing stories of sexual assault recounted by some women. Some of these women were current serving members but others had discharged because they considered there was no viable alternative as they felt unsupported by the ADF to which they had been faithful.³⁶

Other women discharged because they had to confront the perpetrator or harasser each day on the base. A woman who was sexually assaulted and had recently discharged told the Review:

I have lost everything, my identity and my sense of purpose.³⁷

The Return of Service Obligations placed on ADF members creates additional pressures:

This guy who I went on a few dates with began to stalk me with texts and wanting to go out with me. I couldn't really tell anyone but it became quite intense. One night I had a few drinks and I was with him. He ended up raping me. He knew about my boundaries regarding sex. I feel it was my fault. I couldn't tell anyone about this. He is [still in the particular Service]. The treatment I have endured has meant that I am now looking to discharge and have applied for a job with a mining company. As I haven't completed my ROSO [return of service obligation] I am concerned that the [Service] won't let me discharge without a penalty.³⁸

The Review also heard of unacceptable behaviour during recruitment processes. One person told the Review that her experience with a particular Service interview panel was a significant factor in her decision not to pursue what had, until then, been a long held dream to one day be an officer in that Service:

Every interview panel I fronted was presided over by three male Officers of differing levels. At one of my interviews, wearing my suit, one of the Officers implied I was a prostitute, making jokes...and they all laughed (I sat uncomfortably). I was also asked if I was successful, how I would resist propositions from fellow [Service] personnel? Did I plan to get married (I was 17) and have a family as most men would not marry a woman who [deployed with men] How would I cope when my peers would be on shore leave and with strippers and hookers... I came out of the interview quite shaken up.³⁹

As indicated in Chapter 3, a consistent theme heard by the Review was how women in the ADF were expected to 'protect' their 'reputation' and the sometimes dire consequences for those individuals who were unsuccessful in doing so. The Review was told:

There were so many rumours about me – I was supposed to have slept with everyone. Soldiers would do what they could to sleep with me. I was constantly pulled into the boss' office to answer the false rumours. I nearly left at that point.⁴⁰

That label sticks with you through your career so you might be a major 20 years down the track and they bring out this story from 20 years ago that you know is no longer even relevant.⁴¹

Instances of gender-based bullying and exclusion were also reported to the Review. Such behaviour generally occurred when women were a small minority in specific units and the leadership of that unit was deficient. The Review heard, for instance, from a woman who was the only woman in her course:

The guys hated me. They were trying to get me off-course. They just didn't want me there. It only takes one person to change everyone's opinions. There was one particular person who just didn't want me there. And he got all the other boys on side. All he used to do was tell me stories about how all the chicks he ever [worked with] were shit, except for one. I just tried to ignore it but it upset me all the time. We'd go away on trips and all the guys would organise to do something. They didn't invite me. On the final section of our course they were trying to get rid of me. They were giving me wrong information or not passing on information – they were trying to make me fail. And so then I had to pull aside one of the guys who had been my friend and he admitted that it'd been going on, but he said that there wasn't much he could do.⁴²

Another woman who was in a large male-dominated unit disclosed to the Review:

I was constantly subjected to harassment, bullying and intimidation. People would talk behind my back. I never let the [senior non-commissioned officers] or the other officers see how upset I was. I was in tears most nights. I am normally a confident and strong person so it was really out of character. The adjutant of the unit was very opposed to having women in the corps. He was very sexist and picked up on everything about my work, my social life, who I was sleeping with etc. I felt he was conducting a campaign of abuse and harassment against me. I was put up for deployment to Afghanistan and when I got into country it got worse. I was called the dumb blonde behind my back, woken constantly during rest time and lies were made up about me for my report as a way of trying to make me go home. It was the worst six months of my life. I came home a shell of a person with zero confidence. I got no support when I came back. Everyone knew what was happening but no-one did anything about it. I suffered depression and anxiety and was seeing a psychiatrist three times per week.⁴³

(c) The Treatment of Women in the ADF Survey

The *Treatment of Women in the ADF Survey* did not ask participants if they had experienced sexual harassment, sex discrimination or had been sexually assaulted.⁴⁴ Rather, it focused on their *perceptions* of the impact of this behaviour on a person who had experienced it. The results provide a further important source of information to the Review.

Perceptions of harassment/discrimination/abuse were less positive for women compared to men. A higher proportion of women respondents reported perceiving that women are more likely than men, to be the recipients of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse. However many also believed that men can suffer from this behaviour. More women than men considered that a woman's 'reputation' regarding her sexual behaviour can negatively impact her military career and that experiencing sexual harassment or discrimination would have a negative impact on career progress.

Broadly, the Survey indicated the following:

- 65% of women and 44% of men agreed that women are more likely to experience sexual harassment or discrimination in the ADF than men.
- 54% of women and 39% of men agreed that women are more likely to experience sexual abuse in the ADF than men. 60% of women and 41% of men agreed that experiencing sexual harassment or sex discrimination in the ADF would have a negative impact on career progress.
- 58% of women and 41% of men agreed that experiencing sexual abuse in the ADF would have a negative impact on career progress.
- 68% of women and 35% of men agreed that a woman's 'reputation' regarding her sexual behaviour can inhibit her military career.
- 13% of women and 25% of men agreed that a man's 'reputation' regarding his sexual behaviour can inhibit his military career.

(d) The AHRC Sexual Harassment Survey – ADF Component

As part of the Review, Roy Morgan Research administered a workplace sexual harassment survey to identify the prevalence, nature and reporting of sexual harassment in the ADF. A full analysis of the survey results, including the methodology and limitations, is at Appendix N.4.⁴⁵ The survey formed part of a broader project undertaken by the Australian Human Rights Commission that examines sexual harassment in Australian workplaces (the National Survey).⁴⁶

(i) Prevalence of sexual harassment⁴⁷

Women are much more likely to experience sexual harassment in the ADF than men. In the last five years 25.9% of women and 10.5% of men in the ADF have experienced sexual harassment in an ADF workplace. This compares to prevalence rates in the National Survey of 25.3% of women and 16.2% of men in the last five years. A disaggregation by Service and gender is presented in table 7.5.

These figures combine those respondents who reported experiencing sexual harassment according to the legal definition, as well as those who did not report having experienced sexual harassment, but did report experiencing *specific behaviours* that constitute sexual harassment.⁴⁸ This was done to ensure that the experiences of respondents who were unable to identify sexual harassment from the legal definition would still be recorded. The combination of these results provides an accurate representation of the prevalence of sexual harassment.

It is important to note that about one in five women (20.3%) and one in ten men (10.2%) in the ADF reported *not* experiencing sexual harassment according to the legal definition of sexual harassment, but then went on to report experiencing behaviours that in fact constitute sexual harassment. This suggests that in the ADF there is a lack of awareness about what behaviours in fact constitute sexual harassment and what may be considered lawful or appropriate workplace behaviours.

Table 7.5: Prevalence of sexual harassment in the ADF by Service and gender, previous five years

Service	Women	Men
Navy	28.1%	13.9%
Army	25.8%	8.9%
Air Force	23.7%	10.8%
Whole of ADF	25.9%	10.5%

(ii) Nature of sexual harassment and characteristics of persons involved

Nature of sexual harassment

The most common sexual harassment experienced by women in the ADF was:

- ‘Sexually suggestive comments or jokes that made you feel offended’ (14.6%).
- ‘Intrusive questions about your private life or physical appearance that made you feel offended’ (12.7%).
- ‘Inappropriate staring or leering that made you feel intimidated’ (9.7%).

The most common sexual harassment experienced by men in the ADF was:

- ‘Sexually suggestive comments or jokes that made you feel offended’ (4.2%).
- ‘Sexually explicit emails or SMS messages’ (4.1%).
- ‘Intrusive questions about your private life or physical appearance that made you feel offended’ (3.4%).

Additionally, 6.2% of women and 1.2% of men in the ADF reported experiencing inappropriate physical contact, 2.9% of women and 0.2% of men reported receiving requests or pressure for sex or other sexual acts, and 0.9% of women and no men reported experiencing actual or attempted rape.

Overall, women in the ADF were more likely to feel more offended and intimidated by their experience than men.⁴⁹ 12.1% of women and 1.5% of men who reported experiencing sexual harassment were ‘extremely offended’ by their experience, and 10.2% of women and 2% of men were ‘extremely intimidated’ by their experience.

Women’s experience of harassment in the ADF was also more likely to last longer than men’s.⁵⁰

Characteristics of targets

A majority of those who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF were under 30 years (71.1% of women, 50.9% men). 44.5% of women and 34.2% of men who were harassed were from the 18-24 age group, and 27% of women and 16.2% of men who were harassed were from the 25-29 age group. ADF Census data indicates that in 2011, 6% of all Permanent ADF personnel were under 20 and 46% were 20-29.⁵¹

Women in the ADF were more likely to experience sexual harassment earlier than men. 66.5% of women who experienced sexual harassment reported it took place in their first year at the location and about half of these during the first three months. Comparatively, for men 61.7% experienced sexual harassment behaviours after working in the location for more than a year.

Characteristics of harasser

The profile of the harassers of men and women was similar:

- Women and men reported that their harasser was more likely to be male (94.7% of women and 78.9% of men).
- Women reported that the harasser was more likely to be between 21 and 40 years of age (38.2% said 21-30 years of age, 31.6% said 31-40 years of age). Men also reported that their harasser was more likely to be aged between 21 and 40 years of age (42.4% said 21-30 years of age, 27.4% said 31-40 years of age).
- Women and men reported that their harasser was more likely to be a co-worker (56.7% of women and 65.9% of men).

Respondents reported that harassers were often involved in more than one incidence of sexual harassment in the same workplace. In the ADF, among those who had reported experiencing sexual harassment, 41.5% of women and 46.5% of men knew of other incidences in the same workplace.⁵² A majority of these respondents reported that the same harasser was involved in both/all incidents that they were aware of (59.1% of women, 55.7% of men). This compares to the National Survey, in which similar proportions of respondents reported that they were aware of others experiencing sexual harassment in the same workplace and of these a higher number of women and men reported that the same harasser was involved.

(iii) Addressing Sexual Harassment

Reports and complaints

A very small number of the men and women in the ADF who had experienced sexual harassment made formal complaints, only 25 women and five men out of the 181 people who had experienced sexual harassment in the last five years. For consistency with the rest of this section, findings regarding respondents who made a formal report or complaint are still presented using percentages to the first decimal point. However, given the very small sample bases, such results should be interpreted with care.

Only 21.2% of women and 9.2% of men who had experienced sexual harassment in the ADF in the last five years reported making a formal report or complaint. In the National Survey, a similar proportion of women made complaints, while a significantly larger proportion of men made complaints.

In the ADF, reports or complaints were most commonly made to commanding officers or other senior officers, ADF/APS supervisors and Equity Officers. Two women lodged a complaint or report with the military police, and two women lodged a complaint or report with the civilian police. No men took a complaint or report to either military or civilian police. Similarly, in the National Survey, reports or complaints were most commonly made to managers or supervisors.

About one-third (32%) of ADF survey respondents who made a formal report or complaint reported that they were 'not satisfied at all' with the outcome of the process. By contrast, in the National Survey fewer women and men were 'not satisfied at all' with the outcome of their complaint.

Further discussion on reporting and making a complaint of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse, is at section 7.3.

Non-reporting

The majority (83.4%) of those who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF did not seek support, or make a formal report or complaint, reflecting a similar figure in the National Survey. Among this group in the ADF, 27.2% of women and 26.7% of men did not report because they told the harasser(s) the behaviour was inappropriate, and it ceased.

Higher proportions of women than men in the ADF reported that they did not make a complaint because they did not think it was serious enough (6.6% of women compared to 2.2% of men), thought nothing would be done (6.6% of women and no men), felt it was easier to keep quiet (6% of women and 2.2% of men) and said that the person was too senior (4% of women and 2.4% of men). Higher proportions of men than women reported that they did not make a complaint because the harassment wasn't severe and/or it was minor/mild (17.4% of men compared to 6.4% of women) or they were not offended (7.9% of men compared to 4.8% of women).

Support and/or advice

Only a minority of those who reported experiencing sexual harassment in the ADF in the last five years sought any support or advice (38.6% of women, 25% of men). Among those who sought support or advice, the most likely sources were their commanding officer or senior officer, ADF/APS supervisor or Equity Officer. Three women, and no men among the sample reported seeking support or advice from the civilian police.

(iv) Awareness of other incidents of sexual harassment

Finally, with regard to awareness of the prevalence of sexual harassment in the ADF, more than two in five ADF members (43.4%) were aware of sexual harassment happening to someone else in the ADF workplace.⁵³ This was highest in Navy (46.4%) followed by Army (43.2%) and Air Force (40.9%).

ADF members who were aware of harassment being experienced by others were asked how they learnt of this. The most common responses (disaggregated by gender) were:

- 'told about it by the target' (37.6% of women compared with 17.1% of men)
- 'heard about it in the media' (37% of men compared with 18.5% of women)
- 'heard on the workplace grapevine' (32.5% of women, 32.6% of men).

The most common responses of all respondents that were aware of others being harassed in the ADF were:

- talking or listening to the target/complainant (59.5% of women, 26.2% of men)
- offering advice to the target/complainant (46.6% of women, 21.0% of men)
- reporting the harassment to a commanding officer/senior officer/supervisor etc. (28% of women, 14.3% of men).

Additionally, very few women and no men reported utilising external mechanisms (e.g. civilian police) in response to their awareness of sexual harassment occurring to other in the ADF.

Those who took action when they were aware of sexual harassment occurring were asked about the consequences of this action. 94.7% of ADF members reported that there were no consequences, and the remaining minority was split between positive consequences (e.g. the harassment stopped, received positive feedback) and negative consequences (e.g. being ostracised, victimised or ignored).

7.3 Reporting sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse

In addition to the Sexual Harassment Survey results, the extensive data from the Review's consultations indicated that under-reporting of sexually related misconduct is a significant issue for the ADF. Consultations indicated that members are aware that policies and complaint handling procedures exist to identify, prevent and address unacceptable conduct and that many of the policies targeting sexual harassment, discrimination and sexual abuse were sound, and reasonably well understood.

Even so, members reported to the Review making decisions not to engage with the formal complaint processes, despite the seriousness of their allegations of harassment and assault. Reasons given included the fear of victimisation from peers and supervisors, the negative impact on career progression and, in relation to sexual assault specifically, the personal trauma to which such an assault gives rise. The Review also heard from members who had made a formal complaint but had been disillusioned and disempowered by the experience, frequently as a result of less than optimal implementation of what, on paper, are relatively comprehensive complaint handling procedures. Deficient policies were also identified.

The following section will examine the effectiveness of the ADF's complaints process as a means of responding appropriately and sensitively to complainants of sexual misconduct and abuse.

(a) Overview

The Review heard from a number of sources of the high regard in which the ADF's complaint processes are held. One experienced commander, who had been a victim of unacceptable behaviour early in her career, noted as follows:

It is my view that Defence has extremely supportive and valid guidelines and policy to assist members in making complaints and to assist commanders and managers in the management of reports of incidents of unacceptable behaviour... Sometimes the system fails an individual, and at times, this is demonstrated by a lack of experience, training or understanding by the person responsible for managing the complaint. This is compounded by lengthy but necessary administrative processes to investigate and resolve complaints.⁵⁴

The broad range of experiences ADF members bring to the organisation is also acknowledged:

People join the ADF with attitudes, values and beliefs borne of their upbringing and life experiences. It is inevitable that some behaviour will not measure up to the standards required in a military force... However, the measure of an organisation's commitment to address these behaviours is its capacity to properly report, manage and resolve such incidents and demonstrating a zero tolerance approach.⁵⁵

There was, however, a consistently expressed view across the range of focus groups that the complaints policies and procedures do not adequately address the realities of women's experiences in the ADF. This deficiency also impacts on men in the ADF who are, at times, also subjected to sexual harassment and sexual abuse.

Meanwhile, allegations of harassment and assault in the ADF are frequently under-reported. Certainly, it is not uncommon in broader society,⁵⁶ with researchers identifying various reasons for this. In relation to incidents of sexual assault, for example, studies have identified barriers to reporting such as:

- lack of recognition that an incident is sexual assault, or not considering an incident serious enough to report
- a relationship between victim and perpetrator (not necessarily an intimate relationship, although these are less likely to be reported)
- potential for negative reactions, including fear of not being believed or being blamed

- lack of encouragement from support networks
- fear of repercussions and concerns about the impact of disclosure on others, such as children
- the victim's belief that they can handle an incident themselves.⁵⁷

Evidence indicates that similar barriers to reporting exist in the ADF. This was acknowledged in a recent decision in which the Defence Force Disciplinary Tribunal noted the additional pressures placed on complainants by a 'hierarchical military environment'.⁵⁸

Reluctance to report matters has resulted, for some, from a lack of confidence in the complaints system. In the *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*, a majority of respondents believed that if they reported an incident of unacceptable behaviour appropriate action would be taken, though this included a higher proportion of men (83%) than women (66%). Of female respondents, 21% did not believe that appropriate action would be taken, and 14% were unsure. It is concerning that about one-third of women, and nearly one-in-five men either did not believe that action would be taken, or were unsure.

This was also reflected in individual accounts to the Review:

I was fairly confident in Defence's procedures for dealing with these incidents when I saw them on paper, but now, I've actually seen them in place and seen nothing come of it except an extended sort of investigation...I'm not even really sure what the end result is except perhaps this commander now feels uncomfortable in his position because everyone knows what he did.⁵⁹

Junior members of the ADF are at a particular disadvantage:

When you're new to the Army you might get a little bit of information about what is available to you but you don't necessarily have the confidence to take that further and as a recruit you think the corporals are God and if there's incidences you may feel that it's impossible to work past.⁶⁰

Others consider the complaints process is too reliant on the skill of the members in charge:

I have complete faith in the procedures that Defence has set out in the management of this type of incident. What I don't have faith in is the people to implement them... It depends on what kind of unit you're in [including whether] it is a much more male dominated environment.⁶¹

The Review also heard of inappropriate responses to reports of assault, which compounded the trauma experienced and inhibited even further a formal complaint being made:

[in relation to being sexually harassed] I made a complaint. That just led to me being humiliated by the [commanding officer] in front of the entire school body.⁶²

The potential for a member's career prospects to be adversely affected if they raised a complaint was another theme raised during the Review. A submission observed:

Fear of retribution for raising concerns is frequently cited as a reason for passivity. Actions can include, for example, the stoppage to a preferred posting or delay in promotion. Interestingly, while some members are being subjected to unacceptable behaviour in the workplace, others who acknowledge what is occurring take no action to remediate the situation for fear they will then become targets themselves.⁶³

Members also told the Review as part of the *Treatment of Women in the ADF Survey* and in consultations:

I don't believe making a claim of harassment would affect your career, unless that claim was against an officer. I believe that claims against officers are generally kept quiet and within the unit.⁶⁴

I'd be very reluctant [to complain] because I know for a fact it would be the end of my career... You just get a name, a label for yourself as a trouble maker, as a whinger, as someone that you can't then put on operations with other men, that type of thing.⁶⁵

No squadron would want me as the girl who made a complaint. Have a career or complain were my only options.⁶⁶

Isolation, victimisation and ostracism from peers was also seen as a strong inhibitor to reporting an incident of unacceptable behaviour or sexual misconduct.

The risk of being viewed as a troublemaker if an issue is raised in the workplace appears to be a real and ongoing deterrent for some to make complaints:

If you complain, you'll be isolated. If you stick up for yourself and do E&D, you'll be isolated. No-one will like you.⁶⁷

I think a lot of times you don't want to take it further because you don't want the attention and you don't want to have the name following you around of 'she's a trouble maker' or she's this or that. You just get worried because you don't want it to ruin your reputation.⁶⁸

Participants described deficiencies in the complaint handling processes and lack of support after reporting a sexual assault:

The respondent is [a specific occupation] and the chain of command responsible for the findings was [the same occupation]. I believe the chain of command protected him as despite the findings no detrimental action was taken against him.⁶⁹

On one of my first days back in the job I...ran into the perpetrator. He was located in offices adjacent to [where I was working]... When I complained I was told that I would have to walk the long way around so as to limit my risk of running in to him. I was offered very limited support at this time despite having suffered major trauma.⁷⁰

A male officer also told the Review:

When the victim [of sexual assault] makes a complaint, I'm using a female as an example, she's got no support and the people that do support her, can then be discriminated and victimised as well. The system needs an overhaul.⁷¹

The Review heard, on occasion, concerns from a number of different groups about their experience with the Australian Defence Force Investigative Service ('ADFIS'):

They have a...history of being late, back logged, reports being faulty, evidence not being correctly submitted. There's all these kinds of issues with ADFIS's investigations. They drag on for months on end, nearly years in some cases and things do not get resolved because chains of command change. People post in, post out.⁷²

(b) Sexual Offence Support Person Network (SOSP)

One site specific program worthy of mention is the SOSP network, an initiative of the Command at HMAS *Cerberus*, the Navy's premier training establishment located in southern Victoria. The network was developed in consultation with Victoria Police and the local rape crisis response service. A 'SOSP' is a uniformed member who undertakes the role voluntarily and is provided with specialised training by both internal and external parties. When a sexual assault is reported, through any channel at any time of day, both the complainant and the respondent will be assigned a SOSP. However, the focus of the program is ensuring the medical, counselling and legal needs of the complainant are met. It is the role of the SOSP to be a primary contact of support and information for the complainant/respondent and this may include accessing medical assistance, providing information about support services (both internal and external, the preference being the local rape crisis centre), advising the complainant/respondent about the mandatory reporting process in the state of Victoria (including Victoria Police, ADFIS and the Command), and internal and external complaint procedures and how to access them.

The Review was advised that the IGADF would like this model to be rolled out across ADF bases. The SOSP can, with the permission of the complainant/respondent, accompany the member to the police or medical appointment and can also assist the complainant, based on their preference, to make changes to their accommodation and/or workplace as a matter of urgency if required.

This network is a positive initiative and focuses on providing complainants/respondents with a trained person as a single point of support and information and draws on external support where needed (rape crisis service) to assist the complainant and ensure their medical and safety needs are met.

The Review considers that the SOSOP is an important strategy in supporting complainants of sexual abuse and misconduct. Building on this initiative, the Review recommends that a broader, ADF wide system, that importantly gives the complainants an option of confidentiality, be established. This is discussed further, below.

7.4 Complaints policy framework

The Review examined the key policy documents relevant to the management of complaints alleging unacceptable behaviour and sexual abuse in the ADF. An overview of these policies is provided at Appendix N.1. Generally, whilst many of the policies are sound, their volume and complexity undermines the capacity for consistent and effective implementation. Based on this analysis and the information provided during consultations, the Review identified areas of concern that, taken as a whole, inhibit rather than encourage members from using the complaint handling mechanisms. These systemic areas of concern are discussed in this section.

(a) Complexity of complaint processes

While the Defence Instructions dealing with complaints of unacceptable behaviour and the management and reporting of sexual abuse are detailed and comprehensive, the large number of policies and related documentation – Defence Instructions, checklists and forms – as well as their overlapping nature, can create understandable confusion about what steps need to be taken.⁷³ Ongoing confusion can lead to a delay in implementing procedures, and/or to inappropriate outcomes, such as complaints and alleged perpetrators continuing to be posted together.⁷⁴ These deficiencies, in turn, can undermine the confidence of complainants, as well as respondents, in the process and the outcomes and create a barrier to reporting unacceptable behaviours, including sexual assaults.

(b) Risks associated with focus on ‘self-resolution’

In relation to complaints of unacceptable behaviour, members are encouraged to deal with issues at the ‘lowest possible level’. This is reflected in the existing policy framework, which describes ‘self-resolution’ and ‘supported self-resolution’ as part of the ‘suite’ of options that can be used to resolve complaints or concerns.⁷⁵

There are risks associated with giving inappropriate weight to ‘self-resolution’, given the power differentials that exist in a military environment structured by rank. This may also create a barrier to members utilising formal complaint processes.⁷⁶ Further, it can potentially undermine perceptions of a zero tolerance approach to unacceptable behaviour, particularly sexually based unacceptable behaviour.

Giving inappropriate weight to informal resolution options can create further risks for individuals and for the organisation. For example:

- complainants may not have the appropriate skills to effectively address sensitive issues of a sexual nature with the alleged perpetrator or harasser and therefore do not raise the issue
- serious matters that ought be investigated and, if proven, would lead to disciplinary action, are not appropriate to be dealt with through informal mechanisms

- patterns of unacceptable behaviour, particularly lower level sexual harassment and elements of a sexually hostile work environment, remain undetected
- the accountability of a perpetrator or harasser may be lessened.

Appropriate positioning of self-resolution and assisted self-resolution is an important element to be included in the development of training modules for those who manage complaints of unacceptable behaviour. This will also help build confidence in the impartiality and effectiveness of the complaints management system generally within the ADF. Further, it is consistent with best practice complaint management processes to present options to complainants in a way that acknowledges their potential discomfort or perceived inability to address an issue directly with the alleged perpetrator or harasser. It should be emphasised in all training modules that complainants are under no obligation to address complaints by way of self-resolution or assisted self-resolution.

The Review strongly considers that serious sexual misconduct matters and sexual assaults should not be the subject of self-resolution processes and acknowledges *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-3, 'Management and Reporting of Unacceptable Behaviour'* in this regard.

(c) Responsibilities of commanding officers

The role and leadership of commanding officers is fundamental not only to the effective management of complaints within the ADF, but also to the confidence that members have in accessing complaint mechanisms in the first place. In order to change workplace culture, and to highlight the value of an effective and responsive complaints mechanism, all promotions for commanding officers should be subject to a criterion of 'performance on workplace culture'. This could include recording how many incidents of sexual harassment and discrimination were reported and how many were successfully managed and resolved.

Commanding officers also need to be made aware of issues of concern on their bases by senior officers:

I don't think they understood the personal significance of what had gone on and so if someone doesn't take an event seriously knowing the process and knowing the right forms to fill in, doesn't really matter because if they don't take it seriously they won't do it.⁷⁷

The investigation and findings were conducted at the commander level and I now question the decision making abilities of my senior leaders. These individuals must be held to account for their actions otherwise Defence Instructions and speeches made by the CDF and Senior Leadership Team are nothing but lip service.⁷⁸

Requiring all promotions to be subject to such a criterion would ensure that commanding officers are held accountable for contributing to a healthy organisational culture and for taking any corrective action. Ensuring commanding officers have regular direct dialogue with members on their bases with regard to such issues could also prevent matters escalating to a critical and potentially risky stage. The Review saw evidence of impressive commanding officers who were already doing this. The task for the ADF is to ensure accountability for a healthy organisational culture is understood by every commanding officer.

The Review considers that good leadership is important to discourage abusive behaviour. However, leaders must be supported by effective systems and practices that prevent the behaviour from occurring and which hold perpetrators to account. The Recommendations contained in the Report aimed at addressing sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse will provide the proper support that leaders require to address unacceptable behaviour by those under their command.

(d) Fear of disciplinary action

ADF members told the Review that there is some fear that reporting a sexual assault may result in disciplinary action for the complainant. For instance, there is a fear that fraternisation charges could arise against a victim if the alleged sexual offender committed the offence when they were in the victim's room, contrary to the rules around contact. Alcohol is frequently a factor when sexual misconduct, including sexual assault, occurs

and the Review was told that, when a complainant has consumed alcohol and reported an assault, there is the potential for him or her to face consequences for that behaviour. Additionally, if an assault occurs after consuming alcohol with other members, they too may be disciplined for their drinking. One woman explained:

While I was at [ADF establishment] I was sexually assaulted. I had been drinking with friends one night. When I reported the sexual assault the XO [executive officer] said that if I took it further, both I and my friends would get into trouble for drinking so I decided that I wouldn't take it any further.⁷⁹

Clearly, a victim's well-being and needs should outweigh and precede any action that may be taken (if at all) in regard to their involvement in any "ancillary" behaviour, such as fraternisation or drinking. Change in this regard would be an important step towards treating sexual assault with the seriousness it deserves.

(e) Tracking sexual misconduct

In practice, the systems in place to record complaints and their outcomes are inadequate to reliably track members who may have had more than one complaint of unacceptable behaviour made against them. This is of considerable concern given the potential risks that repeat offenders may present to other ADF members. It is also of concern that in some cases members whose complaints were upheld were obliged to continue working with offenders. For instance, the Review was told by one woman who had reported an incident of sexual harassment:

The perpetrator was a warrant officer who I was left sitting next to for the remainder of the year.⁸⁰

Another woman who had also reported receiving disturbing text messages from a male member stated:

This guy is still in the squadron and I still have to work with him every day.⁸¹

The Review is strongly of the view that where a complaint of any sexual misconduct is upheld, the perpetrator or harasser should be separated from the complainant including being removed from the base.

If a complaint is resolved by way of informal resolution,⁸² then the matter is recorded by the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch but with no identifying information.⁸³ Whilst the relevant case file remains in existence, the lack of identifying information results in no centralised, systematic way of ascertaining the parties to a complaint and whether several separate incidents involve the same respondent.⁸⁴

When a complaint of unacceptable behaviour results in a formal outcome,⁸⁵ in addition to a report being made to the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch, the name and personal details of the member against whom the complaint is made are meant to be provided to the member's career management agency. This information may be taken into account by the relevant Service for career management and postings decisions.⁸⁶

However, it is unclear whether this information is used in any systematic way especially, as it was suggested that it is not standard practice for commanding officers, when dealing with a complaint of unacceptable behaviour, including sexual misconduct by a member, to check whether complaints have previously been made against that member from other units.⁸⁷ It is also unclear whether the relevant career management agency undertakes required checks with the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch on every occasion when a member is posted to a new unit.⁸⁸ Even if this check is conducted, a pattern of unacceptable behaviour resolved through informal resolution mechanisms will not, for the reasons noted above, be revealed.

The risk that repeat 'offenders' are not identified and their behaviour addressed in an appropriate way was highlighted by focus group participants:

There was one dickhead at [base], and a complaint was made against him, held up in my favour, settled at the lowest common possible level, but because it was settled at a mediation level I understand that it is not paper trailed and I've since found out he's done that to several others in the past.⁸⁹

There was a guy in our unit last year that was found to have sexually harassed women through contact on Facebook and sending pictures of his dick via text message. It ended up being about 12 women from the unit and there's only about 14 max at any one time so we kept getting counselled on that, what's going on, this is what we're doing with him, this is what we're not doing with him, what would you like done and then the consensus was at the very minimum, don't ever put this guy in a training command position. He obviously can't be in command over girls who can't stick up for themselves. So this year he got posted to a training command position.⁹⁰

Given the information provided about these matters, it is questionable as to whether the ADF is meeting its own policy objective of identifying repeat behaviour.

(f) Data collection

Data collection is a challenge for any organisation, particularly one as large and as diverse as the ADF. Though a considerable amount of material from the database maintained by the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch was provided to the Review, it was difficult to extract data easily and obtain a complete 'picture' of the scale of the problem facing the ADF.

These difficulties can be attributed to a number of factors:

- As noted earlier, the Review was provided with quarterly updates prepared by the then Fairness and Resolution Branch for the Chief of the Defence Force for 2010. Quarterly updates prepared by the Fairness and Resolution Branch (now the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch) have not, however, been prepared since 2010 and a replacement report is yet to be developed.
- Information provided by the Office of the Judge Advocate General (JAG) confirmed that the statistics recorded by that office do not include information about whether the outcomes of discipline officer scheme charges and summary authority trials relate to sexual misconduct.⁹¹
- Similarly, in relation to the outcomes of Defence Force Magistrate hearings and courts martial proceedings, the Office of the JAG advised that statistics are not collected specifically on the basis of charges relating to sexual misconduct.⁹² Nor are statistics automatically gathered relating to charges or convictions of act of indecency offences.⁹³
- The Office of the Director of Military Prosecutions (ODMP) provides some information about the type of offending reported to that Office in its annual report to the Minister for Defence. For example, in its report for the period of 1 January to 31 December 2009, 'sexual assault' represented 8% of reported offending across the ADF.⁹⁴
- Both the Office of the JAG and the ODMP advised that they do not keep records of criminal charges brought by civilian police or prosecutions that take place in civilian courts.

The Review understands that the ADF personnel database Conduct Reporting and Tracking System, sponsored by the IGADF, includes information about individuals' DFDA and civil convictions. It was told that information about sexual offences and sexual misconduct convictions is recorded but because of database limitations, it is not capable of easy retrieval and historically has not been collated, although it is understood that this is under review.⁹⁵

The Review strongly considers that if information on sexual offences is not collected in a systemic way, it is unlikely that the ADF has an accurate picture of the extent of these matters and of their potential impact on its members.

(g) Termination

Common to all Services are the termination provisions in the *Defence (Personnel Regulations) 2002* for officers and enlisted members.⁹⁶ Further details of the Regulations are contained in Appendix N.2.

Of the three Services, the Army has developed more detailed policy around this issue. Of concern, however, is the fact that civilian criminal convictions do not warrant mandatory consideration of a soldier's retention in the Army. In fact, the implication in the policy is that criminal offences of essentially a non-violent nature (that is, the use of prohibited substances or theft or fraud) are regarded more seriously than offences against the person including sexual abuse.

DI(A) PERS 116-5 *Separation of Regular Army soldiers, Army Reserve soldiers and soldiers on full-time service – policy and procedures* provides policy guidance when considering whether it is in the interests of the Defence Force to retain an enlisted member who has been convicted of 'serious' civil or service offences, or has a history of less serious civil or service offences.⁹⁷ The policy document notes that whilst 'serious civil offences can be difficult to define as civil and criminal courts may take the prospect of adverse administrative action into account when passing sentence',⁹⁸ the finding of guilt or conviction for a sexual offence is specifically noted as one example of a 'possible serious offence'.⁹⁹ The inference that may be drawn from this is that a question remains over whether a sexual offence will amount to a serious offence, rather than automatically being considered serious.

The Review knows of at least one instance where a member was convicted of one count of indecent assault in a civilian court against another member of the ADF. He was sentenced to a term of imprisonment but the whole of the sentence was suspended for 18 months. The offender was retained by the ADF, and continues to serve. The victim in this matter has discharged from the ADF.

The ADF could not advise with certainty that there are no other current serving ADF members who are convicted sexual offenders.

A policy change needs to occur that mandates the review of a member's retention across the Services if convicted of any criminal offence. A specific reference to sexual abuse would highlight the particular seriousness with which Defence views offences of this nature. The terminology would need to be general enough to capture the range of terminology used to describe these offences in the civilian criminal jurisdictions and in the DFDA.

An assessment of the ability of a member who has been convicted of a sexual offence to perform the inherent requirements of their job must be undertaken in order to ensure that the ADF complies with its obligations not to discriminate on the basis of a person's criminal record.¹⁰⁰

It is essential that, when considering whether or not the member is able to perform the inherent requirements of their job, the relevant decision maker has all material relevant to the conviction.

The Review proposes the addition of a requirement in the list of matters that must be considered in all personnel determinations and decisions in the *Defence (Personnel Regulations) 2002* that individuals must be *fit and proper persons for service in the ADF*.

Regulation 87(1) of the *Defence (Personnel Regulations) 2002* should be amended so that the specific reference currently found within the termination grounds for officers is also available for consideration in relation to enlisted members. Importantly, the reference should include that termination may be considered where the member has been convicted of an offence or a service offence and the Chief of the officer's Service has certified that, having regard to the nature and seriousness of the offence, the retention of the member is not in the interests of the ADF.

(h) Minimum period of service and return of service obligations

As referred to in earlier Chapters, all ADF members are expected to serve for a period specified as the Initial Minimum Period of Service (IMPS).¹⁰¹ The IMPS differs across occupations and is designed to ensure that the ADF receives reasonable value from its investment in the recruitment, initial training and development of its personnel.¹⁰² In addition, Service Chiefs have the authority to impose a Return of Service Obligation (ROSO) on members who receive specified training, education, experience or undertake special duties.¹⁰³

ADF policy notes that applications to resign from the ADF from personnel who have not completed their IMPS will not normally be approved unless compassionate or otherwise compelling personal reasons exist.¹⁰⁴ An application to resign citing compelling personal reasons may, in exceptional circumstances, be approved subject to the member agreeing to meet a financial condition, in lieu of serving out the IMPS.¹⁰⁵

Service Chiefs also have the authority to waive a ROSO or to reject the application for separation from the ADF of a member who has not acquitted a ROSO.¹⁰⁶ The conditions that may attach to a member's separation from the ADF depend, however, on whether the application is accepted as having been based on 'compassionate' reasons or 'compelling personal' reasons. An application citing compassionate reasons may be approved and will generally not attract a financial condition.¹⁰⁷ An application citing compelling personal reasons may, in exceptional circumstances, be approved subject to payment of a financial condition.¹⁰⁸

As previously noted, the Review heard from a number of women of their desire to discharge from the ADF due to the trauma they experienced not only as a result of having been sexually assaulted or harassed but also due to a failure to have their complaint appropriately addressed. This has been compounded in a number of cases by the risk of serious financial detriment if a member seeks to separate from the ADF either before their IMPS or ROSO is completed.

The aim of the recommendations made throughout this Report is, of course, for the ADF to find better ways of supporting and retaining members, rather than losing them. Where a member decides, however, that it is in their best interests to leave the organisation in which he or she experienced assault or harassment, that member should not be penalised in the form of a financial condition being imposed if their IMPS or ROSO has not been acquitted.

Nor should the member, when considering whether to apply for discharge, be left uncertain as to whether their reason for discharge will be considered a 'compassionate' reason or a 'compelling personal' reason, with different potential financial consequences. Given the information gathered by the Review, leaving members who have experienced sexual assault or harassment, whether male or female, subject to the uncertainty of these provisions cannot be an outcome that the ADF desires as a first class employer.

The Review recommends that the policies addressing waiver of IMPS and ROSO be amended to provide clarity about these matters and to ensure that a member who has made a decision to discharge because of sexual assault or sexual harassment is able to do so expeditiously and without financial penalty, upon production of supporting evidence of physical, psychological or emotional trauma.

7.5 Proposal for reform

After careful analysis of the data sources available to the Review, an examination of the policies and practices of the ADF in relation to dealing with complaints of unacceptable behaviour and sexual abuse, and after hearing from a diverse range of members, male and female, the Review concludes that current structures and systems have failed some ADF members at a fundamental level. This failure impacts not only on the individuals concerned, but has broader implications for operational effectiveness, team cohesiveness and the attraction and retention of personnel. The ADF must rethink and redesign its approach, place greater emphasis on preventative strategies and provide a more robust and effective complaints system in which all members can have confidence.

In relation to prevention strategies, any suite of measures designed to eradicate sexual misconduct must include rigorous and meaningful prevention and education programs. Certainly, most members receive education on acceptable behaviour and equity and diversity, some also receiving this before they are deployed. Some members felt that this training was satisfactory, though others described it as 'death by PowerPoint'.¹⁰⁹ Equally, whilst many considered that current training was largely grounded in common sense, others felt it was not effective. The *National Standards for the Primary Prevention of Sexual Assault through Education* provides a best practice framework which the ADF should consider in the implementation of preventative measures of sexual assault.¹¹⁰

As the Review found in its *Report into the Treatment of Women at the Australian Defence Force Academy* (the ADFA Report), an effective primary prevention tool for sexual assault and other sexual misconduct is education about gender relations, sexual ethics and healthy and respectful relationships. Any preventative education needs to be meaningful, interactive and resonate with members.

Education about prevention can be effective when accompanied by other strategies, such as the promotion of strong messages about gender equality and the unacceptability of violence against women. The Review reiterates its belief that 'one-off', add-on programs have limited value. Those that are embedded into existing education and support processes, based on the themes that underpin overall organisational values, practice and policy, will have greater benefits.¹¹¹ One senior ADF member told the Review:

I believe that every single person who enters the ADF must receive hard-hitting training on what comprises sexual assault, what do to reduce the incidence of sexual assault, options for reporting sexual assault and their responsibilities to 'protect their mates' as both potential victims and perpetrators.¹¹²

Further, as mentioned above, many incidents of sexual misconduct in the ADF go unreported. Factors that lead to a decision not to make a formal complaint are varied but, in relation to sexual abuse, the following all play a part:

- the trauma of the incident itself, as well as a fear of not being believed
- victimisation and retribution; fear of the negative impact on career progression and promotion
- fear of being disciplined for collateral issues such as drinking, and the impact on personal life, family and career
- 'losing control' of the complaint if it is addressed through normal military channels
- fear of reprisals from peers and supervisors in their everyday working and living context.¹¹³

The Review considered a number of options to provide the ADF and its members with a more effective framework for action. This included the 'restricted reporting' system for sexual assaults specifically used by the US military and coordinated through the US Sexual Assault Prevention Response Office. The Israeli Military also has a restricted reporting regime.

The essence of this approach is to provide victim care for those who have been sexually assaulted, regardless of any law enforcement involvement, investigation or proof of any assault.¹¹⁴ Restricted reporting allows victims to report an incident confidentially and access medical and counselling support without disclosing identities or initiating an investigation. It provides command with de-identified information about rates of sexual assault that may help to effect systemic change. Victims can elect to convert to an 'unrestricted' status at a later stage should they wish to do so. The report would then be investigated through the chain of command. The Review notes that the *Report of the Review into Allegations of Sexual and other Abuse in Defence* has recommended that in Phase 2 of its Review there should be 'further examination of the establishment of a system for permitting the restricted reporting of sexual assaults in Defence with particular regard to the availability of such a system for the receipt of allegations arising from the distant or even middle distant past.'¹¹⁵

It has been acknowledged that a 'restricted' report does not apportion accountability for the alleged act.¹¹⁶ The Inspector General ADF 2011 report recommends that this approach should not be adopted by the ADF because of this lack of accountability, as well as the view that such an approach is inconsistent with the

maintenance and enforcement of Service discipline, potentially allowing sexual assailants to continue to serve undetected.¹¹⁷ Certainly, careful consideration would need to be given to the application of a measure of this nature in the Australian context having particular regard to legal obligations imposed on the ADF, including those relating to vicarious liability under the Sex Discrimination Act.¹¹⁸ Nevertheless, as outlined below, the Review is concerned that to date, the ADF has failed to adopt an approach that appropriately and sensitively focusses on the needs and wishes of a complainant.

The Review was also concerned at the current deficiencies in terms of data collection and strategic use of data in relation to incidents of sexual harassment, sexual misconduct and sexual assault. An accurate picture of the extent of sexually based unacceptable behaviour cannot be gained. This means that offenders cannot be tracked, repeat offenders cannot be identified, outcomes cannot be measured and the level of risk to other ADF members cannot be determined and addressed.

A situation should not endure whereby incidents of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse continue to go unreported and complainants remain without support. Instead, it is incumbent upon any first class employer to take a 'complainant focussed' approach, one which empowers the complainant to make choices and which may aid in the initial stages of recovery. Further, the benefit of more accurate information about rates of sexual assault will significantly aid the ADF's attempts to ensure a safe workplace and appropriately target prevention programs.¹¹⁹

(a) Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response Office

The Review recommends the establishment of a dedicated 'Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response Office' ('SEMPRO'). This Office would be headed by a senior officer of at least a one star rank or Senior Executive Service (SES) level, who would report directly to the Chiefs of Services Committee (COSC). The Office would be located in Defence Headquarters and have overall responsibility for coordinating and implementing ADF prevention strategies and responses to complaints by members of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse, thereby creating one central body within the organisation that can accurately collect data on incidents and analyse this in order to develop appropriate responses and prevention strategies.

(i) Prevention and education strategies

Preventing harassment and violence must be the foremost priority of the ADF. This requires changing the culture in the ADF that enables harassment and violence to take place (often with impunity) and that disempowers women and men from making complaints. Through collaboration with expert independent providers, SEMPRO would be responsible for coordinating education and training, including a wide-spread multi-media campaign advertising the ADF's 'zero tolerance' policy, clearly articulating consequences and penalties for sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual assault, encouraging bystander action and listing the contact details of SEMPRO for complainants.

Given the particular cultural and formative significance of recruitment and training establishments, SEMPRO, in collaboration with expert independent educators, should provide recruits and trainees with interactive education on:

- respectful and healthy relationships, as well as sexual ethics
- the meaning, inappropriateness and impact of sexist language and sexual harassment
- the meaning of consent
- the appropriate use of technology
- stalking, controlling and threatening behaviours
- the importance of bystander action.¹²⁰

Effectiveness of these education and training efforts should be evaluated every two years with an external evaluator and assessed against key indicators that measure attitudinal and behavioural change.

Training and education should also be provided to all members entering command positions.

A robust, effective and responsive complaints system (as detailed below) will also be a preventative strategy, discouraging sexual harassment, sex discrimination and the commission of sexual abuse and contributing to a shift in culture towards the desired zero tolerance.

(ii) A new approach to complaint handling

Aim and role of the Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response Office

The aim of SEMPRO would be to provide a holistic response service for complainants. SEMPRO would oversee a centralised, effective, robust and sensitive complaints system to provide more effective redress and support for complainants than is currently the case.

This new approach would be particularly designed to address the significant under-reporting of sexual offences within the ADF. It would also be the single point of data collection, analysis and mapping of all sexual misconduct and abuse matters. Appropriate levels of expertise and resourcing of the Office would need to be a priority for the ADF.

SEMPRO would be positioned as the first point of contact for complainants. The first report of a complainant is recognised as the most critical time for an individual seeking support after experiencing sexual assault and the ADF must ensure that professional and compassionate assistance is available to members so that the complexity and entirety of their needs are met and that further trauma is prevented.¹²¹ Placing SEMPRO in this role would not prevent a member from approaching their commanding officer or chain of command directly if they chose to do so. In those circumstances, the commanding officer would refer the member to SEMPRO but would remain as the point of contact.

SEMPRO should be resourced to provide a 24 hour/seven day a week telephone hotline and online service ('talk, text, type') operated by experienced staff who are skilled in responding to complainants – female and male – of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual assault. The ADF should draw on the examples and experience of organisations that already exist that provide a referral and support service¹²² in order to be accessible and effective.

The services offered to members by SEMPRO would include:

- information about all complaint options (both internal and external to the ADF, as well as confidential (restricted reports)
- assistance and support to navigate the complaints process
- referrals to appropriate counselling and support services in every State and Territory¹²³
- on request, an option to be provided with a support person to liaise with the member's commanding officer or chain of command.

Commanding officers would continue to have the primary responsibility to monitor and address any behaviour that may constitute victimisation of a complainant, or bystander, as a result of making a complaint. SEMPRO should also have a role in providing ongoing support to these members.

Where there is any ancillary behaviour on the part of a complainant that may be subject to disciplinary action, such action should be deferred to a later date, if at all, while the sexual misconduct and sexual offence matters are appropriately addressed.¹²⁴

In making this recommendation the Review also supports complementary single Service initiatives such as SOSF. It considers that complainants should be provided with a range of options suitable to their needs and wishes.

Confidential (restricted) reports

The ADF, through SEMPRO, must investigate as a matter of urgency, mechanisms to allow for confidential (restricted) reporting of sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual offence complaints. Given the extent of under-reporting, this would ensure access to information and support to members who are victims of sexual harassment or sexual assault, but who may not have otherwise reported an incident and would not have access to support services.¹²⁵ Experience from other militaries demonstrates that confidential reporting leads to a significant increase in the number of men and women accessing services. A confidential reporting system would also allow for the collection of de-identified data that would not otherwise be available.

Relationship with external organisations

The ADF should harness the expertise of other organisations with experience in providing support and referral services to men and women who have experienced sexual assault and sexual harassment. The ADF should enter into appropriate arrangements with such external service providers if those providers are willing to undergo training in relation to the ADF context. In this way, SEMPRO could offer an alternative avenue for support and advice, particularly if complainants do not wish to engage with the ADF's internal complaints system. The ADF must provide adequate resourcing and assistance to ensure that these organisations have the capacity to provide these services, and that their expertise in sexual harassment and sexual assault matters is enhanced by an understanding of the military.

Outreach service

SEMPRO should be adequately resourced to provide an outreach service to all ADF establishments, including a rolling cycle of visits to each base every two years. This service would provide both relevant training and education and offer members an opportunity to discuss issues of concern with SEMPRO personnel. This service should complement, rather than conflict in any way, the military justice audits conducted on bases by the Inspector-General of the ADF.

7.6 Conclusion

The implementation of measures – such as transparent and robust data systems, a culture where leaders accept enhanced responsibility for unacceptable behaviour occurring in their units, an accessible and rigorous complaints policy framework, and a reporting system that ADF members trust – is critical to creating a culture where sexual misconduct has no place. Taking strong action will demonstrate that the ADF is committed to combatting sexual misconduct and abuse in a manner which provides effective, sensitive support to its members.

No person in any workplace should experience or face the risk of sexual harassment or sexual abuse. First class employers implement strong measures to eradicate such behaviours and the Review is convinced that, at the senior leadership level of the ADF, there is an absolute determination to do just that. The key is to ensure that this commitment is translated into swift and consistent action that is replicated across each of the Services.

- 1 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-4, 'Management and Reporting of Sexual Offences'*, 22 November 2011 ('DI(G) PERS 35-4') at para 19, defines 'acts of indecency' as including acts that 'have an "indecent" nature and are committed on, or in the presence of, a person. An act of indecency will almost always relate to any unwanted sexual behaviour or touching, committed against a person without their consent. Examples may include touching a person's breast or genitalia, exposing genitalia whilst making lewd or suggestive comments, or masturbating in the presence of another person. As these examples illustrate, the act of indecency need not be committed on a person and can be committed in the person's presence. In some jurisdictions of Australia, there is a separate offence of 'indecent assault'. This is not the situation in the ACT and in this Instruction the offence of 'indecent assault' is included in the category of offences referred to as "acts of indecency".'
- 2 DI(G) PERS 35-4, above, para 20, refers to 'sexual assaults' as 'a range of different forms of abuse used to force sexual acts against a person. This category includes the offence of 'sexual intercourse without consent', which is commonly known as rape. The offence of sexual intercourse without consent (ie rape) occurs when a person does not consent or agree to penetration (to any extent) of the vagina or anus by a penis, or by another part of the body such as a finger, tongue, or other object. This category also includes fellatio or cunnilingus without consent. Failure to withdraw upon becoming aware that a person is not consenting can also amount to sexual intercourse without consent. This category also includes offences involving violence or threatened violence against a person with intent to engage or attempt to engage in sexual intercourse without the consent of that person. There are a number of graduations of this latter type of offence to take into account different degrees of violence.' Definitions of these graduated forms of sexual assault are contained in Annexure A.
- 3 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-3, 'Management and Reporting of Unacceptable Behaviour'*, 28 June 2009 ('DI(G) PERS 35-3').
- 4 DI(G) PERS 35-4, note 1.
- 5 SQLNDR F James, email to the Review, 12 June 2012.
- 6 Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2010-11*, vol 1, Appendix 5, p 265.
- 7 *Defence Annual Report 2010-11*, above.
- 8 *Defence Annual Report 2010-11*, above.
- 9 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 3, para 46.
- 10 'Case Count' provided to the Review by SQLNDR F James, 12 June 2012.
- 11 'Case Count', above.
- 12 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 3, para 46.
- 13 'Case Count', note 10.
- 14 The Review notes that this figure does not appear to be consistent with the figure provided to the CDF in the 2010 quarterly updates prepared by the then Fairness and Resolution Branch in which it was noted that a total of 27 sexual offence complaints were made during the first half of 2010 and 25 sexual offence complaints were made in the second half of the year. DGFR J Diercks to CDF, Minute, *Fairness and Resolution – Quarterly Update, 1 Jan – 31 Mar 2010*, p 3, para 13; DGFR J Diercks to CDF, Minute, *Fairness and Resolution – Quarterly Update, 1 Apr – 30 Jun 2010*, p 2, para 12; DGFR J Diercks to CDF, Minute, *Fairness and Resolution Update, 1 Jul – 31 Dec 2010*, p 2, para 16.
- 15 Inspector General Australian Defence Force, *Review of the Management of Incidents and Complaints in Defence including Civil and Military Jurisdiction* (2011), p 29.
- 16 ADFIS, Service Police Central Records Office, *Advice on the number of people still in the ADF who have been convicted of criminal offences*, Report 10/2012 for Broderick Review, 14 May 2012, p 5.
- 17 The Review notes that this figure does not appear to be consistent with the figure provided to the CDF in the 2010 quarterly updates prepared by the then Fairness and Resolution Branch in which it was noted that a total of 27 sexual offence complaints were made during the first half of 2010 and 25 sexual offence complaints were made in the second half of the year (DGFR J Diercks to CDF, Minute, *Fairness and Resolution – Quarterly Update, 1 Jan – 31 Mar 2010*, p 3, para 13; DGFR J Diercks to CDF, Minute, *Fairness and Resolution – Quarterly Update, 1 Apr – 30 Jun 2010*, p 2, para 12; DGFR J Diercks to CDF, Minute, *Fairness and Resolution Update, 1 Jul – 31 Dec 2010*, p 2, para 16).
- 18 J McRoberts APM, Commissioner of Police for the NT, Correspondence to Commissioner Broderick, 30 April 2012; S Hodges, Director Strategy & Performance, WA Police, email to the Review, 4 May 2012; Commander APJ Cerritelli, Tasmania Police, Correspondence to Commissioner Broderick, 3 May 2012.
- 19 M Hyde, Commissioner of Police, South Australia Police, Correspondence to Commissioner Broderick, 30 April 2012. Commissioner Hyde advised that the South Australia Police records were searched for arrests and reports where the victim or offender nominated their occupation description as Air Force Personnel, Army Personnel, Navy Personnel, RAAF Personnel or Soldier and that since 2000, there have been a total of 23 reported incidents alleging rape and other sexual offences involving either a victim or suspect or both as a member of the ADF. Of those 23 incidents, 17 involved suspects from the ADF and in 10 of those matters an ADF member was the complainant. Prosecutions resulted in 11 matters and one ADF member was convicted since 2000.
- 20 A Scipione APM, Commissioner of Police, NSW Police Force, Correspondence to Commissioner Broderick, Undated but received 31 May 2012. Commissioner Scipione advised that 'given the inherent limitations of the data, this information provided should not be published in any report that may arise from the Review or otherwise released publicly'; R Quaadvlieg, Chief Police Officer for the ACT, Correspondence to Commissioner Broderick, 17 May 2012.
- 21 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 22 Focus group 17C.
- 23 Focus group 27A.
- 24 Focus group 39D.
- 25 Focus group 19B.

- 26 Focus group 12B.
- 27 *Horne v Press Clough Joint Venture* (1994) EOC 92-556; *Freestone v Kozma* (1989) EOC 92-249.
- 28 [2007] FMCA 59.
- 29 [2007] FMCA 59, [198].
- 30 Confidential meeting.
- 31 Confidential submission 14.
- 32 Confidential meeting.
- 33 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 34 Focus group 7B.
- 35 Focus group 7B.
- 36 Confidential submission 26.
- 37 Confidential meeting.
- 38 Confidential submission 7.
- 39 Confidential submission 1.
- 40 Confidential meeting.
- 41 Focus group 33A.
- 42 Confidential meeting.
- 43 Confidential meeting.
- 44 All *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey* figures quoted in this Chapter are taken from the electronic sample. See Appendix B for further examination and discussion.
- 45 1000 ADF members were surveyed for the ADF component, and this sample was re-weighted by Roy Morgan Research in order to reflect the actual gender and Service representations across the ADF as of 1 June 2012 (minus members under 18 years), provided by Dr J Vaile, Assistant Director of DSPPR.
- 46 The broader project is the 2012 version of the Australian Human Rights Commission's sexual harassment in the Australian workplace survey. A comprehensive report on sexual harassment in the Australian workforce will be released by the Sex Discrimination Commissioner in the last quarter of 2012.
- 47 This section deals with prevalence rates of sexual harassment as experienced by the individual. Prevalence regarding a respondents 'awareness of other incidents of sexual harassment' is dealt with separately below.
- 48 Respondents were initially read a simplified legal definition of sexual harassment (that accords with the definition under the *Sex Discrimination Act* (Cth) 1984), as follows:
"Sexual harassment is an unwelcome sexual advance, unwelcome request for sexual favours or other unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature which, in the circumstances, a reasonable person, aware of those circumstances, would anticipate the possibility that the person would feel offended, humiliated or intimidated."
Respondents who reported having experienced sexual harassment as per the legal definition in the ADF in the last five years were then read a list of 12 sexual harassment behaviours and asked which, if any, described what had happened to them. Respondents who did *not* report having experienced sexual harassment after being read the definition above were read the same list of behaviours, and asked whether they had experienced any of the behaviours in the ADF workplace in the last five years.
This was to ensure that the experiences of respondents who were unable to identify sexual harassment from the legal definition would still be recorded.
The combination of these results provides an accurate representation of the prevalence of sexual harassment, since anyone who identified at least one behaviour from the list was counted. This combined figure was used as the base to measure and report on the total incidence of sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years.
- 49 On a scale of one to five, where one was 'not at all' and 5 was 'extremely', the average level of offense for women was 3, and for men it was 2.3; the average level of intimidation for women was 2.5, and for men it was 1.9.
- 50 The responses to length of behaviours/s by gender were:
- It was a one off – 37.3% of women, 47.7% of men
 - Less than one month – 19.9% of women, 13.4% of men
 - One to three months – 12.8% of women, 8.7% of men
 - Four to six months – 8.6% of women, 5.6% of men
 - Seven to 12 months – 1% of women, no men.
 - More than one year – 1.6% of women, no men
 - Ongoing (continuous) – 6.7% of women, 5.6% of men
 - Sporadic (comes and goes) – 11.3% of women, 16.8% of men
 - Other/don't know – 0.8% of women, 2.1% of men.
- 51 Census data from '02_2011 Broderick Review Phase 2_RFI6' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 13 January 2012.
- 52 This was highest in the Air Force (47.6%) followed by Army (44.9%) and Navy (43.3%).
- 53 This figure combines the total number of personnel who were aware of sexual harassment happening to someone else. It includes: (1) those that have experienced sexual harassment and were aware of harassment happening to someone else in the same workplace; (2) and responses from the whole sample to whether they know of sexual harassment happening to someone in the ADF in general.
- 54 Public submission 26 Heymans.
- 55 Public submission 26 Heymans.

- 56 D Lievore, *Non-reporting and Hidden Recording of Sexual Assault: An International Literature Review*, Commonwealth Office of the Status of Women (2003), p 27. At www.aic.gov.au/documents/D/4/6/%7BD4631AC0-2DDC-4729-AD3C-8A69DF33BA65%7D2003-06-review.pdf (viewed 13 June 2012); Australian Human Rights Commission, *Sexual harassment: Serious business – Results of the 2008 Sexual Harassment National Telephone Survey* (2008), p 31. At www.hreoc.gov.au/sexualharassment/serious_business/SHSB_Report2008.pdf (viewed 13 June 2012); Australian Law Reform Commission, *Family Violence – A National Legal Response*, ALRC Report 114 (2010). At www.alrc.gov.au/publications/family-violence-national-legal-response-alrc-report-114 (viewed 13 June 2012).
- 57 Australian Law Reform Commission, above; A Quadara, 'Responding to young people disclosing sexual assault: A resource for schools', *ACSSA Wrap*, No 6 (2008). At www.aifs.gov.au/acssa/pubs/wrap/acssa_wrap6.pdf (viewed 13 June 2012); Lievore, above, p 28.
- 58 *Low v Chief of Navy* [2011] ADFDAT 3, [98] (Tracey, White and Mildren JJ).
- 59 Focus group 34E.
- 60 Focus group 33A.
- 61 Focus group 34E.
- 62 Confidential submission 16.
- 63 Confidential submission 3.
- 64 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 65 Focus group 40A.
- 66 Confidential meeting.
- 67 Focus group 12B.
- 68 Focus group 35B.
- 69 Confidential submission 5.
- 70 Confidential submission 9.
- 71 Focus group 38A.
- 72 Focus group 34E.
- 73 The Inspector General Australian Defence Force 2011 report noted the potential confusion created by the separate policies for dealing with complaints of sexual offences and complaints of unacceptable behaviour with the attendant risk that commanders and managers may attempt to resolve disciplinary or criminal matters informally: Inspector General Australian Defence Force, note 15, p 27. Reference was also made to the conclusion reached by the Honourable Roger Gyles in Part 1 of the HMAS Success Commission of Inquiry Report that some incidents that warranted a disciplinary response and investigation had been managed as an equity and diversity issue.
- 74 See for example, G Rumble, M McKean and D Pearce, *Report of the Review of Allegations of Sexual and Other Abuse in Defence* (2011) pp 140-144.
- 75 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 3, Annexure E.
- 76 In relation to complaints alleging that a sexual offence has occurred, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-4, 'Management and Reporting of Sexual Offences'* notes that 'mediation and other forms of alternative dispute resolution **are not to be used** as a means of resolving sexual offence complaints' (emphasis added) and that '[a]ny measures aimed at resolution must include steps to ensure there is no repeat of the behaviour or victimisation of either party. This may require consideration of disciplinary or formal administrative action. Commanders and managers must also undertake regular follow-up action to prevent recurrence and to ensure that victimisation does not occur': DI(G) PERS 35-4, note 1, para 78.
- 77 Focus group 19B.
- 78 Confidential submission 5.
- 79 Confidential submission 8.
- 80 Focus group 19B.
- 81 Focus group 7B.
- 82 By way of self-resolution, supported self-resolution, apology, alternative dispute resolution, counselling of the respondent or a behavioural development program for individual or group needs: DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 3, Annexure E.
- 83 Further details of the record keeping requirements for complaints of unacceptable behaviour are contained in Appendix N.2 – Tracking Repeat Offenders.
- 84 Meeting with Values, Behaviours and Resolution Branch (formerly Fairness and Resolution Branch).
- 85 A formal outcome involves disciplinary action or administrative sanction against a member: DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 3, Annexure E.
- 86 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 3, Annexure F, para 8.
- 87 Meeting with Values, Behaviours and Resolution Branch.
- 88 Meeting with Values, Behaviours and Resolution Branch.
- 89 Focus group 23A.
- 90 Focus group 34E.
- 91 Response from Chief Judge Advocate (BRIG Ian Westwood), Office of Judge Advocate General provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 3 April 2012.
- 92 Response from Chief Judge Advocate (BRIG Ian Westwood), Office of Judge Advocate General above.
- 93 Response from Chief Judge Advocate (BRIG Ian Westwood), Office of Judge Advocate General above.
- 94 Department of Defence, Director of Military Prosecutions, Report for the period 1 January to 31 December 2009, Annexure E.
- 95 CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 17 July 2012.
- 96 *Defence (Personnel) Regulations 2002*, Chapter 9, Part 2, Divisions 1 and 2.

- 97 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (Army) PERS 116-5 'Separation of Regular Army soldiers, Army Reserve soldiers and soldiers on full-time service – policy and procedures'*, para 87-91 ('DI(A) PERS 116-5').
- 98 DI(A) PERS 116-5', above, para 88.
- 99 DI(A) PERS 116-5', above, para 88.
- 100 See *Australian Human Rights Commission Act 1986* (Cth), Part II – Division 4 (ss 30, 31 and 32); *Australian Human Rights Commission Regulations 1989* (Cth), reg 4. See also Australian Human Rights Commission, *On the record: Guidelines for the prevention of discrimination in employment on the basis of criminal record*. At http://www.hreoc.gov.au/human_rights/criminalrecord/on_the_record/contents.html (viewed 28 June 2012).
- 101 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 33-5 'Arrangements for service in the Australian Defence Force'*, para 18 ('DI(G) PERS 33-5').
- 102 DI(G) PERS 33-5, above, para 18.
- 103 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 33-2 'Return of Service Obligation'*, para 2 ('DI(G) PERS 33-2').
- 104 DI(G) PERS 33-5, note 101, para 18.
- 105 DI(G) PERS 33-5, note 101, para 18.
- 106 DI(G) PERS 33-2, note 103, para 2. Service Chiefs may delegate these powers to the Directors-General of the relevant Service personnel management agency (para 2).
- 107 DI(G) PERS 33-2, note 103, para 21.
- 108 DI(G) PERS 33-2, note 103, para 21. An offer of employment is stated as not generally considered a compelling reason for approving an application to separate from the ADF. An application for any other reason may be approved subject to the payment of a financial condition.
- 109 Focus group 38C.
- 110 M Carmody, S Evans, C Krogh, M Flood, M Heenan and G Ovenden, *Framing best practice: National Standards for the primary prevention of sexual assault through education, National Sexual Assault Prevention Education Project for NASASV* (2009), pp 197-8.
- 111 Australian Human Rights Commission, *Review into the Treatment of Women at the Australian Defence Force Academy* (2011), p 96.
- 112 Confidential submission 25
- 113 Confidential submission 25.
- 114 A Ballard, *Report on Sexual Assault Prevention and Intervention in a Military Environment* (2009), p 21. At www.churchilltrust.com.au/site_media/fellows/2009_Ballard_Angela.pdf (viewed 31 May 2012).
- 115 Rumble et al, note 74, p 1.
- 116 Ballard, note 114, p 22.
- 117 Inspector General Australian Defence Force, note 15, p 30.
- 118 *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth), s 106. Note also section 105 of the SDA that provides that 'a person who causes, instructs, induces, aids or permits another person to do an act that is unlawful under Division 1 or 2 of Part II shall, for the purposes of this Act, be taken also to have done the act'.
- 119 Ballard, note 114, p 22.
- 120 See P McDonald, M Flood and the Australian Human Rights Commission, *Encourage, Support, Act: Bystander Approaches to Sexual Harassment in the Workplace*, AHRC (2012).
- 121 National Council to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children, *Time for Action: The National Council's Plan for Australia to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children, 2009-2021* (2009), p 79. At <http://apo.org.au/research/time-action-national-councils-plan-australia-reduce-violence-against-women-and-their-childr> (viewed 10 July 2012).
- 122 Further information available at National Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence Counselling Service, *1800RESPECT Online*, <http://www.1800respect.org.au/1800RESPECT-online.html> (viewed 27 June 2012).
- 123 See, for example, information provided at National Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence Counselling Service, *1800RESPECT Online*, above (at Appendix N.6).
- 124 This is also an approach adopted by the US military: US Department of Defense, *Instruction Number 6495.02, 'Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Procedures'*, 23 June 2006, updated 13 November 2008. At <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/649502p.pdf> (viewed 10 July 2012).
- 125 Under-reporting of sexual assault is widely acknowledged in the literature. See for example, the Australian Centre for the Study of Sexual Assault, *International Violence Against Women Survey: the Australian Component*, and other Victimisation surveys available on the website. At <http://www.aifs.gov.au/acssa/statistics> (viewed 28 June 2012).



“We’re talking about people leaving their children ... I couldn’t go to the letterbox without my son thinking that I wasn’t coming back.”

ADF member (Focus Group)



Chapter 8:

Adequacy and Accessibility
of Support Mechanisms

In summary

- ADF service obligations have a significant impact on family life and stability.
- The ADF's posting and deployment cycle can result in the family of ADF members experiencing problems in accessing child care, disruption to education and employment difficulties. The posting and deployment cycle also causes lengthy periods of separation from family.
- There are a range of services to support the families of ADF members. Many of these work well but a more targeted approach could make them more effective.
- Housing is an important condition of service for ADF members. Despite this, members experience difficulties with the availability of appropriate housing (including proximity to schools, child care and partners' place of work) and the security of on-base housing for women. Many of the challenges are heightened for members with dependents and members living in remote locations.
- Psychological stresses and physical injuries at work can impact on the health of ADF members.
- Between 2007 and 2011, women's involvement in work health and safety incidents overall was broadly proportionate to their representation in the ADF but they were over-represented in reports of minor injuries and work health and safety incidents at the ADF's larger training establishments.
- There are barriers and negative perceptions attached to using the mental health support system available to members.
- Better targeting of support measures may have positive results on the productivity and retention of personnel, including women.

Women and men alike make great personal sacrifices as members of the ADF. They are posted to different locations every few years, deploy overseas and risk their safety in service of their country. The partners and families of serving members also sacrifice much to support their serving member, and the Review is deeply respectful of all of these contributions.

This Chapter will discuss the impact of Defence service on members and their families and examine the supports which are available. Key issues include impacts on family life, access to housing, and members' health. The primary perspective of the Review is women, but the issues discussed below impact on the experience of all personnel. This means that strategies to improve the situation for women will also improve the situation for men.

8.1 Impact on families

The pressures of postings and deployments make the lives and careers of ADF members significantly different from that of their civilian counterparts. This section discusses the impact that ADF service can have on ADF families, including the difficulty in accessing appropriate child care and schooling for children, employment for spouses/partners of ADF members in new locations, separation from families, relationship breakdown, and the implications that these issues have for the ADF. It will also identify measures that the ADF could implement to lessen the impact of ADF service on families.

(a) Posting and deployment cycle

Throughout their careers, many members will experience extended periods of absence from their families. Among permanent ADF members, 56% have been deployed operationally since 1999 and most of these deployments were between two and eight months. More recently, 21% of permanent members had been deployed on operations in the 12 months to May 2011, with an average duration of 4.1 months.¹ Navy personnel posted to seagoing ships can also spend between 150 and 180 days away from home on non-operational deployments each year.² ADF members also spend time away from home for ADF purposes other than deployments, such as training exercises. The 2011 ADF Census data indicated that the average time away from home was 65 nights in the 12 months to May 2011.³

ADF members can also expect postings to different locations throughout their careers. As outlined in section 4.4, each Service aims to provide personnel with three year postings in each role and back-to-back postings in the same geographic location, although qualitative evidence presented to the Review suggests more frequent movements often occur. Certainly, responses to the 2009 *Families Survey* suggest a high rate of movement for ADF families during a member's period of service.⁴ It states, '42.8% of respondents reported that they had moved between one and three times, while just over one-quarter (26.3%) reported that they had moved between four and six times. Overall, 9.9% of the respondents reported that they had moved ten or more times.'⁵ In 2010/11, Defence spent approximately \$203.8 million on 21,300 relocations, the majority of which were related to postings.⁶

The time that women, in particular, may spend on deployment or away from their families can give rise to judgemental attitudes from people in the community. There is a perception in the community that a 'good' mother is always with her children and should never spend extended periods away from them. Known as the 'good mother belief', this perception is not generally made about fathers. ADF women can be particularly vulnerable to negative attitudes from those not in Defence about their decision to deploy. This can place a significant emotional burden on serving mothers.

(b) Impact on families and children

The Report has already discussed the challenges that ADF families can encounter in accessing appropriate child care that is responsive to their needs, particularly in relation to the hours and locations of child care supported by the ADF (see Chapter 6). In addition to these issues, the ADF's posting and deployment cycle can create issues for members who need to access child care. The need for child care is heightened when an ADF member is deployed, which can place extra caring pressures on an ADF member's spouse or other family members. This pressure is increased for single parents or in situations where both parents are posted or deployed at the same time. At these times, personnel may seek assistance from extended families, such as having a grandparent move in to provide extra assistance:

When I was up here a couple of years ago my commanding officer had a two or three year old son and her husband was deployed. Then we got sent on exercise in Queensland for two months or just over. She flew her mother up to live in her house and look after her child.⁷

Sometimes when you're single, because people are so aware that you're single, they all want to help you...but when you're with a partner, no one helps you as much because they think that you're the parent, so you're ok. I think it's funny that often women that I know...will get the mother-in-law to move in [when they are deployed] but when the...men deploy, women are often left with the kids. We don't get a nanny or an in-law to come with us, but when the man's left with the child, then there is help brought in.⁸

Members can also experience difficulties accessing child care when they are posted to a new location:

She has to compete with the wider community to get child care places and yet sometimes she doesn't know that she's coming here until three months beforehand. When you've got a six month waiting list for child care, that's bloody hard. She's literally bouncing around trying to find a day care centre and at the same time, not knowing where she's going to be living but she knows where she's posted to.⁹

Posting to a new location is a particularly important time at which families may require child care support. Not all families are able to seek assistance from a friend or other family member. Furthermore, the assistance required at these times would generally need to be more flexible than that provided by a traditional child care centre. This reflects the sometimes short notice given to members prior to deployment and the extended hours during which support may be required.

Posting to a new location may also create other forms of instability for families. One issue that emerged is disruption to the education of older children. One female member told the Review:

My eldest daughter is six, she has lived in two different states, she's lived in four different houses, five different day cares, two different schools and she's in Year One...Now luckily she is adaptable, confident, outgoing...but at the same time, she can only put up with so much.¹⁰

Another member stated:

Obviously, every three years if you get posted to another posting...you're disrupting their school.¹¹

These reports are supported by the 2008 Defence Attitudes Survey, where between 47% and 55% of ADF respondents who indicated they have dependent children reported that their children's education was being affected by postings.¹² This is a significant percentage and is indicative of the sacrifice that members and their families are making for the ADF. Depending on the new posting location, members may also have difficulty accessing quality education for their children. While not the case in all locations, this was raised as an issue in some remote and regional areas visited by the Review. For example, in one location the Review heard:

In high school though, the education level's probably not to the same standard as the rest of the country...when they leave here, they do have some problems when they go back to either study in another school or go to university. So we do have the opportunity and Defence can pay for education at boarding schools elsewhere, but it's not always the best option for high school.¹³

Partners/spouses of members may also encounter employment difficulties in new posting locations. Some of these issues are identified in the draft 2011 ADF Census report, which found that, after the last job change due to Service-related relocation, the spouses/partners of ADF members were out of work for an average of 5.4 months. That report also notes that the income of many spouses/partners was less when they regained employment than they had received previously.¹⁴ One member articulated the difficulties that partners/spouses who are not members of the ADF can encounter in maintaining their career:

The [ADF] doesn't really take into account their situation so they'll send me wherever they want and then obviously [my partner has] just got to pack up and start a new job. It's hard for her to get ahead anywhere...It's hard for your partner to have a career when you're in the Defence Force.¹⁵

Career difficulties are not isolated to cases where only one partner/spouse is in the ADF. The posting cycle can also have an impact on career and family life where both spouses are ADF members:

It's very hard to have two successful careers and children...There's a lot you need to manage and there's a lot of luck involved [to get] postings in the same location which also coincide with your promotion...At the end of the day it was easier for [my wife] to discharge and get civil employment than it was to continue...The other part was with both being serving members, at one stage there we were sort of tag teaming. I was overseas, came back, she left a month later, came back, I went and did promotion courses. There was a two year period where we saw each other 30 or 40 days.¹⁶

Due to the disruptions and instability that regular re-posting can create for families, a number of members told the Review of their decision to be 'Member with Dependents (Unaccompanied)' (sometimes referred to as 'married separated'), whereby they are posted to one location while their family remains in a separate location, and the associated strains that this can create:

There's a lot of people living married but separated...in Defence because their wife and children are steady at school and they don't want to be...moving their children all the time, every two years, because they're happy at their school and that would be disruptive to family life. So the husband has

taken it on to live separated from the family to...ensure stability for his wife and children...and then of course that puts pressure on...everyone and the relationship.¹⁷

Extended periods of separation from families, due to deployment, exercises or other postings, can be difficult for ADF members. A number of members spoke to the Review about missing important family events. In a deployed environment the Review met one ADF member who had not yet seen his newborn child. Other members stated:

I think it's a personal feeling more than anything else, I felt like I've abandoned my kids for the last five months...I missed two birthdays, I missed a tenth birthday and a seventh birthday.¹⁸

A lot of men that have deployed [have] been away from their children. They've missed births... My husband has been gone for...over three years of his little girl's life, and she's six.¹⁹

Members also told the Review about the impact deployments have on their children:

We're talking about people leaving their children, which I'm still dealing with...I couldn't go to the letterbox without my son thinking that I wasn't coming back.²⁰

The 2009 *Dunt Mental Health Review* (the Dunt Review) considered the effect that ADF service can have on members' families. In addition to some of the issues discussed above, the Dunt Review noted that families may encounter some of the adverse psychological impacts that the deployment experience can have on members.²¹

The Review heard that members on deployment have varying degrees of access to communications technologies such as Internet-based video calling (for example, through Skype), which would assist to maintain contact with their families during long periods of separation. One female member on deployment spoke of how useful these tools are:

You know once upon a time we were writing letters and it was taking three months to get to each other. Now I can Skype [my husband] and see the kids in the background. It's really good to be able to deploy and know that we have access to that. For the people that don't it must be very hard.²²

The Review spoke to a woman on deployment who was present for her six year old daughter's ANZAC Day Service through the technology 'Face Time'. It had been a positive experience for both the ADF member and her daughter.²³

Another woman spoke of how she would like to have improved access to communications tools in order to maintain her relationship with her partner:

I'm in a situation where I'm not communicating with my partner other than email because there's no opportunity to do it. You go, well, that's deployment, deal with it. But you see other people that do have the access and you get really envious. You see they have these tools to maintain their relationship.²⁴

(c) Relationship stress

Anecdotally, the Review also heard that relationship breakdown is a significant issue within the ADF. In consultations, ADF members reported:

Last year [in] the unit I was with prior to going on our exercise, I had 23 break ups [out of 32 unit members].²⁵

It takes a special person to be an Army wife. 'Cause I know a lot of other people that may have full partnered with a female when they were younger, joined the Defence Force then all of a sudden within a year, [it's] 'no, I can't stand this'... You see a lot of breakups in the Defence Force.²⁶

The limited communication options for submariners can create anxiety about family or partners. A submariner told the Review:

I remember I was on a 12 week patrol [and] my wife was sending through the family-grams. Her dad had got really sick while I was on patrol and she was so sad about it...She stopped sending them for about four weeks because she was just dealing with the fact that he had cancer and everything, so she wasn't sending them. I'm out there at sea, suddenly the family-grams stop, nothing for a month and I'm thinking 'what [is going on]?'...if [Navy] can devise ways of even just getting a little bit more of written stuff from your family I think that would be a lot better and I think they should address that.²⁷

Data from the 2011 Census suggests that 16.9% of permanent members have experienced a divorce and/or a revocation/breakdown of a Defence-recognised de facto/interdependent partnership at any time during their ADF service.²⁸ Given that the median length of service is seven years for permanent ADF members, it does appear that many ADF members experience a significant relationship breakdown within a relatively short period of time.²⁹ However, it is difficult to ascertain how this compares to relationship breakdown and divorce rates in the broader Australian community.³⁰

(d) Implications for ADF

The impact that ADF service, particularly the posting and deployment cycle, has on members' family life has broader implications for the ADF. A key issue is the impact on retention. The Review heard many stories about members choosing to move to the Reserve or discharge from the ADF because they did not want to continue the instability and/or separation in their family lives:

It's taken the last five years to get my husband posted to the same locality as me...He's been told he's only here for the next two years. When he posts, I'll be leaving because it took so long for us to get posted together and it was really distressing for me.³¹

It's the simple things that they could fix without it really costing any money and paying anybody any more, and that could fix retention. Because the guys who are exiting to go to mining, it isn't because they don't love the Army anymore. It's the family is sick of the guy going on two minutes' notice to move without any sort of warning, or he's going on a course and...away for four months. Then we're going to send him on deployment for six months. It's those issues...that affect my retention and my interest in retention, not the money.³²

Other members indicated that they considered taking similar action:

out of the three years I will have spent in this posting, we will have been co-located for less than 11 months...It is a constant, demoralising struggle to be co-located and many times I have considered discharge due to being fed-up with the lack of cooperation and negative attitude from [Service].³³

Men and women in deployed environments in particular, told the Review about the psychological impact of being away for long periods from their families. This added further stress to an already challenging environment.³⁴

These observations suggest that there is an imperative for the ADF to improve the extent to which they support serving members and their families. The ADF has many resources in place but these efforts need to be enhanced and targeted.

(e) Support services and policies

(i) Existing support

Defence's policy on family support is set out in Defence Instruction (General) Personnel 42-1 *Australian Defence Force Family Support Policy*. The Defence Community Organisation (DCO) has primary responsibility for providing practical support services, through:

- critical incident and casualty support
- absence from home support, to 'minimise the impact on families of the members' absence from home due to deployment or other service-related reasons'
- mobility support, to 'minimise the effects on families of moving locations'.³⁵

Specific supports offered by DCO include the Emergency Support for Families Scheme, assistance for members who have dependents with special needs, education assistance and the Partner Education and Employment Program. DCO also manages Defence's child care program.³⁶

Further, Defence Families of Australia is a ministerially appointed group that represents the views of Defence families by reporting, making recommendations and influencing policy that directly affects families.³⁷ It also maintains an accessible and informative website offering advice for families and partners in a series of areas including health, money and education. These are necessary and very important supports which the Review endorses.

(ii) Areas for improvement

There are several other areas where the support system could be improved. The recent restructure to DCO has caused some uncertainty regarding the level and types of services to be offered in the future, particularly in the provision of child care.³⁸

Some members suggested that the mechanisms through which DCO offers support to the families of deployed personnel do not always meet the needs of these families. In particular, the Review heard that the times at which support activities are scheduled do not allow attendance by working partners/spouses. One woman spoke about the difficulties her partner had encountered:

On deployments my partner is not looked after with the welfare issue because he can't come to morning teas, he can't drop everything and do the day thing. He's a full time worker, so he doesn't get the phone calls, he doesn't get the contact.³⁹

DCO could consider scheduling some support activities at alternative times to enable working spouses/partners to also participate. A similar suggestion was also raised by some respondents to the 2009 *Families Survey*.⁴⁰

It was also suggested to the Review that support for members and their families should be more integrated than it is currently. The Review heard that:

The programs that exist within Defence are still very much 'this is for the member, this is for the family' ...they need to get those programmes connected and then, you know that would really show that a member is considered to be a part of the family unit. It's not an us and them ...mentality.⁴¹

Options to further integrate the support provided to members and their families, as a means of better addressing the impact that ADF life has on families, would be beneficial.

Another issue is the limited availability of services offered by DCO to couples where both partners are ADF members. The DCO website notes that its 'main priority is the immediate family of ADF members'.⁴² One member explained the difficulty that she and her spouse had experienced in accessing appropriate services for their circumstances:

We talk about people whose spouses may be civilians, we don't talk about them having their spouses as serving member...So the Defence Community Organisation now is for families of serving members, not just serving members, which immediately excludes both my husband and I from going there and getting support through DCO because the expectation is that there are enough support mechanisms for serving members within Defence.⁴³

The member continued to explain that while she was able to access a psychologist as an ADF member, she wasn't able to receive assistance from a DCO social worker as she would have preferred.⁴⁴ This suggests a need for the ADF to consider broadening the types of support offered to families where both partners are members of the ADF.

In addition, the Review recommends that a more holistic, structured and coordinated mechanism is required to facilitate members' access to particular services at the time of posting (whether to a new location or on deployment), or throughout the posting cycle. Career management agencies should develop a Support to Posting plan as part of career planning and/or when posting decisions are made and communicated to members. This plan should be developed in consultation and with the agreement of each member. It will enable both the career management agency and member to reduce the instability caused by postings and deployments, and also facilitate members' access to services when they need them most.

Greater efforts to develop 'joint career plans' for partners who are both serving members would also alleviate many of the stresses Defence couples face. Joint Career Plans would help to reduce separation, ensure greater family stability and improve career opportunities for both partners (rather than one partner exiting the Service due to difficulties in being co-located, or one partner being repeatedly deployed/undertaking operational service).

8.2 Housing

The provision of housing assistance is an important condition of service for ADF members, particularly in the context of posting cycles that require members to move regularly from location to location. Housing assistance provided by the ADF is valued by members but the Review heard that it also presents challenges. These include difficulties with the locations of Defence housing, issues with accessing appropriate housing in remote areas and safety concerns. These challenges and their impact on members (and in some instances, their families) will be discussed in this section.

There are several forms of housing assistance available to members depending on their needs at a particular time:

- Service Residences – Defence owned or rented property off-base
- Rent Allowance that enables members to rent in the private market
- Living-In accommodation – Defence owned on-base accommodation
- Home Purchase Assistance Scheme that supports members to purchase their own home.

Members are normally eligible for one form of housing assistance at a time. Service residences and on-base accommodation are prioritised for members with dependents, but other members may be able to use them if there is a surplus.⁴⁵

The importance of housing assistance was affirmed by members in the Review's focus groups and many reported positive experiences of housing, such as the sense of community and support fostered through the provision of 'married quarters' on-base.⁴⁶ The high value placed on housing assistance by members of the ADF was also affirmed by the 2008 Defence Attitude Survey, with over 60% of ADF members stating that subsidised housing remained an important influence on their decision to stay in the ADF.⁴⁷ However, there are a number of challenges related to the provision of housing support, as discussed below.

(a) Members with dependents

The Review found that members posting with dependents face particular challenges in relation to housing. The ADF policy that housing should be provided within a 30 kilometre radius of the members' place of duty has a significant impact on members with dependents. For example, this policy does not take into consideration the distance to a partner's place of work (civilian or ADF) or appropriate childcare facilities and schooling. For some members this results in them having to either forfeit housing assistance to secure housing that meets their family's needs, or sacrifice good schooling for their children and/or many hours of travel a day to drive to school or work:

Basically we were told [that it] doesn't matter how far your wife has to travel to work. We only post you based on [your place of duty] so you're entitled to these houses.⁴⁸

You get a house that's available. You may be lucky and have a selection of a few, but at the end of the day if there's only one house available then that's yours...So you either have to go and buy or rent privately and knock back the house, or put your child in a school in a zone that you may not be comfortable with.⁴⁹

The impact of this policy was heightened for members posted to some locations where there is a shortage of Defence housing (including in remote locations) and many capital cities where members are often forced to live at the outer edges of the city radius with little or no choice about the particular home.⁵⁰ Greater flexibility in the design and implementation of Defence housing policies could mitigate these impacts.

(b) Remote locations

Members can face difficulties in securing appropriate, affordable and safe housing, especially in remote locations.

The ADF informed the Review that securing Defence housing in remote locations, such as Karratha, Geraldton, Nhulunbuy, Weipa, Tully and Mission Beach, is particularly challenging.⁵¹ Difficulty in accessing housing is compounded in mining areas such as Karratha, where rents can be very high. While Defence is currently building and acquiring housing in many of these remote areas, the impacts of the shortage on members were a key issue in focus groups:

Places to stay, rental properties, and the quality and the standard and the price for what you're paying is just astronomical here.⁵²

It's very hard for 'singlies' to get any type of accommodation. But in my section I've actually seen so far two 18 year old [marriages] go ahead. They get married so they can get a married quarter, because they can't get it in town.⁵³

Trying to get into a rental as a de facto was difficult, because all of the companies [think] 'we're not renting to you guys because you're just going to get de facto and then get a DHA house, so we don't want to rent to you'.⁵⁴

While single members may be able to use married quarters on base when they are not in use, this is not permanent and they may be asked to vacate at short notice if the accommodation is needed by other members:

All the young singlies that were in married quarters got kicked out. It was so terrible...They were empty for so long and then they [say] 'you can have those married quarters and live in there because they're empty'. And suddenly something happens and they all get kicked out. They've got dogs, a houseful of furniture.⁵⁵

Members also described some of the problems of 'living-in' accommodation on base, which was heightened for members in remote locations who have a smaller social network and few choices about alternative accommodation:

You feel like you live in a fishbowl.⁵⁶

Everyone knows exactly what everybody else is doing.⁵⁷

I'm a shift worker, so I will be at work from eight o'clock at night until eight o'clock in the morning, have to sleep during the day, and it's almost impossible sometimes... You have roommates, you have cleaners come in, you have the boozier which is right behind me.⁵⁸

(c) Safety

The Review was concerned by statements of women in focus groups relating to feeling unsafe living in on-base accommodation:

We had two girls in my room and the door would not lock, and they would not fix it... Anybody could walk in and out of our rooms anytime they wanted.⁵⁹

The lines where X's partner initially was, where the assault took place, she was the only female in 'tin city' [as it is referred to]. She was living there with all the males in her course of which there were eight. In the lines immediately next door there were a large number of recently returned soldiers being accommodated.⁶⁰

If you lived in the accommodation lines, alcohol becomes a major problem resulting in drunken behaviour and many booze parties. Some soldiers were loud, obnoxious and out of control as alcohol was allowed on base. When [I] complained, [the] unit did nothing. I didn't drink, smoke and kept to myself... I hated it.⁶¹

The Review has been informed that the ADF is currently making efforts to upgrade single living-in accommodation on some bases, including the security features of this accommodation. For example, under the Single Living Environment and Accommodation Precinct (Single LEAP) project, the units are being fitted with 'crimsafe doors' which, according to the ADF, have 'already protected at least one female resident from the aggravated advances of a spurned male colleague'.⁶²

Further, the Review heard that as 'each unit has its own ensuite, the risk associated with women having to travel [through] male dominated [accommodation] to shared shower and lavatory facilities, particularly at night' is reduced.⁶³ The Review is encouraged by these efforts to increase security and suggests the ADF extend this to temporary accommodations for recruits and trainees also.

8.3 Health and injuries

Serving in the ADF can also have health impacts on members, including psychological stresses and physical injuries.

The health and fitness of its members is central to the ADF's ability to deliver its core responsibilities as a fighting force. As such, free health care, including dental and other ancillary health care (e.g. physiotherapy, optical and podiatry) is provided to all permanent ADF members.⁶⁴ The ADF has a number of strategically important policies and organisations that are responsible for managing the health and wellbeing of its members. These are discussed in Appendix O.1.⁶⁵

An Australian National Audit Office audit of health services for ADF personnel noted that the provision of comprehensive health care was seen as an important factor in the recruitment and retention of personnel.⁶⁶ This is supported by the findings of the most recent Defence Attitude Survey in which 76% of female respondents and 73% of male respondents said that they considered free medical and dental care to be a very or extremely important factor influencing their decision to stay in the ADF, while 50% of female respondents and 52% of male respondents believed that the ADF Family Health Trial was 'very' or 'extremely important'.⁶⁷

(a) Work Health and Safety

The nature of the work undertaken by the ADF contains particular risks and hazards. Perhaps unsurprisingly, this means that ADF members may experience some form of health and/or safety incident throughout their career.

Under workplace health and safety laws, Defence has an obligation to ensure the health and safety of workers as far as is 'reasonably practicable'. Work health and safety legislation provides a framework for health and safety management in Defence workplaces. Where an environment is dangerous to their workers' health, Defence is responsible for ensuring all reasonable steps are taken to redress the problem under the *Work Health and Safety Act 2011* (WHS Act). Under this framework, a WHS incident occurring 'in the conduct of a business or undertaking', must be reported by the supervisor of the workplace or injured person.⁶⁸ The Review was provided with data on physical and psychological incidents extracted from notification and reporting forms (as required under the previous Occupational Health and Safety Act) for the past five years.⁶⁹

Between 2007 and 2011, women were involved in around 13.4% of all incidents, broadly proportionate to their representation in the ADF population (currently 13.8%). Across each Service there was slightly higher proportional representation of women experiencing WHS incidents in Army and Navy (for Air Force the proportion was slightly lower):

- women made up 10.4% of WHS incidents in Army (compared to an overall representation of 9.9% of the Army population)
- women made up 21.1% of WHS incidents in Navy (compared to an overall representation of 18.5% of the Navy population)
- women made up 16.5% of WHS incidents in Air Force (compared to an overall representation of 17.1% of the Air Force population).

By category of injury, women were under-represented in some types of injury and over-represented in others. Women were notably over-represented in minor injuries, where women made up 17% of all reported incidents.⁷⁰ By Service, women made up 13.4% of minor injuries in Army, 25.7% of minor injuries in Navy and 21.6% of minor injuries in Air Force. Within the sport and fitness training category, women made up 18.3% of injuries while undertaking physical training activities.

It was notable that there was a disproportionately high representation of incidents involving women in some of the larger training establishments. For example, between 2007 and 2011:

- at ADFA, there were 359 reported incidents with 37.8% involving women
- at HMAS *Creswell*, there were 532 incidents with 29.3% involving women
- at Duntroon, there were 462 incidents with 17.5% involving women
- at Blamey Barracks, Kapooka, there were 2,565 incidents with 17.7% involving women
- at RAAF Base Wagga, there were 1,080 incidents with 24.5% involving women
- at HMAS *Cerberus* there were 2,183 incidents with 26.4% involving women.

The ADF has robust work health and safety systems in place to address injuries and illness. Women have different health needs and are physiologically different to men, so it is important that these differences are well understood and that women, particularly through the recruit training stage, are given adequate support.

The proportionately higher incident rates for women in some training establishments, the proportionately higher minor injury rates for women, and women's higher representation in physical training activity-related incidents are worthy of greater analysis. While the WHS Act does not require the ADF to protect workers from every possible risk, it does have an obligation to do all that is reasonably practicable to ensure all ADF members are protected from work related injury or illness.

Although the data provided must be treated with caution, work days lost from WHS incidents amounted to over 50,000 days over the 5 year period (gradually reducing over time to just over 8000 in 2011).⁷¹ Significantly, almost half of these days were related to minor injury incidents (although, there were proportionately fewer

work days lost by women than men). Providing appropriate WHS support is essential, not only in fulfilling the ADF's legal obligations, but in reducing the risk of cost or other implications of losing personnel altogether through injury. The Review notes that progress has been made over the last five years in this regard.

The WHS data received from the ADF is complex, with inconsistent descriptions of activities being undertaken when injuries occurred. There was difficulty in obtaining data which was comprehensive, gender-disaggregated and manageable. This is concerning as it does not enable the ADF to better understand whether there are different patterns or types of incidents for men and women, and therefore how to best prevent and manage them.

(b) Mental health

The operational effectiveness of the ADF depends on the mental wellbeing of ADF members and their families. To this end, the ADF has conducted a series of studies and initiatives over the previous decade (detailed in Appendix O.2) that Professor Ian Hickie of the Brain and Mind Research Institute has described as world's best practice.⁷²

One of these studies, the 2010 Mental Health Prevalence and Wellbeing Study, found that the prevalence of 'mental disorder' in the ADF is similar to the Australian community sample but that profiles of specific disorders in the ADF vary.⁷³ It also found that the mental health of ADF females did not differ significantly from that of females in the Australian community.⁷⁴ Anxiety disorders are the most common mental disorder type in the ADF, with higher prevalence among females, while ADF males experience higher rates of affective disorders than the Australian community sample.⁷⁵

In the Review's consultations, members were aware of the psychological stresses of their jobs. One member suggested that, rather than physical demands, 'it's more psychological type burnout or you know, stress related or relationship pressure' that causes most problems for ADF members.⁷⁶ A senior member told the Review about the need for more emphasis to be placed on mental wellbeing as they were seeing more individuals who:

thundered through their career...but then you look at the other side and they are divorced or separated or their children are not functioning and I think we need to change our culture. You need to have a balance because one, it's good for your mental health, but it's also good for your family and keeping you grounded.⁷⁷

A serving health member also impressed the need to act in this area because of the particular 'stresses in Defence service around mental health, rates of accidents, a propensity to certain unsafe behaviours involving alcohol and other stuff' that personnel dealt with constantly.⁷⁸

The ADF has a range of services in place for members who require assistance with mental health issues. These include medical, psychiatric, psychology, nursing, chaplains and social work services.⁷⁹ There is also an All-Hours Support Line, a confidential telephone service for ADF members and their families that is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week.⁸⁰ This service has been outsourced to a company that provides qualified mental health professionals who have been trained in issues that ADF members and their families face. Services on offer can be within or beyond the chains of command. Services outside the chain of command, such as chaplains and the Support Line, appear more readily accessed by members.

ADF chaplains support many ADF members, and many personnel spoke positively about the support that they received from their chaplains (or padres). One member told the Review about a meeting where he told the padre that he was an atheist:

But there was no 'oh, you're not a believer', or 'I'm going to try and turn you my way' and all that. He was just a caring bloke.⁸¹

Another spoke of a tendency to approach a chaplain before a psychologist because:

I don't want it going on my record [and] it won't go on my record talking to a chaplain.⁸²

However, the Review also heard of an incident where a chaplain was unsupportive and critical of a member in a same-sex relationship.⁸³

In focus groups and through submissions, members related many instances where barriers and stigma impacted upon members who utilised mental health care. One spoke of the difficulties in navigating and accessing the mental health services via the chain of command, noting that:

One of my mates I went through with tried to commit suicide and no one helped him. It got to the hierarchy...the commanding officer, colonel level and then from there no one knows what happens with it, it just stops.⁸⁴

Another member was satisfied with the options available, and said that:

I think a lot of the stigma has gone away from that sort of stuff. I think we've got better whether it's mental health and all those other things that are coming to the forefront.⁸⁵

The Review is aware that, in addition to offering practical mental health support services, the ADF also has a policy focus on improving access to mental health care. The *2012-2015 Mental Health and Wellbeing Action Plan* is currently being finalised. This will 'align Defence with the national mental health reform agenda, and put in place a system that is self-monitoring and continuously improving.'⁸⁶ The Review considers that this is a positive move, and one that should be implemented as a priority.

8.4 Conclusion

ADF service can have serious impacts on members and their families. These include impacts on family life, access to housing, and members' health. In many cases, these impacts are exacerbated by the ADF's postings and deployment cycle. The best possible support is required to assist personnel in managing these demands and minimising negative outcomes.

The Review is supportive of the range and quality of services offered to ADF members and their families but finds that there are ways in which this could be improved.

Defence Forces around the world are finding that, where personnel, their families and circumstances are supported, retention is improved. The experiences of international services echo those found in the ADF. The following Chapter examines some of the common trends and challenges occurring in these Services.

- 1 Department of Defence, *Defence Census Public Report 2011* (draft), p 19, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 8 March 2012. The final *Defence Census Public Report 2011* was not available to the Review team at the time of writing.
- 2 Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012.
- 3 Department of Defence, *Defence Census Public Report 2011* (draft), note 1, pp 17-18.
- 4 The 2009 Families Survey was completed by spouses/partners of permanent full time ADF members, permanent full time ADF members who were single parents, and both members of dual ADF couples. Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research, *A Picture of Australian Defence Force Families 2009: Results from the first survey of Australian Defence Force Families General Report*, DSPPR Report 31/2009, September 2009, p 7, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 13 November 2011.
- 5 Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research, *A Picture of Australian Defence Force Families 2009: Results from the first survey of Australian Defence Force Families General Report*, above, p 91.
- 6 'ADF Removals Average Costs' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 1 June 2012. Of the 21,316 relocations in 2010-11, 15,397 were related to domestic and overseas postings and a further 319 were due to 'change of ship's home port/unit relocation'. Other reasons for relocations included discharge, marriage, marriage breakup, death and other housing changes.
- 7 Focus group 11A.
- 8 Focus group 9B.
- 9 Focus group 13B.
- 10 Focus group 32A.
- 11 Focus group 30D.
- 12 Strategic Personnel Policy Research, *2008 Defence Attitudes Survey Summary of Results*, Department of Defence, 2009, p 8. At http://www.defence.gov.au/dpe/dpe_site/publications/2008_Defence_Attitude_Survey_Summary_of_Results.pdf (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 13 Meeting with senior officers, RAAF Base Tindal.
- 14 Department of Defence, *Defence Census Public Report 2011* (draft), note 1, p 22.
- 15 Focus group 31B.
- 16 Focus group 33C.
- 17 Focus group 41A.
- 18 Focus group 14D.
- 19 Focus group 32A.
- 20 Focus group 14A.
- 21 D Dunt, *Review of Mental Health Care in the ADF and Transition through Discharge* (2009), p 129. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/health/DMH/Review.htm> (viewed 25 June 2012).
- 22 Focus group 40A.
- 23 Confidential meeting.
- 24 Focus group 40A.
- 25 Focus group 38B.
- 26 Focus group 32B.
- 27 Focus group 18E.
- 28 '26_2012 Broderick Review Phase 2_RFI 405' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 18 May 2012.
- 29 Median length of service taken from Department of Defence, *Defence Census Public Report 2011* (draft), note 1, pp 13-14.
- 30 The Australian Bureau of Statistics has some information on divorce rates in Australia. In 2010, the crude divorce rate was 2.3 per 1,000 estimated resident population. In 2006 (latest data available) the total 'age-specific divorce rate' was 12.2 per 1000 resident married population for men, and 12 per 1000 resident married population for women. However, as these rates are based on different samples and do not include breakdown of de facto relationships, it is not possible to compare these statistics to available data for the ADF population. For further information regarding divorce rates in the Australian community, see Australian Bureau of Statistics 2011, *Marriages and Divorces, Australia, 2010*, 'Table 1 Selected divorce indicators, Australia, Selected years, 1990-2010' and 'Table 3 Age-specific divorce rates per married population, Selected years, 1976-2006(a)', data cube: Excel spreadsheet, cat. no. 3310.0. At <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/3310.0Main+Features12010?OpenDocument> (viewed 25 May 2012).
- 31 Focus group 23A.
- 32 Focus group 20B.
- 33 *Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*.
- 34 Focus group 38B.
- 35 'RFI 317 - Presentation Broderick Review' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 13 March 2012.
- 36 Information available at the DCO website. See Defence Community Organisation, *Welcome to the Defence Community Organisation*, <http://www.defence.gov.au/dco/default.htm> (viewed 25 June 2012).
- 37 Defence Families of Australia, *About Us*, <http://dfa.org.au/about-us-0> (viewed 5 June 2012).
- 38 'RFI 317 - Presentation Broderick Review', note 35; 'RFI 320 - DCO Workforce Review STP' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 13 March 2012; meeting with Defence Community Organisation.
- 39 Focus group 35F.
- 40 Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research, *A Picture of Australian Defence Force Families 2009: Results from the first survey of Australian Defence Force Families General Report*, note 4, p 84.
- 41 Meeting with Defence Families of Australia.
- 42 Defence Community Organisation, *Frequently Asked Questions*, <http://www.defence.gov.au/dco/faqs.htm> (viewed 28 May 2012).
- 43 Focus group 28A.

- 44 Focus group 28A.
- 45 Extracted from 'DGPPEC to DLO Broderick Review – Defence Housing – Feb 12', 'DGPPEC to DLO Broderick Review – Defence Housing – Feb 12 Attachment A- ADF Housing Strategy 2009-29' and 'DGPPEC to DLO Broderick Review – Defence Housing – Feb 12 Attachment B DHA Breakdown of portfolio' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 12 March 2012. The kind of housing assistance provided to personnel is determined based on several factors including whether they are single or have dependents (and the size and age of dependent family), their rank, the location of the posting (including what housing is available and whether the member owns their own home). Defence policy provides that members will live out unless they are required to live in. However members may choose to live in if live-in accommodation is available (this is determined by the commanding officer of each base). Members with dependents will receive rent allowance if a suitable Service Residence is not available. Generally, members without dependents or whose dependents have not accompanied them on a posting, and who are not required to live-in may receive rent allowance so they rent in the private rent market.
- 46 Focus group 33C.
- 47 Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research, *2008 Defence Attitudes Survey Results Report, Department of Defence*, DSPPR Report 7/2009, May 2009, p 220.
- 48 Focus group 31B.
- 49 Focus group 16D.
- 50 'DGPPEC to DLO Broderick Review – Defence Housing' provided to the Review by SDNLDR F James, 12 March 2012 referring to the scarcity of accommodation in many remote locations and capital cities.
- 51 'DGPPEC to DLO Broderick Review – Defence Housing', above.
- 52 Focus group 10A.
- 53 Focus group 10A.
- 54 Focus group 10A.
- 55 Focus group 10A.
- 56 Focus group 10C.
- 57 Focus group 10C.
- 58 Focus group 10A.
- 59 Focus group 16B.
- 60 Confidential submission 8.
- 61 Confidential submission 2.
- 62 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 31 May 2012.
- 63 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 31 May 2012.
- 64 Australian National Audit Office, *Defence's Management of Health Services to Australian Defence Force Personnel in Australia*, Attorney-General's Department (2010), p 15.
- 65 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 96 – ADF Health Plan' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 12 November 2011.
- 66 Australian National Audit Office, note 64.
- 67 From 2010 Defence Attitude Survey, in Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research, *Brief for Review Teams: Culture of the ADF and Defence*, DSPPR Brief 04/2011 (2011).
- 68 A WHS incident is any accident or event that is caused in the course of Defence work, which involves: work illnesses; uncontrolled fire and explosions; disabling injuries; serious equipment plant or property damage; dangerous occurrences which could have, but did not injure any person; exposures to hazardous substances or circumstances; minor injuries; any other serious incident that could put employees or plant at risk.
- 69 The data was recorded for all WHS incidents for Army, Navy and Air Force members, and in relation to calendar year, location and the type of activity being undertaken when the injury occurred: 'Broderick review by gender.mht' provided by CMDR A Westwood, 23 May 2012.
- 70 In relation to other categories of incidents, over 2007-2011 women represented: 14.4% of Dangerous incidents; 8.7% of Exposure incidents; 17% of Minor injury incidents; 12.2% of Serious injury or illness incidents; 12.5% of Incapacity incidents. The types of activities in which injury incidents occurred were grouped into broad categories including: Sport and fitness training (women were involved in 15.9% of incidents); Work related activities (women were involved in 12.9% of incidents); Other activities (women were involved in 15% of incidents); 'Unspecified' activities (women were involved in 11.4% of incidents); Within the sport and fitness training category there was a significant overrepresentation of women injured while undertaking physical training activities (18.3%).
- 71 The Review was advised that data on work days lost captured through the incident reporting system was not always accurate as not always updated. Defence also indicated they could not include accurate treatment, consequences and outcome information captured on the incident reporting form because this information did not flow "through into the reporting system" in the data extracts provided. The Review was advised that Defence was 'working on this issue and expect to be able to report on all information by mid March 2012', however, the Review was not provided with any further data: CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 23 January 2012.
- 72 Department of Defence, *Defence leads the way on mental health research*, 24 October 2011. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/defencenews/stories/2011/oct/1024.htm> (viewed 6 June 2012).
- 73 S E Hodson, A C McFarlane, M Van Hooff and C Davies, *Mental Health in the Australian Defence Force – 2010 ADF Mental Health Prevalence and Wellbeing Study: Executive Report*, Department of Defence (2011), Key Findings.
- 74 Department of Defence, *Capability through mental fitness: 2011 Australian Defence Force Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy* (2011), p 4. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/health/DMH/docs/2011%20ADF%20Mental%20Health%20and%20Wellbeing%20Strategy%20.pdf> (viewed 30 March 2012).

- 75 Hodson, et al, note 73.
- 76 Focus group 41C.
- 77 Focus group 28A.
- 78 Focus group 13B.
- 79 Joint Health Command, *Mental Health Programs*, Department of Defence. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/health/DMH/i-dmh.htm> (viewed 6 June 2012). See examples of support material: Joint Health Command, *ADF Mental Health Strategy: All Hours Support Line Fact Sheet*, Department of Defence; Joint Health Command, *ADF Mental Health Strategy: Depression and Anxiety Fact Sheet*, Department of Defence. At http://www.defence.gov.au/health/DMH/i-dmh_factsheets.htm (viewed 28 June 2012).
- 80 Joint Health Command, *All-hours Support Line*, Department of Defence. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/health/DMH/i-all-hours.htm> (viewed 6 June 2012).
- 81 Focus group 34B.
- 82 Focus group 19B.
- 83 Confidential submission 8.
- 84 Focus group 34F.
- 85 Focus group 20D.
- 86 Department of Defence Joint Health Command, *ADF Mental Health Strategy*, <http://www.defence.gov.au/health/DMH/i-dmhs.htm> (viewed 19 July 2012).



“Everyone has the same hurdles to jump through and women don’t tend to perform better or worse in any particular area. I think it’s just down to individuals and their particular talents or abilities and that’s regardless of sex.”

**ADF member
(Confidential Submission)**

Chapter 9:

International Trends and
Lessons: A Review of
Practices in Comparable
Militaries

In summary

Momentum exists for greater inclusion of women in Defence Forces across the globe and for greater recognition of diversity, but progress is yet to be fully evaluated. There is a striking similarity in the themes and recommendations emanating from the different militaries examined, including a focus on:

- promoting a broad understanding of diversity as an operational imperative and core defence value
- securing strong and unequivocal commitment from defence leadership, as well as from middle management
- increasing the number of women and other under-represented groups within senior ranks
- increasing the number of women, not just as an overall figure across the Services, but in specific occupational areas and units
- ensuring that women are not assigned to posts on their own or in small numbers but as part of a larger cohort
- broadening the occupational opportunities available to women, including through the opening of combat roles
- recognising the importance of retention through the use of family friendly policies and career support mechanisms such as mentoring and sponsorship
- recognising the specific needs of women in the field (for example, health care, appropriate uniforms)
- addressing gender-based harassment and violence
- providing effective training and supportive responses
- conducting ongoing assessment and monitoring to evaluate progress
- avoiding one-size-fits-all approaches, particularly in contexts that have already achieved a significant representation of women
- ensuring adequate resourcing to drive cultural change.

The Review's examination of comparable international militaries reveals a continuing echo of the themes and challenges currently faced by the ADF, in turn confirming the Review's findings that certain broad principles need to be observed in order to achieve meaningful change. The ADF is not alone in requiring change, with many militaries around the world attempting to increase women's representation and progression to senior ranks. This Chapter identifies trends and lessons from international Services that may assist the ADF as it works towards being a first class employer for both male and female personnel.

Certainly, the ADF is itself recognised internationally as having taken the lead on many relevant practices – an increased emphasis on employee work-life balance and consolidation of equity programs being just two examples.¹ Nevertheless, challenges continue to exist in realising the ADF's potential as a first class employer in this regard, with similar obstacles facing Defence Services around the globe. Like the ADF, international Defence Forces have grappled with the formal integration of women into their ranks, some more successfully than others. Most have made parallel strides and faced similar setbacks as they recognise that establishing formal equality of opportunity does not necessarily lead to equality of outcomes.

The Review has focussed its examination on those Services which bear most cultural and historical similarity to the ADF, such as the United States Armed Forces, the UK Armed Forces, the Canadian Forces (CF) and New Zealand Defence Forces (NZDF); as well as on the Defence Forces of the Netherlands, Norway and, to a lesser extent Sweden, as examples of nations that have made particularly strong commitments to the participation of women in both civilian and defence environments.

While this Chapter does not attempt an exhaustive analysis, it touches briefly on some of the common challenges facing these defence forces, before moving to a discussion of possible solutions.

9.1 An elusive critical mass

The absence of a critical mass of women in any defence arena remains, in itself, a significant impediment to career progression. A variety of evidence exists to support the idea that women act more distinctively once their numbers reach a given threshold.² Certainly, literature examined by the Review suggests that the greater the presence of women as Defence personnel – both in terms of the breadth of the roles they occupy, as well as their presence in leadership positions – the more likely their acceptance by male colleagues.

Equally, literature suggests that the smaller the representation of women in any particular Service, occupation or unit, the more reluctant other women will be to join. This is not simply for reasons of camaraderie, but because female personnel do not want to attract attention as the ‘token’ woman nor function under the heightened scrutiny that seems to accompany this novelty status.

As one study in the US context confirmed, the lack of a significant number means that an ‘average’ or more generalised view of women is unachievable. Women therefore tend to be perceived in terms of the performance of the small number present – judged by the conduct of their only other female colleague, or pitted in opposition to them. In other words, ‘one woman sets the reputation for all...’³

Further, without identifiable female role models, women question their potential to reach senior positions and therefore the value of investing in a defence career. This means that the absence of women can be self-perpetuating, as can their presence. Certainly, the Review’s discussions with US defence representatives confirm this – the absence of women in senior ranks of less traditional occupations such as mine clearance diving for example, slows the assignment of further numbers of women into these units.⁴

All of the Services examined had put efforts into increasing the number of women within their ranks. While figures tend to vary depending on what elements of each Service are included, currently the Canadian Forces (CF) are nominated throughout international literature as a benchmark, with an overall representation of women totalling around 15.1%.⁵ CF representatives told the Review, however, that numbers are stagnating, with the CF putting a new emphasis on recruiting.⁶ The NZDF, albeit a smaller force, has a representation of 16.3%.⁷ Similarly, women comprise around 14.5% of total US forces⁸ while, in contrast, the UK, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden remain at single digit percentages.⁹ As the Review has found, though, total representation is not always an indication of overall commitment to women’s inclusion, nor of the opportunities available to women once they arrive.

9.2 Limited opportunities – occupational segregation

While the overall number of women personnel in the defence forces examined remains below that which is necessary to achieve meaningful change, the Review’s examination also confirmed that, like the ADF, these forces still struggle to secure women’s participation across the full breadth of Service occupations.

Historically, of course, male and female personnel were officially segregated into different defence occupations – the role of Oceanographic Operator, for example, specifically being an all-female occupation in the CF until 1985 because women were seen to have greater manual dexterity and ability to pay attention to detail.¹⁰

As novel as this may now seem, occupational segregation still manifests in each Force examined and in different proportional representations across each arm of Service. For example, while the Army almost invariably has the lowest number of women in each national Force, women were present in the highest numbers in the Navy in New Zealand and the Netherlands on the one hand¹¹ but in the Air Force in Canada and the UK and US on the other.¹² Arguably, the greater representation in the Air Forces of the larger defence

powers is partially due to the fact that Air Force personnel are less likely to be exposed to ground close combat, or perhaps the result of the Air Force's more recent emergence as an operational wing.

In addition to the variation across the Services, women remain overrepresented in particular fields within each branch – medical, administrative and support roles dominating the areas in which women are most commonly employed. As an example, figures from Canada indicate that, despite the CF's relative success in gender integration, as at 2007, around 80% of those employed in dental health roles were women; while women represented less than 4% of personnel in naval maintenance, electrical, mechanical and engineering trades and only 1.3% of those employed in the combat arms.¹³

Similarly, figures from the Netherlands confirm a disproportionate number of women in medical service, administration, logistics and communications, with few in combat, technical, or maintenance roles. This varied from Service to Service, with women seldom working in technical classifications in the Navy and Air Force, but better represented in combat units, with 33% of those in the Navy and 19% in the Air Force being in combat roles although, as pilots they tended to fly helicopters, rather than fighter jets.¹⁴

In the US, active-duty women are much more heavily concentrated in administrative and medical roles than active-duty men, with administrative positions the leading occupation for women in the Marine Corps and the second highest in the US Air Force behind health care.¹⁵

Meanwhile, in the UK Armed Forces, where around only 70% of occupations in the Royal Navy and Army, and 96% of posts in the Royal Air Force are open to women, support roles also dominate. It is interesting to note, however, that there was a greater percentage of women in the warfare and logistics branches in the Royal Navy than in the medical branch as at 2006, although it seems over half of these remained shore-based and further breakdown was not located.¹⁶

Regardless of the international context, it is clear that attitudinal barriers and expectations – both from women themselves and from others – continue to propel the majority of female defence personnel along particular career paths. While this is a cultural phenomenon that is difficult to overcome with formal policy, as shown in Appendix P, international forces are attempting to redress the underrepresentation in particular areas of Service through specific recruitment and awareness campaigns.

This is certainly an imperative, as studies of women's progression through defence ranks suggest that diverse occupational experience is a significant factor in promotion opportunities, increasing their experience and, in turn, their authority and acceptance as leaders.¹⁷

9.3 Combat exclusion

While the concentration of women in traditional occupations may be an example of informal – or circumstantial – segregation, the continuing exclusion of women from ground close combat roles by some Defence Services remains an official form of segregation.

As discussed in section 5.3, Canada, the Netherlands, Norway and New Zealand have all officially removed restrictions on women's participation in combat roles, albeit with some initial qualifications.¹⁸ The US continues to exclude women 'from assignments to units and positions below the brigade level whose primary mission is to engage in direct combat on the ground',¹⁹ other than, more recently, assignments to support roles in those contexts. Similarly, the UK excludes women from roles whose primary duty is 'to close with and kill the enemy', such as infantry and artillery.²⁰

Also as discussed in section 5.3, the ADF is moving towards the integration of women in all Service roles. In fact, the ADF has been recognised as a possible model for international forces to study when contemplating moving to full integration.²¹

For the purposes of this Chapter, though, the ADF's decision can be reinforced by noting the widespread acknowledgment of the role that active combat experience plays in career progression in defence cultures.²² This is in part because combat experience is regarded as a strong indicator of leadership skill and ability. In many cases, it is part of the job description or required skill base and has been widely acknowledged as the most significant contributing factor to promotion opportunities.²³ Less tangibly, combat experience is also a way for personnel to prove themselves as 'real' soldiers and gain the respect and regard of their peers, in turn cementing their authority as leaders.²⁴

It is also worth briefly examining the increasing confusion that surrounds this issue in contexts such as the US. It is interesting to note, for example, that palpable differences have existed between the relevant US Army and Department of Defense policies that enforce the exclusion, leaving room for some inconsistent application,²⁵ while the changing nature of combat means that it is more and more difficult to identify and segregate the 'front line'. This difficulty of segregating the 'front line' has been articulated by Admiral Mike Mullen in the United States as:

In a war where there is no longer a clear delineation between frontlines and sidelines, where the war can come at you from any direction, [we have] large numbers of women...exposed to some form of combat.²⁶

Accordingly, despite being officially restricted from being formally 'assigned' to combat units, women have been nevertheless 'attached' to many combat units – often receiving the same combat, weapons and counter-insurgency training and being exposed to the same risks.²⁷ In fact, in 2010, over 40% of women veterans reported that they had been exposed to hostile action.²⁸ Similarly, many US Servicewomen have died in the US's most recent deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan and, despite being legally excluded from combat, two have been awarded the Silver Star for valour in combat.²⁹

Slightly differently, in 2003, the US Army established all-female 'Lioness' teams to follow all-male Marine combat units on what has been described to the Review as 'stability operations'.³⁰ Designed as a 'calming' presence to engage with the local female population and, where necessary, to search Iraqi women for weapons or explosives, they are nevertheless exposed to risk. Similarly, as in the ADF, Female Engagement Teams (FETs) continue to accompany infantry units and Marine manoeuvre units in Afghanistan and, as of November 2009, all international and Afghan security forces were directed to establish FETS of their own. Meanwhile, in 2010, the first class of 24 women officers began to be integrated to assignment on guide-missile attack and ballistic-missile submarines – exposing them to forward deployed strike and strategic deterrent operational experience.³¹

As one commentator has noted, 'the reality on the ground has outpaced the debate',³² with critics suggesting that bureaucratic sidesteps are depriving women of professional recognition and post deployment support.³³

More generally, longstanding calls for the removal of the last combat restrictions, including by the congressionally mandated Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC), are supported by a growing body of qualitative and quantitative research. This research suggests that such a step would neither disrupt unit cohesion nor pose a particular risk specific to women. Rather, it is critical to operational effectiveness, especially if talented women are to be recruited and retained in service.³⁴

Despite this, and following extended consideration within the Pentagon, a decision was announced in February 2012 to officially open *support* roles in combat units to women, with a promise to 'continue to open as many positions as possible to women'.³⁵ It is estimated that this will open over 14,000 active-duty and reserve jobs previously off-limits, including combat medic, artillery mechanic, communications expert and other posts that support, rather than directly engage in fire fight.³⁶ Infantry and special forces roles will remain closed, however, with progress on implementation of the changes to be reviewed in six months.³⁷ All Services are engaged in the implementation of this decision, albeit with varying approaches, and are also researching how further reform might be achieved.³⁸

9.4 Lack of women in leadership

Though indisputably important, a lack of combat experience is just one of a range of obstacles to women's career progression. Certainly, no Service examined had a proportional representation of women at star rank officer level. In NZ³⁹ or the UK, for example, the highest ranking female officer in the Army being a Brigadier⁴⁰ while only two women held 2 star rank or above in the Netherlands at 2007.⁴¹

As at 2005 only 6% of those US Officers ranked at Major General (2 star) and 3.3% of those at Brigadier General level (1 star) were women.⁴² In 2008, General Ann E. Dunwoody became the first appointed to 4 star General,⁴³ while Lt. Gen Janet Wolfenbarger recently became the first woman promoted to four star general in the US Air Force.⁴⁴ In the CF, as at 2009, women represented 3% of general officers in the Army and 8% in the Air Force, with none at similar rank in the Navy.⁴⁵

As well as an indication that talented women are not progressing through the ranks, a shortage of women in leadership deprives other female personnel of the example and potential mentoring from which they might benefit.⁴⁶

For the women who do reach leadership level, one of the challenges they face is continuing isolation in operational environments – addressing the same issues over and over, and pioneering every time they move into a new context in which they are, yet again, the first.⁴⁷ Further, the attention they attract also impacts those they lead, compounding the significance of a woman at the helm.⁴⁸

Of particular interest, statistics regarding women in leadership can be misleading. For example, as at 2010, 17% of women in the US Services were officers, compared with 15% of men.⁴⁹ Yet the small number of women personnel overall mean that just one individual can distort the percentage. One such study cites an example in which three Marine Corps women were eligible for promotion and, with one selected, the promotion rate became 33%.⁵⁰

In addition, the US Air Force also has a comparatively large representation of women at officer level. Yet the tendency of women to gravitate towards professional roles in the medical, legal and chaplaincy corps can skew the picture, meaning that, in some cases, apparent improvements are masking a professional form of occupational segregation⁵¹ Clearly, a more meaningful statistic would be that 17% of officers in the US Armed Forces are women, rather than the other way around.

Common to all Services examined by the Review was a decline in the number of women personnel beyond the levels of 'middle management', or at around the five to ten year Service mark. The CF, for example, has experienced a significant number of women leaving at this point, the biggest reason nominated being the conflict of Service with their family plans or obligations.⁵² Similarly, the Netherlands has identified that retention of women is certainly as important a goal as recruitment; with one Dutch commentator suggesting lateral re-entry/horizontal intake as a strategy to overcome attrition.⁵³

The studies referred to above suggest that the women who remain in Service past the usual attrition point do have similar opportunities for promotion as men.⁵⁴ Forces committed to promoting talented women, then, should promote measures that support women to stay in Service. Obvious examples are family friendly work practices and reasonable parental leave policies. Limited provisions in some Services, however, as well as lengthy deployments away from home, make it difficult for female personnel to continue in service, especially if they are single parents, as many are.⁵⁵

For example, the US Department of Defence generally gives new mothers only six weeks of maternity leave before they must return to some form of work or training. Each Service branch then has its own post-birth deferment from deployment policy, the Army generally giving women only four months to stay home with their infants before deploying them on tours of duty which currently average 15 months. In a slight improvement, the Marines offer 6 month deferments and their tours average 7 months; while the Navy has moved to a

12 month deferment with deployments usually a maximum of 6 months, if not less.⁵⁶ The Review understands that the Pentagon is currently examining this disparity⁵⁷ and, certainly, the Review's discussions with US defence representatives confirm that other Services are observing the Navy's extended deferment with interest.⁵⁸

Finally, in addition to problems in retaining women, much of the literature examined by the Review suggests a lag in attitudes about women's leadership abilities that has not kept pace with their ascension to senior positions.⁵⁹ As in the civilian context, and as in the ADF, many Servicewomen feel compelled to perform at a higher standard than men, simply to gain the same recognition.

Interestingly, studies also note that Defence Forces are increasingly looking for 'transformational' leadership qualities traditionally associated with women, such as collaboration, mentoring and building cohesive organisations.⁶⁰ This implies that the needs of Defence Forces are outpacing their traditional culture and systems.

9.5 Hyper-masculine culture

A wide body of research describes the military environment as one which not only encourages masculine traits in individuals, but which celebrates masculine values within a static organisational structure.⁶¹ Such culture, across many contexts, is generally referred to as a hyper-masculine culture.

This controlling and homogenous culture is one which, by its very nature, discourages difference. On occasion, it reveals itself in extreme and shocking behaviours.⁶² Too often, it is also displayed in gender-based violence and harassment, as will be discussed in the next section – a behaviour used as much to keep women in their place and to bond with male colleagues over exploits, as it is for sexual gratification.⁶³

Most commonly, perhaps, this culture manifests in generalised resistance to women's integration – treating it as something imposed from without, rather than embraced from within. This can range from palpable hostility, to stereotyping women along sexual lines (promiscuous, lesbian, or asexual) through to treating women as completely invisible. International literature extensively explores the less measurable aspects of this hostility – aspects that will only adapt as a result of internal cultural change. There is also value, however, in examining some of the more tangible examples of the way in which women's invisibility manifests.

One such example is the failure to provide women with appropriate uniforms, accommodation or health care, one report observing that active duty women receive limited access to routine health care or appropriate supplies via the US defence health care system, TRICARE.⁶⁴ While a full range of services are theoretically on offer, services struggle to deliver in the field, leaving female personnel with inadequate access to gender-specific products and prescriptions, and women reluctant to disclose concerns to male command, or to admit to injury which may be perceived as weakness.

Equally, upon returning home, women veterans have often been met with inadequate facilities or care. The US Veterans Affairs infrastructure, for example, has been, until recently, unfamiliar with health problems specific to women, such as damage to reproductive systems from chemical exposure.⁶⁵ More generally, women veterans appear to be especially at risk of persistent disadvantage, such as unemployment, homelessness and mental health problems.⁶⁶

In particular, many female veterans experience a range of serious health problems as a consequence of Military Sexual Trauma (MST). In fact, in financial year 2011, 19.4% of Operation Enduring Freedom/Operation Iraqi Freedom/Operation New Dawn female Veterans reported a history of MST when screened by a Veterans Affairs (VA) healthcare provider, compared with 0.9 % of equivalent male Veterans. Rates of MST reported among all Veterans screened by the VA were 23.0% for females and 1.2% for males.⁶⁷

Problems associated with MST were described to the Review as ranging from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), through to migraines, stomach disorders, chronic fatigue, fibromyalgia and gynaecological problems.

This means that access to appropriate and anonymous support is identified as an ongoing concern,⁶⁸ with the US Department of Veterans Affairs recently establishing a Taskforce to bring about cultural change in the way health services and benefits are delivered to women veterans.⁶⁹ This is particularly important given that women are the largest growing demographic of US veterans, with their number projected to increase from 1.8 million in 2011 to 2 million in 2020, at which point women will make up 10.7 per cent of the total veteran population.⁷⁰

Equally concerning are reports that after disclosing that they have been the victim of a sexual assault, women veterans have been incorrectly diagnosed with personality disorders and then involuntarily discharged from service.⁷¹ The Review was advised that the US Service branches are beginning to examine this worrying trend.⁷²

Meanwhile, the 2010 Report of the Defence Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS) relates examples of female personnel continuing to receive inadequate uniforms and equipment whilst on operations. DACOWITS focus group members reported receiving ill-fitting, oversized uniforms that impeded their ability to do their jobs; being issued inadequate vests that had been rejected by other Service branches; or being issued jackets with insufficient plates, leaving female soldiers to divide and distribute them between them depending upon the direction of enemy fire.⁷³

In an extension of this, the Review was advised that women are experiencing specific health problems as an indirect result of their uniform's limitations – contracting urinary tract infections in the field, for example, because they are unable to stop and urinate quickly in the way that their male colleagues can. The Review was also told that women's shorter stature can mean that, on long marches, their rucksacks repeatedly hit them in the sciatic nerve, causing long term chronic pain.⁷⁴ This represents a blunt illustration of a culture that continues to be designed for men.

9.6 Gender-based violence and harassment

Perhaps the most palpable manifestation of the defence masculine culture is the scale of gender-based violence against women within Defence Services worldwide. From the extraordinary rates of sexual assault reported during US deployments, through to escalated rates of sexual harassment in the Swedish Armed Forces when compared to the civilian environment,⁷⁵ these forms of hostility towards women act as a significant impediment to women's increased representation, retention and progression through the Services.

Most specifically in the US, reports suggest that over 52 sexual assaults occur each day in the Service, with 85% going unreported and commanders sending fewer than one in four reported cases to trial.⁷⁶ One commentator reports that US female Service personnel deployed in Iraq were more likely to be raped by a fellow soldier than to be injured by enemy fire,⁷⁷ a form of betrayal within the military family suggested to the Review as being akin to incest.⁷⁸ Meanwhile, the Review's investigations reveal a tendency to disbelieve women's claims.⁷⁹

Certainly, this is not a recent phenomenon, nor confined to the US. In 1998, the military magazine *Maclean's* reported that Canada's military police had investigated 145 sexual assaults by members of the CF in 1997 alone, a large number given the relative size of the Canadian Services. In a developing scandal, the investigation revealed a pattern of sexual offending and subsequent systemic failure that mirrored those identified elsewhere, including in Australia and the US. These patterns included the reluctance of women to come forward and report, the common experience of not being believed, a failure to respond by the chain of command, disciplinary action for related but trivial matters against the victims, rather than the perpetrators, and consequent disillusionment with the military as a whole on the part of the complainants.⁸⁰

All Services examined reported similar problems, albeit on much smaller scales than the US.⁸¹ Equally, and as will be discussed, all Forces examined were making significant efforts to address this, identifying sexual assault and any form of harassment as damaging to unit cohesion and combat effectiveness.

Certainly, the US has made the most significant efforts of all Forces examined, as a result of the scale mentioned above.

Establishing the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office (SAPRO) in 2005 as a single point of contact for sexual assault policy, the Department of Defense has invested real resources in training, response, reporting and accountability, and increased support for victims. One million personnel have been trained as first responders, including specially appointed Sexual Assault Response Co-ordinators, with sexual assault program offices established at every major defence installation.⁸²

The appointment of a two star general to lead SAPRO was met with approval and there has been a significant increase in rates of reporting of sexual assault which SAPRO claims, quite reasonably, is an indication of growing confidence in the system.⁸³ Still, one media report claims that in 2010, fewer than 21% of reported cases went to trial, with commanding officers deciding not to prosecute, or impose non-judicial or administrative punishment and, certainly, there is considerable commentary on the inadequacy of the military legal system's response to rape.⁸⁴ Encouragingly, reforms were recently announced to provide greater resources to each Service branch for victims support and the investigation of offences; as well as to elevate disposition of sexual assault allegations to the rank of Colonel (Navy Captain) in recognition of their severity, an announcement that has been met with approval from US advocacy groups.⁸⁵

In addition, the 2011 DACOWITS Report highlighted the need to improve confidence in the system, noting a lack of follow-up on reported sexual assaults and any consequent disciplinary action that makes it difficult for personnel to know whether sexual assaults are taken seriously, whether an individual's rank affects the outcome, or whether perpetrators are held to account.⁸⁶

While significant efforts have been invested in acknowledging and addressing the extent of sexual assault in international Defence Services, reform of the magnitude that is needed takes time to achieve real results.

9.7 Broad Observations – from Integration to Inclusion

The barriers facing women in Defence Services around the globe are certainly numerous, and well documented in the literature examined by the Review. The Review's objective is to identify trends and initiatives which seek to overcome these barriers and in order to do this, it is useful first to make some broad observations about the contexts in which they are likely to develop.

The first is that, while increasing the representation of women in Defence is a vital first step, overall numbers in respective Defence Forces do not necessarily reflect a wider political commitment to women's participation. Nor do they reflect the opportunities available for women within each Service to rise to leadership positions. As this Chapter identifies, nations with an overt political commitment to the recruitment of women to all aspects of Service, such as the Netherlands and Norway, nevertheless struggle to recruit and retain a critical mass of female personnel.⁸⁷ For example, Norway was the first NATO state to open all combat positions, including submarine service, in 1985. Yet no woman had served as a marine commando or fighter pilot 15 years later.⁸⁸

The United States, with its continued (albeit qualified) restrictions on assignments, has a higher proportional representations of women across the Services, as observed above. Again, international literature nominates Canada as a benchmark in terms of a high representation of women and the highest number of women at senior levels.⁸⁹

The Review notes that the nature of the overall mission seems, to a significant degree, to impact on the opportunities made formally available to women. As an example, the New Zealand Defence Force, whose international mission is concerned mainly with peacekeeping operations and crisis response – yet holds a fairly marginal role in national civic life – has a comparatively high overall representation of women.

The background against which initiatives have been developed, and the specific events which have preceded them, can influence the focus of policy. As noted earlier, the sheer size of the US Defence Forces, as well as a series of sexual assault scandals, have seen US efforts largely invested in responding to these, as well as to the highly charged debate over opening remaining combat roles to women.

Having grappled with its own scandals in the 1990s, the CF has arguably been able to proceed further down the road in terms of taking a proactive approach to gender integration. This stands in contrast to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), which is currently the subject of a class action launched by over 100 former female personnel who claim a longstanding culture of harassment and discrimination.⁹⁰ Within the RCMP, a hotline has been established and a review is underway by the Commission for Public Complaints Against the RCMP regarding the manner in which harassment complaints have been addressed.⁹¹ It seems that the RCMP is only now beginning to confront behaviours that were acknowledged by the CF decades ago.

The Defence Services examined face similar opportunities and challenges within the broader economic and military context. All are competing with civilian employers in buoyant labour markets to attract and retain members – recognising that, in what has been described as the ‘war for talent’ they need to provide the kind of conditions and career opportunities that can rival civilian industry.⁹² Services are also recognising that over half their best recruits or graduates are either women or from minority groups – a talent pool which any defence force seeking full capability cannot afford to ignore.⁹³ In short, Services are recognising that they also need to be employers of choice to be combat effective.

In doing so, Forces are moving to a different, and perhaps more promising, phase in the inclusion of women – away from their initial, ‘gender-neutral’ approach that complied with external or legislative requirement. The assumption behind this approach was that the door should simply be opened to women, assimilating them into the military norm without any change to custom and practice – a “just add women and stir” approach. This left differences ignored and the overarching culture intact.

As the most successful employers have progressively discovered – and as this Report explores – individual differences can be an organisational strength. Harnessing this strength requires unequivocal commitment from an organisation’s leadership – both in terms of strong statements and policies; as well as adequate support and resources. It also requires an understanding that change will take time – particularly in the defence context, in which leaders are ‘grown’, rather than hired on lateral intake.⁹⁴

This means establishing policies that prevent and respond to violence, for example, as well as other forms of hostility towards personnel who do not fit the traditional mould. It means establishing policies which maximise retention and acknowledge that the profile of defence personnel has shifted significantly in recent generations – a profile which should reflect the face of the nation it serves.⁹⁵ It means looking to the civilian sector for examples of policies which encourage retention and loyalty.⁹⁶

As such, international Services are recognising the benefits of improving the defence experience for *all* members – moving from policy that approaches the integration of women as a problem to be addressed, to a focus on the value of diversity and individual talents in all their forms.⁹⁷ As mentioned earlier in this Report, a representative of the CF told the Review:

Integration is not about women, it’s about the team....about building everyone’s self-confidence.⁹⁸

All Services are at a reasonably early stage in this recognition, meaning that, in many cases, progress is yet to be evaluated.

What follows is a sample of the ways in which the forces examined are approaching this next step towards genuine gender integration.

9.8 Principles and Lessons Learned

The following section details principles and lessons learned from the international evidence examined by the Review. The principles identified contribute to the framework for the Review's recommendations. More detail and examples of promising practices from international militaries are provided at Appendix P.

(a) Principle 1: Strong leadership drives reform

Strong statements and examples set by leadership have been identified as being the biggest factor in the success of gender integration or inclusion.⁹⁹ Certainly, the congressionally mandated Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC), which handed down its findings in 2010, noted that personal commitment from leaders trained in the value of diversity is essential to women ascending to senior positions – the consequences of such commitment being observed by the Review's discussions with the US Navy in particular.¹⁰⁰ Similarly, as discussed earlier in the Report, the Review was advised by representatives of the CF that, when first trialling the integration of women into combat units, 'buy-in' from leadership was the most significant factor in the initiative's success, regardless of the number of women placed in each unit.¹⁰¹

All Services examined had a range of strong policies, endorsed by leadership, that address issues such as sexual assault and harassment, dispute resolution, career progression and strategies for retention. Similarly, unequivocal statements of the value of diversity were present in all Services examined, albeit with varying emphases,¹⁰² a sample of which is nominated in Appendix P.

These policies reflect an increasing realisation that a one-size fits all approach does not always garner positive results. While 'special treatment' can sometimes be counter-productive, an entirely gender-neutral approach that ignores difference altogether is just as destructive – especially when juxtaposed upon a masculine culture that, in every other way, singles out female personnel as 'token' or 'other'. In short, defence forces are realising that gender blind 'integration' does not make women feel included – just invisible.

Responding to this requires unequivocal commitment from an organisation's leadership – both in terms of strong statements and policies, as well as adequate support and resources. This means embedding the value of diversity and equity across the full of breadth of the Services through regular training and education. It means policies that prevent and respond to sexual violence, bullying and harassment, as well as to other forms of hostility towards women. It includes examining those policies that demonstrate a complete disregard of personnel who do not fit the traditional defence mould. It also means adequate investment of resources and supports; as well as regular evaluation.¹⁰³

Along these lines, the most successful approach appears to be one in which difference is acknowledged and addressed through mainstreamed training and education, rather than being treated as an optional extra. Additionally, successful approaches include pragmatic recognition of difference and can be as fundamental as ensuring appropriate facilities and uniforms,¹⁰⁴ appropriate health support and information (regarding birth control, for example); as well as examining whether the physical standards set for the full range of occupations do, in fact, reflect the realistic requirements of the task.

Defence Force efforts to create truly inclusive Services have been rewarded with recognition by various civilian sectors. Such acknowledgement has been publicised with pride by the Services themselves.

(b) Principle 2: Diversity of leadership increases capability

Just as important as strong leadership on the imperative of inclusion and diversity, is a truly diverse leadership that better reflects the membership of the Services. As explored throughout this Report, factors which prevent women from assuming leadership positions, include their limited exposure to opportunities which broaden their experience, practical and structural barriers to their remaining in Service as well as, less tangibly, perceptions about their ability to lead.¹⁰⁵

In recognition of these impediments, the Committee for Women in NATO Forces (CWINF) has made certain specific recommendations that member states reserve available positions for qualified women, pay special consideration to women as a target group and establish a moderate quota system which gives priority to the under-represented gender.¹⁰⁶

(c) Principle 3: Increasing numbers requires increasing opportunities

In addition to its recommendations regarding commitment from leadership, the MLDC recommended the creation of a 20-30 year workforce pipeline. In order to do so, of course, Services need to commit to improving recruitment and retention. Certainly, the CWINF recommendations referred to earlier promote active recruitment of women to defence environments, with initiatives that include the regulation of physical fitness tests for women, information campaigns that specify military career options for women, inviting all eligible women to an information day in a letter outlining the value of military service, and ensuring an equal number of women and men in recruitment and selection boards.

Equally important, the CWINF recommends the implementation of guarantees that female personnel will not be assigned to all-male groups and that junior female personnel are assigned to groups with senior female personnel. Understanding what drives women to join and remain in Defence Service is also a crucial first step.

(d) Principle 4: Greater flexibility will strengthen the ADF

No matter what the occupation, the representation of women is only likely to increase if women are retained, as well as recruited, in Defence. As the CWINF and the MLDC have observed, where women stay in Defence Service longer, they are more likely to rise to positions of leadership. In turn, where more women occupy positions of leadership, others are more likely to follow.¹⁰⁷

As observed earlier, all forces examined were experiencing a higher rate of attrition in female personnel than male personnel – in general at about the time at which women are customarily juggling their parenting and professional lives.¹⁰⁸ This means that workforce practices that respond to this through increased flexibility are essential to retention. Further, in the US context, a study notes that a greater proportion of active-duty women are likely to be married to fellow defence personnel if they are married; or more likely to be single parents than their male counter parts, making flexibility even more important.¹⁰⁹

As discussed earlier in this Report, the CF has identified that each Service member retained equals ten new personnel recruited in terms of value to the force, also recognising that employees' personal lives are the strongest motivation for employees to stay.¹¹⁰ Accordingly, policies which make the experience of serving in the Defence Forces more compatible with these outside obligations and interests can contribute to retention of all personnel, and therefore a stronger Defence Force.

(e) Principle 5: Gender based harassment and violence ruins lives, divides teams and damages operational effectiveness

The Review examined initiatives combating gender-based violence and harassment in international defence forces. While all had very clear and robust anti-harassment policies, as well as comprehensive sexual assault response mechanisms, the standout example is the US DOD's Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office (SAPRO) and supporting initiatives. Detail is provided in Appendix P and informs some of the Review's recommendations in this area.

9.9 Conclusion

Given the universality of these themes, it is clear that the direction has been set towards greater diversity at the higher levels of integrated Defence Forces. The question remains whether this will translate to and enhance the experience of female personnel on the ground.

An answer may lie in a study of the views of CF female personnel on the strategies of superiors which, in their opinion, aided gender integration in the operational field. Practices nominated by these personnel bear a strong resemblance to those identified above and include:

- setting an example (leadership on diversity)
- inspiring teamwork (transformational and diverse leadership)
- not singling women out (accumulating a critical mass)
- mentoring (retention and career progression)
- dealing with difference ‘without making a big deal’ (gender-inclusive, not gender-blind), and, importantly
- not defining integration as only an issue relating to women (acknowledging the benefits to operational effectiveness).¹¹¹

As the Review was told by a female representative of the CF:

As stiff and closed as the Army sounds [and] because of our culture, it brings the best and the worst out of people...We have a much better chance of achieving career opportunities for women...than out there in the corporate world.¹¹²

From operational theatres to Joint Command, the imperatives appear to be the same. It is now for all Defence Forces, including the ADF, to harness this momentum.

- 1 G Scoppio, 'Diversity Best Practices in Military Organizations in Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States' (2009) 9(3) *Canadian Military Journal* 17, 23-24. At <http://www.journal.forces.gc.ca/vo9/no3/doc-05-scoppio-eng.pdf> (viewed 25 June 2012). See also MAJ L Bourgon, *The CF as an Employer of Choice: The Key for a Successful Gender Integration* JCSP 33 Exercise New Horizons, Canadian Forces College (2007), p 24. At <http://www.cfc.forces.gc.ca/259/290/293/287/bourgon.pdf> (viewed 4 June 2011).
- 2 D Studlar and I McAllister, 'Does a critical mass exist? A comparative analysis of women's legislative representation since 1950' (2002) 41 *European Journal of Political Research* 233.
- 3 MAJ A Evertson and CAPT A Nesbitt, *The Glass Ceiling Effect and its Impact on Mid-Level Female Officer Career Progression in the United States Marine Corps and Air Force*, Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, March 2004, p 122. At www.dtic.mil/dacowits/research/glassceiling.pdf (viewed 28 January 2012).
- 4 Meeting with Navy Personnel Office of Diversity and Inclusion, USA.
- 5 Canadian Forces, *National Report to the Committee for Women in NATO Forces* (2009), p 2. At http://www.nato.int/issues/women_nato/meeting-records/2009/national-reports/canada-national-report-2009.pdf (viewed 25 June 2012).
- 6 Meeting with Canadian Commanders delegation.
- 7 New Zealand Defence Force, *Annual Report* (2011), p 13. At www.nzdf.mil.nz/downloads/pdf/public-docs/2011/nzdf-annual-report-2011.pdf (viewed 22 March 2012).
- 8 Data current as of 30 September 2010: Women in the Military Service for America Memorial, 'Statistics on Women in the Military', <http://www.womensmemorial.org/Press/stats.html> cited in Service Women's Action Network, *Women in Combat – The Facts*, Fact Sheet, February 2011, p 1. At <http://servicewomen.org/media/publications/#factSheet> (viewed 25 June 2012).
- 9 Women represent a total of 9.1% of the UK Armed Forces. See UK Ministry of Defence, *Women in the Armed Forces*. At www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/Factsheets/PersonnelFactsheets/WomenInTheArmedForces.htm (viewed 29 March 2012). In the Netherlands, the representation of women in the Dutch Defence Force stood at only 9% in 2009, despite a concerted effort to recruit women: E Jansen and WO=MEN WG 1325, Dutch Gender Platform, *UNSCR 1325 In-country monitoring report – The Netherlands*, Global Network of Women Peace-builders (October 2010), p 15. At <http://www.wo-men.nl/cms/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/UNSCR-1325-monitoring-report-The-Netherlands-20101.pdf> (viewed 25 June 2012). Meanwhile, a brief provided to the Review by the Norwegian Ministry of Defence on 4 March 2012 notes that, as at 2 March 2012, women represented 8.6% of Norwegian defence personnel, with a goal of 20% by 2020: 'Request for information, Australian Defence Staff: Recruitment and retention of women in the Norwegian armed forces (NAF) – evaluations and reports', Response from the Norwegian Ministry of Defence, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 4 March 2012. Swedish figures are generally broken down into conscripts and officers, and therefore tend to vary, but at a representation of 4.6% of both groups, women account for a very small number of the active duty armed forces in Sweden, as opposed to 40% of civilian defence personnel. See European Commission, Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities, EQUAL, *Practical examples – Equal Opportunities*, http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/equal/practical-examples/opport-06-se-genderforce_en.cfm (viewed 28 March 2012).
- 10 As has been observed in other defence contexts, the exclusively female nature of the role led to Oceanographic Operators developing a reputation as promiscuous on the one hand, or as lesbians on the other: LTCOM K Davis, 'From Ocean Ops to Combat Ops: A Short History of Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces' in K Davis (ed), *Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Perspectives and Experience* (2009), pp 69-72.
- 11 R Moelker and J Bolsch, *Hidden Women: Women in the Netherlands Armed Forces*, Publications of the Faculty of Military Science, No. 2008/01 (2008) Netherlands Defence Academy, p 24. At hbo-kennisbank.uvt.nl/cgi/nda/show.cgi?fid=1721 (viewed 25 June 2012). See also K Filipe, 'Women Thrive on Sea Adventures' *The Timaru Herald*, 14 October 2011. At www.stuff.co.nz/timaru-herald/news/5782964/Women-thrive-on-sea-adventures (viewed 27 March 2012).
- 12 As at May 2009, the proportion of women's representation across the Service branches of the CF stood at Air Force 17.5%, Army 11%, Navy 13.9%. Canadian Forces, *National Report to the Committee for Women in NATO Forces* (2009), note 5, p 2. In the US, meanwhile, nearly one third of all women in the US military are in the Air Force (31%), as opposed to only 22% of all men. Only 7% of military women are Marines, compared with 16% of men. E Patten and K Parker, 'Women in the US Military: Growing Share, Distinctive Profile', Pew Social & Demographic Trends, p 7. At <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2011/12/22/women-in-the-u-s-military-growing-share-distinctive-profile/> (viewed 14 January 2012). In the UK women number 12.3% of the RAF, 9.3% of the RN and 8.2% of the Army. See UK Ministry of Defence, *Women in the Armed Forces*, note 9.
- 13 Canadian Forces, *National Report to the Committee for Women in NATO Forces* (2007), p 4. At www.nato.int/ims/2007/win/pdf/canada-2007.pdf (viewed 4 July 2011). See also Davis, 'From Ocean Ops to Combat Ops: A Short History of Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces', note 10, p 82. The Review was also recently advised that women comprise only 4.2% of officers in the combat arms: Meeting with Canadian Commanders delegation.
- 14 Moelker and Bolsch, note 11, p 27. Of interest, the Review notes advice that women pilots in the US Navy and Air Force were preferring to fly large planes, rather than fighter jets, in part because of an unwelcoming culture in the fighter jet arena, but also because the large aircraft operated out of only two bases, meaning that personnel were more likely to establish stable family lives in one of two locations: Meeting with Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity, Office of Secretary of Defense, USA.
- 15 Evertson and Nesbitt, note 3, p 61.
- 16 UK Ministry of Defence, *Women in the Armed Forces*, note 9. In a slightly different take on occupational segregation, the Review was advised that, in Norway, women are not particularly attracted to defence roles and potential candidates head instead to the police force (approximately 40% of the Norwegian police force are women): 'Request for information, Australian Defence Staff: Recruitment and retention of women in the Norwegian armed forces (NAF) – evaluations and reports', Response from the Norwegian Ministry of Defence, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 4 March 2012.

- 17 See generally Evertson and Nesbitt, note 3; Y Doll, 'US Army Women General Officers and their Strategies for Ascension' (2007) 7(3) *International Journal of Business Strategy*. At http://usacac.army.mil/cac2/cgsc/repository/dcl_DOLLArticle.pdf (viewed 14 January 2012).
- 18 Norway was the first to remove all restrictions in 1985, while Canada followed in 1989, though keeping the restriction on women serving in submarines until 2001, when the purchase of four Victoria Class submarines allowed for greater privacy in accommodation. New Zealand has removed all restrictions, while the Netherlands retains restrictions on submarine and Marine Corps duty, citing 'practical considerations': Moelker and Bolsch, note 11, p 24. It should be noted that the UK and US have both recently lifted the bar on women serving in submarines, though confining their assignment to larger vessels and, in the US, to a limit of 3 women on any crew to 155 men. This has been criticised in the US context as 'dual-track' career progression, and perpetuating the isolation of women. See Alliance for National Defence, *The Submarine assignment policy for women*, Issue Paper. At <http://www.4militarywomen.org/Submarines.htm> (viewed 25 June 2012).
- 19 Defence Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS), *Annual Report* (2010), p 10. At <http://dacowits.defence.gov/Reports/2010/> (viewed 14 January 2012). See also Service Women's Action Network, note 8, Document 6.
- 20 P Cawkill, A Rogers, S Knight and L Spear, *Women in Ground Close Combat Roles: The Experiences of other Nations and a Review of the Academic Literature* (2009), p 9. At http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/7A18C2A3-C25B-4FA1-B8CB-49204A109105/0/women_combat_experiences_literature.pdf (viewed 23 August 2011).
- 21 Defence Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS), *Annual Report* (2011), p 14. At <http://dacowits.defence.gov/Reports/2011/> (viewed 14 January 2012).
- 22 In the Israeli context, Rimalt notes that exclusion from combat roles excludes women not only from leadership in the military but also leadership in politics and industry: N Rimalt, 'Women in the Sphere of Masculinity: The Double-Edged Sword of Women's Integration in the Military' (2007) 14 *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy* 1097, p 1104.
- 23 UK Ministry of Defence, *Equality and Diversity Annual Report 2008-2009*, p 5. At <http://mod.uk/DefenceInternet/Templates/InformationProfile.aspx?NRMODE=Published&NRNODEGUID=%7B1992AB7E-5091-48A2-878D-4FAD5E5FC4E0%7D&NRORIGINALURL=%2FDefenceInternet%2FAboutDefence%2FCorporatePublications%2FPersonnelPublications%2FEqualityandDiversity%2FDiversityInformation%2FEqualityDiversityScheme.htm&NRCACHEHINT=Guest> (viewed 24 June 2011), notes that: 'Promotion has tended to depend on operational experience or experience in the Combat Arms. As women are now...deploying on operations, it is expected that they will reach the higher ranks with time'.
- 24 See, for example, A Febraro, *Women, leadership and gender Integration in the Canadian combat arms: A qualitative study*, Technical Report, DRDC Toronto TR 2003-170 (December 2003). At <http://pubs.drdc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc31/p521088.pdf> (viewed 25 June 2011).
- 25 Service Women's Action Network, note 8, p 2.
- 26 ADM M Mullen, US Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, addressing Congress in November 2010, cited in DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2010), note 19, p 13.
- 27 DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2010), note 19, p 12.
- 28 DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2010), note 19, p 11.
- 29 Service Women's Action Network, note 8, p 1.
- 30 Meeting with Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services, USA.
- 31 Service Women's Action Network, note 8, pp 3-4.
- 32 L Alvarez, 'Women at Arms: G.I. Jane stealthily breaks the combat barrier', *The New York Times*, 16 August 2009, p 1, cited in DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2010), note 19, p 11.
- 33 Service Women's Action Network, note 8, p 4. See generally DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2010), note 19, p 11. The Review notes, in this regard, a comparison between the recognition afforded to CF and US female soldiers at equivalent level. See M Rzechowka, *Gender Integration and Modern Military Forces: A Comparative Analysis*, pp 75-77. At www.army.forces.gc.ca/caj/documents/vol_13/iss_2/CAJ_vol13.2_10_e.pdf (viewed 26 June 2011).
- 34 For general discussion see DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2010), note 19; Military Leadership Diversity Commission, *From Representation to Inclusion: Diversity Leadership for the 21st Century Military*, Final Report (2011). At <http://mldc.whs.mil/index.php/final-report> (viewed 2 February 2012). Meanwhile, anecdotal observations about women's participation in frontline units include women's tendency to gravitate towards community building activities and humanitarian projects in their spare time – in turn, involving their male colleagues and improving morale, as well as relationships with the local community. MAJ J Speiser-Blanchet 'There's No Hell Like Tac Hell' in Davis (ed), *Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces*, note 10, p 55.
- 35 L Shane, 'More Combat Roles for Women, but still no infantry', *Stars and Stripes*, 8 February 2012. At <http://www.stripes.com/news/more-combat-opportunities-for-women-but-still-no-infantry-1.168074> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 36 Shane, above.
- 37 Shane, above.
- 38 Of interest, the Review was advised that US legislative provisions which still formally require men to register for the draft may be affected if all combat roles were opened to women: Meeting with Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services, USA.
- 39 National Equal Opportunities Network, *National Conversation About Work – New Zealand Army*, p 2. At http://live.isitesoftware.co.nz/neon/documents/Final_NZ_Army.pdf (viewed 4 August 2011).
- 40 UK Ministry of Defence, *Equality and Diversity in the Armed Forces*, www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/AboutDefence/WhatWeDo/Personnel/EqualityandDiversity/EqualityAndDiversityInTheArmedForces.htm (viewed 27 March 2012). See also N Hopkins, 'Army's Top Woman Gives First Interview', *Defence News*, 13 January 2012. At www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/DefenceNews/PeopleInDefence/ArmysTopWomanGivesFirstInterview.htm (viewed 27 March 2012).
- 41 Moelker and Bolsch, note 11, p 25.

- 42 At this point 11.8% of Colonels were women and 12.7% of LtCols were women; 13.6% of Majors, 18.1% of Captains, 21.5% of 1st Lieutenants and 20.1% of 2nd Lieutenants: Doll, note 17.
- 43 E Mulhall, 'Women Warriors: Supporting She 'Who Has Borne the Battle', *Issue Report, October 2009*, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, p 2. At http://media.iava.org/IAVA_WomensReport_2009.pdf (Viewed 15 January 2012).
- 44 US Air Force, News, <http://www.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123289113> (viewed 30 March 2012). See also L Goessi, 'US Air Force Pins First Female Four Star General', *Digital Journal*, 7 June 2012. At <http://digitaljournal.com/print/article/326220> (viewed 15 June 2012).
- 45 Canadian Forces, *National Report to the Committee for Women in NATO Forces*, note 5, p 2.
- 46 For example, MAJ Anne Reiffenstein of the CF notes the palpable contrast of being a woman entering a male only unit, with entering a unit led by a woman in MAJ A Reiffenstein, 'Gender Integration – An Asymmetric Environment' in Davis (ed), *Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces*, note 10, p 7.
- 47 Reiffenstein, note 46, p 4.
- 48 LTCOM Marta Mulkins, 'Command at Sea: July 2003- June 2005' in Davis (ed), *Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces*, note 10, p 41. Another study notes that a small number of women in visible command positions can generate complacency: Evertson and Nesbitt, note 3, p 86.
- 49 Patten and Parker, note 12, p 7.
- 50 Evertson and Nesbitt, note 3, p 44.
- 51 Evertson and Nesbitt, note 3, p 43.
- 52 V Canto and K Kelloway, *Comprehensive Analysis of Canadian Forces Attrition Data, 1988-1999*, Report Prepared for Director Operational Research Personnel Operational Research Team and Directorate of Strategic Human Resource Coordination (2001), p 119, cited in Bourgon, note 1, p 11. The Norwegian Armed Forces report that discrimination is one of three main reasons that women leave the Service: 'Request for information, Australian Defence Staff: Recruitment and retention of women in the Norwegian armed forces (NAF) – evaluations and reports', Response from the Norwegian Ministry of Defence, provided to the Review, 2 March 2012.
- 53 Moelker and Bolsch, note 11, p 8.
- 54 Evertson and Nesbitt, note 3, p 44.
- 55 Marriages of female troops are, in fact, failing at three times the rate of their male counterparts. Patten and Parker, note 12, p 6. Meanwhile, NZDF personnel express the slightly different concern that, because of the relatively small size of the force, personnel are stretched thin, with the same people rotated on multiple missions: National Equal Opportunities Network, *National Conversation About Work – New Zealand Army*, pp 4-5. At http://live.isitesoftware.co.nz/neon/documents/Final_NZ_Army.pdf (viewed 4 August 2011).
- 56 Meeting with Navy Personnel Office of Diversity and Inclusion USA.
- 57 Mulhall, note 43, p 4.
- 58 Meeting with Navy Personnel, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, USA; Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations USA.
- 59 Much of the international literature scanned in Phase 1 of the Review explored performance and perceptions of leadership qualities in female cadets, with female cadets often coming out ahead of male cadets in performance indicators, particularly in respect of personality 'hardiness' and self-assurance, as well as academic performance. Despite this, *perceptions* of female and male leaders differed, with junior male officers assumed to be just as qualified as senior male officers, but junior female officers perceived to be underqualified: S Gibson, 'Perceptions of US Military Leadership: Are All Leaders Created Equally?' (2005) 24(2) *Equal Opportunities International* 1. See also LTCOL M J M Kelley, *Gender Differences and Leadership* (1997). At www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/awc/97-104.pdf (viewed 25 June 2012); M J Morgan, 'Women in a Man's World: Gender Differences in Leadership at the Military Academy' (2004) 34(12) *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 2482, p 2482; P Bartone, S Snook and T Tremble Jr, 'Cognitive and Personality Predictors of Leader Performance in West Point Cadets' (2002) 14(4) *Military Psychology* 321; G L Watkins and M C Bourg, 'The Effects of Gender on Cadet Selection for Leadership Positions at the United States Military Academy' (1997) 15 *Minerva: Quarterly Report* 63.
- 60 Doll, note 17, 2.3.
- 61 See, generally, Kelley, note 59.
- 62 As was the case in the mid-1990s when the First Regiment of the Canadian Airborne was disbanded after engaging, amongst other things, in quite sadistic initiation rites steeped in misogyny and homophobia: D Winslow, 'Rites of Passage and Group Bonding in the Canadian Airborne' (1999) 25(3) *Armed Forces & Society* 429.
- 63 J Callahan, 'Manifestations of Power and Control: Training as the Catalyst for Scandal at the United States Air Force Academy' (2009) 15 *Violence Against Women* 1149.
- 64 See, for example, Mulhall, note 43.
- 65 Meeting with Veterans Affairs, USA.
- 66 Department of Veterans Affairs, Women Veterans Task Force, *2012 Report: Strategies for Serving our Women Veterans*, Draft for Public Comment (1 May 2012), pp 6-7. At http://www.va.gov/opa/Publications/Draft_2012_Women-Veterans_StrategicPlan.pdf (viewed 17 May 2012).
- 67 Department of Veterans Affairs, Women Veterans Task Force, above, pp 5-6.
- 68 See, for example, Mulhall, note 43.
- 69 Meeting with Veterans Affairs, USA.
- 70 Department of Veterans Affairs, Women Veterans Task Force, note 66, p 2. It should be noted here that women are less likely to enrol as veterans, meaning that there is further potential for the demographic to grow: Meeting with Veterans Affairs, USA.

- 71 See D S Martin, 'Rape Victims Say Military Labels Them "Crazy"', *CNN*, 14 April 2012. At http://www.cnn.com/2012/04/14/health/military-sexual-assaults-personality-disorder/index.html?eref=rss_topstories (viewed 15 May 2012).
- 72 Meeting with Veterans Affairs, USA.
- 73 DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2010), note 19, p 12.
- 74 Meeting with Army Surgeon General Women's Health Task Force, USA.
- 75 A Estrada and A Berggren, 'Sexual Harassment and its Impact for Women Officers and Cadets in the Swedish Armed Forces' (2009) 21(2) *Military Psychology* 162-185.
- 76 Service Women's Action Network, *Department of Defense Appoints General to Head Sexual Assault Office*, (Media Release, 12 September 2011). At http://Servicewomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/SAPRO-Press-Release-9_12_11.pdf (viewed 3 February 2012).
- 77 See Statement of Jane Harman, Cong Rep, 'Sexual Assault in the Military': Hearing Before the Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs of the H. Comm. on Oversight and Government Reform, 110th Cong. 1 (2008) cited in CAPT M Schmid, 'Comment: Combating a Different Enemy – Proposals to Change the Culture of Sexual Assault in the Military' (2010) 55 *Villanova Law Review* 475.
- 78 Meeting with Veterans Affairs, USA.
- 79 Meeting with Veterans Affairs, USA.
- 80 Anthony DePalma, 'Rape Cases Shake Up The Army In Canada', *The New York Times*, 16 July 1998. At <http://www.nytimes.com/1998/07/16/world/rape-cases-shake-up-the-army-in-canada.html> (viewed 17 July 2012).
- 81 A Netherlands Service wide inquiry found 'bullying' to be more of a problem in the Dutch Services than sexual harassment, but it is possible that this is because the small proportion of women in the Dutch forces did not represent a sufficient proportion of respondents. CMDR M Meijer and L/CMDR R De Vries, 'Sexual Harassment in Netherlands Naval Operations', NATO, RTO-MP-HFM-158 (undated), p 29-1. At <http://ftp.rta.nato.int/public//PubFullText/RTO/MP/RTO-MP-HFM-158//MP-HFM-158-29.doc> (viewed 6 June 2011).
- 82 Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office, *Mission and History*, www.sapr.mil/index.php/about/mission-and-history (viewed 27 March 2012).
- 83 SAPRO reports a 105% increase in reporting in the last 6 years. Briefing to DACOWITS, Dr S Holroyd, SAPRO, June 2011: DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2011), note 21, p 4.
- 84 See, for example, Schmid, note 77; D M Hollywood, 'Creating a True Army of One: Four Proposals to Combat Sexual Harassment in Today's Army' (2007) 30 *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender* 151.
- 85 Service Women's Action Network, 'The Secretary of Defense Announces Major Policy Reform; Swan Says "Biggest Step Thus Far to Combat Military Sexual Assault"' (Media Release, Tuesday 17 April 2012). At <http://Servicewomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/PanettaCaseDispositionpresserFinal.pdf> (viewed 15 May 2012).
- 86 DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2011), note 21, p ii. In addition, the Committee noted as ongoing concerns that DOD and the Services should consider placing greater attention on prevention of sexual harassment as distinct from sexual assault; that additional specialized training should be required for investigators, counsellors and victim advocates in sexual assault matters; and that investigation should occur into whether there are special problems of sexual assault and sexual harassment in the recruiting process and, if so, how they should be addressed.
- 87 Commentators note the disparity between the ambition of successive Norwegian governments to increase the representation of women within the armed forces, and the reality. They suggest that this is, in part, because Scandinavian and Northern European cultures are less militarised, with defence careers consequently attracting less prestige. See Moelker and Bolsch, note 11; A Schjolset, *NATO and the Women: Exploring the Gender Gap in the Armed Forces*, Peace Research Institute Oslo (2010). At www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Publication/?oid=192310 (viewed 19 November 2011).
- 88 OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, *Handbook on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Armed Personnel* (2008), p 122. At www.osce.org/odihr/31393 (viewed 21 January 2012). Meanwhile, the brief provided to the Review notes that a range of research projects are underway under the auspices of the Norwegian Defence Department to investigate Norway's progress on gender integration. 'Request for information, Australian Defence Staff: Recruitment and retention of women in the Norwegian armed forces (NAF) – evaluations and reports', Response from the Norwegian Ministry of Defence, p 1, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 4 March 2012.
- 89 Schjolset, note 87, p 35.
- 90 'RCMP Sexual Harassment Lawsuit: 150 Former, Current Members File Class-Action Suit', *Huffington Post*, 29 March 2012. At http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2012/03/27/rcmp-sexual-harrassment-lawsuit_n_1383235.html (viewed 29 March 2012).
- 91 Commission for Public Complaints Against the RCMP, *Update on the Complaints Commission's Investigation into RCMP Workplace Harassment*, 23 April 2012, www.cpc-cpp.gc.ca/index-eng.aspx, (viewed 25 June 2012). A Report is expected by the end of the year.
- 92 See Bourgon, note 1, p 24. The Review was advised that the US Navy experiences a particular drag to the nuclear industry and pays retention bonuses of about \$20,000 – \$30,000 a year to specific occupations as a result: Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 93 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 94 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 95 Meeting with ADM Mark Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations USA. The Review was advised that the US Navy has a goal of being a Service that 'looks like America' by the year 2040.
- 96 For example, the US Vice Chief of Naval Operations cites IBM as a model. By moving to a mobile workforce, IBM has dramatically increased its number of senior female employees: Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.

- 97 See, for example, New Zealand Defence Force, *From Equity to Diversity*, www.nzdf.mil.nz/personnel-records/personnel-branch/from-equity-to-diversity.htm (viewed 27 March 2012). Interestingly, one US study notes that the female members of the current active-duty US forces are more racially diverse than their male counterparts, making a broader understanding of 'diversity' even more relevant to these particular Service personnel: Patten and Parker, note 12.
- 98 Meeting with Canadian Commanders delegation.
- 99 The Report of the Defence Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services in the US found that the 'key factor amongst best practice initiatives is consistently engaged leadership': USA Department of Defense, *Report of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services*, (2009), p 88. At www.quantico.usmc.mil/download.aspx?Path=../Uploads/Files/SAPR_DTFSAMS_Report_Dec_09.pdf (viewed 21 June 2011). Commentators note that engaged leadership includes the influence of those directly in operational command: see Davis 'From Ocean Ops to Combat Ops: A Short History of Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces', note 10, p 82.
- 100 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA; see also, Military Leadership Diversity Commission, note 34; K A Scott, *Universal or Gender-specific? Exploring Military Leadership from a Subordinate Perspective*, Technical Report, DRDC Toronto TR 2003-121, October 2003. At <http://pubs.drc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc57/p521079.pdf> (viewed 6 June 2011). Commentators also note the importance of a commitment from middle management, as the personnel who implement policy: Evertson and Nesbitt, note 3, p 44.
- 101 Meeting with Canadian Commanders delegation.
- 102 Emphases vary across the forces, from the UK's focus on 'diversity, not political correctness' from the UK Armed Forces – see UK *Chief of the General Staff's Equality and Diversity Directive for the Army*, Army Code 64340, April 2008, p 1. At http://www.army.mod.uk/documents/general/CGS_ED_Directive-Apr_08.pdf (viewed 3 July 2011), in contrast to the overt reference to 'gender' in the Scandinavian and Dutch environments. See, for example, Meijer and De Vries, note 81, p 29-2.
- 103 Certainly, CWINF recommendations recognise this, calling for annual evaluation of measures and indicators, the appointment of a gender advisor in all operations and the generation of checklists for how gender is incorporated in operational planning and operations. The Committee also calls for the provision of equipment and clothing that fit women's bodies and needs; and separate sanitary facilities and accommodations for women and men. Committee for Women in NATO Forces, *Improving the Gender Balance: A Selected List of Best Practices*, CWINF 2008. At www.nato.int/issues/women_nato/2008-11-gender_balance.pdf (viewed 30 March 2012).
- 104 Reiffenstein, note 46, p 4. Major Anne Reiffenstein notes the very basic challenge of walking into a unit as the only woman and finding no women's bathroom. See also MAJ S Forbes 'Building Trust and Credibility at Home and Abroad' in Davis (ed), *Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces*, note 10, p 28.
- 105 Much of the international literature scanned explored performance and perceptions of leadership qualities in female cadets, with female cadets often coming out ahead of male cadets in performance indicators, particularly in respect of personality 'hardiness' and self-assurance, as well as academic performance. Despite this, *perceptions* of female and male leaders differed, with junior male officers assumed to be just as qualified as senior male officers, but junior female officers perceived to be underqualified. S Gibson, 'Perceptions of US Military Leadership: Are All Leaders Created Equally?' (2005) 24 (2) *Equal Opportunities International* 1. See also Kelley, note 59; Morgan, note 59; Bartone, et al, note 59; Watkins and Bourg, note 59.
- 106 Committee for Women in NATO Forces, note 103.
- 107 Military Leadership Diversity Commission, note 34, p 11.
- 108 Moelker and Bolsch, note 11, p 24. Also note that a significantly larger percentage of female personnel are on short-term contracts.
- 109 Patten and Parker, note 12.
- 110 Bourgon, note 1, p 19.
- 111 A Febraro, *Women, Leadership and Gender integration in the Canadian combat arms: A qualitative study*, Technical Report DRDC Toronto TR 2003-170 (December 2003). At <http://pubs.drc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc31/p521088.pdf> (viewed 20 June 2011).
- 112 Meeting with Canadian Commanders delegation.

Appendices

Appendix A

Consultations

Appendix A.1 – Meetings

Date	Meeting Detail
19 October 2011	Chief of Defence Force Action Plan for the Recruitment and Retention of Women Meeting – representatives from each Service, CDF's office and Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch
20 October 2011	Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research, Department of Defence
20 October 2011	Career Management Agencies: CAPT M. Miller, Director Navy People Career Management Agency COL W. Stothart, Directorate Officer Career Management Army WGCDR K. Ashworth, Directorate Personnel Air Force
24 October 2011	Air Commander Australia AVN M.A. Skidmore AM and Senior Leadership, HQ Air Command
27 October 2011	Commander Australian Fleet RADM S.R. Gilmore, AM, CSC, RAN (2011) Commander Australian Fleet RADM T.W. Barrett, AM, CSC, RAN (2012) and Senior Leadership Fleet Headquarters
2 November 2011	Personnel Policy Senior ADF Representatives: CDRE V. McConachie, Director General Navy People BRIG G. Reynolds, Director General Personnel – Army AIRCDRE R. Rodgers, Director General Personnel – Air Force
4 November 2011	CMDR C. Clarke, Commanding Officer, HMAS <i>Kuttabul</i>
8 November 2011	Forces Commander MAJGEN M. Slater DSC, AM, CSC, and Senior Leadership HQ Forces Command
10 November 2011	WGCDR K. Kooij, Commanding Officer HQ Air Lift Group and Security Police, RAAF Richmond
11 November 2011	AVM M. Staib, CSM, Commander Joint Logistics
14 November 2011	CAPT L. Charles Jones, Commanding Officer HMAS <i>Sydney</i> and Senior Leadership, HMAS <i>Sydney</i>
14 November 2011	Equity and Diversity Officers, HMAS <i>Sydney</i>
16 November 2011	Director General Defence Force Recruiting, AIRCDRE H. Ehlers and Defence Force Recruiting Representatives

Date	Meeting Detail
21 November 2011	Commander Northern Command, AIRCDRE K. Watson and Senior Leadership, HQ Northern Command
22 November 2011	WGCDR A. McNerney, Commanding Officer 322 Expeditionary Combat Support Squadron and Senior Leadership, RAAF Tindal
23 November 2011	BRIG G. McLachlan, AM, ADC, Commanding Officer, 1 st Brigade and Senior Leadership 1 st Brigade, Robertson Barracks
24 November 2011	LCDR P. Ruhl, Staff Officer Capability Patrol Boat Group and Senior Staff HMAS <i>Coonawarra</i>
28 November 2011	MAJGEN C. Williams AM, Commanding Officer 2 nd Division and COL Dean Franklin, Chief of Staff 2 nd Division, Randwick Barracks
30 November 2011	CDRE E. Rushbrook, CSC, Director General Health Capability and Director General Navy Health Service
30 November 2011	ADF Health Professionals
30 November 2011	BRIG I. Spence, Director General Reserves – Army BRIG W. Sowry, Deputy Head Cadets, Reserves and Employer Support Division and Plan SUAKIN Reserve Reform Stream Representatives
30 November 2011	Director General Workforce Planning AIRCDRE T. Needham and Defence Workforce Planning Branch Representatives
30 November 2011	Mr J. Diercks, Director General and Ms E. Swavley, Director Rights and Responsibilities, Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch (formerly Fairness and Resolution Branch)
6 December 2011	CAPT M. Hill, Commanding Officer HMAS <i>Cerberus</i> CAPT K. Richards (CO Designate) and Senior Leadership HMAS <i>Cerberus</i>
7 December 2011	Defence Force Recruiting Representatives – Melbourne
8 December 2011	Dr G. Dennerstein
14 December 2011	WGCDR G. Johnson, Commanding Officer No. 26 Squadron and Senior Leadership RAAF Base Williamstown
18 January 2012	CMDR A. Morthorpe, CSM, Commanding Officer HMAS <i>Success</i> and Senior Leadership HMAS <i>Success</i>
31 January 2012	CMDR R. Overmeyer, Executive Officer HMAS <i>Stirling</i>
31 January 2012	CAPT M. Potter, Commander Submarine Force and Senior Staff Submarine Force HMAS <i>Stirling</i>

Date	Meeting Detail
1 February 2012	CMDR J. Cupples, Commanding Officer HMAS <i>Dechaineux</i> and Senior Leadership HMAS <i>Dechaineux</i>
1 February 2012	CMDR J. Harrap, Commanding Officer HMAS <i>Collins</i> and Senior Leadership HMAS <i>Collins</i>
2 February 2012	Senior Leadership, Special Air Services Regiment, Campbell Barracks
3 February 2012	LTCOL S. Omari, Commanding Officer Pilbara Regiment and Senior Leadership, 6 th Brigade Pilbara Regiment, Karratha
14 February 2012	Ms Alison Larkins, Acting Defence Force Ombudsman
14 February 2012	Mr M. Callan, Director General Defence Community Organisation and Senior Staff Defence Community Organisation
15 February 2012	BRIG D. Mulhall AM, CSC, Commander 17 th Combat Service Support Brigade and Senior Leadership 17 th Combat service Support Brigade, Randwick Barracks
17 February 2012	CAPT G. Andrew, Commanding Officer HMAS <i>Albatross</i> and Senior Leadership Fleet Air Arm
20 February 2012	Air Force Promotion Board – Observation
22 February 2012	GPCAPT T. Checker, Commandant RAAF College, WGCDR W. Merckx, Commanding Officer No. 1 Recruit Training Unit and Senior Leadership No. 1 Recruit Training Unit, RAAF Base Wagga
28 February 2012	MAJGEN G. Fogarty, AM, Head People Capability
28 February 2012	Mr J. Diercks, Director General Values, Behaviours and Resolution Branch
28 February 2012	Ms A. Desalis, Director Complaints Resolution and Representatives Directorate of Complaints Resolution
28 February 2012	Australian Defence Force Investigation Service Representatives
5 March 2012	CAPT P. Leavy, Director Navy People Policy, CAPT W. Bairstow, Director New Generation Navy, CAPT N. Youseman, Director Navy Category Management, CAPT S. Ottaviano, Director Navy People Career Management Agency and Navy Career and Category Management Representatives
5 March 2012	COL B. Stevens, Director of Workforce Strategy – Army and Army Career Management Representatives

Date	Meeting Detail
6 March 2012	GPCAPT A. Elfverson, Director of Personnel – Air Force WGCDR S. Dorsett, Deputy Director Flexible Employment and Remuneration, WGCDR D. Gibbon, Deputy Director Air Force Workforce Diversity and Air Force Career Management Representatives
6 March 2012	Ms. J. Blackburn, National Convenor, Defence Families Australia
15 March 2012	LTGEN A. Power, AO, CSC, Chief of Joint Operations and Principal Staff Officers, Headquarters Joint Operations Command
15 March 2012	CAPT A. Norris, Director Joint Control Centre, Headquarters Joint Operations Command
16 March 2012	MAJGEN C. Orme, AM, CSC, Commander Australian Defence College, CDRE R. Menhinick CSC, Commandant Australian Command and Staff College and Senior Leadership Australian Defence College
16 March 2012	Defence Housing Australia Senior Staff Representatives
19 March 2012	BRIG G. Bilton, CSC, Commander 7 th Brigade, BRIG G. Lawler, CSC, Commander 16 th Aviation Brigade, BRIG D. Coghlan, AM, Commander 6 th Brigade and Senior Leadership Gallipoli Barracks, Enoggera
19 March 2012	Chiefs of Service Committee Meeting
20 March 2012	BRIG S. Caughey, CSC, Commander 3 rd Brigade and Senior Leadership 3 rd Brigade Lavarack Barracks, Townsville
21 March 2012	GPCAPT G. Harland, Officer Commanding 82 Wing and Senior Leadership RAAF Base Amberley
22 March 2012	COL D. Burke, Commandant Army Aviation Training Centre and Senior Leadership Army Aviation Centre, Oakey
22 March 2012	Army Promotion Board – Observation
23 March 2012	LTCOL B. Sharp, Commanding Officer 7 th Signal Regiment and Senior Leadership 7 th Signal Regiment, Borneo Barracks, Cabarlah
29 March 2012	COL S. Ryan, Commandant Combined Arms Training Centre and Senior Leadership, Combined Arms Training Centre, Bridge Barracks, Puckapunyal
29 March 2012	COL D. Hay, Commandant Army Recruit Training Centre and Senior Leadership, Army Recruit Training Centre, Blamey Barracks, Kapooka
30 March 2012	BRIG A. Creagh, Director General Public Affairs
3 April 2012	Senior Leadership 2 nd Commando Regiment, Holsworthy Barracks

Date	Meeting Detail
3 April 2012	MAJ P. Manuel, Officer Commanding 2 nd Surgical Company 2 nd General Health Battalion, 17 th CSS Brigade, Holsworthy Barracks
10 April 2012	Navy Promotion Board – Observation
16 April 2012	MAJGEN M. K. Hertog, Director, Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office (SAPRO), United States Army, Washington D.C.
16 April 2012	United States Navy Personnel Office of Diversity and Inclusion, Washington D.C.
16 April 2012	United States Army Surgeon General Office, Women’s Health Taskforce, Washington D.C.
16 April 2012	ADM M. Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy, Washington D.C.
17 April 2012	Mr M. Applegate, Director Manpower Plans and Policy, United States Marine Corps, Washington D.C.
17 April 2012	Ms H. Hemphill, Chair of the Defence Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS) and COL I. White, Military Director for DACOWITS, Washington D.C.
17 April 2012	United States Department of Veterans Affairs, Washington D.C.
18 April 2012	Mr C. Johnson, Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity, Office of the United States Secretary of Defense, and Military Leadership and Diversity Commission, Washington D.C.
18 April 2012	Ms J. Beyler, Military Personnel Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Washington D.C.
18 April 2012	Mr L. Stubblefield, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Diversity and Leadership, Washington D.C.
23 April 2012	MAJGEN S. Smith, AM, Commander Joint Task Force 633, Australian Forces Middle East Area of Operations, UAE
23 April 2012	CDRE J. Meade, Commander Combined Task Force 150, UAE
24 April 2012	Chaplain M. Fraser, Al Minhad Air Force Base, UAE
26 April 2012	WGCDR C. Williams, Afghanistan
27 April 2012	BRIG S. Wilkie, Assistant Commander Afghanistan, Kabul, Afghanistan
27 April 2012	Artillery Advisory Team, Kabul, Afghanistan

Date	Meeting Detail
27 April 2012	APS Staff, Kabul, Afghanistan
2 May 2012	LTCOL M. Constable, Commanding Officer School of Infantry and Senior Leadership School of Infantry, Lone Pine Barracks, Singleton
7 May 2012	CAPT M. Shindy, Director FFG System Program Office, Fleet Base East
16 May 2012	COL J. Carignan, Head of Delegation and Chief of Staff, Land Forces Central Area and Canadian Forces Representatives
29 May 2012	CAPT C. McCracken, Directorate Workforce Modelling Forecasting and Analysis
1 June 2012	Ms C. McGregor, Deputy Secretary Defence People Group (formerly People Strategies and Policy Group)
8 June 2012	Chiefs of Service Committee Meeting

Appendix A.2 – Focus groups

The Review met with over 1200 personnel in focus groups which it conducted at each of the military bases visited in Australia, the UAE and Afghanistan. These focus groups were designed to enable the Review to capture a broad cross-section of views within the ADF. The focus groups involved discussions with women, men, senior officers, junior officers, senior NCOs, junior NCOs, mixed gender, mixed rank, tri-service, recruits, trainees, specialised and category specific personnel, and Permanent and Reserve members. Additionally, the Review conducted focus groups for comparative purposes with US and Canadian Defence personnel embedded with Australian members in Afghanistan. Below is a list of the bases visited by the Review.

Focus Group Location	Number of focus groups held at each location
NAVY	
Navy Women's Leadership Program, HMAS <i>Harman</i>	1
HMAS <i>Kuttabul</i> / Navy Fleet Base East	8
HMAS <i>Sydney</i>	4
HMAS <i>Coonawarra</i>	2
HMAS <i>Cerberus</i>	6
HMAS <i>Success</i>	4
HMAS <i>Stirling</i>	3

Focus Group Location	Number of focus groups held at each location
HMAS <i>Collins</i>	2
HMAS <i>Albatross</i>	4
Defence Plaza Sydney	1
ARMY	
1 st Brigade Robertson Barracks, Darwin	5
Victoria Barracks, Sydney	1
SASR Campbell Barracks, Swanbourne	4
Pilbara Regiment, Karratha	2
17 th Brigade Randwick Barracks, Sydney	3
7 th Brigade, 16 th Aviation Brigade and 6 th Brigade Gallipoli Barracks, Enoggera	4
3 rd Brigade Lavarack Barracks, Townsville	4
Army Aviation Centre, Oakey	2
7 th Signal Regiment, Toowoomba	3
Combined Arms Training Centre, Bridge Barracks, Puckapunyal	3
Army Recruit Training Centre, Blamey Barracks, Kapooka	4
2 nd Commando Regiment and 2 nd General Health Battalion, Holsworthy Barracks	6
School of Infantry, Lone Pine Barracks, Singleton	4
AIR FORCE	
RAAF Base Richmond	4
RAAF Base Tindal	4
RAAF Base Williamstown	4
No.1 Recruit Training Unit, RAAF Base Wagga	5
RAAF Base Amberley	4

Focus Group Location	Number of focus groups held at each location
TRI-SERVICE and INTERNATIONAL	
ADF Senior Women's Forum, Russell Offices, Canberra	1
Headquarters Northern Command, Darwin	2
Headquarters Joint Operations Command, Bungandore	4
Australian Defence College	2
Al Minhad Air Force Base, UAE	6
Multinational Base, Tarin Kowt, Afghanistan	7
Kabul International Airport-North, Kabul, Afghanistan	3
Headquarters, International Security Assistance Force, Afghanistan	5
Op ASTUTE, East Timor (via Videoconference)	2

Appendix A.3 – Executive Consultation Group Participants

NAVY			
Fleet Headquarters			
RADM	Steve Gilmore	AM, CSC	Commander Australian Fleet to 21 December 2011
RADM	Tim Barrett	AM, CSC	Commander Australian Fleet from 22 December 2011
CDRE	Steve McDowall	DSM, CSM	Commander Surface Force
CDRE	Andrew Smith		Commodore Support
CAPT	Nicholas Stoker	CSM	Commander Mine Warfare, Clearance Diving, Hydrographic, Meteorological and Patrol Force
CAPT	Nicole Curtis		Fleet Medical Officer
CMDR	Christine Clarke		CO HMAS Kuttabul
CMDR	Letitia Van Stralen	CSC	Fleet Legal Officer

CMDR	Patrick O'Brien		Deputy Training Authority Initial Training Leadership and Management
CMDR	John Wearne		Deputy Director Navy Training Policy
CMDR	Graeme Pedley		Chief of Staff – Minewarfare Clearance Diving
<i>HMAS Cerberus</i>			
CAPT	Mark Hill	CSC	CO
CAPT	Katherine Richards		CO Designate
CMDR	Shane Glassock	CSC	XO
CMDR	Michael Oborn		XO Designate
CMDR	Mark Muir		Head Maritime Warfare-South
Mr	Chris Harrison		Command Equity Advisor
<i>HMAS Success</i>			
CMDR	Ainsley Morthorpe	CSM	CO
CMDR	Adam Birch		Engineering Officer
CMDR	John Metzl		Supply Officer
LCDR	Gerry Savvakis		XO
WO	Deb Butterworth	OAM, CSM	Ship's Warrant Officer
<i>HMAS Stirling</i>			
CAPT	Mark Potter	CSC	Commander Submarine Force
CMDR	James Lybrand		Deputy Commander Submarine Force
CMDR	Brett Westcott		Submarine Escape and Rescue Manager
CMDR	Michael Manfield		Training Authority-Submarines
CMDR	Jason Cupples		CO HMAS Dechaineux
CMDR	James Harrap		CO Crew 3 HMAS Collins
CMDR	Ken Marr		XO Crew 3 HMAS Collins

CHAP	Melissa Baker		Fleet Base West 1 Chaplain HMAS Stirling
LCDR	Allan Dennison		Principal Staff Officer Personnel
LCDR	Garry Williams	CSM	Deputy Chief of Staff Submarine Force
LEUT	Benjamin Vandermeer		Phase 3 Officer, HMAS Collins
LEUT	Johanne Harrap		2IC Submarine Recruiting Team
WO	Jodi Bonney		Ship's Warrant Officer Submarine Force, HMAS Stirling
CPO	Kylie Broughton		Chief of the Boat, HMAS Collins
LS	Kelly Fraser		Medic (Clinical Manager), HMAS Collins
<i>HMAS Albatross</i>			
CAPT	Gordon Andrew		CO
CAPT	Colin Lawrence		Commander Navy Aviation Systems Program Office
CMDR	Carl Capper		XO
CMDR	Matthew Shand		CO 723 Squadron
WO	Brian Collins		Ship's Warrant Officer
<i>Directorate of Navy People</i>			
CAPT	Simon Ottaviano		Director Navy People Career Management Agency
CAPT	Nick Youseman	CSM	Director Navy Category Management
CAPT	Warren Bairstow	CSC	Program Director New Generation Navy
CMDR	Peter Leavy		Director Navy Personnel People
CMDR	Jan Noonan	CSC	Deputy Director Navy Category Management – Warfare
CMDR	Jo Bastian		Senior Project Officer New Generation Navy
CMDR	Roger Fonhof		Deputy Director Navy People Career Management

CMDR	Natasha Burney		Deputy Director Navy Category Management – Aviation
CMDR	Steve Bowater	OAM	Deputy Director Navy Category Management – Engineering and Submarines
LCDR	Debbie Dunchue		Staff Officer Policy Navy People Career Management Agency
Participation via other fora			
CAPT	Angela Bond		Director Military Salary and Allowances Policy
CAPT	Michele Miller		Director Navy People Career Management Agency
CMDR	Fiona Sneath		Staff Officer Legal to CDF
CMDR	Rachel Durbin		Deputy Director Navy Category Management Engineering
CMDR	Jennifer Heymans		Navy Women’s Strategic Advisor
LCDR	Elizabeth Waddell		Aircrew Training Continuum Coordinator
LCDR	Casey Scully-O’Shea		Staff Officer Program Director New Generation Navy
LCDR	Lorraine Grey		Member Support Coordinator-Navy QLD/NT
LCDR	Debra Byrne		Director Navy AOD Services
LCDR	Angeneta Googe		Deputy Director Navy Occupational and Environmental Health
LCDR	Debbie Dunchue		Staff Officer Policy NPCMA
LEUT	Louisa Young		NGN Benefits Manager
LEUT	Jennifer Macklin		Staff Officer Diversity – NPCMA
LEUT	Barbara Butler		Reviews Implementation Officer ADFA
LEUT	Lauren Milburn		Naval Liaison Officer 92WG Headquarters
PO	Trish Muller		Instructor – ADF Physical Training School

LS	Melissa Westley		Aviation Technician Aircraft Maintenance Facility
LS	Trish Dollisson		Directorate Navy Information Warfare
AB	Anita Jenkins		Training Coordinator Mine Warfare Systems
ARMY			
Headquarters Forces Command			
COL	James Burns		Assistant Chief of Staff
COL	Neil Sweeney		Colonel Operations G3
COL	Cameron Purdey	CSC	Colonel Logistics G4
COL	James Roche		Colonel Signals G6
COL	Debra Bradford		Colonel Education Training and Development
COL	Evan Carlin		Command Legal Officer
LTCOL	Shaun O'Leary		Colonel Training G7
LTCOL	Tim Rudd		Staff Officer 1 Headquarters Support
LTCOL	Mona Goldsmith		Staff Officer 1 Personnel Operations
Randwick Barracks			
Headquarters 2nd Division			
MAJGEN	Craig Williams		Commander
COL	Dean Franklin	CSC	Chief of Staff
17 Combat Service Support Brigade			
BRIG	David Mulhall	CSC	Commander
COL	Ed Smeaton		Chief of Staff
LTCOL	Nicole Sadler	CSC	CO 1 st Psychology Unit
LTCOL	Giles Pugh		Staff Officer 1 Operations
LTCOL	Rebecca Talbot		Staff Officer 1 Support

LTCOL	Richard Mogg		Plans Officer
MAJ	Justine Buist		Staff Officer 2 Personnel
MAJ	Hilary Dixon		Staff Officer 2 Health and Wellness
WO1	Martin Lenicka		RSM
WO1	Kym Bishop		Formation Chief Clerk
Taylor Barracks			
Pilbara Regiment			
LTCOL	Saad Omari	DSC	CO
MAJ	Damien Casey		XO
MAJ	Alan Williams		Officer Commanding Training Support Squadron
MAJ	Denis Davey		Operations Officer
MAJ	Anthony Mew		Officer Commanding 1 Squadron
MAJ	William McDade		Officer Commanding 2 Squadron
MAJ	Graham Woodhouse		Officer Commanding 3 Squadron
MAJ	William Phillips		Padre
CAPT	Jared Slansky		Adjutant
CAPT	Christopher Bates		Quartermaster
2LT	Karen Davey		Recruiting Officer
Gallipoli Barracks			
6 Brigade			
BRIG	David Coghlan	AM	Commander
7 Brigade			
BRIG	Greg Bilton	CSC	Commander
LTCOL	Byron Cocksedge		Chief of Staff
LTCOL	David Sweeney		S07 (Senior Medical Officer)

MAJ	Ian Dawes		S2
MAJ	David Guthrie		S3
MAJ	Gabrielle Follett		S4
LT	Jesse Platz		Liaison Officer to Commander 7 Brigade
WO1	Bob Thompson	OAM	RSM
16 Aviation Brigade			
LTCOL	Daryl Campbell		Chief of Staff
Lavarack Barracks CSC			
3 Brigade			
BRIG	Shane Caughey	AM, CSC	Commander
LTCOL	Stephen Moore	CSM	Deputy Commander
LTCOL	Chris Smith	CSC	CO 2 Royal Australian Regiment
LTCOL	Craig Lauder		CO 3 Combat Engineer Regiment
LTCOL	Dan Bennett		CO 3 Combat Signal Regiment
MAJ	Melanie Lenaghan		Senior Intelligence Officer
MAJ	Paul Firth		Senior Logistics Officer 3 Brigade
MAJ	Nathan Ellis		2IC 1 Royal Australian Regiment
MAJ	Dan Gosling		2IC 3 Royal Australian Regiment
MAJ	Darren Rosemond		OC B Squadron 3 rd /4 th Cavalry Regiment
MAJ	David Stables		A/CO 3 Combat Service Support Brigade
WO1	Bruce Walker	OAM	RSM 3 Brigade
Army Aviation Centre Oakey			
COL	David Burke		Commandant Army Aviation Training Centre
LTCOL	Eamon Barton		CO School of Army Aviation
LTCOL	Michael Millar		CO RAEME Aircraft Maintenance School

LTCOL	Robert Boughen		SO1 Plans Training
LTCOL	Douglas Maddocks		SO1 Safety and Standards
MAJ	Bernard Hayes		2IC Army Helicopter School
Borneo Barracks			
7 Signal Regiment (Electronic Warfare)			
LTCOL	Brenda Sharp		CO
MAJ	Philip Lockley		2IC
CAPT	Sarah Isdale		Adjutant
WO1	Peter Quinn		RSM
WO2	Gregory Mathers		Chief Clerk
Blamey Barracks			
Army Recruit Training Centre			
COL	David Hay		Commandant
LTCOL	David Wilton		Deputy Commandant
MAJ	Patricia Hunt		S1/4
WO1	David Galloway		RSM
1 Recruit Training Battalion			
LTCOL	Steven D'Arcy		CO
WO1	Trudy Casey	OAM	RSM
Bridges Barracks			
Combined Arms Training Centre			
COL	Sean Ryan		Commandant
WO1	Paul Tyrrell		RSM
School of Armour			
LTCOL	Tony Archer		CO
WO1	Alby Chirichilli		RSM

School of Artillery			
MAJ	Karl Britton		Operations Officer
WO1	Scott Driscoll		RSM
Lone Pine Barracks			
School of Infantry			
MAJ	Andrew Patterson		2IC
CAPT	Scott Tobias		Operations Officer
CAPT	Thomas Middleton		Adjutant
WO1	Darren Murch	OAM	RSM
Director General Career Management Army			
COL	Brendan Stevens		Director Workforce Strategy Army
COL	Wade Stothart		Directorate of Officer Career Management, Officer Career Manager
LTCOL	Ana Duncan		Directorate of Officer Career Management, Senior Career Advisor
LTCOL	Greg Jenkins		Deputy Director Reserve Solider Career Management
MAJ	Dell Madge		Staff Officer 2 Workforce Strategy Army
MAJ	Narelle Powers		Directorate of Soldier Career Management, SO2 Career Management Group
Participation via other fora			
BRIG	Iain Spence		Director General Reserves – Army
BRIG	Linda Reynolds	CSC	Army Adjutant General
COL	Kath Stewart		Director J6 Plans
COL	Bronwyn Worswick		Director of Military Justice
LTCOL	Elizabeth Khan		Staff Officer Directorate of Workforce Strategy – Army
Mrs	Michelle Hannaford		Leadership Development Coordinator

AIR FORCE

RAAF Base Glenbrook

Headquarters Air Command

GPCAPT	Kathryn Dunn	AM	Director Training Systems
WGCDR	Wilma Tennant	CSM	Personal Staff Officer to Air Commander Australia
WGCDR	Tim Creevey		Deputy Director Air Knowledge Management
WGCDR	Pierre Blais	CSC	Deputy Director Safety and Air Worthiness
WGCDR	Chris Morris		Director Communications and Information Systems / A6
WGCDR	Grant Pinder		Deputy Director Logistics Support and Systems
WGCDR	Nigel Leurs		Deputy Director Integrated Workforce Management
SQNLDR	April Rose		LS1 Legal Officer
WOFF	Gerard Hallinan		Executive Warrant Officer
Mrs	Judy Ferrier		Public Affairs Advisor to Air Commander Australia
Mr	Jonathan Powell		Director Corporate Performance Management
Ms	Sandra Onus		Program Director Air Force Improvement

RAAF Base Richmond

WGCDR	Kaarin Kooij		CO HQ Air Lift Group/Staff Officer People Capability
LACW	Kim MacMenigall		22 Squadron Military Working Dog Handler
LACW	Renee Keen		22 Squadron Military Working Dog Handler

RAAF Base Tindal			
WGCDR	Allister McInerney		CO 322 Expeditionary Combat Support Squadron / Senior ADF Officer
SQNLDR	Tom Fitzsimmons		OIC 3 Control and Reporting Unit
SQNLDR	Sally Borgelt		OC 2 Expeditionary Health Squadron Detachment
SQNLDR	Damien Fairhurst		Flight Commander 452 Squadron
SQNLDR	Brett Green		Security Police Officer
SQNLDR	Olivia Stuart-Atkinson		Staff Officer Equity and ADF Policy
SGT	Karen Voysey		Security Police
SGT	Candida Willis		Senior Equity Adviser
Miss	Jennifer Micallef		Defence Social Worker
RAAF Base Williamstown			
GPCAPT	Tracey Friend	CSC	OC 42 Wing
WGCDR	Amanda Robinson		SO 1 Personnel / CO HQ Air Combat Group
WGCDR	Hyph Read-Jones		SO 1 Personnel / CO HQ Surveillance and Response Group
WGCDR	Nicholas Robertson		SO1 Logistics Engineering / CO HQ 81 Wing
WGCDR	Amy Beck		CO Classic Hornet Logistics Management Unit
SQNLDR	Lyndon Turner		XO 26 Squadron
SQNLDR	Tim Lewis		XO 381 Expeditionary Combat Support Squadron
RAAF Base Wagga			
RAAF College			
GPCAPT	Tony Checker	OAM	Commandant
WGCDR	Jim Lewis		Deputy Commandant

No 1 Recruit Training Unit			
WGCDR	Billy Merkx		CO
SQNLDR	Kristine Johnston		Senior Administration Officer
SQNLDR	Garth Herriot		Chief Instructor
CHAP	Alan Williams		Chaplain
FLTLT	Joshua Borg		No 2 Flight Commander
WOFF	Ken Robertson		Warrant Officer Disciplinary
WOFF	Rick Mortellaro		Training Warrant Officer
FSGT	Stuart Eastwood		Section Commander Training Management Section
FSGT	David Adam		OIC Small Arms Training Section
RAAF Base Amberley			
GPCAPT	Geoff Harland	CSC	OC 82 Wing
WGCDR	Robert Denney		XO 82 Wing
WGCDR	Murray Jones	CSC	CO 1 Squadron
WGCDR	Simon Nickson		CO 23 Squadron
WGCDR	Geoffrey Fox		CO 33 Squadron
WGCDR	Paul Long		CO 36 Squadron
Participation via other fora			
GPCAPT	Sue McGready		Director of Supply Capability – Air Force
GPCAPT	Cath Roberts	CSC	Director Enabling Capability – Air Force
GPCAPT	Anne Borzycki		Chief of Staff Australian Defence College
GPCAPT	Jenny Fantini		Director Strategy – Aerospace Systems Division
WGCDR	Karen Ashworth		XO Directorate of Personnel –Air Force
WGCDR	Deanne Gibbon		Deputy Director Air Force Workforce Diversity

WGCDR	Sally Dorsett		Deputy Director Flexible Employment and Remuneration
SQNLDR	Linda Saunders		Remuneration and Flexible Employment Manager
JOINT OPERATIONS COMMAND			
LTGEN	Ash Power	AO, CSC	Chief of Joint Operations
CDRE	Michael Noonan	AM	Director General Operations
CDRE	David Scott	OAM	Principle Staff Officer Intelligence
CDRE	Braddon Wheeler		Director General Maritime Operations
BRIG	Wayne Goodman	AM	Chief of Staff
AIRCDRE	William Henman	OAM	Director-General Air / Director-General Air Command Operations
AIRCDRE	Hayden Marshall		Director General Support
CAPT	Fiona Freeman		Director Military Options, Plans
CAPT	Allison Norris		Director Joint Control Centre
COL	Simon Tuckerman	CSC	Commander 1 Joint Movement Group
GPCAPT	Ted Schneider		Director Operational Evaluation
LTCOL	Patricia Sharp		J63
CHAP	Glynn Murphy		Chaplain, Special Operations HQ
Mr	Kevin Pippard		Group Finance Officer
VICE CHIEF OF THE DEFENCE FORCE GROUP			
Cadet, Reserve and Employer Support Division			
BRIG	Bill Sowry	CSC	Deputy Head Cadet, Reserve and Employer Support Division
Mr	Jerome Reid		Director SRP Reserve Reform Stream
Ms	Emma Turner		Project Officer

Joint Health Command			
CDRE	Elizabeth Rushbrook	CSC	Director General Health Capability / Director General Navy Health Service
Ms	Martine Cosgrove		Regional Mental Health Coordinator – Regional Health Service NSW
Dr	Danielle Klar		Regional Health Director SNSW – Regional Health Service
Dr	Cath Kelaher		Senior Medical Adviser Medical Services
Dr	Felicity Williams		Command Medical Adviser Garrison Health Operations
Australian Defence Force Investigative Service			
LTCOL	Dave McGarry		Director of Operations
Mr	Daniel Barwick		Manager Service Police Central Records Office
DEFENCE PEOPLE GROUP			
People Capability Division			
MAJGEN	Gerard Fogarty	AM	Head People Capability
Workforce Planning			
Mr	Russell Philbey		Director Workforce Information
Mr	Steven House		Assistant Director Workforce Information
Ms	Emily Jacka		Director Strategic Personnel Policy Research
Ms	Diala Raad		Research Officer – Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research
Mrs	Angie Sturrock		Assistant Director Workforce Intelligence
Ms	Dorota Thorp		Assistant Director Workforce Intelligence

Defence Force Recruiting		
AIRCDRE	Henrik Ehlers	Director General Defence Force Recruiting
Mr	Michael Hoffmann	Regional Manager Defence Force Recruiting Victoria/ Tasmania
SQNLDR	Michael Ward	Senior Military Recruiting Officer Defence Force Recruiting Victoria
People Policy & Culture Division		
Ms	Annebelle Davis	Director General Strategy Integration and Coordination
People Solutions Division		
Values, Behaviours and Resolutions		
Mr	John Diercks	Director General
Ms	Amanda Desalis	Director Complaints Resolution
Mrs	Ellen Swavley	Director Right and Responsibilities
Ms	Amber Brentnall	Deputy Director Gender and Sexual Orientation
DEFENCE SUPPORT GROUP		
Defence Community Organisation		
Mr	Michael Callan	Director General – Defence Community Organisation
Mr	Luke Carroll	Director Plans – Defence Community Organisation
Mrs	Nicki Curtin	Director Transition Support Services – Defence Community Organisation
DEFENCE FAMILIES AUSTRALIA		
Mrs	Julie Blackburn	National Convenor, Defence Families Australia

Appendix B

Survey Information: *The Review into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey*

The Review, in consultation with the Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research (DSPPR), administered a survey with the aim of understanding the attitudes and opinions of ADF members on a range of issues relevant to the treatment of women. This appendix gives an overview of the survey methodology, a summary of the results, and presents two sets of tables (all items from the electronic survey, gender disaggregated and all items from the paper survey, gender disaggregated).

Appendix B.1 – Methodology

The Review into the Treatment of Women in the ADF Survey ('the *Treatment of Women in the ADF Survey*') was designed by the Review in consultation with DSPPR. It was administered to two sample groups: one via email (the electronic survey) and one in focus groups (the paper survey). Altogether, over five-thousand responses to the survey were collected, both online and in focus groups.

The electronic survey was emailed to a 20% stratified sample of the ADF by DSPPR on 31 January 2012. Out of the 21,099 members who were invited to participate (11,771 permanent ADF and 9,328 reservists), 4,766 provided valid responses (3,639 permanent ADF and 1,127 reservists).

The paper survey was administered in small focus groups (generally less than 15 participants) that were convened by the Review at ADF establishments around Australia. The Review collected 523 responses, and 95% of these were permanent ADF members (n=497).

Due to the different methodologies used for the collection of these responses, as well as the different demographic of the respondents, the sub-samples have not been combined for the purposes of analysis. In most cases throughout the Report, references to the *Treatment of Women in the ADF Survey* defer to the electronic survey results because of the size and demographics of this sample.

Caveats

The following caveats apply to the material and analyses in this appendix:

- The survey data has been derived from a sample of the target population who were motivated to respond, and who made an autonomous decision to do so. It may not necessarily be representative of the entire ADF population.
- The total number of responses is different for each question and the percentages are based on differing totals.
- Members may have withdrawn from focus groups or not completed the paper survey on account of personal experiences of sexual discrimination/harassment/abuse and this may in turn impact on the accuracy of the results.
- Survey questions may have been interpreted differently by respondents. For example, 4.7% of all survey respondents made comments at the end of the survey suggesting a belief that the survey questions were biased. This perception may have impacted on how they interpreted and responded to those items of concern.
- For the electronic survey, respondents may have experience in both permanents and Reserves, however this won't be reflected in results as the permanents sample was only asked length of service in permanents, Reserves only asked about length of service in Reserves.
- Results are only disaggregated by rank groupings for electronic survey respondents, because of the small numbers involved in the paper sample, particularly at Senior Officer level.

Demographics

The electronic sample comprised of:

- 78% men (n=3728), 22% women (n=1,032)
- 47% Army (n=2,214), 30% Air Force (n=1,414), 24% Navy (n=1,138)
- 30% JNCOs (n=1,418), 31% SNCOs (n=1,461), 29% Junior Officers (n=1,383), 10% Senior Officers (n=494)¹

The paper sample comprised of:

- 55% men (n=279), 45% women (n=232)
- 48% Army (n=250), 29% Navy (n=149), 23% Air Force (n=121)
- 47% JNCOs (n=242), 25% SNCOs (n=127), 26% Junior Officers (n=133), 3% Senior Officers (n=16)

Results

The results are organised into the following sections:

- a) Career management
- b) Mentoring and development
- c) Career progression
- d) Women's representation in the ADF, leadership
- e) Work and family balance
- f) Flexible working arrangements and impact on career
- g) Impact of family responsibilities on career development
- h) Child care
- i) Consideration of family circumstances
- j) Sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse
- k) Reporting sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse
- l) ADF policies and implementations

Each subsection above contains a brief overview, and select findings and figures as appropriate.

Tables

There are two groups of tables presented:

1. Electronic survey, all items disaggregated by gender
2. Paper survey, all items disaggregated by gender

Appendix B.2 – Results

(a) Career management

A majority of respondents gave positive responses to the items about career development. 81% of electronic respondents, and 59% of paper respondents agreed that their 'career development has generally been good'. 82% of electronic respondents and 87% of paper survey respondents agreed that they 'can access adequate information to manage [their] career.' There was very little difference between the genders in response to these items.

(b) Mentoring and development

Over 80% of all respondents agreed that they had 'sufficient access to learning and development opportunities'.

For the statement 'mentoring and networking opportunities are available to provide role models, information and advice for women progressing through their careers', the survey revealed that:

- Among electronic survey respondents 28% of women and 5% of men disagreed
- Among paper survey respondents 20% of women and 5% of men disagreed
- At Senior Officer ranks, 41% of women and 8% of men disagreed (electronic sample only).

(c) Career progression

A majority of respondents were positive about items dealing with career progression and opportunities. In both samples, a majority of respondents believed that both men and women were promoted on merit. The majority of men and women agreed that 'women have the same career advancement opportunities as men', 'women are well represented in career streams where there are good opportunities for progression', but more women than men disagreed with these items. Women were also more likely to agree that 'women hit a glass ceiling at Lieutenant Colonel/Commander/Wing Commander level.' Select findings for specific statements are provided below:

'Women have the same career advancement opportunities as men in my Service':

- Among electronic survey respondents 26% of women and 13% of men disagreed with the statement
- Among paper survey respondents 15% of women and 11% of men disagreed
- At Senior Officer ranks, 44% of women and 14% of men disagreed (electronic sample only).

'Women are well represented in career streams where there are good opportunities for progression':

- Among electronic survey respondents 20% of women and 8% of men disagreed
- Among paper survey respondents 12% of women and 7% of men disagreed
- At Senior Officer ranks, 35% of women and 13% of men disagreed (electronic sample only).

'Women hit a glass ceiling at Lieutenant Colonel/Commander/Wing Commander' level':

- A large proportion of both men and women did not know whether 'women hit a glass ceiling at Lieutenant Colonel/Commander/Wing Commander level'
- Among electronic survey respondents 26% of women and 7% of men agreed
- Among paper survey respondents 22% of women and 4% of men agreed
- At Senior Officer ranks, 46% of women and 7% of men agreed (electronic sample only).

(d) Women's representation in the ADF leadership

Women were more likely than men to agree that there should be more women in the ADF and leadership positions. Most of the items dealing with women's representation had sizable groups of respondents answering 'don't know'. Very few respondents did not believe that 'there will be more women in leadership positions in the ADF in the coming years', and nearly all respondents were 'comfortable working for women of senior rank'. Select findings appear below:

'The ADF should increase the representation of women in the ADF workforce':

- Among electronic survey respondents 53% of women and 34% of men agreed
- Among paper survey respondents 55% of women and 38% of men agreed

'There should be more women in leadership positions in the ADF' select findings:

- Among electronic survey respondents 62% of women and 32% of men agreed
- Among paper survey respondents 64% of women and 37% of men agreed

'There will be more women in leadership in the ADF in the coming years' select findings:

- Among electronic survey respondents only 4% of women and 3% of men disagreed
- Among paper survey respondents only 3% of women and 3% of men disagreed

(e) Work and family balance

About three-quarters of all respondents agreed that their 'workplace encourages a healthy balance between my work, home and family life' and that they are 'able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life'. Among electronic survey respondents, the responses were similar for both genders, while among paper survey respondents, women were more likely to agree with these items than men.

(f) Flexible working arrangements and impact on career

A total of 46% of electronic survey respondents, and 39% of paper survey respondents agreed that they 'would feel comfortable in applying for part-time or flexible work arrangements'. These numbers dropped further to 39% (electronic) and 33% (paper) when respondents were asked if they would 'would feel comfortable asking for part-time or flexible work arrangements if promoted'. Women were slightly more likely to be comfortable asking for flexible arrangements than men.

Most respondents agreed that 'some career streams are better able to allow flexible work practices than others' and few did not think that accessing flexible work would have a negative impact on their careers.

'If I accessed flexible working arrangements (such as working part time) my career progression would be negatively impacted' select findings:

- 20% of electronic survey respondents and 19% of the paper survey respondents disagreed with this item

(g) Impact of family responsibilities on career development

More women than men agreed that family or caring responsibilities impacted on their career, and on their ability to go on deployment. The difference between men's and women's responses was widest at the level of Senior Officer. About half of all respondents believed that deployment was necessary for their career progression.

'My career is impacted by family/caring responsibilities' select findings:

- Among electronic survey respondents 57% of women and 36% of men agreed
- Among paper survey respondents 33% of women and 28% of men agreed

'Family responsibilities affect my ability to go on deployment' select findings:

- Among electronic survey respondents 56% of women and 39% of men agreed
- Among paper survey respondents 38% of women and 26% of men agreed

(h) Child care

More respondents believed that better access to childcare would improve their career prospects compared to those who did not.

'ADF members have adequate access to child care' select findings:

- Among electronic survey respondents 23% of women and 28% of men agreed
- Among paper survey respondents 24% of women and 27% of men agreed

'Better access to child care would improve my ability to access opportunities for career progression' select findings:

- Among electronic survey respondents 38% of women and 31% of men agreed
- Among paper survey respondents 23% of women and 28% of men agreed

(i) Consideration of family circumstances

There were mixed responses to the item about the consideration given to family situations when considering postings, and there was majority support for differential gender treatment in the context of the different life courses of women and men. Nearly half of all respondents believed that the ADF considers their family circumstances when considering postings and deployment. Women were more likely to agree that the ADF should be more flexible to the different life courses of men and women, although about half of all male respondents agreed with this proposition as well.

'The ADF should be more flexible to the different life courses of men and women e.g. women taking time out to have children, caring responsibilities' select findings:

- Among electronic survey respondents 61% of women and 49% of men agreed
- Among paper survey respondents 61% of women and 54% of men agreed

(j) Sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse

Men and women had very different perceptions of how sexual 'reputations' could influence military careers. Women were twice as likely as men to believe that a woman's 'reputation' could inhibit her career. There were also different responses by gender to the item about whether women were more likely than men to experience sexual harassment, discrimination or abuse in the ADF, and that such an experience would have a negative impact on career progression. Select findings appear below:

'A woman's 'reputation' regarding her sexual behaviour can inhibit her military career':

- Among electronic survey respondents 68% of women and 34% of men agreed
- Among paper survey respondents 62% of women and 31% of men agreed

'Women are more likely to experience sexual harassment or discrimination in the ADF than men':

- Among electronic survey respondents 65% of women and 40% of men agreed
- Among paper survey respondents 54% of women and 39% of men agreed

'Women are more likely to experience sexual abuse in the ADF than men':

- Among electronic survey respondents 54% of women and 39% of men agreed
- Among paper survey respondents 52% of women and 39% of men agreed

'Experiencing sexual harassment or sex discrimination in the ADF have a negative impact on career progress':

- Among electronic survey respondents 60% of women and 41% of men agreed
- Among paper survey respondents 51% of women and 42% of men agreed

(k) Reporting sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse

A majority of respondents believed that if they reported an incident of unacceptable behaviour appropriate action would be taken. However about one-third of women, and nearly one-in-five men either did not believe that action would be taken, or were unsure. Large numbers of women (over half) and men (about one-third) also either agreed with or were unsure if reporting an incident would have a negative impact on their career.

‘If I report an incident of unacceptable behaviour I believe appropriate action will be taken’ select findings:

- Among electronic survey respondents 21% of women disagreed and 14% were unsure, 10% of men disagreed and 8% were unsure
- Among paper survey respondents 13% of women disagreed and 16% were unsure, 5% of men disagreed and 11% were unsure

‘Reporting sexual harassment, sex discrimination or sexual abuse would have a negative impact on my career’ select findings:

- Among electronic survey respondents 34% of women agreed and 27% were unsure, 12% of men agreed and 20% were unsure
- Among paper survey respondents 22% of women agreed and 33% were unsure, 11% of men agreed and 22% were unsure

(I) ADF policies and implementations

Across all of the ADF policies and implementation items, a majority of women and men were positive about ADF policies and their application by their CO/manager. While responses by gender were similar to most of these items, there were some notable divergences including those listed below.

‘The ADF supports women through the different stages of their lives (e.g. as mothers, carers)’:

- Among electronic survey respondents 28% of women and 7% of men disagreed
- Among paper survey respondents 15% of women and 9% of men disagreed

‘The ADF supports the recruitment and retention of women’:

- Among electronic survey respondents 19% of women and 3% of men disagreed
- Among paper survey respondents 13% of women and 4% of men agreed

Appendix B.3 – Survey tables, responses by gender

Electronic Survey

Table 1: My career development has generally been good
(Male n=3726, Female n=1029)

My career development has generally been good.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	2.6%	12.6%	2.8%	68.1%	14.0%	100.0%
Female	2.9%	16.4%	2.5%	64.3%	13.8%	100.0%
Total	2.6%	13.4%	2.7%	67.3%	13.9%	100.0%

Table 2: I can access adequate information to manage my career

(Male n=3717, Female n=1024)

I can access adequate information to manage my career.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.9%	11.2%	4.2%	70.8%	11.9%	100.0%
Female	1.9%	13.7%	5.0%	66.9%	12.6%	100.0%
Total	1.9%	11.7%	4.4%	69.9%	12.0%	100.0%

Table 3: Men are promoted on merit

(Male n=3715, Female n=1023)

Men are promoted on merit.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	3.6%	15.6%	7.9%	62.3%	10.5%	100.0%
Female	3.4%	17.3%	16.7%	54.8%	7.7%	100.0%
Total	3.6%	16.0%	9.8%	60.7%	9.9%	100.0%

Table 4: Women are promoted on merit

(Male n=3709, Female n=1019)

Women are promoted on merit.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	5.0%	19.0%	11.8%	55.1%	9.1%	100.0%
Female	3.8%	19.1%	17.6%	52.5%	7.0%	100.0%
Total	4.7%	19.1%	13.1%	54.5%	8.6%	100.0%

Table 5: I am comfortable working for women of superior rank

(Male n=3713, Female n=1025)

I am comfortable working for women of superior rank.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.8%	2.3%	3.2%	57.1%	36.5%	100.0%
Female	0.6%	2.0%	1.9%	60.2%	35.3%	100.0%
Total	0.8%	2.3%	2.9%	57.8%	36.3%	100.0%

Table 6: There should be more women in leadership positions in the ADF
(Male n=3700, Female n=1026)

There should be more women in leadership positions in the ADF.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	3.7%	20.1%	44.5%	25.9%	5.7%	100.0%
Female	1.0%	10.0%	26.9%	37.3%	24.8%	100.0%
Total	3.1%	17.9%	40.7%	28.4%	9.9%	100.0%

Table 7: There will be more women in leadership in the ADF in coming years
(Male n=3718, Female n=1024)

There will be more women in leadership in the ADF in coming years.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.5%	2.8%	31.5%	54.8%	10.4%	100.0%
Female	0.5%	5.2%	31.6%	46.3%	16.4%	100.0%
Total	0.5%	3.3%	31.5%	53.0%	11.7%	100.0%

Table 8: The ADF should increase the representation of women in the ADF workforce
(Male n=3700, Female n=1022)

The ADF should increase the representation of women in the ADF workforce.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	4.1%	26.1%	35.6%	30.0%	4.1%	100.0%
Female	1.4%	20.3%	25.2%	40.2%	12.9%	100.0%
Total	3.5%	24.9%	33.4%	32.2%	6.0%	100.0%

Table 9: Women have the same career advancement opportunities as men in my service
(Male n=3713, Female n=1024)

Women have the same career advancement opportunities as men in my service.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	2.3%	10.5%	7.6%	55.6%	24.0%	100.0%
Female	4.9%	21.3%	11.6%	48.2%	14.0%	100.0%
Total	2.8%	12.9%	8.5%	54.0%	21.8%	100.0%

Table 10: Women are well represented in career streams where there are good opportunities for progression

(Male n=3718, Female n=1024)

Women are well represented in career streams where there are good opportunities for progression.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.6%	7.2%	20.3%	57.6%	14.4%	100.0%
Female	2.4%	17.8%	22.5%	49.7%	7.6%	100.0%
Total	1.0%	9.4%	20.8%	55.9%	12.9%	100.0%

Table 11: Mentoring and networking opportunities are available to provide role models, information and advice for women progressing through their careers

(Male n=3711, Female n=1024)

Mentoring and networking opportunities are available to provide role models, information and advice for women progressing through their careers.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.6%	4.6%	34.3%	49.3%	11.1%	100.0%
Female	3.7%	24.7%	21.6%	42.0%	8.0%	100.0%
Total	1.3%	9.0%	31.6%	47.7%	10.4%	100.0%

Table 12: Women hit a glass ceiling at Lieutenant Colonel/Commander/Wing Commander level

(Male n=3718, Female n=1024)

Women hit a glass ceiling at Lieutenant Colonel/Commander/Wing Commander level.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	16.1%	32.1%	45.4%	5.4%	1.1%	100.0%
Female	4.1%	18.4%	51.5%	20.5%	5.6%	100.0%
Total	13.5%	29.1%	46.7%	8.6%	2.0%	100.0%

Table 13: I have sufficient access to learning and development opportunities to improve my skills

(Male n=3711, Female n=1023)

I have sufficient access to learning and development opportunities to improve my skills.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.7%	9.2%	3.2%	74.3%	11.5%	100.0%
Female	1.0%	13.8%	5.5%	65.1%	14.7%	100.0%
Total	1.6%	10.2%	3.7%	72.3%	12.2%	100.0%

Table 14: My workplace encourages a healthy balance between my work, home and family life
(Male n=3709, Female n=1023)

My workplace encourages a healthy balance between my work, home and family life.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	4.3%	14.7%	5.7%	61.6%	13.6%	100.0%
Female	4.4%	14.8%	6.1%	55.7%	19.1%	100.0%
Total	4.3%	14.7%	5.8%	60.3%	14.8%	100.0%

Table 15: I am able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life
(Male n=3704, Female n=1022)

I am able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	2.7%	14.4%	4.6%	67.5%	10.7%	100.0%
Female	3.7%	15.0%	4.1%	62.9%	14.3%	100.0%
Total	2.9%	14.6%	4.5%	66.5%	11.4%	100.0%

Table 16: In my current role, I would feel comfortable in applying for part time or flexible work arrangements
(Male n=3709, Female n=1019)

In my current role, I would feel comfortable in applying for part time or flexible work arrangements.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	13.9%	27.7%	15.5%	35.0%	7.9%	100.0%
Female	8.0%	25.1%	14.7%	37.4%	14.7%	100.0%
Total	12.6%	27.1%	15.4%	35.5%	9.4%	100.0%

Table 17: If I was promoted, I would feel comfortable asking for part time or flexible work arrangements
(Male n=3710, Female n=1018)

If I was promoted, I would feel comfortable asking for part time or flexible work arrangements.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	13.5%	28.2%	20.7%	31.5%	6.1%	100.0%
Female	7.8%	28.4%	19.8%	34.5%	9.5%	100.0%
Total	12.3%	28.3%	20.5%	32.1%	6.8%	100.0%

Table 18: Some career streams are better able to allow flexible work practices than others
(Male n=3712, Female n=1020)

Some career streams are better able to allow flexible work practices than others.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.8%	2.0%	13.0%	57.4%	26.8%	100.0%
Female	0.6%	2.7%	14.4%	55.6%	26.7%	100.0%
Total	0.8%	2.2%	13.3%	57.0%	26.8%	100.0%

Table 19: Family responsibilities affect my ability to go on deployment
(Male n=3133, Female n=767)

Family responsibilities affect my ability to go on deployment.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	9.9%	48.0%	3.6%	28.2%	10.4%	100.0%
Female	7.6%	33.4%	3.1%	28.4%	27.5%	100.0%
Total	9.4%	45.1%	3.5%	28.2%	13.7%	100.0%

Table 20: Deployment is necessary for my career progression
(Male n=3667, Female n=1013)

Deployment is necessary for my career progression.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	4.8%	37.0%	9.4%	34.0%	14.8%	100.0%
Female	5.5%	33.6%	11.0%	33.6%	16.4%	100.0%
Total	4.9%	36.3%	9.8%	33.9%	15.1%	100.0%

Table 21: My career is impacted by family/caring responsibilities
(Male n=3051, Female n=764)

My career is impacted by family/caring responsibilities.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	7.0%	50.1%	7.1%	28.8%	6.9%	100.0%
Female	4.8%	33.2%	4.8%	35.1%	22.0%	100.0%
Total	6.6%	46.7%	6.7%	30.1%	9.9%	100.0%

Table 22: ADF members have adequate access to child care
(Male n=3661, Female n=1011)

ADF members have adequate access to child care.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	8.2%	17.4%	46.9%	23.9%	3.6%	100.0%
Female	10.1%	21.3%	45.7%	19.0%	4.0%	100.0%
Total	8.6%	18.3%	46.6%	22.9%	3.7%	100.0%

Table 23: Better access to child care would improve my ability to access opportunities for career progression
(Male n=2442, Female n=607)

Better access to child care would improve my ability to access opportunities for career progression.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	6.7%	28.5%	33.9%	21.9%	9.0%	100.0%
Female	6.6%	23.9%	31.3%	24.5%	13.7%	100.0%
Total	6.7%	27.6%	33.4%	22.4%	9.9%	100.0%

Table 24: If I accessed flexible working arrangements (such as working part time) my career progression would be negatively impacted
(Male n=3656, Female n=1013)

If I accessed flexible working arrangements (such as working part time) my career progression would be negatively impacted.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	2.9%	17.3%	34.7%	33.5%	11.7%	100.0%
Female	3.3%	14.5%	33.1%	36.7%	12.4%	100.0%
Total	3.0%	16.7%	34.4%	34.2%	11.8%	100.0%

Table 25: The ADF considers my family circumstances when considering postings/deployment
(Male n=3183, Female n=797)

The ADF considers my family circumstances when considering postings/deployment.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	11.2%	26.6%	16.7%	41.2%	4.4%	100.0%
Female	10.3%	22.2%	18.8%	43.4%	5.3%	100.0%
Total	11.0%	25.7%	17.1%	41.7%	4.6%	100.0%

Table 26: The ADF should be more flexible towards the different life courses of men and women e.g. women taking time out to have children, caring responsibilities
(Male n=3662, Female n=1013)

The ADF should be more flexible towards the different life courses of men and women e.g. women taking time out to have children, caring responsibilities.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	6.3%	25.1%	20.0%	40.5%	8.1%	100.0%
Female	2.7%	16.0%	19.9%	42.8%	18.6%	100.0%
Total	5.5%	23.1%	20.0%	41.0%	10.4%	100.0%

Table 27: A woman's 'reputation' regarding her sexual behaviour can inhibit her military career
(Male n=3657, Female n=1012)

A woman's 'reputation' regarding her sexual behaviour can inhibit her military career.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	7.6%	32.6%	25.1%	28.4%	6.3%	100.0%
Female	1.1%	13.8%	17.4%	40.7%	27.0%	100.0%
Total	6.2%	28.5%	23.4%	31.0%	10.8%	100.0%

Table 28: A man's 'reputation' regarding his sexual behaviour can inhibit his military career
(Male n=3663, Female n=1015)

A man's 'reputation' regarding his sexual behaviour can inhibit his military career.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	8.7%	42.6%	23.2%	22.4%	3.0%	100.0%
Female	16.2%	53.1%	17.6%	10.8%	2.3%	100.0%
Total	10.3%	44.9%	22.0%	19.9%	2.9%	100.0%

Table 29: Women are more likely to experience sexual harassment or discrimination in the ADF than men
(Male n=3650, Female n=1012)

Women are more likely to experience sexual harassment or discrimination in the ADF than men.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	8.7%	27.6%	19.9%	38.4%	5.4%	100.0%
Female	2.9%	18.7%	14.0%	44.8%	19.7%	100.0%
Total	7.4%	25.7%	18.6%	39.8%	8.5%	100.0%

Table 30: Women are more likely to experience sexual abuse in the ADF than men
(Male n=3658, Female n=1014)

Women are more likely to experience sexual abuse in the ADF than men.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	6.8%	22.9%	31.1%	35.0%	4.2%	100.0%
Female	2.7%	16.7%	26.6%	40.5%	13.5%	100.0%
Total	5.9%	21.5%	30.1%	36.2%	6.2%	100.0%

Table 31: Experiencing sexual harassment or sex discrimination in the ADF would have a negative impact on career progress
(Male n=3649, Female n=1008)

Experiencing sexual harassment or sex discrimination in the ADF would have a negative impact on career progress.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	6.4%	23.2%	29.8%	33.2%	7.5%	100.0%
Female	3.2%	12.7%	24.7%	43.0%	16.5%	100.0%
Total	5.7%	20.9%	28.7%	35.3%	9.4%	100.0%

Table 32: Experiencing sexual abuse in the ADF would have a negative impact on career progress
(Male n=3652, Female n=1016)

Experiencing sexual abuse in the ADF would have a negative impact on career progress.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	6.5%	22.7%	30.1%	32.2%	8.5%	100.0%
Female	3.4%	12.7%	26.2%	39.5%	18.2%	100.0%
Total	5.8%	20.5%	29.2%	33.8%	10.6%	100.0%

Table 33: If I report an incident of unacceptable behaviour I believe appropriate action will be taken
(Male n=3657, Female n=1016)

If I report an incident of unacceptable behaviour I believe appropriate action will be taken.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	3.1%	6.5%	7.5%	54.9%	28.1%	100.0%
Female	5.6%	14.0%	14.2%	49.1%	17.1%	100.0%
Total	3.6%	8.1%	9.0%	53.6%	25.7%	100.0%

Table 34: Reporting sexual harassment, sex discrimination or sexual abuse would have a negative impact on my career

(Male n=3663, Female n=1017)

Reporting sexual harassment, sex discrimination or sexual abuse would have a negative impact on my career.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	22.4%	45.9%	19.9%	8.8%	3.0%	100.0%
Female	9.3%	29.4%	27.4%	25.5%	8.4%	100.0%
Total	19.6%	42.3%	21.6%	12.4%	4.2%	100.0%

Table 35: The ADF is a family friendly employer

(Male n=3629, Female n=1007)

The ADF is a family friendly employer.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	4.5%	22.5%	9.2%	57.4%	6.5%	100.0%
Female	3.8%	22.3%	12.2%	55.1%	6.6%	100.0%
Total	4.3%	22.5%	9.8%	56.9%	6.5%	100.0%

Table 36: The ADF supports the use of a range of flexible work practices

(Male n=3622, Female n=1004)

The ADF supports the use of a range of flexible work practices.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	3.6%	19.9%	21.0%	51.2%	4.3%	100.0%
Female	2.7%	18.4%	19.3%	53.5%	6.1%	100.0%
Total	3.4%	19.6%	20.6%	51.7%	4.7%	100.0%

Table 37: The ADF supports women through the different stages of their lives e.g. as mothers, carers

(Male n=3627, Female n=1007)

The ADF supports women through the different stages of their lives e.g. as mothers, carers.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.8%	6.6%	25.5%	55.5%	11.7%	100.0%
Female	3.8%	23.9%	21.2%	45.2%	6.0%	100.0%
Total	1.4%	10.3%	24.6%	53.2%	10.4%	100.0%

Table 38: The ADF supports the recruitment and retention of women
(Male n=3628, Female n=1006)

The ADF supports the recruitment and retention of women.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.5%	2.9%	15.2%	63.1%	18.3%	100.0%
Female	3.0%	15.8%	17.0%	54.6%	9.6%	100.0%
Total	1.0%	5.7%	15.6%	61.2%	16.4%	100.0%

Table 39: The ADF is committed to improving the representation of women in senior ranks
(Male n=3624, Female n=1005)

The ADF is committed to improving the representation of women in senior ranks.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.5%	1.6%	35.0%	48.3%	14.6%	100.0%
Female	2.9%	11.5%	36.1%	41.9%	7.6%	100.0%
Total	1.0%	3.8%	35.2%	46.9%	13.0%	100.0%

Table 40: My CO/manager is a family friendly employer
(Male n=3617, Female n=1002)

My CO/manager is a family friendly employer.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.5%	4.8%	16.3%	57.8%	19.5%	100.0%
Female	1.7%	5.1%	18.0%	54.1%	21.2%	100.0%
Total	1.5%	4.9%	16.7%	57.0%	19.9%	100.0%

Table 41: My CO/manager supports the use of a range of flexible work practices
(Male n=3608, Female n=1003)

My CO/manager supports the use of a range of flexible work practices.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	2.3%	8.4%	28.0%	48.6%	12.7%	100.0%
Female	2.1%	7.1%	30.0%	45.5%	15.4%	100.0%
Total	2.3%	8.1%	28.4%	47.9%	13.3%	100.0%

Table 42: My CO/manager supports women through the different stages of their lives e.g. as mothers, carers

(Male n=3614, Female n=1003)

My CO/manager supports women through the different stages of their lives e.g. as mothers, carers.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.5%	1.4%	36.4%	46.1%	15.5%	100.0%
Female	1.3%	5.0%	35.1%	43.7%	15.0%	100.0%
Total	0.7%	2.2%	36.1%	45.6%	15.4%	100.0%

Table 43: My CO/manager supports the recruitment and retention of women

(Male n=3605, Female n=997)

My CO/manager supports the recruitment and retention of women.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.4%	1.1%	32.1%	49.2%	17.2%	100.0%
Female	1.1%	3.2%	34.2%	45.9%	15.5%	100.0%
Total	0.6%	1.5%	32.6%	48.5%	16.8%	100.0%

Table 44: My CO/manager is committed to improving the representation of women in senior ranks

(Male n=3603, Female n=1001)

My CO/manager is committed to improving the representation of women in senior ranks.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.5%	1.4%	51.9%	33.7%	12.4%	100.0%
Female	1.3%	4.4%	47.6%	35.4%	11.4%	100.0%
Total	0.7%	2.1%	51.0%	34.1%	12.2%	100.0%

Paper Survey

Table 45: My career development has generally been good
(Male n=278, Female n=231)

My career development has generally been good.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	6.5%	29.1%	4.3%	46.4%	13.7%	100.0%
Female	9.5%	28.6%	3.9%	42.9%	15.2%	100.0%
Total	7.9%	28.9%	4.1%	44.8%	14.3%	100.0%

Table 46: I can access adequate information to manage my career
(Male n=279, Female n=231)

I can access adequate information to manage my career.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.4%	7.9%	3.9%	69.9%	16.8%	100.0%
Female	0.9%	7.8%	4.3%	64.5%	22.5%	100.0%
Total	1.2%	7.8%	4.1%	67.5%	19.4%	100.0%

Table 47: Men are promoted on merit
(Male n=278, Female n=231)

Men are promoted on merit.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.1%	11.2%	12.9%	62.2%	12.6%	100.0%
Female	0.9%	13.9%	16.9%	55.8%	12.6%	100.0%
Total	1.0%	12.4%	14.7%	59.3%	12.6%	100.0%

Table 48: Women are promoted on merit
(Male n=274, Female n=229)

Women are promoted on merit.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.5%	12.0%	16.1%	58.8%	11.7%	100.0%
Female	0.9%	14.0%	18.8%	54.1%	12.2%	100.0%
Total	1.2%	12.9%	17.3%	56.7%	11.9%	100.0%

Table 49: I am comfortable working for women of superior rank
(Male n=277, Female n=229)

I am comfortable working for women of superior rank.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.1%	1.1%	4.0%	63.5%	30.3%	100.0%
Female		1.3%	0.9%	54.6%	43.2%	100.0%
Total	0.6%	1.2%	2.6%	59.5%	36.2%	100.0%

Table 50: There should be more women in leadership positions in the ADF
(Male n=277, Female n=227)

There should be more women in leadership positions in the ADF.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.7%	14.1%	48.4%	27.4%	9.4%	100.0%
Female		7.0%	28.6%	41.0%	23.3%	100.0%
Total	0.4%	10.9%	39.5%	33.5%	15.7%	100.0%

Table 51: There will be more women in leadership in the ADF in coming years
(Male n=278, Female n=228)

There will be more women in leadership in the ADF in coming years.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male		2.5%	30.2%	56.8%	10.4%	100.0%
Female		3.1%	32.0%	52.2%	12.7%	100.0%
Total		2.8%	31.0%	54.7%	11.5%	100.0%

Table 52: The ADF should increase the representation of women in the ADF workforce
(Male n=273, Female n=226)

The ADF should increase the representation of women in the ADF workforce.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.5%	19.0%	41.8%	32.6%	5.1%	100.0%
Female	0.4%	16.8%	27.9%	41.2%	13.7%	100.0%
Total	1.0%	18.0%	35.5%	36.5%	9.0%	100.0%

Table 53: Women have the same career advancement opportunities as men in my service.
(Male n=277, Female n=230)

Women have the same career advancement opportunities as men in my service.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.8%	8.7%	8.7%	58.1%	22.7%	100.0%
Female	1.3%	13.5%	11.3%	54.3%	19.6%	100.0%
Total	1.6%	10.8%	9.9%	56.4%	21.3%	100.0%

Table 54: Women are well represented in career streams where there are good opportunities for progression
(Male n=279, Female n=229)

Women are well represented in career streams where there are good opportunities for progression.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male		7.2%	19.0%	58.1%	15.8%	100.0%
Female	0.9%	11.4%	21.0%	54.6%	12.2%	100.0%
Total	0.4%	9.1%	19.9%	56.5%	14.2%	100.0%

Table 55: Mentoring and networking opportunities are available to provide role models, information and advice for women progressing through their careers
(Male n=278, Female n=229)

Mentoring and networking opportunities are available to provide role models, information and advice for women progressing through their careers.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male		5.0%	34.5%	49.6%	10.8%	100.0%
Female	2.2%	17.5%	21.0%	50.2%	9.2%	100.0%
Total	1.0%	10.7%	28.4%	49.9%	10.1%	100.0%

Table 56: Women hit a glass ceiling at Lieutenant Colonel/Commander/Wing Commander level
(Male n=277, Female n=230)

Women hit a glass ceiling at Lieutenant Colonel/Commander/Wing Commander level.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	9.7%	29.2%	57.0%	3.6%	0.4%	100.0%
Female	3.5%	19.6%	54.8%	17.8%	4.3%	100.0%
Total	6.9%	24.9%	56.0%	10.1%	2.2%	100.0%

Table 57: I have sufficient access to learning and development opportunities to improve my skills
(Male n=278, Female n=231)

I have sufficient access to learning and development opportunities to improve my skills.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.7%	6.1%	5.4%	69.1%	18.7%	100.0%
Female	0.4%	6.9%	3.5%	73.6%	15.6%	100.0%
Total	0.6%	6.5%	4.5%	71.1%	17.3%	100.0%

Table 58: My workplace encourages a healthy balance between my work, home and family life
(Male n=278, Female n=231)

My workplace encourages a healthy balance between my work, home and family life.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	2.9%	20.5%	9.4%	55.4%	11.9%	100.0%
Female	3.0%	15.2%	4.8%	58.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Total	2.9%	18.1%	7.3%	56.6%	15.1%	100.0%

Table 59: I am able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life
(Male n=277, Female n=231)

I am able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.4%	20.2%	7.9%	61.0%	9.4%	100.0%
Female	2.2%	15.6%	5.6%	60.6%	16.0%	100.0%
Total	1.8%	18.1%	6.9%	60.8%	12.4%	100.0%

Table 60: In my current role, I would feel comfortable in applying for part time or flexible work arrangements
(Male n=274, Female n=229)

In my current role, I would feel comfortable in applying for part time or flexible work arrangements.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	17.5%	32.8%	15.7%	26.3%	7.7%	100.0%
Female	7.0%	31.4%	16.2%	32.8%	12.7%	100.0%
Total	12.7%	32.2%	15.9%	29.2%	9.9%	100.0%

Table 61: If I was promoted, I would feel comfortable asking for part time or flexible work arrangements
(Male n=277, Female n=230)

If I was promoted, I would feel comfortable asking for part time or flexible work arrangements.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	15.5%	31.0%	24.9%	20.9%	7.6%	100.0%
Female	4.3%	29.6%	27.8%	29.6%	8.7%	100.0%
Total	10.5%	30.4%	26.2%	24.9%	8.1%	100.0%

Table 62: Some career streams are better able to allow flexible work practices than others
(Male n=279, Female n=231)

Some career streams are better able to allow flexible work practices than others.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.4%	2.2%	15.8%	54.5%	26.2%	100.0%
Female	0.4%	3.5%	20.3%	47.2%	28.6%	100.0%
Total	1.0%	2.7%	17.8%	51.2%	27.3%	100.0%

Table 63: Family responsibilities affect my ability to go on deployment
(Male n=279, Female n=223)

Family responsibilities affect my ability to go on deployment.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	12.2%	48.4%	13.6%	20.4%	5.4%	100.0%
Female	12.1%	38.6%	11.2%	22.4%	15.7%	100.0%
Total	12.2%	44.0%	12.5%	21.3%	10.0%	100.0%

Table 64: Deployment is necessary for my career progression
(Male n=277, Female n=227)

Deployment is necessary for my career progression.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	3.6%	33.6%	11.2%	36.8%	14.8%	100.0%
Female	5.3%	31.7%	11.9%	37.9%	13.2%	100.0%
Total	4.4%	32.7%	11.5%	37.3%	14.1%	100.0%

Table 65: My career is impacted by family/caring responsibilities
(Male n=279, Female n=222)

My career is impacted by family/caring responsibilities.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	11.1%	47.0%	14.0%	24.4%	3.6%	100.0%
Female	9.0%	43.7%	14.0%	23.0%	10.4%	100.0%
Total	10.2%	45.5%	14.0%	23.8%	6.6%	100.0%

Table 66: ADF members have adequate access to child care
(Male n=278, Female n=229)

ADF members have adequate access to child care.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	11.9%	17.6%	43.9%	21.6%	5.0%	100.0%
Female	6.6%	16.6%	53.3%	17.5%	6.1%	100.0%
Total	9.5%	17.2%	48.1%	19.7%	5.5%	100.0%

Table 67: Better access to child care would improve my ability to access opportunities for career progression
(Male n=272, Female n=217)

Better access to child care would improve my ability to access opportunities for career progression.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	5.1%	18.4%	48.9%	18.4%	9.2%	100.0%
Female	4.1%	14.3%	59.0%	13.8%	8.8%	100.0%
Total	4.7%	16.6%	53.4%	16.4%	9.0%	100.0%

Table 68: If I accessed flexible working arrangements (such as working part time) my career progression would be negatively impacted
(Male n=278, Female n=229)

If I accessed flexible working arrangements (such as working part time) my career progression would be negatively impacted.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	4.3%	15.5%	41.0%	28.8%	10.4%	100.0%
Female	1.7%	16.6%	39.7%	33.2%	8.7%	100.0%
Total	3.2%	16.0%	40.4%	30.8%	9.7%	100.0%

Table 69: The ADF considers my family circumstances when considering postings/deployment
(Male n=276, Female n=225)

The ADF considers my family circumstances when considering postings/deployment.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	10.1%	25.7%	23.6%	36.6%	4.0%	100.0%
Female	6.7%	21.8%	22.2%	41.3%	8.0%	100.0%
Total	8.6%	24.0%	23.0%	38.7%	5.8%	100.0%

Table 70: The ADF should be more flexible towards the different life courses of men and women e.g. women taking time out to have children, caring responsibilities
(Male n=279, Female n=228)

The ADF should be more flexible towards the different life courses of men and women e.g. women taking time out to have children, caring responsibilities.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	5.4%	17.2%	24.0%	42.7%	10.8%	100.0%
Female	2.2%	15.8%	21.1%	45.6%	15.4%	100.0%
Total	3.9%	16.6%	22.7%	44.0%	12.8%	100.0%

Table 71: A woman's 'reputation' regarding her sexual behaviour can inhibit her military career
(Male n=277, Female n=229)

A woman's 'reputation' regarding her sexual behaviour can inhibit her military career.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	3.2%	34.7%	30.7%	26.7%	4.7%	100.0%
Female	1.3%	18.3%	18.3%	36.7%	25.3%	100.0%
Total	2.4%	27.3%	25.1%	31.2%	14.0%	100.0%

Table 72: A man's 'reputation' regarding his sexual behaviour can inhibit his military career
(Male n=278, Female n=230)

A man's 'reputation' regarding his sexual behaviour can inhibit his military career.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	4.3%	41.4%	30.2%	19.8%	4.3%	100.0%
Female	11.3%	46.5%	23.0%	17.4%	1.7%	100.0%
Total	7.5%	43.7%	27.0%	18.7%	3.1%	100.0%

Table 73: Women are more likely to experience sexual harassment or discrimination in the ADF than men
(Male n=278, Female n=231)

Women are more likely to experience sexual harassment or discrimination in the ADF than men.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	6.1%	29.9%	25.5%	33.1%	5.4%	100.0%
Female	3.0%	18.2%	24.7%	39.4%	14.7%	100.0%
Total	4.7%	24.6%	25.1%	36.0%	9.6%	100.0%

Table 74: Women are more likely to experience sexual abuse in the ADF than men
(Male n=279, Female n=229)

Women are more likely to experience sexual abuse in the ADF than men.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	3.6%	25.1%	32.3%	34.1%	5.0%	100.0%
Female	3.1%	18.8%	26.6%	42.8%	8.7%	100.0%
Total	3.3%	22.2%	29.7%	38.0%	6.7%	100.0%

Table 75: Experiencing sexual harassment or sex discrimination in the ADF would have a negative impact on career progress
(Male n=278, Female n=229)

Experiencing sexual harassment or sex discrimination in the ADF would have a negative impact on career progress.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	3.2%	18.0%	36.3%	37.8%	4.7%	100.0%
Female	1.7%	17.0%	30.1%	38.4%	12.7%	100.0%
Total	2.6%	17.6%	33.5%	38.1%	8.3%	100.0%

Table 76: Experiencing sexual abuse in the ADF would have a negative impact on career progress
(Male n=276, Female n=228)

Experiencing sexual abuse in the ADF would have a negative impact on career progress.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	4.0%	17.8%	38.8%	34.4%	5.1%	100.0%
Female	1.8%	18.0%	32.0%	33.3%	14.9%	100.0%
Total	3.0%	17.9%	35.7%	33.9%	9.5%	100.0%

Table 77: If I report an incident of unacceptable behaviour I believe appropriate action will be taken
(Male n=278, Female n=231)

If I report an incident of unacceptable behaviour I believe appropriate action will be taken.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	2.2%	3.2%	10.8%	56.5%	27.3%	100.0%
Female	3.5%	9.5%	15.6%	53.2%	18.2%	100.0%
Total	2.8%	6.1%	13.0%	55.0%	23.2%	100.0%

Table 78: Reporting sexual harassment, sex discrimination or sexual abuse would have a negative impact on my career
(Male n=277, Female n=231)

Reporting sexual harassment, sex discrimination or sexual abuse would have a negative impact on my career.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	17.3%	50.2%	22.0%	7.6%	2.9%	100.0%
Female	8.7%	37.2%	32.5%	18.2%	3.5%	100.0%
Total	13.4%	44.3%	26.8%	12.4%	3.1%	100.0%

Table 79: The ADF is a family friendly employer
(Male n=273, Female n=229)

The ADF is a family friendly employer.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	4.4%	26.0%	15.4%	44.7%	9.5%	100.0%
Female	0.4%	22.3%	13.1%	57.2%	7.0%	100.0%
Total	2.6%	24.3%	14.3%	50.4%	8.4%	100.0%

Table 80: The ADF supports the use of a range of flexible work practices
(Male n=273, Female n=229)

The ADF supports the use of a range of flexible work practices.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	5.1%	22.7%	20.1%	45.8%	6.2%	100.0%
Female	1.3%	14.8%	21.0%	55.5%	7.4%	100.0%
Total	3.4%	19.1%	20.5%	50.2%	6.8%	100.0%

Table 81: The ADF supports women through the different stages of their lives e.g. as mothers, carers
(Male n=272, Female n=229)

The ADF supports women through the different stages of their lives e.g. as mothers, carers.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.8%	7.0%	26.5%	55.1%	9.6%	100.0%
Female	2.2%	12.7%	18.3%	58.1%	8.7%	100.0%
Total	2.0%	9.6%	22.8%	56.5%	9.2%	100.0%

Table 82: The ADF supports the recruitment and retention of women
(Male n=273, Female n=229)

The ADF supports the recruitment and retention of women.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male		4.0%	16.5%	65.6%	13.9%	100.0%
Female	2.2%	10.9%	17.0%	57.6%	12.2%	100.0%
Total	1.0%	7.2%	16.7%	62.0%	13.1%	100.0%

Table 83: The ADF is committed to improving the representation of women in senior ranks
(Male n=272, Female n=228)

The ADF is committed to improving the representation of women in senior ranks.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.4%	3.3%	33.5%	50.7%	12.1%	100.0%
Female	0.9%	7.0%	32.0%	50.9%	9.2%	100.0%
Total	0.6%	5.0%	32.8%	50.8%	10.8%	100.0%

Table 84: My CO/manager is a family friendly employer
(Male n=271, Female n=228)

My CO/manager is a family friendly employer.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.8%	3.7%	21.4%	54.6%	18.5%	100.0%
Female	0.9%	5.3%	15.8%	50.9%	27.2%	100.0%
Total	1.4%	4.4%	18.8%	52.9%	22.4%	100.0%

Table 85: My CO/manager supports the use of a range of flexible work practices
(Male n=272, Female n=228)

My CO/manager supports the use of a range of flexible work practices.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	1.5%	9.6%	34.9%	42.3%	11.8%	100.0%
Female	1.8%	8.8%	25.4%	42.1%	21.9%	100.0%
Total	1.6%	9.2%	30.6%	42.2%	16.4%	100.0%

Table 86: My CO/manager supports women through the different stages of their lives e.g. as mothers, carers
(Male n=272, Female n=227)

My CO/manager supports women through the different stages of their lives e.g. as mothers, carers.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.4%	2.9%	34.9%	49.6%	12.1%	100.0%
Female	0.9%	4.8%	24.7%	46.3%	23.3%	100.0%
Total	0.6%	3.8%	30.3%	48.1%	17.2%	100.0%

Table 87: My CO/manager supports the recruitment and retention of women
(Male n=272, Female n=228)

My CO/manager supports the recruitment and retention of women.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.4%	1.8%	30.1%	52.9%	14.7%	100.0%
Female	1.3%	3.1%	24.6%	47.8%	23.2%	100.0%
Total	0.8%	2.4%	27.6%	50.6%	18.6%	100.0%

Table 88: My CO/manager is committed to improving the representation of women in senior ranks
(Male n=272, Female n=228)

My CO/manager is committed to improving the representation of women in senior ranks.						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Male	0.7%	1.1%	44.1%	40.1%	14.0%	100.0%
Female	0.9%	2.6%	39.0%	36.8%	20.6%	100.0%
Total	0.8%	1.8%	41.8%	38.6%	17.0%	100.0%

Appendix C

Review into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force Survey²

Your Service	Royal Australian Navy	Australian Regular Army		Royal Australian Air Force	
	Royal Australian Navy Reserve	Australian Regular Army Reserve		Royal Australian Air Force Reserve	
Your gender	Male			Female	
Your age	___ years				
Your marital status	Married	Interdependent partnership (includes de facto relationship)	Divorced/ separated	Widowed	Single (never married)
Do you have dependent children or other legal dependents?	Yes			No	
Your rank	Recruit	SMN/PTE(E)/ AC/ACW	AB/LCPL/LAC/ LACW	LS/CPL/CPL(E)	
	PO/SGT	SSGT	CPO/WO2/FSGT	WO/WO1/ WOFF	
	MIDN/OCDT/ SCDT/OFF CADET	ASLT/2 LT/ PLTOFF	SBLT/LT/ FLGOFF	LEUT/CAPT/ FLTLT	
	LCDR/MAJ/ SQNLDR	CMDR/LTCOL/ WGCDR	CAPT/COL/ GPCAPT	CDRE/BRIG/ AIRCDRE and above	
Your length of service in Permanent ADF	___ years			Not applicable	
Your length of service in Reserves	___ years			Not applicable	
Length of time served in your current unit	6 months or less	7 to 12 months	13 to 18 months		
	19 to 24 months	25 to 30 months	31 to 36 months		
	More than 36 months				
Is your current unit the first you have served in?	Yes			No	

Please mark your opinion of the statements on the scale below.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree
My career development has generally been good.					
I can access adequate information to manage my career.					
Men are promoted on merit.					
Women are promoted on merit.					
I am comfortable working for women of superior rank.					
There should be more women in leadership positions in the ADF.					
There will be more women in leadership in the ADF in the coming years.					
The ADF should increase the representation of women in the ADF workforce.					
Women have the same career advancement opportunities as men in my Service.					
Women are well represented in career streams where there are good opportunities for progression.					
Mentoring and networking opportunities are available to provide role models, information and advice for women progressing through their careers.					
Women hit a glass ceiling at Lieutenant Colonel/Commander/Wing Commander level.					
I have sufficient access to learning and development opportunities to improve my skills.					
My workplace encourages a healthy balance between my work, home and family life.					
I am able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life.					

	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree
In my current role, I would feel comfortable in applying for part time or flexible work arrangements.					
If I was promoted, I would feel comfortable asking for part time or flexible work arrangements.					
Some career streams are better able to allow flexible work practices than others.					
Family responsibilities affect my ability to go on deployment.					
Deployment is necessary for my career progression.					
My career is impacted by family/ caring responsibilities.					
ADF members have adequate access to child care.					
Better access to child care would improve my ability to access opportunities for career progression.					
If I accessed flexible working arrangements (such as working part time) my career progression would be negatively impacted.					
The ADF considers my family circumstances when considering postings/deployment.					
The ADF should be more flexible towards the different life courses of men and women eg women taking time out to have children, caring responsibilities.					
A woman's 'reputation' regarding her sexual behaviour can inhibit her military career.					
A man's 'reputation' regarding his sexual behaviour can inhibit his military career.					
Women are more likely to experience sexual harassment or discrimination in the ADF than men.					

	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Women are more likely to experience sexual abuse in the ADF than men.					
Experiencing sexual harassment or sex discrimination in the ADF would have a negative impact on career progress.					
Experiencing sexual abuse in the ADF would have a negative impact on career progress.					
If I report an incident of unacceptable behaviour I believe appropriate action will be taken.					
Reporting sexual harassment, sex discrimination or sexual abuse would have a negative impact on my career.					

Please mark your opinion of the statements on the scale below for both the ADF generally and then for your CO/manager.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree
The ADF is a family friendly employer.					
The ADF supports the use of a range of flexible work practices.					
The ADF supports women through the different stages of their lives, eg as mothers, carers.					
The ADF supports the recruitment and retention of women.					
The ADF is committed to improving the representation of women in senior ranks.					
My CO/manager is a family friendly employer.					
My CO/manager supports the use of a range of flexible work practices.					

	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree
My CO/manager supports women through the different stages of their lives, eg as mothers, carers.					
My CO/manager supports the recruitment and retention of women.					
My CO/manager is committed to improving the representation of women in senior ranks.					

Are there any other comments you would like to make?

Appendix D

Chapter 1: The Case for Change: Why the ADF Should Care about Women's Representation and Progression

Appendix D.1 – Australian National Action Plan on Women Peace and Security 2012-2018

Background

Although they may not often be engaged in combat themselves, women are disproportionately affected by conflict. In conflict situations today, the UN estimates that 90% of casualties are civilians. The majority are women and children.³

The ways in which women and girls experience conflict are wide-ranging and complex, often reflecting the different gender roles and their status in society. Targeted gender-based acts of violence are increasingly used as a weapon of war. Women and girls also face broader challenges in relation to their physical or mental health, wellbeing and economic security.

However, women are not only victims needing protection in the context of conflict. They are also agents of change, participating as combatants in some cases and in others, making significant contributions to conflict prevention and building peace. The exclusion of women from formal decision-making processes means that their role in preventing conflict, peace-building and relief and recovery efforts, remains undervalued and unrecognised.

In 2004, the UN Secretary-General called on Member States to develop national action plans to implement UN Security Council Resolution 1325 ('UNSCR 1325'). Since then, the UN has established a Women, Peace and Security agenda by passing additional Security Council Resolutions. These instruments provide an international framework which recognises the critical role of women's contribution to conflict resolution and sustainable peace.

In October 2000, the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted a landmark resolution on Women, Peace and Security (UNSCR 1325). UNSCR 1325 was the first Security Council Resolution to specifically address the impact of war and armed conflict on women and girls. On 8 March 2012, International Women's Day, the Minister for Women, the Hon Julie Collins, MP, released the *Australian National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security 2012-2018* ('the National Action Plan') that sets the framework for how Australia will implement UNSCR 1325.⁴

The overall aim of UNSCR 1325 is to support, strengthen and increase women's participation and decision making across all areas of prevention, protection and reconstruction of their own countries. There are two main aspects to UNSCR 1325: it calls for the role of women to be increased in the planning, preparation, decision-making and execution with regard to peace missions, and it also calls for more attention to the effects on women of conflicts and peace operations.

UNSCR 1325 provides a general framework for the integration of gender into policy surrounding international peace and security.

There are 5 key themes underpinning UNSCR 1325 and its supporting resolutions:

- 1. Prevention** – incorporating a gender perspective in conflict prevention activities and strategies and recognising the role of women in preventing conflict.
- 2. Participation** – recognising the important role women already play in all aspects of peace and security, and enhancing women's meaningful participation, both domestically and overseas, through:
 - striving for more equal representation of women and men in Australian peace and security institutions

- working with international partners to empower local women to be involved in formal peace and security processes in fragile, conflict and post-conflict settings in which Australia is operating.
3. **Protection** – protecting the human rights of women and girls by working with international partners to ensure safety, physical and mental wellbeing, economic security and equality, with special consideration for protecting women and girls from gender-based violence.
 4. **Relief and Recovery** – ensuring a gender perspective is incorporated in all relief and recovery efforts in order to support the specific needs and recognise the capacity of women and girls.
 5. **Normative** – raising awareness about and developing policy frameworks to progress the Women, Peace and Security agenda, and integrating a gender perspective across government policies on peace and security.⁵

The national action plans aim to improve outcomes for women and girls in these areas. By December 2011, 34 countries had adopted National Action Plans including Canada, the Netherlands, Norway, UK and US.

Australia's role

Australia has been a strong supporter of UNSCR 1325 and the Women, Peace and Security agenda internationally. As part of this, there is already a broad program of work underway to integrate a gender perspective and recognition of gender-specific issues into all of Australia's peace and security efforts, to protect women and girls' human rights, and to promote their participation in conflict prevention, management and resolution.

This work includes:

- The appointment of a Global Ambassador for Women and Girls (responsible for high level advocacy around gender equality and empowerment of women, particularly in the Asia Pacific, with protection of women and girls in conflict zones and women in leadership roles a core part of this mandate).
- Regional cooperation between the AFP and other police forces to facilitate women's participation and protection of human rights.
- Development programs supported by AusAID to supporting representation of women in peace negotiations and their active role in maintaining and promoting peace in their communities.
- Establishment of the Australian Civil-Military Centre to improve Australia's civil-military cooperation regarding conflict and disaster management overseas and protecting the rights of women and girls in these settings.
- Supporting the international framework for human rights and achieve gender equality more broadly.⁶
- The removal of restrictions on women from employment in combat roles to support participation of women in the ADF and this Review into the treatment of women add to this broad program of work.

As a consolidation of these various programs and initiatives, the Australian Government announced the development of its own National Action Plan that would not only articulate Australia's ongoing commitment to UNSCR 1325, but also establish a clear framework which identifies strategies and actions that Australia will undertake both locally and overseas over a 6 year period from 2012-2018.⁷

Australian National Action Plan

The National Action Plan contains a number of high level strategies that the Australian Government will undertake against the thematic areas of UNSCR 1325:

1. Integrate a gender perspective into Australia's policies on peace and security.
2. Embed the Women, Peace and Security agenda in the Australian Government's approach to human resource management of Defence, Australian Federal Police and deployed personnel.
3. Support civil society organisations to promote equality and increase women's participation in conflict prevention, peace-building, conflict resolution, and relief and recovery.
4. Promote Women, Peace and Security implementation internationally.
5. Take a co-ordinated and holistic approach domestically and internationally to Women, Peace and Security.⁸

The National Action Plan also outlines detailed practical actions for the delivery of these strategies, and measures to track their progress over time.

The Government will release a progress report against these measures every two years (over the 6 years of the Plan). There will also be an independent interim review, which will focus on assessing whether the actions under the National Action Plan are still relevant and give guidance and advice on emerging issues in relation to Women, Peace and Security and future implementation of the Plan. A final independent review will assess the overall success of the National Action Plan and provide advice on the direction and focus of the next Plan.⁹

The National Action Plan and this Review

The National Action Plan clearly intersects with the work of the Review in several ways. In particular, actions around embedding principles of participation and protection of women in policy frameworks, human resource management and training programs within the ADF complement the Review's task of making recommendations relating to the treatment of women. Other actions which will be supported by implementation of the Review's recommendations include:

- Assessing and further building on training programs for Australian defence, police and civilian personnel to enhance staff competence and understanding of the principles of the women, peace and security agenda.
- Ensuring women have opportunities to participate in the AFP, Defence and ADF and in deployments overseas, including in decision-making positions.
- Ensuring formalised complaints mechanisms for the safe reporting of allegations of gender-based violence and harassment in Australian peace and security institutions are established and supported.
- Investigating all reports and allegations of gender-based violence involving Australian defence, police, civilian or contracted personnel.

Central to the aims of UNSCR 1325 is the building of a critical mass of high functioning women who are given access and provided support to participate in the peace and reconstruction processes and to begin the cultural shifts to bring about positive change for all women in their countries.

This will involve the participation of women in Australian military, police and civilian deployments to fragile, conflict and post-conflict situations. The key focus of the Review on increasing participation of women in the ADF and the lifting of gender restrictions on combat roles will also enhance the potential contribution of women in the ADF.

The ADF is also involved in activities supporting UNSCR 1325 aims. For example, the ADF deploys female personnel to work in 'Female Engagement Teams'. These Teams meet with local Afghan women to discuss their security needs, including meeting with female community leaders to discuss gender issues. Communities are also supported to build institutions, and social and economic structures that provide for the safety, security and dignity of all citizens, particularly women (e.g. the Special Operations Task Group's deployment of female medics on patrol which provides health clinics for local women and girls).¹⁰

Deployed military and police personnel play a role in protection of communities including women and girls, and this is often included in Australia's peacekeeping mandates (for example, in Afghanistan, the protection and longer-term security of the civilian population is central to the mission of the ADF's Mentoring Task Force).¹¹

Again, the National Action Plan highlights the critical importance of embedding these principles into policy frameworks and human resources management of the ADF. The Review's recommendations will inform work to ensure training, policies and processes around sexual harassment, discrimination, abuse and assault, are adequate and appropriate. Implementation of the Review's recommendations will strengthen the ADF's and Australia's role in implementing UNSCR 1325.

Integral to the success of UNSCR 1325 is that the agencies who deal with civil society on the ground during and after conflict and those agencies working towards the long term reconstruction of the country integrate a gendered approach when dealing with civil society. Strong actions to advance women's participation in decision making, peace processes and reconstruction efforts are needed.

This includes the strengthening and integrating of gender training of the military and civil agencies present in conflict, post-conflict and reconstruction activities and the ADF works with other Government agencies such as AusAID to ensure that cultural and gender considerations inform force preparation, and that gender experts are deployed to missions where required.

Appendix D.2 – United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 S/RES/1325 (2000) 31 October 2000

The Security Council, Recalling its resolutions 1261 (1999) of 25 August 1999, 1265 (1999) of 17 September 1999, 1296 (2000) of 19 April 2000 and 1314 (2000) of 11 August 2000, as well as relevant statements of its President, and *recalling also* the statement of its President to the press on the occasion of the United Nations Day for Women's Rights and International Peace (International Women's Day) of 8 March 2000 (SC/6816),

Recalling also the commitments of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (A/52/231) as well as those contained in the outcome document of the twenty-third Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly entitled "Women 2000: Gender Equality, Development and Peace for the Twenty-First Century" (A/S-23/10/Rev.1), in particular those concerning women and armed conflict,

Bearing in mind the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the primary responsibility of the Security Council under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security,

Expressing concern that civilians, particularly women and children, account for the vast majority of those adversely affected by armed conflict, including as refugees and internally displaced persons, and increasingly are targeted by combatants and armed elements, and *recognizing* the consequent impact this has on durable peace and reconciliation,

Reaffirming the important role of women in the prevention and resolution of conflicts and in peace-building, and *stressing* the importance of their equal participation and full involvement in all efforts for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security, and the need to increase their role in decision-making with regard to conflict prevention and resolution,

Reaffirming also the need to implement fully international humanitarian and human rights law that protects the rights of women and girls during and after conflicts,

Emphasizing the need for all parties to ensure that mine clearance and mine awareness programmes take into account the special needs of women and girls,

Recognizing the urgent need to mainstream a gender perspective into peacekeeping operations, and in this regard *noting* the Windhoek Declaration and the Namibia Plan of Action on Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective in Multidimensional Peace Support Operations (S/2000/693),

Recognizing also the importance of the recommendation contained in the statement of its President to the press of 8 March 2000 for specialized training for all peacekeeping personnel on the protection, special needs and human rights of women and children in conflict situations, *Recognizing* that an understanding of the impact of armed conflict on women and girls, effective institutional arrangements to guarantee their protection and full participation in the peace process can significantly contribute to the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security,

Noting the need to consolidate data on the impact of armed conflict on women and girls,

1. *Urges* Member States to ensure increased representation of women at all decision-making levels in national, regional and international institutions and mechanisms for the prevention, management, and resolution of conflict
2. *Encourages* the Secretary-General to implement his strategic plan of action (A/49/587) calling for an increase in the participation of women at decision-making levels in conflict resolution and peace processes
3. *Urges* the Secretary-General to appoint more women as special representatives and envoys to pursue good offices on his behalf, and in this regard *calls on* Member States to provide candidates to the Secretary-General, for inclusion in a regularly updated centralized roster
4. *Further urges* the Secretary-General to seek to expand the role and contribution of women in United Nations field-based operations, and especially among military observers, civilian police, human rights and humanitarian personnel
5. *Expresses* its willingness to incorporate a gender perspective into peacekeeping operations, and *urges* the Secretary-General to ensure that, where appropriate, field operations include a gender component
6. *Requests* the Secretary-General to provide to Member States training guidelines and materials on the protection, rights and the particular needs of women, as well as on the importance of involving women in all peacekeeping and peace-building measures, *invites* Member States to incorporate these elements as well as HIV/AIDS awareness training into their national training programmes for military and civilian police personnel in preparation for deployment, and *further requests* the Secretary-General to ensure that civilian personnel of peacekeeping operations receive similar training
7. *Urges* Member States to increase their voluntary financial, technical and logistical support for gender-sensitive training efforts, including those undertaken by relevant funds and programmes, inter alia, the United Nations Fund for Women and United Nations Children's Fund, and by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and other relevant bodies
8. *Calls on* all actors involved, when negotiating and implementing peace agreements, to adopt a gender perspective, including, inter alia:
 1. The special needs of women and girls during repatriation and resettlement and for rehabilitation, reintegration and post-conflict reconstruction
 2. Measures that support local women's peace initiatives and indigenous processes for conflict resolution, and that involve women in all of the implementation mechanisms of the peace agreements
 3. Measures that ensure the protection of and respect for human rights of women and girls, particularly as they relate to the constitution, the electoral system, the police and the judiciary

9. *Calls upon* all parties to armed conflict to respect fully international law applicable to the rights and protection of women and girls, especially as civilians, in particular the obligations applicable to them under the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and the Additional Protocols thereto of 1977, the Refugee Convention of 1951 and the Protocol thereto of 1967, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of 1979 and the Optional Protocol thereto of 1999 and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989 and the two Optional Protocols thereto of 25 May 2000, and to bear in mind the relevant provisions of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court
10. *Calls on* all parties to armed conflict to take special measures to protect women and girls from gender-based violence, particularly rape and other forms of sexual abuse, and all other forms of violence in situations of armed conflict
11. *Emphasizes* the responsibility of all States to put an end to impunity and to prosecute those responsible for genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes including those relating to sexual and other violence against women and girls, and in this regard *stresses* the need to exclude these crimes, where feasible from amnesty provisions
12. *Calls upon* all parties to armed conflict to respect the civilian and humanitarian character of refugee camps and settlements, and to take into account the particular needs of women and girls, including in their design, and recalls its resolutions 1208 (1998) of 19 November 1998 and 1296 (2000) of 19 April 2000
13. *Encourages* all those involved in the planning for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration to consider the different needs of female and male ex-combatants and to take into account the needs of their dependants
14. *Reaffirms* its readiness, whenever measures are adopted under Article 41 of the Charter of the United Nations, to give consideration to their potential impact on the civilian population, bearing in mind the special needs of women and girls, in order to consider appropriate humanitarian exemptions
15. *Expresses* its willingness to ensure that Security Council missions take into account gender considerations and the rights of women, including through consultation with local and international women's groups
16. *Invites* the Secretary-General to carry out a study on the impact of armed conflict on women and girls, the role of women in peace-building and the gender dimensions of peace processes and conflict resolution, and *further invites* him to submit a report to the Security Council on the results of this study and to make this available to all Member States of the United Nations
17. *Requests* the Secretary-General, where appropriate, to include in his reporting to the Security Council progress on gender mainstreaming throughout peacekeeping missions and all other aspects relating to women and girls
18. *Decides* to remain actively seized of the matter.

Appendix D.3 – Additional UN Security Council Resolutions¹²

UNSCR 1820 (2008) condemns the use of rape and other forms of sexual violence in conflict situations, stating that rape can constitute a war crime, a crime against humanity, or a constitutive act with respect to genocide. The Resolution calls on Member States to comply with their obligations to prosecute the perpetrators of sexual violence, to ensure that all victims of sexual violence have equal protection under the law and equal access to justice, and to end impunity for sexual violence.

UNSCR 1888 (2009) complements UNSCR 1820 and asks the UN Secretary-General to rapidly deploy a team of experts to situations of particular concern regarding sexual violence. The Resolution further calls for the appointment of a special representative to lead efforts to end conflict-related sexual violence against women and girls, and to include information about the prevalence of sexual violence in a report to the UN Security Council by UN peacekeeping missions.

UNSCR 1889 (2009) reaffirms the provisions of UNSCR 1325, encouraging Member States to continue to pursue implementation of this Resolution. UNSCR 1889 calls on the Secretary-General to develop a strategy, including through appropriate training, to increase the number of women appointed to pursue ‘good offices,’ particularly as Special Representatives and Special Envoys, on the Secretary-General’s behalf and to submit within six months a set of indicators to track implementation of UNSCR 1325.¹³

In 2010, in response to UNSCR 1889, the UN Secretary-General proposed specific performance indicators to the Security Council, to track and provide guidance to the implementation of UNSCR 1325. These indicators were endorsed by the UN Security Council in a Presidential Statement issued on 26 October 2010. While these indicators are not all applicable to the national efforts of all Member States, they offer inspiration for the identification of specific and measureable ways in which Member States can monitor their own performance.

UNSCR 1960 (2010), building on UNSCRs 1820 and 1888, calls for an end to sexual violence in armed conflict and provides measures aimed at ending impunity for perpetrators of sexual violence. The Resolution also encourages Member States to deploy a greater numbers of women military and police personnel and provide appropriate training to all personnel on sexual and gender-based violence within their UN peacekeeping operations.

Appendix D.4 – Australian National Action Plan 2012-2018: Strategies and Measures¹⁴

**Indicates the ADF is a responsible agency under the National Action Plan.

Strategy 1: Integrate a gender perspective into Australia’s policies on peace and security	
Action	Measures
1.1 Policy frameworks of relevant Government departments are consistent with the objectives and intent of UNSCR 1325.**	a. Number, title and description of relevant official policy and guidance documents that contain reference to the Women, Peace and Security agenda or resolutions 1325, 1820, 1888, 1889 and 1960.
1.2 Develop guidelines for the protection of civilians, including women and girls.**	

Strategy 2: Embed the Women, Peace and Security agenda in the Australian Government's approach to human resource management of Defence, Australian Federal Police and deployed personnel

Action	Measures
2.1 Assess and further build on training programs for Australian defence, police and civilian personnel to enhance staff competence and understanding of Women, Peace and Security.**	<p>a. Number and percentage of Australian military, police and civilian personnel deployed in operations that have received training on Women, Peace and Security (including their responsibilities under UNSCR 1325, 1820, 1888, 1889 and 1960), and a description of that training.</p> <p>b. Number of women and men employed by the Australian Federal Police, Australian Defence Force and Department of Defence, disaggregated by department and level.</p> <p>c. Number of Australian Government employees deployed and posted to conflict and post-conflict settings disaggregated by sex, department and level.</p> <p>d. The number of reported cases of sexual exploitation and abuse allegedly perpetrated by Australian Government employees deployed to conflict and/or post conflict settings reported to Australian and host government agencies.</p>
2.2 Ensure women have opportunities to participate in the AFP, Defence and ADF and in deployments overseas, including in decision-making positions.**	
2.3 Ensure formalised complaints mechanisms for the safe reporting of allegations of gender-based violence and harassment in Australian peace and security institutions are established and supported.**	
2.4 Investigate all reports and allegations of gender-based violence involving Australian defence, police, civilian or contracted personnel.**	

Strategy 3: Support civil society organisations to promote equality and increase women's participation in conflict prevention, peace-building, conflict resolution and relief and recovery

Action	Measures
3.1 Support domestic non-government organisations, such as the National Women's Alliances, and international civil society organisations to engage in peace and security initiatives, including by raising awareness of UNSCR 1325.	<p>a. Description of civil society activities funded by the Australian Government that pertain to Women, Peace and Security.</p> <p>b. Description of approaches taken by the Australian Government to share information with civil society on the Women, Peace and Security agenda.</p> <p>c. Description of domestic educational activities that relate to the promotion of the Women, Peace and Security Agenda.</p>
3.2 Support Australian and international civil society organisations to promote the roles and address the needs of women in the prevention, management and resolution of conflict.	
3.3 Invite Australian non-government organisations to nominate a selection of representatives to meet with the Women, Peace and Security Inter-departmental Working Group once a year.**	
3.4 Encourage an understanding of Women, Peace and Security amongst the Australian public.	

Strategy 4: Promote Women, Peace and Security implementation internationally

Action	Measures
4.1 Support capacity building for women in fragile, conflict and/or post-conflict settings through promoting opportunities for women's leadership and participation in decision-making at a country level.**	a. Description of international assistance provided for activities pertaining to Women, Peace and Security.
4.2 Ensure that Australia's humanitarian assistance and recovery programs in conflict and post-conflict situations respect applicable international human rights and refugee law in regards to women and girls, and can be accessed by and benefit diverse groups of vulnerable women and girls.	b. Description of strategies employed by the ADF and AFP to facilitate the engagement and protection of local women in peace and security efforts.
4.3 Support humanitarian action that responds to gender-based violence in crisis situations, with particular regard to health.	c. Description of peace processes in which Australia has played a prominent role.
4.4 Consider the use of specific strategies to promote the participation and protection of women and girls in fragile, conflict and/or post-conflict settings, for example ADF Female Engagement Teams and the use of gender advisers.**	d. Description of institution-building strategies Australia has been involved in that promote Women, Peace and Security.
4.5 Ensure peace processes in which Australia plays a prominent role promote the meaningful participation of women, and consider local women's needs, rights and capacity.	e. Number and description of interventions and support of resolutions and policy in the UN Security Council, General Assembly, UN Human Rights Council and other relevant fora addressing Women, Peace and Security issues.
4.6 Promote women's involvement in the development of institutions, including national judiciary, security and governance structures in fragile, conflict and/or post-conflict settings so that women can access and benefit from these structures.**	f. Description of initiatives to contribute to the development of best practice guidance on issues relating to Women, Peace and Security.
4.7 Encourage the promotion of women's involvement and leadership in the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts through engagement with the UN and other multilateral fora, including in the development of best practice guidance.**	g. List of Australian women and men in senior UN decision-making positions relating to peace and security.
4.8 Support women experts, special envoys, commanders and high-ranking officials to promote a high level consideration of gender issues in fragile, conflict and /or post-conflict settings.**	
4.9 Promote the global advancement of gender equality through international engagement, including through the UN and other multi-lateral fora.	
4.10 Incorporate the protection of the rights of women and girls in bilateral and multilateral discussions on the protection of civilians in conflict and post-conflict situations, particularly with regard to gender-based violence.**	
4.11 Promote formalised complaints mechanisms for the safe reporting of allegations of gender-based violence and harassment in fragile, conflict and post-conflict settings.**	
4.12 Support efforts by local or international authorities to prosecute perpetrators of gender based violence during conflict and/or in post-conflict settings.**	

Strategy 5: Take a co-ordinated and holistic approach domestically and internationally to Women, Peace and Security	
Action	Measures
5.1 Foster ongoing civil-military cooperation and information sharing in operations, to protect women and girls.**	a. Number and key outcomes of Australian Government inter-departmental meetings that address the Women, Peace and Security agenda.
5.2 Continue to promote information sharing on UNSCR 1325 and women's participation within and between Australian Government agencies.**	

Appendix E

Chapter 2: Chief of Defence Force Action Plan for the Recruitment and Retention of Women: How effective was it?

Appendix E.1 – Snapshot of initiatives and updates

Theme	Initiative	Status as at April 2011	Status as at Nov 2011	Mapping the Action Plan to the Review Report and Recommendations
Increase enlistment of women	1. Continue implementation of Recruitment of Women Strategy.	On track	On track	<p>While the Review suggests there should be continued monitoring and evaluation of Recruitment of Women Strategy (ROWS) initiatives to ascertain whether they are increasing attraction/ conversion of women through the recruiting pipeline, the Review also finds that the ROWS will not be enough <i>on its own</i> to increase the representation of women across the ADF. Targeted interventions are needed to enhance recruitment and broaden occupational opportunities available to women. (Recommendations 8-10).</p> <p>The Report also makes recommendations to increase the attraction of women at different stages, including entering the ADF mid-career. (Recommendation 8)</p>
	2. Investigate and develop a plan to expel barriers to enlistment.	Complete ('Attracting Women to the ADF' Research Project)	Monitor	
	3. Investigation of low female conversion rates (conversion from initial enquiry to enlistment)	On track	On track	
	4. Communicate benefits of women in the ADF, highlighting work-life balance.	Complete (Promotion in all recruitment material of Women in the ADF)	Monitor	
	5. Examine employment opportunities for mid-career entry points.	Complete	On track	
Develop mentoring and networking frameworks	6. Develop a range of mentoring, coaching, networking and shadowing programs.	On track	On track	<p>The Review makes recommendations to integrate and rationalise available programs and facilitate access to appropriate mentorship, networking and sponsorship opportunities. (Recommendation 12)</p> <p>These should be based on best practice principles.</p>
	7. Investigate the use of social networking technology.	Complete	Monitor	
	8. Develop a funded Young Female Leaders Network.	Complete	Investigate further	
	9. Develop a 'Women in Defence' intranet site.	Complete	Monitor	

Theme	Initiative	Status as at April 2011	Status as at Nov 2011	Mapping the Action Plan to the Review Report and Recommendations
Provide a workplace that accommodates career flexibility and difference	10. Education program on gender diversity and leadership for key senior and middle managers.	On track	On track	<p>The Review recommends the establishment of a new Flexible Work Directorate, which will be responsible (among other roles) for education on management of flexible work arrangements. (Recommendation 14)</p> <p>More broadly, Recommendations 1-4 (flowing from Principle 1 that strong leadership is necessary to drive reform) are designed to secure strong and unequivocal commitment to gender diversity from Defence leadership as well as from middle management.</p>
	11. All new personnel policy development is to be run against a 'filter' to ensure that access to flexible working arrangements is not compromised.	On track	On track	<p>The Review makes a range of recommendations to address systemic and cultural impediments to accessing flexible working arrangements. (Recommendations 14 and 15)</p> <p>The Review has also been advised that the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch (formerly Fairness and Resolution Branch) informally considers every new piece of policy from a gender and general diversity perspective, as part of the new formal process by which all Defence Instructions are developed and periodically reviewed. There is no similar oversight process for application of these policies within the single Services.</p>
	12. Policies relating to pregnancy / maternity leave and promotion need review including the categorisation of pregnant women as MEC 3.	Complete (Pregnancy specific medical category – MEC (303))	Monitor	<p>The Review makes a number of recommendations to facilitate flexible working arrangements and allow for more flexibility in career progression. (Recommendations 7, 14, 15)</p> <p>In addition, the Review suggests that policies on workplace restrictions during pregnancy should be based on contemporary research and best practice.</p>

Theme	Initiative	Status as at April 2011	Status as at Nov 2011	Mapping the Action Plan to the Review Report and Recommendations
	13. Develop, implement and communicate broadly a plan that supports personnel taking career breaks related to professional and personnel reasons.	On track	On track	<p>The Review's recommendations under Principle 4 recognise the importance of retention through facilitating greater career flexibility and use of work and family policies.</p> <p>Recommendation 7 proposes a number of measures to be put in place to build flexibility into the career model, time in rank provisions, timing of and access to 'career gates' and career pathways to enable more flexibility in career progression.</p> <p>Recommendation 8 emphasises the importance of facilitating the re-entry of personnel from the Reserve. The Review also recommends that COSC communicate its commitment to an ADF culture that is supportive of women's participation and a specific identified framework that will underpin its goals. (Recommendation 2)</p>
	14. Develop, implement and communicate a process for maintaining regular contact with personnel who are on a career break.	On track	On track	<p>The Review recommends the development of mechanisms to allow people on leave to access training and career gate courses online, and to register for particular tasks/projects, if they wish to do so. (Recommendation 7)</p> <p>It is noted that Plan SUAKIN recommended implementation of an e-portal in order to provide Reservists and the wider Reserve community with a web-based interface to stay connected with the Defence community.</p>
	15. The policy of 'one person against one position' be amended.	Complete	On track	<p>The Review recommends the introduction of a workforce management system that enables more than one member to be posted/assigned to the same position. (Recommendation 15)</p>

Theme	Initiative	Status as at April 2011	Status as at Nov 2011	Mapping the Action Plan to the Review Report and Recommendations
	16. Provide ADF members with the same entitlement as is available under the DeCA with respect to the ability to purchase additional annual leave.	Of concern	Of concern	This is not within the Review's terms of reference.
	17. Provide ADF members with the same entitlement as is available under the DeCA with respect to the right to be able to work part-time hours after maternity or adoption leave.	On track	On track	This is accommodated under the ADF's new Flexible Working Arrangements policy (for up to two years). As such, it is not addressed in the Review's recommendations.
	18. Investigate provision of broader access to various child care arrangements.	On track	On track	<p>The Review recommends the development of 'Support to Postings' plans by career management agencies and personnel as part of career planning and/or when postings decisions are made. This will address issues such as child care and other supports. (Recommendation 17)</p> <p>The Review also suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is a need for Defence to consider the provision of more flexible child care options for ADF members • Defence should examine the operation and accessibility of its child care services, including in remote and regional locations, to ensure that they effectively meet the needs of ADF personnel • the point system in the Defence child care Priority of Access Guidelines should be reviewed to ensure that it appropriately reflects the needs of ADF families.

Theme	Initiative	Status as at April 2011	Status as at Nov 2011	Mapping the Action Plan to the Review Report and Recommendations
Reform career management philosophy and practice	19. The <i>Strategic Career Management Framework</i> should be implemented in accordance with the COSC outcomes of September 2007.	On track	On track	The Recommendations under Principle 2 recognise that the current rigid, linear, one-size-fits-all career continuum does not allow for talent to be managed in a flexible way, and seek to improve the pathways for increasing the representation of women in senior ranks. (Recommendations 5-7) Recommendation 17 also provides career management with mechanisms for working with personnel to support career/work flexibility.
Make commanders accountable for retention	20. Develop a process to evaluate Unit command and Career Management Agency effectiveness in retention of their personnel.	On track	On track	The Review's Recommendations under Principle 1 include the development of a performance framework to ensure accountability for retention of personnel and high performing and inclusive defence environments. (Recommendations 2 and 4)
	30. (previously 20A). Ensure that Performance Appraisal reporting includes a specific assessment of how commanders contribute to the retention of their personnel.	Complete	On track	
	21. Develop a behavioural compact articulating the attitudes and behaviours expected of all members of the ADF in their interactions with women in the services, their families, the community and on deployment.	Complete	Complete	
	22. Consider benefits of joint program with AFL/ NRL on respect and responsibility.	Complete	Investigate further	This is a matter for the ADF's consideration.
	23. Develop lead and lag indicators to measure the impact of the Action Plan	On track	On track	As the Review Report suggests that the implementation of the Action Plan should be discontinued in its current form, the development of lead and lag indicators to measure the impact of the Action Plan is not applicable to the Review's recommendations.

Theme	Initiative	Status as at April 2011	Status as at Nov 2011	Mapping the Action Plan to the Review Report and Recommendations
	25. Develop a process to capture the number of applications and approvals of flexible working arrangements and link this to the HRMeS.	On track	On track	The Review recommends that the responsibilities of the proposed Flexible Work Directorate include the collection of tri-Service data on applications for flexible working arrangements. (Recommendation 14)
Communicate organisational attributes and the suite of (newly) available working conditions	24. Develop an education and communication package and policy guide to inform ADF members on the flexibility provided by the existing ADF work-life balance policy.	On track	On track	The Review has made it clear in Principle 1 that strong statements and examples set by leadership are vital to the success of increasing gender diversity, and the recommendations which follow are aimed at communicating and promoting a broad organisational understanding of the business case for women in the ADF as a core operational imperative. (Recommendations 2-4) As noted above in relation to CDF Action Plan recommendation 10, the Review recommends that the role of the new Flexible Work Directorate include education on management of flexible work arrangements. (Recommendation 14)
	26. Communicate examples of personnel who have undertaken non-traditional career paths and succeeded.	On track	On track	
	27. Provide presentations at Service pre-command courses on "effective management of men and women in the ADF" and "flexible workplace options in the ADF".	On track	On track	
	28. MINDPMS to launch the CDF Action Plan	Complete	Complete	
	29. Develop a strategic communications plan for internal and external audiences linked to Force 2030 foundation elements and articulating what success will achieve and why this is important	Complete	Monitor	

Appendix E.2 – Progress on CDF Action Plan for the Recruitment and Retention of Women Initiatives

Increase enlistment of women into the ADF

The starting point of the CDF Action Plan ('Action Plan') is that in order to retain women the ADF must first attract them. In a competitive labour market, this means positioning the ADF as an employer of choice.

With this aim, the first five initiatives focus on increasing the enlistment of women into the ADF, largely through implementation of the *Recruitment of Women Strategy* (RoWS). The RoWS, discussed in section 4.2, predates the Action Plan and was developed in 2007. It did not receive dedicated funding until the 2009 Defence White Paper.¹⁵

Supporting these initiatives, the Action Plan focuses on investigation of reasons for women not joining the ADF and for the development and funding of a plan to address these barriers. It also calls for investigation into the reasons for the significantly lower conversion rates of women through the recruiting process than men (for example, in 2009 the conversion rate from enquiry to enlistment was 20:1 for women, compared to 11:1 for men).¹⁶

The RoWS was developed from research examining the attraction of women to the ADF, and was directed towards increasing the appeal of ADF careers to women and countering stereotypical views which turn prospective candidates away. In the April 2011 progress update, it was reported that each Service was in the process of ongoing implementation of the RoWS, led by Defence Force Recruiting, and that strategies were put in place to address barriers to enlistment identified in the research.

The progress updates also report that Defence Force Recruiting's investigations showed two main factors impacting on the low conversion rates of women candidates: that women were second-guessing their decision to join based on lack of insight into realities of career in ADF, and poor physical fitness.¹⁷ For example, Army reported in April 2011 that the Physical Fitness Test failure rate for female Army candidates was 30.34% (compared to 3.26% for males).¹⁸ Measures developed to address this included a Women's Mentoring Program (to enable communication between candidates and serving members) and a candidate fitness program.¹⁹ As section 4.2 examines, however, this somewhat oversimplifies the issue – there are a range of other complex reasons for the higher rates of attrition of women through the recruiting process.

The Action Plan also called for the development of promotional material highlighting jobs that women do in the ADF and how a career in the ADF makes a difference and allows an appropriate work-life balance. In April 2011, it was reported that this was complete and 'women are now incorporated into all media DFR makes use of to promote Defence.'

The Action Plan also contained one further significant enlistment related initiative requiring that opportunities for mid-career entry points for men and women be examined. This had earlier been reported as 'completed' because the *Defence (Personnel) Regulations 2002* and existing personnel policies were viewed as providing a comprehensive framework allowing for mid-career entry of personnel. However, in November 2011, the Working Group reported that this policy framework had not been accompanied by cultural change and that mid-career entry was only used in limited categories for specialist officers or lateral entry.

On revisiting each of the initiatives related to enlistment of women at the November 2011 meeting of the Working Group, the position was that none of them had yet been completed. No further detailed update was provided as DFR were unable to attend the meeting. As section 4.2 discusses, the Review has found that there is still a gap between the conversion rates of women and men, from enquiry to enlistment, within the 'recruiting pipeline'.

Develop mentoring and networking frameworks

These initiatives focused on the development of mentoring and networking frameworks to improve opportunities for women to reach higher ranks and provide role models for women progressing through the system. This included development of mentoring, coaching, networking and shadowing programs.

The Action Plan required the ADF to make these types of programs available throughout a person's career, so that they take into account and emphasise, the value of people with different needs, rather than focusing only on women. The initiatives encompass non-traditional models for these types of programs, utilising social networking technologies, and requiring the creation of a Women in Defence website and a 'Young Female Leaders Network'.

Although in April 2011 progress against these tasks was reported as 'good', in November 2011, the position was that none of these tasks have been completed. As section 5.4 discusses in more detail, the Services have a number of programs in place, however, these are inconsistent in their implementation and how they are accessed.

Provide a workplace that accommodates career flexibility and difference

The Action Plan contains nine separate initiatives around accommodating workplace flexibility and difference. The initiatives are directed towards ensuring career flexibility and a culture that supports career breaks and flexible work options to cater for personnel at different 'ages and stages'. Overall, the aim is to create a culture which recognises that a 'one size fits all' linear career model is no longer appropriate for the ADF.²⁰

One initiative relates to the development of an education program on gender diversity and leadership, aimed at key senior and middle managers (particularly for personnel in key leadership appointments and career management), to assist them to better understand the need for, and champion, the positive benefits of a more gender balanced workforce that is supportive for women.

Defence has rolled out a pilot gender leadership training/education package, 'Leading a Gender Diverse Workforce', provided to Service training organisations for each Service to tailor to suit its requirements. This package is intended to be a key development to support this Action Plan initiative.²¹

The Services also have their own broad strategies underway: Army is implementing Flexible Career Pathways and has released the Chief of Army's 'Work-Life Balance Intent', Navy participates in a Women's Leadership Program and has created the role of 'Navy Women's Strategic Adviser'²² whose role is to 'ensure that all people issues are considered against the gender filter to ensure any decisions do not adversely impact on women'²³ Air Force has implemented a Gender Diversity Strategy and created the Directorate of Workforce Flexibility and Diversity as 'an avenue of support and advice to commanders/managers to assist facilitation of flexible work arrangements'.²⁴

In April 2011, it was reported that good progress has been made against these initiatives, noting that some require policy changes and have implications for workforce structure that would take several years to fully implement. When the Working Group revisited these action items in November 2011, however, it was noted that none of these tasks had been completed.²⁵

Several of these initiatives mandated changes to ADF policies to ensure they do not operate in a way that discourages the development of a culture that recognises flexibility in a person's work or career, for example:

- amending the 'one person against one position' policy to allow job-sharing
- running personnel policy against a 'filter' to ensure access to flexible working arrangements are not limited
- ensuring policies do not discriminate against pregnant women or those on maternity leave (e.g., medical downgrading related to pregnancy and the extent to which this acts as a barrier promotion or other employment opportunities)
- ensuring women can seek part-time work arrangements following return from maternity leave

- allowing for more flexibility than rigid and linear career path structures currently permit for people to take career breaks and the like (e.g., inflexible requirements for time in rank before promotion points can be passed)
- allowing for purchasing of additional leave.

The newly revised Defence Instruction on Flexible Working Arrangements is intended to accommodate job-sharing and part-time work. For example, the flexible work policy permits job-sharing and allows women returning from maternity leave to apply to work part time for up to two years. At the November 2011 meeting, the Working Group noted the importance of developing a communication strategy to ensure people are aware of the policy and combat perceptions that it is unreasonable to implement practices allowing for a greater balance between work and family.

The Working Group also found there was a need for further review to identify policies that may discriminate or that may limit access to flexible working options. Revisions to the Medical Employment Classification structure have made some improvements in relation to pregnant women/those on maternity leave, and physical fitness policies have been amended to better meet the needs of women returning to work from maternity leave. Air Force also flagged policy shifts so that those on part-time leave without pay no longer have seniority adjusted pro-rata (and so are not discriminated against when presented to promotion boards or other employment opportunities).

The Working Group also noted that there is a form of informal review by the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch (formerly Fairness and Resolution Branch) as part of the 'System of Defence Instructions process' (i.e., the formal process by which all Defence Instructions are developed and periodically reviewed).²⁶ The Working Group noted, however, there was 'no accompanying process in place for single service requirements'.²⁷

The Working Group agreed that further review should include analysis of data to identify if there is evidence to show that there are links between policies and promotion rates of women.

The Action Plan also calls for processes to be established to maintain communication with personnel on career breaks. As at November 2011, it was reported that no formal policy has been developed around this. Although the Services had some mechanisms in place this was sometimes inconsistent and not monitored.²⁸

There is one Action Plan initiative in the area of workplace flexibility listed as 'of concern': the recommendation that ADF members have the same entitlement as Defence APS employees to purchase additional leave (of up to four weeks).²⁹ This initiative was developed because of the view that many ADF parents had difficulties with insufficient leave to cover periods such as school holiday care under.

In November, it was reported that Defence was unable to implement this due to the systems used to administer ADF leave and pay.³⁰ The Working Group noted that this action item was to be put on hold until 2012 – 2015, when there would be a technical refresh of the systems and 'availability of funding to make whatever system changes were still necessary':

While Defence senior committees agreed with the concept they did not agree to introduction of the provision at this time due to system deficiencies which mean that unlike the APS system which is automated, an ADF system would be manual with an associated high administrative burden and a financial cost to Defence which could not be met at the time due to other, higher priorities.³¹

The final initiative under the theme of career flexibility requires investigation into provision of broader access to child care arrangements. This Action Plan initiative was previously reported as 'on track' and being handled by Defence Community Organisation (DCO). In an email to the Review on 24 January 2012, Defence advised that:

The review of childcare gaps and needs referred to in the action plan was conducted during 2009. The purpose of the review was to determine future strategies to meet the child care needs of Defence Families. This review was conducted for Defence by an external consultant and informed the Defence response to the post ABC Learning collapse period and the management of the Defence Child Care Program (DCCP) during this turbulent time. As a result, the DCCP maintained its stability and continued provision of services to Defence families despite great volatility in the sector. A further review will be conducted as part of routine business planning and preparation prior to June 2015.³²

Reform of career management policy and practice

The Action Plan contains one stand-alone initiative in relation to career management: implementation of the *Strategic Career Management Framework*. The objective behind this initiative is to reform career management to facilitate behaviour and cultural change, which is still lacking despite policies to enable career flexibility.

In particular, this focuses on selection, promotion and appraisal of career managers and education programs for them, to ensure that career managers recognise the value of personnel of different backgrounds, support alternate career paths and recognise their role in the retention of personnel. This initiative also focuses on transparency in promotion and command selection by setting clear criteria, to ensure that policies and processes for promotion do not disadvantage women.³³

At the November 2011 Working Group meeting no update was provided. The status of this initiative remained as 'on track' with the following comment: 'Need to revisit'. Although the recommendations within the Framework had been agreed, funding was lacking until 2012-13. Each of the Services reported that processes were underway in relation to selection, training and coordination of career management.

Make commanders accountable for retention

The Action Plan sets out several initiatives with a focus on measuring the contribution made by commanders and career managers to retention of personnel, particularly women, through their decisions and actions. The intention behind these initiatives is to provide for mechanisms to evaluate the retention climate within the ADF and measure the effectiveness of commanders and career managers through the human resources metrics systems, including through performance appraisal reporting, and processes such as capturing and recording information on applications/approvals for flexible working arrangements.³⁴

Each Service has feedback/performance appraisal mechanisms in place. Performance appraisal reports (PARs) are expected to assess the member's performance over the reporting period, to identify individuals' strengths and weaknesses, provide feedback on performance and developmental needs, identify suitability for promotion courses and postings, and monitor performance levels.³⁵

The Action Plan requires a specific assessment of how commanders contribute to the retention of their personnel to be included in performance appraisal reporting. However, despite the recent introduction of a new PAR system, the Working Group noted in November 2011 that 'even the new rating system does not presently hold commanders accountable and so does not address the intent of this initiative'. The Working Group also noted that due to the difficulty in capturing all flexible work arrangements being accessed identified and discussed, this initiative 'may be unable to be completed'.³⁶

Project LASER-Retention (the Longitudinal ADF Study Evaluating Retention) is aimed at accurately modelling the retention of personnel undergoing initial training and in the first five years of service, to provide a better understanding of why members stay or leave. However, as the Working Group has observed, this project is not set up to evaluate the effectiveness of unit command and career management in the retention of their personnel.³⁷

The Working Group concluded that there was a need to identify other methods that can be utilised to make commanders accountable for the retention of their personnel.

Under the broad theme of accountability, the Action Plan also calls for the development of a behavioural compact articulating expected attitudes and behaviours of ADF members. This is one of only two initiatives which are 'complete', as COSC agreed that the intent of this initiative was captured in existing mechanisms/codes of conduct/statement of values for each Service. A further initiative requiring consideration of Defence developing a joint program with the AFL and NRL (national football codes) on respect and responsibility has been 'held for further guidance'.³⁸

In relation to one of the fundamental initiatives underpinning the Action Plan – the requirement to develop lead and lag indicators to measure the impact of the Plan itself – it was reported in April 2011 that some initial discussions had taken place about developing success measures and this was 'on track'. However,

the minutes of the November 2011 Working Group meeting note: 'Discussed the difficulty in developing lead indicators. Meeting to be arranged with workforce planning to progress this action item.' Defence subsequently advised the Review that, to date, no such indicators have been developed.³⁹

Communicate organisational attributes and the suite of available working conditions

The last major theme of the Action Plan is directed towards the need for proactive communication of the various initiatives and actions being undertaken within the ADF to improve recruitment and retention of women.

The Action Plan recommends initiatives around communicating success stories, (particularly examples of personnel who have undertaken non-traditional career paths or have made flexible working arrangements work) to reinforce the message that such career paths are viable and valued. The aim is to educate the ADF workforce, paving the way for behavioural change on available flexible work arrangements, and to clarify myths and misunderstandings. An important aspect is that senior leadership is united in communicating this message consistently.⁴⁰

These communication initiatives overlap with implementation of other areas of the Action Plan, for example:

- creating awareness around family friendly policies and sending the message that a career in the ADF can allow women flexibility and the ability to maintain a suitable work-life balance
- developing the gender diversity leadership education package
- establishing communication processes around the release of new Flexible Working Arrangements policy.⁴¹

The Action Plan also requires a comprehensive communications strategy to be developed, linking success of the Plan to the Defence White Paper 2009. At the November 2011 meeting, however, it was reported that the only completed initiative within this thematic area was the launch of the Action Plan itself.

Appendix E.3 – Report on Women’s Participation in Navy (2009) on the CDF Women’s Action Plan,⁴² Christine McLoughlin – Observations

Observations of the McLoughlin report include:

- the importance of ensuring that senior leadership understands the business case for increasing the participation of women and the costs of failing to retain trained women, improving feedback loops within Defence in relation to policies which have changed and results flowing from the Action Plan
- the Action Plan does not address some fundamental systemic/cultural barriers, such as the absence of women in key leadership and decision-making forums (which are largely position and rank based), or the lack of flexibility in structuring the career continuum for particular roles
- the Action Plan does not address the inconsistency in the ADF’s people management capability and it should contain a component which focuses on accountability in relation to people management capabilities. Items that should be included are lag indicators like discharge requests, sick leave, Equity and Diversity incidents, flexible work arrangement requests and approvals. Lead indicators could include an ‘annual workforce engagement score’ to provide information about the culture in a unit
- the Action Plan does not do enough to address the cultural resistance within the ADF to any notion of preferential treatment for women. One suggestion in the McLoughlin report is to include early, visible and practical education to women from the outset of their careers on how they might be able to make family and career work. This may suggest the need for more radical initiatives, including positive discrimination to achieve a ‘critical mass’ of women across the board.

Appendix F

Chapter 4: The ADF Workforce Pipeline: Women's representation and critical issues – Section 4.1 Representation

Enlistee separation rates by gender, financial year

The Review has calculated that separation rates for recruits are higher for women than men, and this is most noticeable in Army than the other Services. For the period of financial years 2004/05 to 2010/11, recruit separation rates by gender are:

- Army – women 17.8%, men 13.1%
- Navy – women 16.4%, men 14.5%
- Air Force – women 12.2%, men 11.2%.

These conversion rates are calculated from annual ab initio enlistment and 12 month rolling separation figures provided to the Review by the Workforce Planning Branch.⁴³

12 month rolling separations (for rank E00) are taken from 1 July at the beginning of the next financial year and enlistee figures are taken for the entire financial year.

As per the Directorate of Workforce Planning's advice, the Review acknowledges that the definition of Recruits has changed over time, and so the charts below use the Directorate of Workforce Planning's category of E00 for Recruits across each Service.

Army				
	Financial year	Enlistees	Separations from E00	Separation rate from E00
Male	2010/11	1807	265	14.7%
Female	2010/11	184	27	14.7%
Male	2009/10	2482	246	9.9%
Female	2009/10	210	36	17.1%
Male	2008/09	2719	341	12.5%
Female	2008/09	193	41	21.2%
Male	2007/08	2689	316	11.8%
Female	2007/08	207	23	11.1%
Male	2006/07	2154	293	13.6%
Female	2006/07	131	19	14.5%
Male	2005/06	1979	254	12.8%
Female	2005/06	144	17	11.8%
Male	2004/05	1876	349	18.6%

Army				
	Financial year	Enlistees	Separations from E00	Separation rate from E00
Female	2004/05	142	52	36.6%
Total Male	2004/05- 2010/11	15706	2064	13.1%
Total Female	2004/05- 2010/11	1211	215	17.8%

Navy				
	Financial year	Enlistees	Separations from E00	Separation rate from E00
Male	2010/11	835	103	12.3%
Female	2010/11	200	37	18.6%
Male	2009/10	1081	173	16.0%
Female	2009/10	268	52	19.4%
Male	2008/09	931	147	15.8%
Female	2008/09	237	51	21.5%
Male	2007/08	1001	120	12.0%
Female	2007/08	316	31	9.8%
Male	2006/07	973	102	10.5%
Female	2006/07	279	31	11.1%
Male	2005/06	764	128	16.8%
Female	2005/06	215	29	13.5%
Male	2004/05	786	153	19.5%
Female	2004/05	176	47	26.7%
Total Male	2004/05- 2010/11	6371	926	14.5%
Total Female	2004/05- 2010/11	1691	278	16.4%

Air Force				
	Financial year	Enlistees	Separations from E00	Separation rate from E00
Male	2010/11	467	54	11.6%
Female	2010/11	113	12	10.6%
Male	2009/10	593	65	11.0%
Female	2009/10	152	20	13.2%
Male	2008/09	617	71	11.5%
Female	2008/09	152	20	13.2%
Male	2007/08	670	72	10.7%
Female	2007/08	170	25	14.7%
Male	2006/07	603	81	13.4%
Female	2006/07	133	16	12.0%
Male	2005/06	610	58	9.5%
Female	2005/06	136	10	7.4%
Male	2004/05	377	41	10.9%
Female	2004/05	90	12	13.3%
Total Male	2004/05- 2010/11	3937	442	11.2%
Total Female	2004/05- 2010/11	946	115	12.2%

Appendix G

Chapter 4: The ADF Workforce Pipeline: Women's representation and critical issues – Section 4.2 Recruitment

Appendix G.1 – ADF Recruitment Figures

Table 1: All enlistment categories for 2010-11⁴⁴

Gender	Officer (O) or Other Ranks (E)	Ab initio	Transfer from the Reserve	Transfer from Gap Year	Re-enlistment	Service Transfer	Overseas transfer
F	E	493	40	33	11	2	0
F	O	156	22	3	2	4	0
M	E	3065	145	64	101	35	23
M	O	568	80	9	17	36	10
Total =		4282 (87%)	287 (5.8%)	109 (2.2%)	131 (2.7%)	77 (1.6%)	33 (0.7%)

Table 2: Women as a percentage of all enlistment categories for 2010-11⁴⁵

Gender	All categories	Ab initio	Transfer from the Reserve	Transfer from Gap Year	Re-enlistment	Service Transfer	Overseas transfer
% of F Officer and Other Ranks)	15.6%	15.2%	21.6%	33.0%	9.9%	7.8%	0%
% of F (Officers)	20.6%	21.5%	21.6%	25.0%	10.5%	10.0%	0%
% of F (Other ranks)	14.4%	13.9%	21.6%	34.0%	9.8%	5.4%	0%

Table 3: Women as a percentage of ab initio enlistments from financial year 2002-03 to 2010-11⁴⁶

Total ADF ab initio enlistments FY 2002-03 to 2010-11							
FY	Gender	Officer (O) or Other Ranks (E)	ab initio	Total F	Total M	Total	%F
FY2002/2003	F	E	566	708	3501	4209	16.8%
FY2002/2003	F	O	142				
FY2002/2003	M	E	2924				
FY2002/2003	M	O	577				

Total ADF ab initio enlistments FY 2002-03 to 2010-11							
FY	Gender	Officer (O) or Other Ranks (E)	ab initio	Total F	Total M	Total	%F
FY2003/2004	F	E	590	741	3870	4611	16.1%
FY2003/2004	F	O	151				
FY2003/2004	M	E	3296				
FY2003/2004	M	O	574				
FY2004/2005	F	E	402	542	3470	4012	13.5%
FY2004/2005	F	O	140				
FY2004/2005	M	E	2965				
FY2004/2005	M	O	505				
FY2005/2006	F	E	476	636	3790	4426	14.4%
FY2005/2006	F	O	160				
FY2005/2006	M	E	3247				
FY2005/2006	M	O	543				
FY2006/2007	F	E	526	718	4231	4949	14.5%
FY2006/2007	F	O	192				
FY2006/2007	M	E	3606				
FY2006/2007	M	O	625				
FY2007/2008	F	E	659	855	4816	5670	15.1%
FY2007/2008	F	O	196				
FY2007/2008	M	E	4205				
FY2007/2008	M	O	610				
FY2008/2009	F	E	566	724	4723	5447	13.3%
FY2008/2009	F	O	158				
FY2008/2009	M	E	4118				
FY2008/2009	M	O	605				

Total ADF ab initio enlistments FY 2002-03 to 2010-11							
FY	Gender	Officer (O) or Other Ranks (E)	ab initio	Total F	Total M	Total	%F
FY2009/2010	F	E	619	796	4693	5489	14.5%
FY2009/2010	F	O	177				
FY2009/2010	M	E	4094				
FY2009/2010	M	O	599				
FY2010/2011	F	E	486	649	3633	4282	15.2%
FY2010/2011	F	O	156				
FY2010/2011	M	E	3071				
FY2010/2011	M	O	568				

Table 4: Number of enquiries to DFR – Financial Year 2006-07 to 2010-11

The following table shows the number of enquiries received across each of the Services since 2006/07:⁴⁷

	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	FY 11-12**
RAN						
F	911	3463	4575	5670	3989	1010
M	2403	6426	10848	11354	7740	2320
Blank	5131	414	17	0	0	0
Total	8445	10303	15440	17024	11729	3330
ARA						
F	3165	8859	10522	13720	10827	2866
M	16008	32901	45991	50286	39997	10935
Blank	21220	1350	16	0	0	0
Total	40393	43110	56529	64006	50824	13801

	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	FY 11-12**
RAAF						
F	1362	4610	6817	6779	5245	1345
M	3312	10042	16638	17203	12347	3186
Blank	10227	686	16	0	0	0
Total	14901	15338	23471	23982	17592	4531
Service not specified						
F	823	2170	4885	3218	1903	357
M	2141	5377	8232	3984	2494	571
Blank	9238	881	39	0	0	0
Total	12202	8428	13156	7202	4397	928
Total ADF						
F	6261	19102	26799	29387	21964	5578
M	23864	54746	81709	82827	62578	17012
Blank	45816	3331	88	0	0	0
Total	75941	77179	108596	112214	84542	22590
Women as a percentage of total ADF enquiries						
	8.24%*	24.75%	24.68%	26.19%	25.99%	24.69%

* This figure is not considered due to the high number of 'blank' gender counts.

** Figures up to October 2011.

Table 5: Applications to join ADF and Annual Targets – Financial Year 2003-04 to 2010-11

The table below shows the number of applications to join the ADF in each financial year since 2003/04, as well as the recruiting targets set for those years.⁴⁸

	FY 03-04	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	FY 11-12**
RAN									
F	1085	775	694	922	1007	1115	1103	920	242
M	3213	2442	2279	2906	2391	3046	3693	2602	748
Total	4298	3217	2973	3828	3398	4161	4796	3522	990

	FY 03-04	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	FY 11-12**
ARA									
F	2073	1761	1754	1692	1643	1835	2171	1862	598
M	12094	10650	9921	10843	9736	11883	13372	10574	3886
Total	14167	12411	11675	12535	11379	13718	15543	12436	4484
RAAF									
F	1031	811	926	1060	965	1133	786	579	193
M	3262	2599	2905	2908	2742	3461	3201	2173	654
Total	4293	3410	3831	3968	3707	4594	3987	2752	847
Service not specified									
F					4				
M	1				12				
Total	1	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0
Total ADF									
F	4189	3347	3374	3674	3619	4083	4060	3361	1033
M	18570	15691	15105	16657	14881	18390	20266	15349	5288
Total	22759	19038	18479	20331	18500	22473	24326	18710	6321
TARGET	8656	8441	8739	9166	10715	11017	9907	7358	2015
Women as a percentage of total ADF enquiries									
	18.40%	17.58%	18.25%	18.07%	19.56%	18.17%	16.69%	17.96%	16.34%

** Figures up to October 2011.

Appendix G.2 – Recruiting Expenditure

Table 1: Total DFR Expenditure 2001-02 to 2010-11⁴⁹

	2001-02 \$m	2002-03 \$m	2003-04 \$m	2004-05 \$m	2005-06 \$m	2006-07 \$m	2007-08 \$m	2008-09 \$m	2009-10 \$m	2010-11 \$m
Actual expenditure	61.338	58.471	90.668	89.996	91.004	110.809	154.178	156.934	153.318	142.111

Table 2: Breakdown of DFR Expenditure 2003-04 to 2010-11⁵⁰

	2003-04 \$m	2004-05 \$m	2005-06 \$m	2006-07 \$m	2007-08 \$m	2008-09 \$m	2009-10 \$m	2010-11 \$m
Employee Expenses	15.317	14.722	15.306	17.167	18.515	19.464	21.838	22.992
Recruiting Services Contract	46.697	46.695	44.288	52.440	78.104	78.717	80.293	72.963
Advertising and Marketing	26.944	26.367	27.193	36.896	49.931	50.512	38.614	33.978
Other	1.711	2.211	4.217	4.306	7.628	8.241	12.573	12.178
Total	90.668	89.996	91.004	110.809	154.178	156.934	153.318	142.111

Defence advised that the substantial increase in expenditure in 2007-08 of about \$26 million per year resulted from funding for the Recruiting Services Contract to implement the Reform of DFR initiatives and for Service Marketing and Branding (part of the R2 initiatives). This covered the cost of establishing and staffing the Candidate Relationship Management Centre, Specialist Recruiting Teams and Career Promotions Teams, additional facilities leases, facility enhancements and relocations, and increased enlistments.⁵¹ Over 2008-10, costs also included extra expenditure for 'contract transition'.

Table 3: Table showing enlistments, expenditure and costs per enlistment from 2000-02⁵²

Year	Reserve Men	Reserve Women	Total Reserve	Permanent Men	Permanent Women	Total Permanent	Gap Year Men	Gap Year Women	Total Gap Year	Grand Total	Recruiting spend*	Cost per enlistment using Grand Total
2000-2001			2,566			5,131				7,697		
2001-2002			2,870			5,836				8,706	61	7,007
2002-2003			3,065			4,322				7,387	58.5	7,919
2003-2004			2,494			4,747				7,241	90.7	12,526
2004-2005			2,372			4,145				6,517	90	13,810
2005-2006			2,432			4,677				7,109	91	12,801
2006-2007	2,384	516	2,900	4,468	761	5,229				8,129	110.8	13,630
2007-2008	2,071	469	2,540	5,169	975	6,144	398	102	500	9,184	154.2	16,790
2008-2009	1,969	401	2,370	4,894	741	5,635	392	231	623	8,628	156.9	18,185
2009-2010	2,253	375	2,628	4,871	804	5,675	458	210	668	8,971	153.3	17,088
2010-2011	1,469	202	1,671	3,771	659	4,430	258	146	404	6,505	142.1	21,845

Notes:
 DFR assumed national recruitment responsibility in FY 2003-04.
 Data between FY 2000-01 and 2005-06 is drawn from Recruiting Achievement Reports.
 Data between FY 2000-01 and 2005-06 lacks the granularity to effectively break recruiting achievement down by gender.
 Gap Year commenced in FY 2007-08.

* From Breakdown of DFR Expenditure table above.

Appendix G.3 – DFR Performance Against Effectiveness and Cost/Efficiency Targets

An audit report by the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) noted that in December 2006, Defence proposed reforms to DFR to reduce the length of the recruitment process from enquiry to enlistment and improve the conversion ratio, with the aim of allowing Defence to meet its recruitment targets.⁵³ Defence commenced the introduction of the New DFR model with Manpower during 2007–08. The Table below shows 'performance against a number of effectiveness and cost/efficiency targets that Defence proposed to Government to measure the success of the new recruitment model'.⁵⁴

Table 1: DFR recruitment targets and actual achievement 2007-08 to 2009-10

Description	Target					
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10 (Actual results are for first 6 months of the year only)	
Effectiveness measure	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Increasing the % of overall full-time enlistment targets achieved from 84% in Dec 2006	86%	81.6%	88%	78.9%	90%	90.0%
Improving the conversion ratio (enquiry to application to enlistment from 13:3:1 in Dec 2006)	12:3:1	12:3:1	11:3:1	12:3:1	11:3:1	12.9:2.5:1
Cost/efficiency measure						
Maintaining the cost per recruit at \$0.013m (same level as Dec 2006)	\$0.013m	\$0.017m	\$0.013m	\$0.018m	\$0.013m	\$0.013m
Reducing the time taken to process applications for general enlistment from an average 30 weeks (in Dec 2006)*	15 weeks	34 weeks	10 weeks	41 weeks	6 weeks**	49 weeks

* This efficiency measure relates to the total time taken from enquiry to enlistment.

** Defence informed the ANAO that: 'the 6 week target referred to was developed in 2006 when the environmental context was very different, and is based on an industry benchmark for time in process. Defence has dropped this industry benchmark target as unsuitable for ADF recruitment and it will not appear in the next ADF Recruiting Strategic Plan which is currently being developed.'⁵⁵

Appendix G.4 – ADF Recruiting Initiatives

R2 Recruitment Initiatives

Reforms to Defence Force Recruiting (DFR) under R2 included implementation of a 'New Recruitment Model' to improve 'recruitment achievement through a more candidate-focused, streamlined and efficient recruiting process.'⁵⁶ Although there was increased percentage achievement of recruiting targets, however, this initiative did not result in improvements in processing times or enquiry/enlistment ratios.⁵⁷

For example, the marketing and branding initiatives focused on extending Defence's marketing strategies and improving the branding of the Services, to reach to a wider pool of people and influence perceptions of the ADF as a career option within the community. Although brand platforms were launched for each Service, there is no indication that these have been gender-sensitive or that the ADF has taken into account appeal to specific groups, including women, in developing its 'brand oriented communications'.⁵⁸

Similarly, although the ADF Technical Trades Strategy encompasses programs open to young women and men equally, evaluation of the Strategy does not examine its gender impact or whether it has been successful in attracting young women into technical roles which are non-traditional.⁵⁹

Although the Cadets program is directed towards 'youth development', rather than recruitment, cadets are traditionally a strong source of ADF recruits. The R2 initiative was designed to support recruitment by expanding the Cadets program over a 10 year period. This expansion was ongoing at the time of the 2010 R2 evaluation. The report did note, however, that young people joining cadets may already be pre-disposed to an ADF career, rather than developing this interest as a result of participating in the program. It cautioned that the program's impact on increasing recruitment of a wider pool of people into the ADF might therefore be negligible.⁶⁰

A 2008 review of the Cadets scheme found that as well as contributing to the development of confidence, leadership and other skills, many young people found 'their cadet unit is a place where they feel welcome, valued and safe'.

RoWS Initiatives

A key priority of the *CDF Action Plan for the Recruitment and Retention of Women* is increasing the enlistment of women. The starting point of the Action Plan is that to retain women the ADF must attract them, and that within a competitive labour market, the ADF must position itself as an employer of choice. The RoWS predates the Action Plan and was established in 2007 when representation of women in annual ab initio recruit intakes was low at around 13.5%. The main focus of the CDF Action Plan initiatives around recruiting is on implementing the RoWS.

The RoWS was developed from the findings of a 2005 report around attraction of women,⁶¹ later confirmed in a 2010 report.⁶² The research indicated that women often viewed ADF advertising as heavily focused on recruiting men and that there was an overriding perception of the ADF as a 'male dominated' organisation, with few women in high-ranking positions. Media reports of sexual harassment, assault and victimisation, combined with a general lack of awareness about military lifestyle, contributed to this perception.⁶³

The 2005 report identified a need to demystify what daily life was like for women in the ADF. It also highlighted the role of the protracted application process as a barrier to enlistment of potential candidates. The 2010 report further recommended that there needed to be a balance between projecting an attractive image of life in the ADF and portraying a realistic view of a military career.

As one member of the CDF Action Plan Working Group commented:

The metrics around the number of women coming in and asking for a job and then that turning into someone we would employ, there was a massive disparity... I think the research was basically focussed on the fact that we poorly depicted what an ADF model career could be for a woman.⁶⁴

The research showed two major factors impacting on the low conversion rates of female candidates:

- Women second-guessing their decision to join based on lack of insight into realities of career in ADF, and influencers (e.g., parents, partners, friends and teachers) discouraging them.
- Women's perceptions of physical fitness, and fitness assessment failure rates, are a major barrier to enquiry.⁶⁵

Initiatives to generate enquiries and raise awareness of employment opportunities for women in the ADF include:

- an Alumni visits program (where servicewomen visit schools and community groups in their posted regions to share their experiences)
- a 'Women in the ADF' site within the DefenceJobs website
- development of promotional material highlighting jobs that women do in the ADF and how a career in the ADF helps others, makes a difference and allows an appropriate work-life balance.⁶⁶

RoWS initiatives to address these factors have included a Women's Mentoring Program to enable communication and networking between candidates and current serving members, and a 'fitness program to assist women to pass their pre-enlistment physical test', with the capacity to be used to support candidates throughout the recruiting pipeline.⁶⁷

Appendix G.5 – The Recruitment Process

Defence Force Recruiting (DFR) provides marketing and recruiting services to the ADF through a 'public sector/private sector collaboration between Defence and Manpower Services (Australia) Pty Ltd'⁶⁸ (Manpower). DFR's stated mission is to 'recruit the right people to sustain and enhance Defence capability'.

This arrangement replaces the previous system where each Service was responsible for its own recruitment.

Recently, the ADF has signed a five-year contract with ManpowerGroup, covering 'marketing, recruitment operations, medical and psychological assessments and the co-ordination of selection boards and employment offers'. It is reported that 'renewal of the contract will be subject to the ADF's outcome-based requirements, which fundamentally requires that the company delivers the numbers.'⁶⁹

There are 16 Defence Force Recruiting Centres around Australia, with the headquarters located in Canberra. DFR is staffed by Service personnel, APS personnel and Manpower staff, comprising:

- 221 full-time and 86 part-time ADF personnel
- 28 Defence APS personnel
- 365 contracted personnel (including psychology and medical personnel).⁷⁰

There is also a dedicated Candidate Relationship Management Centre (CRMC) staffed by Manpower to 'actively support candidates through the ADF recruiting process and improve the recruitment process by enabling regular contact between potential candidates, ADF personnel and DFR staff'.⁷¹

This is a significant reduction in personnel required to provide Defence's recruiting capability. In the mid-1990s, for example, approximately 1500 ADF and Defence APS personnel were involved in recruiting operations within the single Services.⁷²

A 2003 Defence Instruction sets out the roles and responsibilities involved at various stages of the recruiting process.⁷³ Defence has key responsibilities around recruitment planning and activities through DFR, including:

- Setting enlistment/appointment targets (each Service has the authority for setting its own targets)
- Setting recruiting entry standards and policy
- Monitoring Manpower's performance
- Providing 'embedded' ADF or Defence APS personnel within Manpower.

Manpower provides recruiting services to the ADF to present suitable candidates and achieve recruiting targets, as well as administrative support in managing candidates through the recruiting process. This includes responsibility for:

- processing times for candidates (from initial enquiry to the letter of offer)
- creating and providing Defence data relating to candidates and recruitment
- recruitment services (including psychological and medical testing and assessment) and marketing/advertising expertise
- other requirements as part of the contract with Defence, including achieving key performance indicators
- Manpower also runs a Candidate Relationship Management Centre (CRMC) to 'actively support candidates through the ADF recruiting process and improve the recruitment process by enabling regular contact between potential candidates, ADF personnel and DFR staff'.⁷⁴

A Defence Instruction broadly sets out these key performance indicators as including achievement of enlistment targets in each category and retaining enlistees for at least 12 months. Another KPI is to reduce advertising and marketing expenditure by 5% per year, without adverse impact upon enlistment targets and candidate quality.⁷⁵

Following unsatisfactory recruiting results and a review of the Defence recruiting system in 2006, the 'New DFR' was developed as a recruiting service delivery model to provide a more streamlined and 'candidate-focused' recruiting process.

An overview of the new Service Delivery Model which identifies several key stages of the recruiting process (diagram follows) includes:

- An interested individual makes a phone/online enquiry (or walks into a Recruiting Centre). Initial screening takes place to see if they comply with basic eligibility requirements (for e.g., age or citizenship status). Information is recorded on the candidate's 'PowerForce profile' (an electronic record of their progress through the recruiting pipeline).
- Following initial screening, candidates are booked into a YOU Session ('Your Opportunities Unlimited'), where candidates undergo an aptitude test, an initial medical screening and discuss suitable available job categories with a Careers Counsellor. Candidates are allocated a case manager to finalise their job preferences and help them prepare for assessment (ensuring documentation is collected or any additional testing required).⁷⁶
- The candidate attends an assessment session involving a medical examination, psychologist interview and the 'Defence Interview'.
- If successful, the candidate is allocated to an enlistment coordinator to be allocated a job (if a general entry candidate) or recommendation to Officer Selection Board (officer entry candidate).
- Where a candidate is matched to a recruiting target, they are allocated an enlistment/appointment date and sent a letter of offer. Preparation for enlistment/appointment involves a pathology test, security clearance and passing a Pre-enlistment Fitness Assessment (PFA).⁷⁷

Service Delivery Model – Overview

1

Candidate submits enquiry through DefenceJobs website (www.defencejobs.gov.au) Online Application Tool, 13 19 01 Recruiting Hotline or through a Defence Force Recruiting Centre / Careers Promotion Activity. Candidate initially screened for ADF basic eligibility requirements and booked to initial testing, a Your Opportunities Unlimited (YOU) Session.

2

Your Opportunities Unlimited (YOU) Session

Candidate sits an aptitude test to see what jobs they are eligible for. They see a Nurse for initial medical screening (BMI, Colour Perception, etc) and speak to a Career Counsellor regarding their interest in the ADF. At the end of the session candidates are provided a YOU pack, which will contain all the information to continue their application and identify which jobs the candidate can apply for. The candidate is handed over to their Case Manager who will finalise the candidates preferences and subsequent eligibility requirements.

3

Preparation for Assessment

To prepare candidates for Assessment Session, their Case Manager ensures all required documentation has been signed / collected, including consent to Criminal History Record Check and required education records. Candidate may also be required to undertake additional testing, depending on job preference. Finally, the Case Manager will complete a Checklist with the candidate to make sure they are ready to progress to their Assessment Session.

4

Assessment Session

Candidate's Assessment Session includes examination by Doctor and interview with Psychologist. Candidates will also be interviewed by a Defence Interviewer. Successful General Entry candidates will be allocated to an Enlistment Co-ordinator for job allocation. Officer Entry candidates will be recommended to attend an Officer Selection Board.

5

Preparation for Enlistment / Appointment

Candidates successful at their Assessment Session, and depending on job preferences their Selection Board are allocated a position pending availability. Candidate is required to undertake a pathology test, Pre-enlistment Fitness Assessment and complete a Security Pack, along with any additional forms that are required.

6

Enlistment / Appointment

Candidate completes a brief medical examination and finalises any documentation that is required. Family and friends are invited to attend Enlistment / Appointment ceremony. Candidate is then transported to their respective Services training establishment.

As part of this model, Manpower operates the 'Candidate Relationship Management Centre' ('CRMC'), a centralised call centre to provide for enhanced case management of candidates. This is intended to improve conversion rates and reduce 'wastage' in the recruiting pipeline.⁷⁸ The CRMC has responsibilities to:

- Develop a relationship with and provide some mentoring to candidates
- Confirm candidates' job preferences, understanding of the roles they are applying for and target availability in those areas
- Keep candidates 'warm' through regular contact through the process
- Help candidates with preparation for their interview.

The CRMC has also had some success on a confined scale with a series of specific campaigns to recruit candidates in particular focus areas:

- In 2010 concerns were identified that numbers of candidates in the recruiting pipeline, particularly for the Royal Military College (RMC) intakes, were low. The CRMC ran an outbound campaign contacting 158 ADFA candidates who had withdrawn their applications in 2008, resulting in 23 applications for entry being reactivated.
- In May 2011, all full time rifleman roles were filled, however, candidates continued to list this as their first job preference and were turned away. The CRMC contacted 183 candidates and successfully converted 58 to part-time rifleman positions in geographical areas where there were gaps (e.g. South Australia, Western Australia, Albury and Tasmania).
- In 2011, the applications for Gap Year far exceeded the number of available places. CRMC contacted candidates not shortlisted for Gap Year with the aim of converting them to apply for job categories with unfilled targets. 91 candidates were booked into YOU sessions, including in critical categories.⁷⁹

Appendix G.6 – Gap Year Programs

Navy Gap Year

The Navy Gap Year Program allowed participants to receive training alongside permanent Navy recruits and gain experience at sea. Navy Gap Year participants must undertake an 11-week general entry recruit training followed by a three week seamanship course for development of workplace skills. Training was managed according to the usual RAN training policies.⁸⁰

Following recruit and skills training, participants view officer training at ADFA and HMAS Creswell, and were posted to work experience opportunities, including within sea-going units and shore postings. The aim is to complete at least 22 weeks of service before discharge. The Navy Instruction provides that, where possible, postings will be targeted at vocational interests (e.g. HMAS Albatross for aviation related interests).

Army Gap Year

Army Gap Year service involved completion of an Army Recruit Course, an initial employment training course, and posting to a Land Command unit for at least 5 months. Army indicated that this 'full integration approach' had contributed to Army's high rate of transfers from the Gap Year to ongoing service.⁸¹

Army reported that the Gap Year target for the 2010-11 reporting year was 315. As at May 2010, there were:

- 1002 enquiries and 202 applications from women
- 2571 enquiries and 463 applications from men
- 127 Letters of Offer had been sent to women and 260 to men.

There were 80 female and 111 male enlistees (with a further 21 more females still scheduled to attend recruit training, totaling 85).

Air Force Gap Year

The Air Force Gap Year program consisted of training modules, work experience rotations at Air Force bases, and a visits program. Completion of this is equivalent to completing the Air Force Initial Officer Course and Recruit Training Course. Gap Year service may be terminated early if training is failed.

The Air Force Gap Year program differed from Navy and Army in that participants enlisted as Gap Year Cadets and were provided with a mix of Officer and Other Ranks training, separating them from general enlistment recruits. This was intended to provide participants with a broad experience of the Air Force.

Appendix G.7 – Example of Diversity and Inclusion Service Provider Principles

The National Australia Bank (NAB) has introduced ‘Diversity and Inclusion Service Provider Principles’ as part of its recruiting service provider agreements, which apply from 2012. These principles require recruitment service providers to provide NAB with information regarding their diversity strategy:

Areas to be covered include strategic actions, training and processes that will achieve the supplier’s stated diversity strategy. Reporting on the gender ratio along each step of the recruiting process must also be submitted, including the initial pool of candidates, screening, selection, and short-listing for all roles. There is also a requirement that at least one woman of sufficient quality will be recommended for interview.⁸²

Summary of expectations for search and recruiting firms	
<p>Supporting NAB’s aspirations</p> <p>Service providers will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be true partners in supporting NAB’s aspirations by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Providing a written strategy to improve their own diversity in terms of gender, age, work flexibility, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, etc. » Reporting on gender diversity in their own organisations across all levels and any targets in place. • Providing evidence that they are able to support NAB’s diversity aspiration by utilising: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Inclusive language and imagery » Channels that target diverse labour pools » Validated short-listing processes that weed out biases » Objective interview processes. • Employ a robust approach to training recruitment consultants on diversity and inclusion, cultural awareness, non-English speaking background, bias in selection, EEO and anti-discrimination. This includes training provided to consultants on the service provider’s diversity policy, NAB’s Diversity and Inclusion Policy and unconscious bias. 	<p>Metrics to track success</p> <p>Service providers must also provide progress updates, including KPIs to NAB on a quarterly basis that cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender metrics for all roles (successfully filled or not) which include the gender ratio for each phase of the process including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Initial pool of candidates » Selected for Interview » Shortlist provided to NAB » Selected to interview by NAB. • In addition, shortlists for senior management roles must include at least one woman of sufficient quality/suitability recommended for interview. If such a candidate is not presented, a written explanation is required each time.

Appendix H

Chapter 4: The ADF Workforce Pipeline: Women's representation and critical issues – Section 4.3 Retention

Appendix H.1 – Rates by Services³³

This data is based on three year average length of service data and assumes that 100 men and women commence in the Service at the same time. The graphs show what percentage will be remaining at yearly intervals.

Figure 1: Navy Retention Profiles (Male v Female)




Figure 2: Army Retention Profiles (Male v Female)





Figure 3: Air Force Retention Profiles (Males v Females)



Appendix H.2 – First-Term Completion by Occupation Group and Sex

The separation rate of personnel differs across the various categories of each Service. Following is a table illustrating the percentage of personnel in other ranks who have completed their Initial Mandatory Period of Service (IMPS) by category and shows some differences between men and women, as well as differences between retention across different Services for similar kinds of work.^{B4} Given the small sample size, the figures are not conclusive, however they do point to some interesting differences that the Review suggests the ADF could investigate further using a larger data pool generated by examining trends over several years.

Figure 1: First-term completion by gender, Service and occupation

Enlistment Occupation Group	RAN			ARA			RAAF			ADF		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Aviation				87.1%	85.7%	87.0%	100% ^{B5}	76.2%	78.3%	87.5%	78.6%	84.8%
Communications, Intelligence and Surveillance	70.3%	59.7%	65.3%	67.1%	55.0%	66.1%	81.2%	81.8%	81.3%	72.1%	64.6%	70.5%
Engineering, Construction and Maintenance	67.8%	55.4%	67.0%	73.8%	80.0%	74.0%	83.5%	83.3%	83.5%	73.0%	62.2%	72.5%
Ground Combat				67.9%		67.9%				67.9%		67.9%
Health	60.0%	62.8%	61.8%	77.5%	65.4%	71.9%	66.7%	63.6%	64.1%	73.3%	64.3%	68.2%
Logistics and Administration	70.2%	66.3%	68.3%	71.2%	71.2%	71.2%	79.7%	81.4%	80.6%	72.2%	72.5%	72.2%
Musician	96.0%	76.9%	89.5%	81.8%	77.8%	80.6%	88.2%	100.0%	90.5%	87.2%	80.0%	85.1%
Sea Combat	59.9%	59.1%	59.8%							59.9%	59.1%	59.8%
Service Police and Airfield Defence				50.0%		50.0%	72.5%	90.5%	74.5%	72.2%	90.5%	74.2%
Total	66.2%	62.5%	65.3%	67.5%	66.9%	67.4%	80.7%	80.5%	80.7%	68.9%	68.5%	68.8%

Ground Combat and Sea Combat exhibit lower first-term completion odds than occupations such as Health, Logistics and Administration. The Air Force appears able to retain a higher proportion of their Communications, Intelligence and Surveillance personnel as well as their Engineering, Construction and Maintenance, Logistics and Administration and Service Police and Airfield Defence personnel, than either Navy or Army.

There is a lower completion rate for women in several categories such as Communications, Intelligence and Surveillance in both Navy and Army, Health in Army, and Engineering, Construction and Maintenance and Musician in Navy. The most significant variance in Air Force is in Aviation where 25% less women completed first-term completion than men.

The precise reasons for the differences in attrition across categories are not known by the ADF and could be a combination of factors including the nature of the positions and the personal and psychological attributes of the personnel (including the kinds of personnel attracted to particular categories).⁸⁶

Appendix H.3 ADF Initiatives aimed at retaining personnel

Project LASER⁸⁷

Project LASER (Longitudinal ADF Study Evaluating Retention) aims to build a better understanding of the retention drivers that influence members to stay or leave the ADF during their initial period of service. The focus of Project LASER is on providing empirical data to the Services to support the development of retention initiatives. Project LASER captures members at entry into the organisation, at regular intervals and then upon exit from the organisation. This provides the vital link between reported turnover intentions and actual turnover behaviour for members during their initial period of service. LASER enables identification of the differences between 'stayers' (members who stay in the ADF) and 'leavers' (members who leave the ADF). This will lead to a better understanding of why members choose to stay or leave and in turn will allow the Services to determine how best to convert 'leavers' into 'stayers' with targeted evidence-based retention strategies and initiatives.

The latest report, a 2011 Report based on all Other Ranks LASER respondents who joined in 2010, includes the following key findings:⁸⁸

- Physical fitness is a key challenge for females joining the Army.
- Fewer friends and relatives are encouraging females to join the Navy in 2010 than in 2009.
- Separation from family/partners presents challenges for recruits in training completion.
- Dissatisfaction with branch/trade is still associated with higher attrition.
- There was a large amount of feedback about recruitment process and information provided throughout the process.
- There has been a reduction in observations and experiences of unacceptable behaviour.

Retention and Recruitment (R2) Program

R2, a major recruitment and retention project aimed at improving recruitment and retention into the ADF, included several initiatives aimed at reducing the separation rate of personnel including the use of retention bonuses and bonuses for critical categories and occupations (such as for submariners). An evaluation of the program demonstrates its apparent success in reducing separation rates across the ADF (see Appendix G.4 for further details).⁸⁹ However, an examination of the specific impact on women's retention was not conducted as part of this evaluation and so it is not clear which of the initiatives had the greatest impact on women's retention. Furthermore, given the majority of the measures in R2 did not address structural and systemic issues or the issues of most concern to women (such as addressing the need for greater flexibility and locational stability), it seems unlikely that the impact of R2 initiatives on women's retention would be profound or long-term.

Plan SUAKIN⁹⁰

As part of the Strategic Reform Program, an extensive study into the Reserve forces known as Plan SUAKIN was initiated, aimed at exploring how the Reserve forces can better contribute to a cost efficient and effective force 2030. Plan SUAKIN recommends capitalising on the capability and willingness to work more days within the Reserve forces to enhance ADF capability. In doing so, it recommends a complete reform of Defence's current workforce model. Key recommendations include:

- To establish a spectrum of employment options including full-time, part-time and casual service across the permanent and Reserve forces (seven different employment models in all). This will allow Defence members to move between different employment models as their life circumstances change.
- To create attractive remuneration packages including superannuation for Reserve service.
- Ensure meaningful career management of Reserve forces.

The benefits of the reforms proposed under Plan SUAKIN could be significant for the attraction and retention of women (and men) in the ADF:

- Men and women juggling work/family responsibilities will have far greater options for part-time and flexible work and, significantly, the ability to move between part-time and permanent employment with greater ease to suit their different needs at any one time.
- Efforts to address many of the structural and cultural barriers to personnel accessing part-time and flexible work will be made such as:
 - » The stigma and guilt associated with accessing part-time work because of difficulty in backfilling permanent positions.
 - » Attitudes towards part-time work as 'lesser', 'uncommitted'.
- Superannuation will be offered for part-time work.

The implementation of Plan SUAKIN was approved by the Chiefs of Service Committee on 25 May 2012.

Navy initiatives

Navy has trialled and implemented several initiatives aimed at addressing the high separation rates, particularly among sailors, as a result of strains on work-life balance caused by sea-going requirements.⁹¹ Under the impetus of the *Seachange Workforce Renewal Project*, alternative crewing strategies used by other Navies and commercial enterprises were investigated, and some trials were conducted on Navy vessels. 'Alternative crewing' arrangements are focused on increasing locational stability and a balance between work and home for Navy personnel while ensuring operational effectiveness. They include the following crewing arrangements:

- *Enhanced crewing*—a form of traditional crewing where enhanced shore support relieves sailors of their duties while alongside (such as duty-watch, force protection and routine maintenance)
- *Supplementation (flexi-crewing)*—additional personnel are posted to a crew to increase flexibility for sailors to be released for leave, respite and training
- *Multi-crewing*—multiple complete crews rotate between platforms
- *Modular crewing*—a minimum core crew can be supplemented by specialist, mission specific teams (referred to as 'capability bricks')
- *Civilian crewing*—RAN crews are replaced by civilian personnel from the Merchant marine. Such systems are already successfully employed in the Royal Navy (Royal Fleet Auxiliary) and United States Navy (Military Sealift Command).

Navy has trialled 'multi-crewing' – the rotation of multiple complete crews between platforms/vessels – on several kinds of vessels in different operational environments. Navy currently multi-crews on Hydrographic (Hydro) and Patrol vessels (PB) and has multi-crewed Mine Countermeasure vessels (MHC) on two occasions in recent years.⁹² An evaluation of the use of multi-crewing in Patrol Boat and Hydrographic fleet has shown these to be successful and well-established.⁹³

The Navy has also implemented a 'Minimum Duty Watch' aimed at reducing the level of duty watch required of personnel posted to vessels alongside homeport.⁹⁴ Additionally, Navy has trialled fly-in/fly-out (FIFO) arrangements including on MHCs with platforms rotating between being 'on station' and in maintenance.⁹⁵

Alternative crewing arrangements have generally been met positively by members and address many of the core concerns of women that leave the ADF. Evaluations of the initiatives make concrete proposals for overcoming many of the difficulties that arose during the trials such as perceived inequality in workloads.⁹⁶

Additionally, the *Submarine Whole of Capability Workforce Review* resulted in implementation of a series of initiatives aimed at improving submariners' work/life balance, including:⁹⁷

- Suitably qualified civilian contractors were hired to replace some members of the ship's Duty Watch, thus freeing up some crew members to take leave and reducing the watch keeping workload for the entire crew.
- Increasing crew sizes from 46 to 58 people providing the Commanding Officer with more flexibility within the crew to manage short-term personnel deficiencies.
- Establishment of a Submarine Support Group (SSG) of 27 people to provide 'fly in, fly out' support services to submarines in port.
- Provision of internet and intranet access to submarines.
- Relocation of the Submarine Communications Centre from the east to Fleet Base West at HMAS *Stirling*, to provide twelve additional shore-based jobs in the west, resulting in improved posting stability and incentives to remain in the Navy for submarine communications sailors and their families.
- A new 'try before you buy' internal recruiting program aimed at attracting more junior sailors and junior officers into the submarine service.
- Retention bonuses.⁹⁸

The financial implications of implementing many of these measures are a consideration, however, some of the costs appear to be countered by reduced expense on relocation of personnel and their families, and the longer-term impact on retention among other savings.⁹⁹

Air Force initiatives¹⁰⁰

Project WINTER was initiated in 2011, in response to ongoing ministerial direction for the Services to increase their overall participation of women in the ADF. The largest employment groups in Air Force in terms of personnel numbers also have the lowest overall representation of women aircrew (4.7%), technical trades (2%) and engineering (8%). Project WINTER was instigated in acknowledgement that even small gains in female representation in these 'non-traditional' fields for women will result in significant gains in overall female representation in Air Force.

Project WINTER has already implemented, or is in the process of implementing, a range of initiatives focusing on the education, retention, support and progression of women in non-traditional employment roles. It includes a series of initiatives ranging from marketing to alternative career pathways for women. The next stage of development – designing a specialised marketing and recruiting campaign that will encourage higher numbers of women to pursue non-traditional careers within Air Force – was approved by the Chiefs of Service Committee on 29 May 2012, with a budget of \$600,000.¹⁰¹

The initiatives under Project WINTER appear to take a holistic approach to women's attraction and retention in 'non-traditional' fields of employment for women, recognising that factors such as lack of breastfeeding facilities, flexible work and initiatives to support diversity within Air Force is needed for the success and sustainability of the project. The fact that the initiative is specifically tailored towards the retention of women means that it addresses women's specific needs and concerns in a way that more general retention initiatives do not.

Appendix I

Chapter 4: The ADF Workforce Pipeline: Women's representation and critical issues – Section 4.4 Career management and progression

Promotions Boards

All boards observed by the Review were for promotion to mid-to-senior officer ranks – the Navy board was for promotion to Lieutenant Commander, the Army board for promotion to Colonel, and the Air Force board for promotion to Squadron Leader. In each case the process was thorough and involved, and some brief observations follow.

Navy board

The Navy board attended by the Review was for promotion within one specific primary qualification (PQ). It was staffed by six officers who were one rank or two ranks (in the case of the Chair) more senior than the rank candidates were competing for promotion to. The board included one 'independent' member, one woman, and the others were from different areas within the primary qualification in question. There were 127 candidates examined. Career managers and a note taker were also present.

A substantial dossier was compiled for each candidate, and this was available to the board members before they met. Based on this material, board members independently submitted scores for PQ competency, performance, professional development, potential and NGN signature behaviours and values. These scores were tallied and the candidates were ranked. When the board met they discussed each candidate, paying particular interest to areas where there was an outlying score given by one board member. Board members also noted any instances where they had any perceived or real conflicts of interest.

Candidates were then ranked in several rounds of examination (e.g. round one 'deciding who will definitely not be promoted', round two, identifying a benchmark 'who is competitive for promotion', round three, assessing all those above this point, and deciding 'who will be recommended for promotion').¹⁰² Candidates were considered for their capacity to be both 'qualified and generalist' officers at the next rank, which appeared to offer some scope for the promotion of officers who had not followed the traditionally prescribed career path.¹⁰³

Finally, according to the Chief of Navy's promotion board guidance, 'the officer's overall performance [should be considered] through the prism of Navy's signature behaviours and values.'¹⁰⁴ All candidates were given a score for their signature behaviours at the board attended by the Review, but the ability for assessment in this area was much more limited than in others. While there were seven categories into which 'performance' and 'competence' could be ranked, there were only four quite generic categories for signature behaviour rankings, one of which applied to the vast majority of those examined.¹⁰⁵ The board had little material for assessing candidates in this area other than attendance at mandatory courses and any conduct records. This made this item more of a check against standard behaviour rather than a chance to examine any positive or proactive displays of leadership in this area.

Army board

The Army board attended by the Review was not category specific. It was staffed by 12 officers who were one rank or two ranks (in the case of the Chair) more senior than the rank that candidates were competing for promotion to. There were 117 candidates examined. The board included one woman, and the Review was informed that women who sit on the boards are drawn from various parts of the Army with the aim of having a diverse panel and varied opinions.¹⁰⁶ DOCM-A is considering ways that it can increase diversity, including by having civilian members on its promotion boards.¹⁰⁷

A document of approximately 40 to 50 pages in length which included six years' worth of performance reviews and other supplementary documents was provided to the board before they met. Individuals were independently assessed against four pillars – performance, qualifications, experience and potential – and given a blind vote in a number of categories which were submitted to DOCM-A to compile for the purposes of an initial ordering for further examination.

The board examined candidates with a process similar to the Navy board. Army board members were encouraged to identify and communicate any conflicts of interest for any particular candidate, with the discussion being led by a member with particular knowledge of the individual, or one who gave an outlying score. The ordering was adjusted, and candidates were assigned one of four bands. Band one was for those likely to be promoted in this round (and if there were insufficient positions, then in the next round), band two for those highly competitive, some of whom may be promoted, band three for those unlikely to be promoted at this time and band four for those not to be re-examined by a board.

After all candidates were considered for promotion within the primary/traditional 'command and leadership' pathway, the board examined applicants for promotion through Army's 'pathway strategy'. 'Pathways' was introduced in 2007 to provide alternative career pathways and allow Army to acknowledge and retain skills and individuals who may not advance along its traditional pathway, and to give the Chief a wider range of personnel to prospectively promote.¹⁰⁸ Candidates could be considered through the traditional stream, and also one of the pathway categories. Pathways categories include logistics, aviation, information management, capability and project management, personnel, operations, plans and training, intelligence, and specialist.¹⁰⁹

Air Force board

The Air Force board attended by the Review was category specific. It was staffed by four officers who were one rank or two ranks (in the case of the Chair) more senior than the rank that candidates were competing for promotion to. There were 106 candidates examined. The board members were drawn from the category in question, and there was one woman. The personnel manager for this category and a secretary were also present.

The Air Force process differed from the Navy and Army processes in a few key ways. There appeared to be less material circulated to the board before the day of the meeting, and there were no pre-submitted independent votes. For this reason, candidates were not examined in a prospective merit order, but by seniority. The personnel manager would introduce each candidate, and talk the board through some details which were projected onto a screen at the front of the room. These details included seniority, three years of PAR and other report scores, postings and any administrative issues. The Chair informed the board that the PAR and other scores prominently noted in each candidate's introduction would be a guide, but that they should pay more attention to the narrative element of any reviews. The panel then reviewed files for each candidate available to them on personal computers. From this point, the process more closely mirrored the Navy and Army boards.

Consideration of individual candidates happened in several rounds. In the first round, the panel decided whether or not the candidates would be broadly competitive for promotion, and assigned them to one of several bands. After this round, the board began to rank candidates by finding 'benchmark' individuals, and then comparing them to others who were similarly placed.

Appendix J

Chapter 5: The ADF Workforce Structure: Opportunities, Pathways and Barriers – Section 5.1 Occupational Segregation

Appendix J.1 – Number of men and women in each category in order of most highly represented by women¹¹⁰

Figure 1: Navy – Number of men and women in each category in order of most highly represented by women




Figure 2: Army – Number of men and women in each category in order of most highly represented by women





Figure 3: Air Force – Number of men and women in each category in order of most highly represented by women



Appendix J.2 – Changes in the percentage of women by category (in order of most high represented by women) over the last 6 years¹¹¹

Figure 1: Navy – Changes in the percentage of women by category




Figure 2: Army – Changes in the percentage of women by category





Figure 3: Air Force – Changes in the percentage of women by category



Appendix J.3 – Distribution of ranks within categories¹¹²

Figure 1: Distribution of ranks within categories – Navy non-commissioned officers (other ranks)




Figure 2: Distribution of ranks within categories – Navy officers ranks




Figure 3: Distribution of ranks within categories – Army non-commissioned officers (other ranks)




Figure 4: Distribution of ranks within categories – Army officer ranks




Figure 5: Distribution of ranks within categories – Air Force non-commissioned officers (other ranks)





Figure 6: Distribution of ranks within categories – Air Force officer ranks



Appendix J.4 – ADF initiatives to address occupational segregation

The ADF has implemented a number of initiatives that have either aimed to attract women to non-traditional occupations in the ADF or have had this unintended effect. Many of these initiatives are detailed in Appendix G.4. Following is a brief overview of the key aspects of these initiatives that are relevant to addressing occupational segregation.

The ADF Recruitment of Women Strategy (RoWS)

This strategy was launched in 2008 with the aim of increasing the percentage of women among overall recruit intakes annually – with an end goal of achieving a 20% intake of women by Financial Year (FY) 2009-10. The strategy aims at demystifying military life. Although not specifically targeted towards attracting women to technical trades, it does encourage women to consider non-traditional careers through the development of promotional material highlighting the diversity of jobs that women do in the ADF. Initiatives include an Alumni Visits program (visits by servicewomen to schools and community groups in their posted regions) women's mentoring program, and a library of 'Women in the ADF profiles' and other promotional material (with a focus on the range of opportunities open to women in the ADF).

Retention and Recruitment Program (R2)

The R2 Program includes a suite of initiatives aimed at the recruitment and retention of personnel. The Defence Technical Scholarship is granted to students undertaking technically-oriented subjects in years 11 and 12, without any obligation to Defence at the completion of their studies. While not specifically targeted at women, recipients are 'encouraged to consider a trade career in the ADF' through visits and other ADF-oriented activities.

The Gap Year program (See Appendix G.6) exposed young people to Defence Force employment without having to commit to extensive training and return of service. It was very successful in attracting young women to the ADF, particularly in Army, and also enabled women to experience employment in 'non-traditional' fields.

Initiatives of Army

Reduced 'Initial Minimum Period of Service' obligations¹¹³

As a consequence of the Gap Year (which showed that women were more attracted to shorter periods of service), Army has trialled various reduced 'Initial Minimum Period of Service' in trade categories where skills were needed. Currently, there is a reduced 'Initial Minimum Period of Service' from 4 years to 1 year for the following trades:

- Operator Supply
- Driver Specialist
- Operator Administration
- Operator Movements
- Preventative Medicine
- Military Policeman
- Cargo Specialist
- Cook
- Dispatch Air
- Ground Crewman (Mission Support)
- Clerk Finance and
- Dental Assistant.

Other initiatives

The removal of gender-restriction on combat related roles will enable women to enter all positions in Army (an additional 14.6% of positions). These positions are in 'non-traditional' areas of employment for women.

Initiatives of Air Force

*Project WINTER*¹¹⁴ (See also Appendix H)

Project WINTER aims to implement a vast range of activities designed to increase women's overall representation in Air Force, by targeting those employment fields that are not traditionally attractive to women joining the Air Force. It is currently focused on the recruitment, support, retention and progression of women Pilots, Air Combat Officers, Technicians, Engineers and women intending to pursue careers in ground defence roles. It includes a series of initiatives ranging from marketing to alternative career pathways for women.

Importantly, Project WINTER is part of a holistic approach to attracting women into these occupations, recognising that factors such as lack of breast-feeding facilities, flexible work and initiatives to support diversity within Air Force is needed for the success and sustainability of the project.

Initiatives of Navy

Navy's current initiatives focus on recruitment and include:¹¹⁵

- Women's web page on defence jobs website
- Development of a web forum for online discussion
- Navy support to recruitment seminars and trades shows targeting females in trades
- Fitness and wellbeing apps
- Merchandise through DFR
- Conscious placement of females in all advertising/testimonials in non-traditional roles.

Appendix K

Chapter 5: The ADF Workforce Structure: Opportunities, Pathways and Barriers – Section 5.3 Women in Combat: Removal of Gender Restrictions

Appendix K.1 – ADF Policy on Employment of Women

In 1983, Australia ratified the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). However, it maintained two reservations. One reservation supported the exclusion of women from combat related duties and combat duties.

This reservation was reflected in domestic law in an exemption granted to the ADF under the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* that nothing in that Act rendered it unlawful to discriminate against a woman on the grounds of gender in relation to ‘combat related duties’ and ‘combat duties’:¹¹⁶

- ‘Combat duties’ were defined as duties ‘requiring a person to commit, or to participate directly in the commission of, an act of violence against an adversary in time of war’.¹¹⁷ A Defence Instruction further defines ‘direct combat duties’ as including ‘duties exposing a person to a high probability of direct physical contact with an armed adversary’.¹¹⁸
- ‘Combat *related* duties’ were defined as duties requiring a person to work in support of, and in close proximity to, a person performing combat duties, in circumstances in which the person may be killed or injured by an act of violence by an adversary.¹¹⁹

From the 1990s onwards, the policy gradually shifted so that women could serve in all units except ‘direct combat’ units and were no longer precluded from ‘combat related’ positions.

In 2000, Australia withdrew part of its CEDAW reservation, so that discrimination against women was only allowed in relation to employment in combat duties. The ADF policy reflecting this is set out in Defence Instruction DI(G) Pers 32-1 *Employment of Women in the Australian Defence Force*:¹²⁰

ADF Policy

3. The ADF policy on the employment of Service members is to provide equality of opportunity consistent with operational effectiveness. Men and women can compete equally for all employment except those involving ‘Direct Combat Duties’....

...

5. The Direct Combat exclusion precludes the employment of women from the following types of units/positions, and

- a. **Navy.** Clearance diving teams (OBERON Class submarines are currently excluded because of accommodation limitations)
- b. **Army.** Armour, artillery, combat engineers and infantry
- c. **Air Force.** Airfield Defence Guards and Ground Defence Officers.

6. When initiating posting action cognizance must also be taken of employment categories that may have the potential for exposure to embryo toxic substances.

In 2005, this policy was further altered to allow employment of women in support roles in infantry, armoured and artillery units. Defence have advised that Paragraph 5b of the policy above is ‘obsolete’, and the Instruction itself will be reviewed and changed in light of the removal of gender restrictions.¹²¹

Appendix K.2 – Current impact of restrictions on women

As at 31 December 2011:

Within Air Force, out of 130 categories:

- 127 categories are open to both men and women (97.6%), however only 97 categories have female members (76.4%)
- The positions from which women are currently restricted are Airfield Defence Guard and Ground Defence Officer.¹²²

Within Army, out of 185 categories:

- 158 categories are open to both men and women (85.4%), however only 119 categories have female members (75.3%)
- The roles from which women are currently restricted are: in Artillery (Gunner, Light Gunner, Observer), in Armoured Corps (Cavalry, Light Cavalry, Tank Crewman), in Infantry (Rifleman, Patrolman, SAS, Commando). Women can serve as Combat Engineers, though not in Combat Engineer Squadrons and Explosive Ordnance Disposal squadrons.¹²³

Within Navy, out of 184 categories:

- 180 categories are open to both men and women (97.8%), however only 118 categories have female members (65.6%)
- The positions from which women are currently restricted are Clearance Diver roles within various categories.

Appendix L

Chapter 5: The ADF Workforce Structure: Opportunities, Pathways and Barriers – Section 5.4 Mentoring, networking and sponsorship

Formal and informal programs

Mentoring relationships can take a number of different forms. For example, senior leaders can engage in one-to-one mentoring relationships with women. Group mentoring activities may be used to create a welcoming environment, encouraging open discussion and dispelling some of the myths of organisational politics.

Formal mentoring programs are sanctioned by the organisation and generally involve the matching of participants. Aspects of the program are often pre-set, such as the duration of the program or frequency and location. Generally formal mentoring programs also have goals set at the beginning of a mentoring relationship.¹²⁴

Informal mentoring, on the other hand, is where mentor and protégé are 'selected' by mutual choice and attraction, the terms of the relationship are as the parties choose and the goals may evolve over time.¹²⁵ Ideally, however, formal mentoring programs can provide a platform for informal mentoring to develop.

Formal mentorship programs can be useful where there is a gap in the quality of informal mentoring received by men and women. Important considerations to take into account are:

- whether the mentoring relationship is established informally or as part of a formal program
- who are the mentors and protégés
- how they are matched
- what support they are provided through the process.

Networking opportunities can come about through a range of forums to bring women into contact with those who have 'made it work' (for example, by successfully negotiating flexible work arrangements, or providing leadership examples). In an organisation with the geographical spread of the ADF, there appears to have been some success with establishing regional networks with specific aims (such as leadership) to assist women in particular areas of their development. Networking may also be enhanced through online technology.

Some studies of companies suggest that participation in mainstream, rather than women-only, networks is more beneficial for women, noting that 'cross-company and cross-gender programs have characteristics that are likely to combat the advantages of men over women'.¹²⁶

However, although many issues relevant to professional development or career decisions are gender-neutral, some are gender-specific or impact disproportionately on women. These include issues such as inflexible career paths and planning children, perceptions of discrimination or sexual harassment, and the representation of women at senior leadership levels to provide positive role models, all of which have been raised as concerns for women in the Review's focus groups.

Other research identifies some challenges to holistic mentoring relationships between senior men and junior women, such as participants' comfort in discussing gender-specific issues, as well as their experience or knowledge in dealing such issues. A lack of mentoring training may exacerbate the ability to overcome such barriers.

In moving from traditional mentorship to sponsorship, the Male Champions of Change report provides a case study of a formal sponsorship program being rolled out by Goldman Sachs that holds senior executives responsible for the success of specific women.¹²⁷ The program was developed in the context of acknowledgement by leaders that promotion rates of senior women were lagging behind their male counterparts, partly due to the perception that they had a lower profile and fewer advocates from outside their business.

With a view to increasing promotion rates from executive director to managing director level, women at executive director level were assigned two managing director sponsors. These sponsors provided coaching focused on the person's impact on the organisation and their profile and reputation both within the organisation and with external clients. Feedback was also sought from sponsors regarding the candidates' responsiveness to feedback and suitability for promotion.

The program was found to help 'close the gap' in terms of the contribution of these women and their broader recognition and visibility within the organisation.¹²⁸

E-mentoring

E-mentoring programs are increasingly being considered as a new and effective approach to mentoring by providing a process for participants to communicate in confidence or share information within an online community. Online communication can avoid some of the traditional difficulties in face-to-face mentoring, such as power differences or geographical barriers.¹²⁹

Some of the more unique benefits for women reported include:

- development of ICT skills
- networking experiences on a wider scale than would normally be possible
- flexibility of communication methods allowed mentoring to occur without mentoring interfering with family or other commitments.¹³⁰

Each Service has some e-mentoring initiatives in place, however, effective e-mentoring requires an accessible online interface and familiarity with online communication.¹³¹ In some situations, such as certain types of deployment or submarines, such access may be limited. E-mentoring is therefore most effective where it is one of several types of support.¹³²

The US Navy piloted a formalised women's e-mentoring process (managed by an external provider) which matched characteristics of mentors and mentees and utilising email, electronic chat software or Skype.

This program of electronic mentoring was set up in recognition of the importance of mentoring for young women, as a tool for supporting women in their careers and advising them on options, and to deal with the difficulties of members being geographically dispersed on deployment.¹³³

Mentoring, networking and other support frameworks in the ADF

The CDF Action Plan calls for a variety of mentoring, networking and coaching models to be made available within Defence to assist with providing insights into organisational strategies, policies, programs and politics. It suggests that these programs could be conducted internally or facilitated with the assistance of external organisations and must recognise the differing needs of individuals at different life and career stages.

The Action Plan emphasises that these programs should account for, and emphasise, the value of people with different needs, rather than focusing only on women. Suggested initiatives include developing non-traditional models of mentoring, utilising social networking technologies, developing an intranet site and a 'Young Female Leaders Network'.

In response to the Action Plan, each Service has put programs in place. Significant programs include:

- The Navy Leadership Development Program and Navy Women's Mentoring Program funded through the Navy Women's Strategic Adviser
- The Army Women's Networking Forum and Regional Women's Networking and Mentoring Sessions
- The Air Force Gender Diversity Strategy and Leadership Exchange Program.

A summary of some of these initiatives follows below.

Navy

Navy has established a Navy Women's Leadership Program, and Navy Women's Mentoring Program, with participation of both Navy and APS personnel. The Leadership program will provide for more than one hundred female leaders to participate in a number of women's leadership development programs and events around Australia.¹³⁴

The Navy Leadership Development Program includes skills based mentoring workshops which are presented on promotion courses for all ranks.

There is also a voluntary executive coaching program, for senior sailors and officers in key positions or who have completed Navy's three day leadership workshops which are made available to all such personnel over a rolling three year program.

In conjunction with the Navy Leadership Development Program, the Navy Women's Strategic Adviser funds the Navy Women's Mentoring Program known as the Emberin 'My Mentor Challenging Women to Make it Happen' program.¹³⁵ In 2010, 50 positions were funded. In 2011, this was increased to 70 positions.

'My Mentor' is a self-paced, self development program covering 12 modules associated with professional and personal development. The Navy Women's Strategic Adviser coordinates the program across Navy during a specific period of time, and encourages women in the same locality to form peer support groups. Defence reported that feedback from 2010 was very supportive of the program.¹³⁶

Army

The primary initiative conducted by the Army is the Army Women's Networking Forum, run by Army Career Management. The Forum takes place in eight locations around Australia each year, allowing participants to hear from subject matter experts on policy developments, and new initiatives affecting Army women.

Previous forum topics have included work-life balance, childcare, breaks in service, establishing organisational presence. More recently, the forum has discussed include integration of the new Physical Employment Standards, Women in Combat Roles and flexible work. The forum also holds workgroups for discussion of set issues with the outcome reported back to the Chief of Army.

Army reports that participants have responded positively to the Forum, indicating that it 'provides them with a valuable learning opportunity and a platform to allow them to have their concerns heard'.¹³⁷

Career Management Army has also introduced an online forum to complement this, providing appraisal and previews from previous mentoring and networking seminars held across Australia, and information on supporting initiatives such as the Self-Paced Mentoring Program and the Chief Executive Women's Talent Development Program.¹³⁸ Senior leaders are encouraged to be involved in the forum.

The Chief Executive Women's Talent Development Program involves selection of four Army women leaders at Major/Lieutenant Colonel rank to participate in a 9 month mentoring and coaching program. The program facilitates interaction with corporate executives, idea sharing and strategy formulation.

This program has been running for six years and has become very popular, attracting many nominations for acceptance into the program.

Air Force

In the first phase of its 'Gender Diversity Strategy', RAAF focused on leadership, mentoring education and development. In 2011, the following programs were offered:

- A Development Grant sponsored amount by DGPERS-AF for members of any rank to undertake a course that they identify will directly contribute to Air Force's gender diversity or a development course of their choice (for women only)
- 'My Mentor: Mastering Gender Leadership' package for male leaders who manage flexible employment in the workplace or are involved in career development or mentoring of female staff. This course was available by distance in 2011 and targeted male managers/supervisors (all ranks)
- 'My Mentor: Challenging Women to make it happen' package for junior female members covering topics such as gender difference, negotiation, leadership, communication and career planning
- A one day Women in Leadership workshop aimed to provide practical steps and skills for leading in a male dominated environment (for female members who manage or supervise personnel)

- Women and Leadership Australia Employer Program for female members (all ranks) involving at the Australian Women's Leadership Symposium (two day conference) and on-site development workshop supported by an individual coaching session
- 'Leadership Journey for Women', a 10-month structured program for senior women involving three workshops, peer learning opportunities and a workshop for mentors (trial at RAAF Williamtown)
- 'Women's Village' providing online articles, discussions and polls on women's issues, personal development, career and learning, health, finance, relationships, home and lifestyle, parenting, and making a difference.

Despite a large expression of interest initially to the Air Force 'My Mentor' program (which had been successfully adopted by Navy) an interim evaluation found the response to it was not positive.¹³⁹ Women felt that the program was too corporate and that it did not provide opportunities to meet women locally and network in the local area.

Participants were encouraged, through the senior group member in each location, to develop local networking opportunities throughout the program, however, the response to this was limited. Engagement from participants began slowly and proved difficult to draw out thoughts and discussion on topics. Little changed with the smaller group facilitation and results varied between groups.

A key problem was that participants found it difficult to fit the pace of the My Mentor program modules in with other work and family commitments. A RAAF briefing notes that the 'relevance and topic content, while generally interesting and beneficial, may not justify the program cost, given those outcomes could be achieved through other, more tailored means of professional development'. The conclusion was that other methods of facilitation of mentoring and networking required investigation, including a formalised local networking arrangement on each base for participants to get greater engagement.¹⁴⁰

Instead, RAAF have developed a customised program called Women's Integrated Networking Groups ('WINGS'), with a launch in April 2012. This program comprises a 10-month, locally delivered program for Air Force women, involving a two hour facilitated session once per month.¹⁴¹

The program is based on the premise that mentoring relationships will form 'naturally' if women are provided the right opportunities and that the most enduring relationships are those that came about through people connecting through work or social forums, rather than through 'artificially enforced mentoring programs'. The program is targeted towards creating networking, mentoring and learning opportunities for women in their local areas, particularly those working in male-dominated fields who have little access to women in their daily work.

Following success with a trial at RAAF Williamtown, it is being rolled out across major bases in 2012. Facilitators in each location have been identified (primarily interested RAAF Reserves senior women at airman or officer rank), selected and a facilitators' guide developed (with a prospect of future training). There is funding for guest speakers selected by the group/facilitator and meetings will include formal presentation, informal networking and 'facilitated feedback and discussion'.

RAAF advised the ultimate aim is 'that WINGs becomes an embedded part of AF life, and that women posted to a new base will automatically seek out and join the local chapter'.¹⁴²

The program is intended to facilitate the building of support networks for women in under-represented groups who have fewer opportunities for regular networking or mentoring through everyday workplace interacts, sporting or other groups or clubs and other forums. In particular, while women in job groups which are highly-feminised may already have strong networks with like-minded women, those in non-traditional employment groups may have less training and workplace opportunities to share their experiences with other women.

RAAF report that feedback from the trial has shown that networking has assisted participants with issues such as child-friendly GPs in the local area, child care, and other issues experienced by women who are new to a community area.

While the trial and initial roll out is focused on women, it is intended that similar programs for networking and support be rolled out for other under-represented workforce groups such as indigenous members, single parents, working dads and gay, lesbian, bi-sexual and transgendered members.

Air Force also approved funding under the Gender Diversity Strategy for participation in the Chief Executive Women Talent Development Program. Air Force is also seeking to nominate a candidate for the 'WLA Advanced Leadership Program' involving coaching and 360 degree feedback focused on development of senior women managers. The funding secured for these programs is aimed at addressing a perceived gap between the focus of women's development at junior-middle rank level in Air Force and the lack of dedicated women's leadership development courses for senior women.¹⁴³

Appendix M

Chapter 6: Combining a Military Career with Family

Appendix M.1 – Maternity and Parental Leave – Policy Overview

The ADF's policy on maternity and parental leave is set out in its Pay and Conditions Manual (PACMAN).

What types of maternity and parental leave are available to ADF members?

There are two types of 'parental' leave available to ADF members:

1. *Maternity leave* is 'granted to a member who is pregnant or has recently given birth'.¹⁴⁴ A total of 52 weeks is available to members, up to 14 weeks of which is paid. Members are able to take recreation leave or long service leave instead of unpaid leave.¹⁴⁵ Maternity leave may be taken at half pay (to extend the period of paid maternity leave) if approved.¹⁴⁶ If a member returns to work early, she is entitled to take maternity leave again during the 52 week period.¹⁴⁷ An application for maternity leave submitted by an eligible member must be approved.¹⁴⁸ The ADF recognises maternity leave as being associated with pregnancy and childbirth, and as such, it is not available to members who become parents through adoption or surrogacy.¹⁴⁹
2. *Parental leave* is available to members on continuous full-time service who become the parent of a 'newborn or adopted dependent child'.¹⁵⁰ Eligible members may be granted two weeks of paid parental leave and up to 64 weeks of additional unpaid parental leave.¹⁵¹ ADF authorities are not obliged to approve applications for parental leave.¹⁵²

Who is eligible for maternity or parental leave?

Maternity leave

All members who are pregnant 20 weeks before the expected date of birth are entitled to a maternity leave absence.¹⁵³ A member remains entitled to maternity leave if her pregnancy terminates (for example, through miscarriage) 20 weeks or later prior to the expected date of birth. The member must observe the required absence (to be outlined further below) in such a situation.¹⁵⁴

ADF members are entitled to *paid maternity leave* if they have worked a continuous period of 12 months of 'full-time service in the ADF, or any other employment recognised for the purpose of the *Maternity Leave (Commonwealth Employees) Act 1973*'.¹⁵⁵ PACMAN states that 'A member is not entitled to paid maternity leave for any period of absence before her first 12 months' qualifying service.' However,

[a] member with less than 12 months' qualifying service before a period of absence may be entitled to salary if she completes the 12 months during the period of absence. She is entitled for any period of absence that meets both of these conditions:

- a) It starts when she completes 12 months' qualifying service
- b) It ends when the member has had 14 weeks maternity leave.¹⁵⁶

Reservists not on continuous full-time service are not eligible for paid or unpaid maternity leave from the ADF, however they are entitled to a 52 week break from their minimum training service obligation.¹⁵⁷

Parental leave

Members are entitled to paid parental leave if they:

- are on continuous full-time service
- become the parent of, or take 'full parental responsibility for, a newborn or adopted dependent child'
- 'are not entitled to paid maternity leave'.¹⁵⁸

Similar eligibility conditions apply to unpaid parental leave although a member who has taken 52 weeks' maternity leave may then take up to 14 weeks' parental leave.¹⁵⁹ Reservists are not eligible for parental leave but can be granted up to 66 weeks' break in their service obligations.¹⁶⁰

What are the conditions of maternity and parental leave?

Maternity leave

Paid maternity leave, including leave taken at half pay, is considered a period of effective service. Unpaid maternity leave is not a period of effective service. PACMAN states that the following conditions apply to unpaid maternity leave:

- a) It counts as continuous service.
- b) It will not break continuity of service if the conditions for a particular entitlement are met.
- c) The member is not required to remain fit or deployable.
- d) The member continues to receive free medical care. The member is not returned to the payroll for hospitalisation, treatment, illness or convalescence.
- e) The member keeps their housing assistance.¹⁶¹

A member who believes she is pregnant must report to an ADF health facility and Command is informed when a pregnancy is confirmed.¹⁶² Members must take a period of 'required absence' during the latter stages of pregnancy and following childbirth. Generally this is from six weeks before the expected date of birth until six weeks after the actual date of birth, although as discussed further below, a member may be given permission to work during this period.¹⁶³

The period of 'required absence' will generally form part of a member's maternity leave. It is not in addition to the 52 weeks' maternity leave.

PACMAN states that:

A member cannot be made to go on maternity leave earlier than six weeks before the expected date of birth. A medical officer or doctor may declare a member unfit for duty for reasons related to her pregnancy. In this case, the normal ADF fitness for duty arrangements must apply. They apply until the member is declared fit for duty or her required absence starts. The member may be considered fit for other duties. One of the purposes of maternity leave is to recognise that a member may not be fit for duty because of her pregnancy. If a member is placed on convalescence at the same time [provided] for maternity leave, they should happen at the same time.¹⁶⁴

A member may be given permission to continue to perform duty during the period of required absence. A medical certificate is required for this to be approved. A similar situation applies if a member wishes to resume duty during the required absence.¹⁶⁵ The ADF has advised that this process is simple, although approval is variable depending on the member's condition and the recommendations of her specialist obstetrician and ADF medical officer.¹⁶⁶

If a member who is already on leave without pay becomes pregnant, she must serve the original period of leave without pay. She must also observe the required absence, however, if the required absence overlaps with the existing leave without pay, she will not be paid for the overlapping period of required absence. The member is entitled to maternity leave from the day after the end of the leave without pay until the day 52 weeks after the required absence begins.¹⁶⁷

Parental leave

Parental leave must be taken within 66 weeks from the date of birth or adoption. Paid parental leave can only be taken as one unbroken two week period or two periods of up to one week each. Unpaid parental leave can be split into separate periods of leave.¹⁶⁸

How does ADF maternity leave interact with national Paid Parental Leave scheme?

The Commonwealth Government's Paid Parental Leave scheme provides up to 18 weeks parental leave, paid at the national minimum wage, to eligible working parents who are the primary carer of a child born or adopted after 1 January 2011. This pay is in addition to any paid maternity or parental leave provided by Defence. It must be taken within the 52 week period from the date of birth or adoption.¹⁶⁹

The eligible parent must be absent from work to receive Parental Leave Pay. PACMAN states that 'This may be on paid or unpaid leave – or a break in training for Reserves.'¹⁷⁰

Receipt of Parental Leave Pay under the Commonwealth Government Scheme does not affect access to the ADF's maternity and parental leave provisions.¹⁷¹

Appendix M.2 – Flexible Working Arrangements – Policy Overview

The ADF's policy on flexible working arrangements is set out in *Defence Instruction (General) Personnel 49-4 Flexible work arrangements for members of the Australian Defence Force*. Conditions related to part-time leave without pay are also included in PACMAN.

Types of flexible working arrangements currently available to ADF members

The following flexible working arrangements are available to ADF members:

- Temporary home located work, which can be used 'in a temporary or occasional arrangement, or as an ongoing arrangement for a specified time, on a part-time or full-time basis.'¹⁷²
- Variable working hours, under which members may 'vary their start and finish times and periods of absence from the workplace to suit their individual circumstances. This may be used in one-off cases or as an ongoing arrangement.'¹⁷³
- Part-time leave without pay (PTLWOP), which enables members to work a reduced number of days in any fortnightly pay period. Under the policy, PTLWOP includes job sharing.¹⁷⁴

Eligibility for flexible working arrangements

All ADF members may apply for temporary home-located work and variable working hours. PTLWOP is only available to members on continuous full time service, and will generally not be approved for members of the Reserve unless the Reservist is on continuous full-time service. In order to be eligible for a flexible working arrangement, a member:

must have completed initial recruit or specialist training, and any period of service to consolidate that training as considered necessary by the CDF or his authorised officer. Defence Members employed overseas on warlike and non-warlike (operational) deployments, on overseas representational duties, overseas exchange programs or on secondment are not eligible for PTLWOP.¹⁷⁵

Members returning from maternity or parental leave 'are entitled to PTLWOP in the two-year period immediately following the birth, or in the case of adoption, the date of placement, of a child or children' where applications for PTLWOP are made in these circumstances, they are 'to be recommended and approved, unless genuine operational requirements exist.'¹⁷⁶

Flexible working arrangements may be considered appropriate in various situations, including:

- allowing greater participation in the care and nurturing of a child, or children, in the two year period immediately following the birth, or in the case of adoption, the date of placement, of a child or children
- enabling respite from arduous periods of ADF service
- fulfilling education, training or other aspirations without terminating ADF Service

- enabling members to meet their personal responsibilities and obligations
- wherever practical, enabling members who are accompanying their spouse or Service-recognised interdependent partner on posting interstate or overseas, to continue working instead of taking Leave Without Pay (LWOP).¹⁷⁷

Application and approval process

Applications are considered on a case-by-case basis. Approval authorities vary depending on the type of flexible working arrangement. For temporary home located work, applications may be approved by the commanding officer (CO)/supervisor (rank must be at least major or equivalent). For variable working hours, applications may be approved by the CO/supervisor (rank must be major or equivalent, or an appropriate delegate). For PTLWOP, applications may be approved by an authority authorised by the Chief of Defence Force, within the career management agencies.¹⁷⁸

The Instruction sets out specific roles and responsibilities for those involved in the application and approval process.

For members, these include identifying the type of flexible working arrangements most appropriate for their circumstances, submitting an application to their CO/supervisor, and ensuring that any application for PTLWOP is also made to the relevant career management agency.

For COs/supervisors, responsibilities include managing workforce and capability issues, providing members with assistance about flexible working arrangements if required, considering 'all FWA [flexible working arrangement] applications in a fair and equitable manner' (noting that external scrutiny will apply to applications that are not approved or recommended), forwarding all applications (regardless of whether or not they are approved) to the career management agency for appropriate action and collection of statistics, maintaining documentation outlining reasons why an application has not been approved and providing these reasons to the member in writing, working with members to manage requirements and workload, regularly reviewing the effectiveness of the flexible working arrangement and including members on flexible working arrangements in workplace activities. Units are responsible for timely processing of flexible work applications.

For career management agencies, responsibilities include working with the member and their CO/supervisor to meet individual and workforce/capability needs, maintaining statistical records for all types of flexible work that are formally applied for and whether these have been approved or not approved, acting as the Approving Authority for PTLWOP applications and processing these applications when received, endeavouring 'not to post a Defence Member during approved periods of PTLWOP, unless genuine operational priorities determine otherwise', and recording details of approved PTLWOP applications on the ADF's personnel management system.¹⁷⁹

As applicable, members who are applying for a flexible working arrangement are encouraged to:

- present a convincing case highlighting personal attributes and the 'associated merits of being employed under a [flexible working] arrangement'
- research employment options in advance, such as locating an appropriate position or task, or another member with whom to job share
- be realistic about whether a unit is likely to be able to support a flexible working position, and prepared to be flexible during negotiations
- be flexible in negotiations for a flexible working arrangement
- allow sufficient time for consideration of the application.¹⁸⁰

When negotiating a flexible working arrangement, managers and members must consider:

- reasons for the request
- duration of the proposed arrangement
- advantages for the member

- advantages for the unit (such as reduced absenteeism, staff retention, and development of skills that are beneficial to the unit)
- whether the duties are suitable for the proposed flexible working arrangement
- the potential impact on the unit's operational effectiveness.¹⁸¹

Managers and members should establish agreed hours of work and communications procedures, and how work will be assessed. Where home-based work is proposed, members and the ADF should consider whether:

- any equipment will be required to enable the member to safely undertake work at home
- the working environment is healthy and safe
- security arrangements are required
- the person who would be working from home is capable of doing so safely and efficiently.¹⁸²

For Army, it should also be considered whether the member's career progression will be affected by any impact of PTLWOP on seniority.¹⁸³

The Instruction notes a number of work areas that may not be suitable for flexible working arrangements, including:

- seagoing or field postings
- jobs that require daily direct customer face to face contact
- situations where regular, face to face contact with other team Defence Members is an integral part of the job
- jobs where access to specialised requirements or classified information is required
- where supervisory or divisional responsibilities may conflict with [flexible working arrangements]
- where the Defence Member is posted to a training establishment
- where equipment or services required to undertake the proposed work cannot be reasonably provided by the Commonwealth.¹⁸⁴

If an application for flexible working arrangements is not approved, members may go through the ADF's Redress of Grievance process. Within Navy, the Navy Personnel Career Management Agency may be able to arrange an alternative place of employment on a case-by-case basis if an application for flexible working arrangements cannot be accommodated in the member's existing workplace. In Air Force, if an application is rejected the member can submit another application for the same or different type of flexible working arrangement through their Chain of Command/Approval Authority.¹⁸⁵

Conditions applying to all flexible working arrangements

Duration

A member may be permitted to use a flexible working arrangement for a maximum of two years per application 'or the remaining tenure of the current posting'. The minimum period for a PTLWOP arrangement is three months.¹⁸⁶

Geographic location

Members can use a flexible working arrangement remote from their posted position, if this is approved and it is cost-neutral to the ADF. Members who are on leave without pay overseas can be employed on a flexible working arrangement, provided that they meet the conditions set out in the Defence Instruction.¹⁸⁷

Additional hours

The Instruction states that 'Members on FWA [flexible working arrangements] may be required to work extra hours in addition to those specified in the FWA [flexible work agreement].'¹⁸⁸

Variation/cancellation/termination

A flexible working arrangement can be varied or cancelled in some circumstances.¹⁸⁹ The policy specifies that at least one month's notice should usually be given to vary or terminate a flexible working arrangement. It also states 'In any job-shared situation, termination of one FWA [flexible working arrangement] may result in the termination of the second FWA [flexible working arrangement] if suitable arrangements cannot be made.'¹⁹⁰

Obligation to meet Service requirements (including individual readiness)

Members on flexible working arrangements must still serve if and when required, including sea duty, deployment and/or exercise. Where this occurs, a flexible working arrangement would usually be temporarily suspended.¹⁹¹

In cases where a member is on PTLWOP, if service is undertaken away from the geographic location of the PTLWOP position (for example, on deployment), the Defence member will usually be required to work full-time hours for the duration of those duties. Generally the member would return to their PTLWOP arrangement at the conclusion of those duties. The maximum duration of the PTLWOP agreement would not be extended by temporary reversion to full-time service.¹⁹² The policy states that:

Regardless of the geographic location of the duties, if the nature of those duties permits their discharge on a part-time basis, then, and at the discretion of the Defence Member's CO, the Defence Member may be permitted to remain on PTLWOP whilst undertaking those duties.¹⁹³

Sea duty can only be undertaken full-time. However, the shore component of a sea/shore roster may be able to be undertaken on a PTLWOP arrangement.¹⁹⁴

Individual readiness standards continue to apply to members on flexible working arrangements.¹⁹⁵

Communication

Ongoing communication is required between the unit and member on flexible working arrangements.¹⁹⁶

Impact on career – Performance appraisal

Members on flexible working arrangements are subject to the ADF's usual performance appraisal process, and if a member is on a flexible working arrangement, this is to be recorded on the appraisal form.¹⁹⁷ The ADF advised the Review that this is for several reasons:

- For the Defence Members: it is important that members working on [flexible working arrangements] have their goals and performance expectations clearly stated and measured against the hours/ conditions worked under the [flexible working arrangement]. This ensures fair assessments are made against explicit (rather than implied) goals and expectations.
- For supervisors: to ensure members are receiving and completing work with outcomes that are reflective of their hours worked. This can also be used as an assessment tool for the effectiveness of the [flexible working arrangement], which is reviewed at regular intervals.
- For the Career Management Agencies: it is to provide the CMA/PMA with an accurate description of the work undertaken in the reporting period and the environment in which the work was undertaken. This is important not only for promotion consideration (may show the member can work without constant supervision, is self-directed and self-disciplined) but may also help identify suitable candidates for positions where members are required to work independent of their chain of command or need to be able to make decisions with limited direction. It may also show that a member has the capacity to manage a heavy workload under significant time restrictions. On the whole, it can positively prove a member's capabilities and capacity for positions of greater responsibility.¹⁹⁸

Impact on career – Promotion – including effect on time in rank

The policy states that ‘Members on [flexible working arrangements] remain eligible for promotion provided they meet normal single-Service promotion criteria. For members on PTLWOP, seniority/time in rank may be calculated on a pro rata basis...’¹⁹⁹ As outlined in section 4.4 arrangements on this issue vary by Service. Part time leave without pay does not affect a member’s seniority in Air Force. However, pro rata calculations are used in Army (although the situation varies depending on whether the member is an officer or a soldier) and Navy to determine the member’s effective service, which is the basis of ‘time in rank’ calculations.

Specific conditions applying for part-time leave without pay

Members on PTLWOP must work a total of between one and nine full days per fortnight.²⁰⁰ This may be in the form of:

- a set number of workdays per fortnightly pay period, or
- a set number of part (work) days per fortnightly pay period, or
- an established period of time in which either a set number of whole or part days can be worked in any one fortnightly pay period.²⁰¹

Members who are involved in a job sharing arrangement would usually work a total of ten days in a fortnightly pay period, shared between the members concerned.²⁰²

Members on PTLWOP remain liable for posting, although where practical, career management agencies will ‘endeavour not to post members during periods of PTLWOP.’²⁰³

Salary is reduced on a pro-rata basis during periods of PTLWOP.²⁰⁴ The policy states that ‘Part-time leave without pay counts as service for salary increment purposes on a pro rata basis.’²⁰⁵ A period of PTLWOP may affect payment of some allowances and accrual of leave.²⁰⁶

If a member on PTLWOP requests maternity leave, the member’s salary during maternity leave will be paid as if the member had continued on PTLWOP during that period. Any recreation leave credit for service during maternity leave would also ‘be reduced as if the member had continued on PTLWOP until it would have ended.’²⁰⁷

Paid days of PTLWOP are counted towards any return of service obligation, at the rate of 1.4 days return of service per paid day.²⁰⁸

Specific conditions applying for temporary home-located work

The policy outlines a number of conditions for temporary home-located work, including:

- a requirement to ensure that the premises are safe
- ensuring that measures are in place to protect the security of Commonwealth assets and classified information
- guidelines to provide for access to the site where necessary.

It also sets out policies related to use of equipment and claims for work-related costs and compensation.²⁰⁹

Appendix M.3 – Defence Child Care Support

The ADF has a 'Defence Child Care Program' which is intended to 'facilitate priority of access to early childhood education and care for Defence families upon arrival in a new posting location, where the local community cannot meet the demand.'²¹⁰

The Defence Child Care Program has two elements:

1. Facilitating priority access to early childhood education and care in Defence Long Day Care and Out of School Hours Care centres. Mission Australia Early Learning Services has operated Defence's child care centres since 1 July 2012. Child care places are available at 20 locations across Australia under this component of the Defence Child Care Program.²¹¹
2. Facilitating access to and sponsorship of Family Day Care under the Extended Child Care Program, including supporting partners of Defence members to become carers. Defence provides \$290,000 per annum to the Extended Child Care Program for 185 places at Darwin Family Day Care, Port Stephens Newcastle, Kath Dickson Toowoomba, Bright Futures Kwinana WA and Wagga Wagga Family Day Care.²¹² When a place at one of these centres is accepted, the Defence family is required to pay the full rate charged.²¹³

The ADF's child care activities are managed by the Defence Community Organisation.

Some funding for child care is provided to Defence families under the Partner Education and Employment Program. Where a partner is 'pursuing job search activities such as travelling to appointments, participating in training, preparing job applications or attending interviews', reimbursement of up to \$250 per child per posting is available for child care costs through a registered child care provider. Families may also be able to access emergency support funding, including for child care, under the Emergency Support for Families Scheme.²¹⁴ However, Defence families are generally expected to pay for child care expenses. The ADF has advised that fees range between \$62-92 per day depending on location, and fees are determined by benchmarking against similar child care services in the area.²¹⁵

Appendix M.4 – Child Care Priority of Access Guidelines – Points Allocation²¹⁶

Category	Criteria	Points allocation per category
A	At least one parent is an ADF member.	5
B	At least one parent is a Defence APS employee.	4
C	At least one parent is a Reserve member not on continuous full time service.	1 <i>(Reserve members given Category C recognition must vacate their placement within one month should it be required by permanent Defence Personnel.)</i>
D	Mobility. Defence Personnel have undertaken a Defence relocation to a new posting locality.	4
E	The child's parent is: single or unaccompanied, is a dual Defence Personnel family, or Defence Personnel returning from maternity leave.	1

Appendix N

Chapter 7: Sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sexual abuse

Appendix N.1 – Key Policy Documents relevant to the management of complaints alleging unacceptable behaviour and sexual offences in the ADF

Unacceptable behaviour

The primary Instruction in relation to the management of complaints of unacceptable behaviour is *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-3, 'Management and Reporting of Unacceptable Behaviour'*.²¹⁷ 'Unacceptable behaviour' is defined as behaviour that, having regard to all of the circumstances, would be offensive, belittling, abusive or threatening to another person or adverse to morale, discipline or workplace cohesion, or otherwise not in the interests of Defence.²¹⁸ Unacceptable behaviour is divided into six categories: harassment, workplace bullying, sexual harassment, discrimination, abuse of power and inappropriate workplace relationships and conflict of interest. A definition of the type of conduct that would fall into each of these categories is provided in the policy document.²¹⁹

The 2007 Report by the Acting Commonwealth and Defence Force Ombudsman – *Australian Defence Force: Management of Complaints about Unacceptable Behaviour* (the 2007 Ombudsman Report)²²⁰ assessed this Instruction and found that it was generally user-friendly, comprehensive and accessible. Suggestions were made to augment some sections and these were adopted in a review of the Instruction in 2009.

Whilst a separate Defence Instruction entitled *Defence Instruction (General), PERS 34-2, 'Complaints of Discrimination and Harassment through the Australian Human Rights Commission'*²²¹ provides guidance on how Defence should respond when such an external complaint is made, it is limited in the information it provides to complainants on how to make such a complaint and the manner in which it will be addressed. Whilst *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-3, 'Management and Reporting of Unacceptable Behaviour'* notes that complaints may be submitted to an external agency, such as the Australian Human Rights Commission, this should be clearly positioned in the Instruction as one of the various avenues by which a complaint may be made.²²²

In the definitions and categories of unacceptable behaviour contained in Annexure B to the Instruction, the reference to the definition of 'sexual harassment'²²³ contained in the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth) does not reflect significant changes recently made to the definition to include anticipating the 'possibility' that the person harassed would be offended.²²⁴ This sets a lower threshold than the previous test that required complainants to establish that 'a reasonable person, having regard to the circumstances, would have anticipated that the person harassed would be offended, humiliated or intimidated'.²²⁵

The manner in which 'discrimination' is defined in Annexure B to the Instruction²²⁶ also conflates a number of provisions of the *Australian Human Rights Commission Act 1986* (Cth).

Each of these matters should be addressed by amendment to the Annexure in order to ensure that all members who rely on the Instruction have correct and clear information about their rights and responsibilities.

Meanwhile, *Defence Instruction (General), ADMIN 67-2, 'Quick Assessment'*²²⁷ provides a clear, effective framework for what should be done following an incident that comes to the attention of the chain of command and where the opinion is formed that a subsequent investigation or inquiry of the occurrence may be required. Its purpose is to quickly assess the known facts about an occurrence – and identify what is not known about an occurrence – in order to make a decision about the most appropriate course of action to be taken in response.

Appropriately, the Instruction emphasises that a Quick Assessment must not be used as the basis for adverse findings or to replace the need for a separate action where it is otherwise necessary. The Quick Assessment is therefore a preliminary inquiry to determine which policy/procedure may apply. When applied to incidents of

unacceptable behaviour such as sexual harassment, abuse or discrimination, it can act as an effective 'funnel' to direct activity in the appropriate direction. The Annexures to the Instruction contain useful tools including a flow diagram and guidance on selecting the most appropriate administrative inquiry, which specifically addresses sexual offences and complaints of harassment or discrimination.

The IGADF 2011 report outlines a number of common perceived problems with the Quick Assessment process, including misunderstanding of the purpose of the process, ambiguity in policy guidance and that engaging in the Quick Assessment process would appear to be unnecessary where an incident is exclusively disciplinary in nature.²²⁸ The IGADF 2011 report notes that the Director General Australian Defence Force Legal Services has advised the IGADF of his intention to amend DI(G) ADMIN 67-2 to address those issues.

The Defence Whistle Blower Scheme²²⁹ is as an alternative and independent means to report alleged misconduct or unethical behaviour.²³⁰

External complaint mechanisms

Options also exist for members to access external avenues for complaint. These include the Inspector General Australian Defence Force and the Defence Force Ombudsman.

In addition, complaints alleging unlawful discrimination under Australia's federal unlawful discrimination laws²³¹ and sexual harassment under the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth) ('SDA') may be made to the Australian Human Rights Commission.

Employers may be vicariously liable under the SDA for the discriminatory acts of their employees (including harassment) unless they can demonstrate that they 'took all reasonable steps' to prevent the doing of the act.²³² The onus is on an employer to prove that they 'took all reasonable steps' or 'took reasonable precautions and exercised due diligence'.²³³

As previously noted in Chapter 7 of this Report, in *Lee v Smith*,²³⁴ the Commonwealth (Department of Defence) was held vicariously liable for the actions of its employees who subjected the applicant to a range of unlawful behaviour. The judgment was critical of the way that Defence and some of its employees approached the investigation of the applicant's complaints. It was found that the investigation:

displays both an indifference and even disinclination on the part of all those involved, from Commanding Officer [X] down to deal with the issues fairly and conscientiously. Indeed, the motivating factor appears to be to dispense with the matter with as little controversy as could be managed... I am satisfied that if the equity and diversity education training had been available to the Applicant, the incident of rape may never have occurred in that the Applicant may have reported the early sexual harassment matters....²³⁵

The ADF must also ensure, as far as is reasonably practicable, the health and safety of its members²³⁶ and the provision and maintenance of a work environment without risks to the health and safety of its members.

Sexual offences

Where a complaint of unacceptable behaviour potentially constitutes a sexual offence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-4, 'Management and Reporting of Sexual Offences'*²³⁷ takes account of the particular issues that arise, including reporting to police and consequent criminal and disciplinary proceedings. The Instruction provides for a Quick Assessment to be conducted, together with other immediate actions in relation to securing the scene and crisis intervention. If there is a reasonable suspicion that a criminal offence may have been committed it constitutes a Notifiable Incident and the additional reporting and management obligations under *Defence Instruction (General) ADMIN 45-2, 'Reporting and Management of Notifiable Incidents'*²³⁸ apply.

The current *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-4, 'Management and Reporting of Sexual Offences'* is dated 22 November 2011. It cancels the previous version of the Defence Instruction issued in 2004²³⁹ and incorporates important elements of DEFGRAM No.35/2009 (now also cancelled). Significantly, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-4, 'Management and Reporting of Sexual Offences'* now provides:

- that all alleged sexual offences involving Australian Public Service (APS) employees, Australian Defence Force (ADF) members, and/or external service providers which occur in the Defence workplace, or which have any association to the Defence workplace (e.g. conferences, work related social gatherings etc.) must be immediately reported to the Australian Defence Force Investigative Service (ADFIS), who will coordinate and determine the appropriate jurisdiction for the handling of the matter. In those cases where the alleged sexual offences cannot be prosecuted under the DFDA the alleged offence must still be reported to ADFIS. Reporting to ADFIS must not be delayed as a consequence of any Unit administrative action such as a Quick Assessment. ADFIS must take into account the range of jurisdictional and operational considerations and, where appropriate, report the alleged offence to civilian police regardless of the wishes of the complainant.²⁴⁰
- for the cancellation and withdrawal of attachments to the Instruction²⁴¹ that have previously been the subject of criticism by police agencies for inhibiting the reporting of matters that should be reported.

Attaching specific forms to the relevant Instruction will reduce the need to cross-refer to other Instructions and facilitate use of the Instructions by commanders and managers in situations where they need to act quickly and decisively.²⁴²

If a complaint is referred by ADFIS to civilian authorities, then the matter will take its usual course in the same way that complaints are made directly to civilian police.

If, however, the complaint is regarded as a 'Service offence' then it may be dealt with pursuant to the *Defence Force Discipline Act 1982* (Cth). This legislation creates the following service Tribunals²⁴³ with power to prosecute ADF members on charges of Service offences against the Act:

- Summary authorities (superior summary authorities, commanding officers and subordinate summary authorities)
- Courts martial (general²⁴⁴ and restricted²⁴⁵)
- Defence Force Magistrates²⁴⁶

A discipline officer scheme also exists to deal with minor disciplinary infractions committed by ADF members below non-commissioned rank and officer cadets. The scheme applies only to certain DFDA offences where the member admits the misconduct and there is no dispute as to the facts.

In summary, it is relevant to note that:

- disciplinary action in the form of a prejudicial conduct charge²⁴⁷ under the DFDA may be taken against a member for unacceptable behaviour
- the only sexual offences likely to be prosecuted under the DFDA are act of indecency offences in the second²⁴⁸ and third degree²⁴⁹ and the offence of an act of indecency without consent.²⁵⁰ These do not include sexual assault which would be referred to the civilian police and dealt with in civilian courts.

Appendix N.2 – Offences dealt with under DFDA

The disciplinary system created by the *Defence Force Discipline Act 1982* (Cth) provides for three categories of offences:

- Uniquely military discipline offences, such as absence without leave, disobedience of a command and prejudicial conduct for which there are no civilian criminal counterparts
- Offences with a close, but not exact, civilian criminal law counterpart, such as assault on a superior or subordinate, or falsification of a service document
- The importation of the civilian criminal law applicable in the Jervis Bay Territory, which includes serious criminal offences such as sexual assault.²⁵¹

Whilst the provisions of the DFDA have application to service offences committed by ADF members overseas, the civilian criminal laws of the Australian states, territories and the Commonwealth do not.²⁵²

However, when an offence is committed by an ADF member in Australia, that member may be subject to both the military justice system and the ordinary civilian justice system. This apparent overlap in jurisdiction is addressed, however, in a number of ways.²⁵³

In relation to offences that may also constitute a criminal offence under the ordinary criminal law of the Commonwealth, States and Territories, jurisdiction under the DFDA in Australia may be exercised only where proceedings under the DFDA can reasonably be regarded as substantially serving the purpose of maintaining or enforcing service discipline.²⁵⁴ It is a matter for the Director of Military prosecutions to decide whether the maintenance of discipline requires that DFDA charges be laid in a particular case.²⁵⁵

In addition, the DFDA specifically excludes military jurisdiction for dealing with a number of serious offences unless consent is provided by the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP).²⁵⁶ These offences include murder and manslaughter²⁵⁷ and certain sexual offences,²⁵⁸ namely, sexual assault in the first,²⁵⁹ second²⁶⁰ and third degree,²⁶¹ sexual intercourse without consent²⁶² and sexual assault with a young person.²⁶³ The *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-4, 'Management and Reporting of Sexual Offences* notes, however, that 'due to the seriousness of these offences, it is unlikely the DPP would give the ADF consent to deal with these offences' and that, as a matter of policy, these sexual offences should be referred to civilian authorities in the first instance.²⁶⁴ Since 1985, the Commonwealth DPP has consented on only two occasions to the DFDA prosecution of sexual assault offences which were alleged to have occurred in Australia.²⁶⁵

A number of other sexual offences contained in section 3 of the *Crimes Act 1900* (ACT) are also 'imported' into the DFDA. Whilst prosecution under the DFDA for these offences does not require the consent of the Commonwealth DPP, the *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-4, 'Management and Reporting of Sexual Offences* recommends the immediate referral of some of these offences to civilian authorities, where the offence occurs in Australia, because of their seriousness.²⁶⁶

Tracking repeat offenders

A unit case file is created for each unacceptable behaviour complaint in a business unit. That file is to contain the complaint, the quick assessment, the reports required by annexure F to the *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-3, 'Management and Reporting of Unacceptable Behaviour'* and all other records created or received by the work unit in the management of the complaint.²⁶⁷ It is also the responsibility of the commanding officer who is managing the complaint to submit an initial report of unacceptable behaviour to the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch (formerly Fairness and Resolution Branch). This initial report is to be submitted after completion of the quick assessment and within seven days of receipt of the complaint.²⁶⁸ Names of the people involved are not to be provided when submitting this initial report.²⁶⁹

All complaints of unacceptable behaviour are meant to be resolved within three months of the complaint being made and the final outcome is to be reported to the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch within seven days of resolution of the complaint.²⁷⁰

It is only in cases where there is a formal outcome (that is, where disciplinary action or administrative sanction is taken²⁷¹) that the member's name and personal details are to be provided to the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch.²⁷²

Termination provisions

Under the *Defence (Personnel Regulations) 2002*, officers may be terminated if:

the officer has been convicted of an offence or a service offence and the Chief of the officer's Service has certified that, having regard to the nature and seriousness of the offence, the retention of the officer is not in the interests of the Defence Force.²⁷³ There is no equivalent provision in the Regulations in relation to enlisted members. The service of an enlisted member may be terminated, however, if the Chief of the enlisted member's Service is satisfied that the retention of the enlisted member is not in the interest of Australia, the Defence Force or the Chief's Service.²⁷⁴

In order to seek termination of an officer or an enlisted member, a termination notice must be issued that:

- states that it is proposed to terminate the person's service
- states the reason for terminating the service
- sets out the facts and circumstances relating to the reason for terminating the service
- invites the person to give the Chief a written statement of reasons why the service should not be terminated
- gives at least 28 days to provide a statement of reasons as to why the proposed action should not be taken.²⁷⁵

All personnel determinations and decisions made under the Regulations must have regard to:

- the ability of the relevant Service to carry out operations that it is carrying out or may be required to carry out
- the size and composition of the relevant Service
- the organisational effectiveness of the relevant Service
- the training of the relevant Service
- the need to ensure the availability of an adequate supply of suitable officers and enlisted members in the relevant Service
- the skills and experience required for the proper performance of duties in the relevant Service
- the management of officers and enlisted members in the relevant Service
- the career advancement needs of officers and enlisted members in the relevant Service.²⁷⁶

The Army has developed more detailed policy around this issue.

In *Defence Instruction (Army) PERS 116-5 'Separation of regular Army Soldiers, Army Reserve soldiers and soldiers on full-time service – policy and procedures'*, it is mandatory to review a soldier's retention in instances involving the use or involvement with prohibited substances, for theft or fraud offences, when a soldier is found to be psychologically unfit for further service or if a soldier breaches a formal warning.²⁷⁷ For all other civilian convictions, Army policy is that retention is to be reviewed and consideration is to be given to the facts of the conviction to determine if it is serious enough to warrant termination action or other administrative action such as a formal warning or censure.²⁷⁸

Appendix N.3 – Survey Information: Sexual Harassment Telephone Survey

The Australian Human Rights Commission's Sexual Harassment National Telephone Survey is administered at regular intervals to examine the nature and prevalence of sexual harassment in Australian workplaces. It was previously administered in 2003 and 2008.

The Sexual Harassment National Telephone Survey (the National Survey) was conducted in 2012 alongside which a workplace sexual harassment survey was also conducted in the ADF (ADF Survey). The simultaneous administration of both surveys allowed for comparisons between the ADF Survey and the National Survey more generally. This report contains a comparison of prevalence data from the ADF Survey and the National Survey.

This appendix gives an overview of the methodology used for the ADF Survey. Following at Appendix N.4 is a comprehensive report of the ADF survey results, prepared by Roy Morgan Research. The ADF survey questionnaire is contained at Appendix N.5.

Methodology

The 2012 Sexual Harassment National Survey is based on the 2008 survey. A few changes were made to the 2012 survey questionnaire to accommodate the 2011 amendments to the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth). The 2012 Survey also expanded the age range of survey respondents and the questions for bystanders.

The ADF Survey questionnaire was based on the questionnaire used for the National Survey, with some changes to language to ensure that questions were appropriate within the ADF context. The 2012 Sexual Harassment National Survey was administered via telephone by Roy Morgan Research on behalf of the Australian Human Rights Commission and the Department of Defence.

The Department of Defence provided a random sample of 5,000 permanent ADF personnel that may be invited to participate in the Survey, in order to achieve the participation of 1,000 ADF personnel.

The sample was partially stratified by Service and rank class (senior officers, junior officers, non-commissioned officers / warrant officers, other ranks).

Rather than stratifying the survey sample by gender, equal numbers of men and women were included, to ensure that women were adequately represented. This was necessary as the findings of previous national surveys indicate that women are more likely than men to experience sexual harassment, and it enabled a comparative analysis of the prevalence among women and men in the ADF.

The survey sample only included Permanent members aged 18 years and older with access to a land line and in some cases to a mobile phone,²⁷⁹ and for practical reasons did not include members on active deployment or posted overseas.

Telephone surveying of ADF personnel commenced on 24 May 2012.

During the Survey period, Roy Morgan Research contacted or attempted to contact 4,997²⁸⁰ ADF personnel. A total of 1,000 personnel completed the survey (500 women and 500 men).

The results of the Survey were then weighted to reflect the actual gender and Service distribution of the ADF population aged 18 years and older, as of 1 June 2012.

Caveats

In gaining approval from the Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee to conduct the survey with ADF personnel, the following caveats relating to the material and analyses of the findings were noted:

- The survey data has been derived from a sample of the target population who were motivated to respond, and who made an autonomous decision to do so. It may not necessarily be representative of the entire ADF population.
- Personnel may have different motivations for choosing whether or not to participate in the survey, which may impact on accuracy of the results. It is possible that those who chose to participate in the study may have experienced some form of sexual harassment and this motivated their decision to participate. Similarly, those that have not experienced any form of sexual harassment may not have chosen to participate because they perceived the study to not be of any relevance to them or chose to participate to counter perceived negative attention on sexual harassment in the ADF.
- Members may have withdrawn from the survey after initially agreeing to participate due to personal experiences of sexual harassment, which may impact on accuracy of results.
- Some participants may not feel comfortable discussing issues regarding sexual harassment over the telephone in a work environment which may influence results of the research.

Roy Morgan Research has mitigated the impact these issues may have had on the survey results. The ADF survey was conducted with a robust sample of 1,000 personnel and findings were re-weighted to reflect the gender and service breakdown of the ADF. This provides findings that are representative of the ADF population.

To address the impact of respondents discomfort discussing issues regarding sexual harassment in the work environment, all were offered an opportunity to be called back at another time and/or on a different telephone number.

In addition, three ADF members withdrew from the survey. These members were excluded from the results.

Appendix N.4 – 2012 Sexual Harassment Prevalence Survey: Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the Australian Defence Force

Roy Morgan
Research

2012 Sexual Harassment Prevalence Survey:

*Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the
Australian Defence Force*

– Prepared for –

Australian Human Rights Commission

GPO Box 5218
Sydney NSW 2001

– Prepared by –

Roy Morgan Research
2nd Floor, 232 Sussex St,
Sydney, NSW, 2000

Discover your **edge**

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	The Prevalence of sexual harassment in the ADF	4
2.1	Introduction	4
2.2	Prevalence of sexual harassment in the ADF workplace	5
2.3	Understanding of the legal definition	8
2.4	Prevalence of the sexual harassment behaviour in the same location	11
2.5	Awareness of sexual harassment happening to someone else in the ADF	13
2.5.1	Awareness of sexual harassment happening to someone else in the ADF workplace	13
2.5.2	Observation of someone else being harassed in the same location where respondent experienced sexual harassment	16
3	The nature of sexual harassment	19
3.1	Introduction	19
3.2	Nature of sexual harassment	19
3.2.1	Types of sexual harassment	19
3.2.2	Duration of sexual harassment	22
3.2.3	Perceived severity of sexual harassment	24
3.3	Characteristics of the target of sexual harassment	26
3.3.1	Age of the target at the time of sexual harassment	26
3.3.2	Employment base	29
3.3.3	Length of time at the location before experiencing sexual harassment	30
3.3.4	Category/trade or corps of the target	31

3.4	Characteristics of the harasser	33
3.4.1	Gender of the harasser	33
3.4.2	Age of the harasser	34
3.4.3	Harasser's relationship to the target	35
3.4.4	Presence of multiple harasser or repeat harassers	36
3.5	Characteristics of the workplace	38
4	Addressing Sexual Harassment	39
4.1	Introduction	39
4.2	Formal reports and complaints	39
4.2.1	Complaint Recipients	42
4.2.2	Consequences of the complaint	44
4.2.3	Timeframe of the Complaint	49
4.2.4	Satisfaction with the Complaint Process	51
4.3	Advice and assistance	52
4.3.1	Sources of Assistance/Advice	54
4.4	Reasons for not seeking advice or making a formal complaint	56
4.5	Bystander actions	59
4.6	Access to information	63

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

1 Introduction

In April 2011, the Minister for Defence requested that the Australian Human Rights Commission (the Commission) to initiate a Review into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force.

The first phase of the Review, completed in October 2011, consisted of a cultural review into the treatment of women at the Australian Defence Force Academy (ADFA) specifically.

Phase Two of the Review examines the treatment of women across the broader Australian Defence Force (ADF). As part of this phase, a survey of sexual harassment in the ADF was conducted.

The survey of ADF personnel was conducted alongside the Commission's national survey of sexual harassment in the workplace in the Australian population, which it has previously conducted in 2003 and 2008. The simultaneous administration of both surveys allows for comparisons between the ADF workplace and National Survey more generally. This report contains a comparison of prevalence data in the ADF workplace and the National Survey.

2 The Prevalence of sexual harassment in the ADF

2.1 Introduction

This chapter investigates the prevalence of sexual harassment amongst ADF employees. It outlines the results regarding the prevalence of sexual harassment in general and specifically in the ADF workplace, looking at the differences between gender and services.

Respondents were initially read an abridged version of the legal definition of sexual harassment, as follows:

“Sexual harassment is an unwelcome sexual advance, unwelcome request for sexual favours or other unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature which, in the circumstances, a reasonable person, aware of those circumstances, would anticipate the possibility that the person would feel offended, humiliated or intimidated.”¹

Respondents who reported having experienced sexual harassment as per the legal definition in the ADF in the last five years were then read a list of 12 sexual harassment behaviours and asked which, if any, described what had happened to them.

Respondents who did *not* report having experienced sexual harassment after being read the definition above were read the same list of behaviours, and asked whether they had experienced any of the behaviours in the ADF workplace in the last five years.

This was to ensure that the experiences of respondents who were unable to identify sexual harassment from the legal definition would still be recorded.

The combination of these results provides an accurate representation of the prevalence of sexual harassment, since anyone who identified at least one behaviour from the list was counted. This combined figure was used as the base to measure and report on the total incidence of sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years, as outlined in the following section.


¹ This is a simplified legal definition that accords with the definition under the *Sex Discrimination Act* (Cth) 1984.

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

2.2 Prevalence of sexual harassment in the ADF workplace

Around a quarter of women (25.9%) and one in 10 men (10.5%) in the ADF reported that they had experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace some time in the last 5 years.

Figure 1 – Prevalence of sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (by gender)²




Base: ADF, all respondents (n=1,000); men (n=500); women (n=500).

² Q5a. Out of the following, how would you describe this harassment? Please answer yes or no to each one of these definitions.
 Q5b. In the last five years, have you experienced any of the following in an Australian Defence Force workplace or at an Australian Defence Force work related event in a way that was unwelcome? Please answer yes or no to each one of these definitions.
 S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Across the services, women in the Navy recorded the highest incidence of sexual harassment (28.1%), followed by the Army (25.8%) and the Air Force (23.7%).

The Navy was also the service with the highest incidence of sexual harassment for men (13.9%), followed by the Air Force (10.8%) and the Army (8.9%).

Figure 2 – Prevalence of sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (by gender and service)³



Bases: ADF, all respondents (n=1000); Navy, men (n=108); Navy, women (n=128); Army, men (n=235); Army, women (n=182); Air Force, men (n=157); Air Force, women (n=190).

Comparing these results with the National Survey, Figure 3 shows that the incidence of sexual harassment in the workplace is almost the same for women in the ADF (25.9%) as for women in the National Survey (25.3%).

Looking at the different services, the incidence rate amongst women is higher in the Navy (28.1%) compared to the National Survey.


For men, the incidence of sexual harassment in the workplace is higher in the National Survey by nearly 6 percentage points (16.2% compared to 10.5%).

³ Q5a. Out of the following, how would you describe this harassment? Please answer yes or no to each one of these definitions.
 Q5b. In the last five years, have you experienced any of the following in an Australian Defence Force workplace or at an Australian Defence Force work related event in a way that was unwelcome? Please answer yes or no to each one of these definitions.
 S1. Can you please confirm your gender?
 S3. Which Service are you currently a member of?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

This difference decreases to 2.3 percentage points when focusing on the Navy (16.2% compared to 13.9% in the National Survey).

Figure 3 – Prevalence of sexual harassment in the workplace in the last 5 years – comparison between ADF and National Survey (by gender)⁴



Base: ADF, all respondents (n =1,000); men (n=500); women (n=500). National Survey, all respondents (n=2,002); men (n=966); women (n=1,036).

⁴ Q5a. Out of the following, how would you describe this harassment? Please answer yes or no to each one of these definitions.
 Q5b. In the last five years, have you experienced any of the following in an Australian Defence Force workplace or at an Australian Defence Force work related event in a way that was unwelcome? Please answer yes or no to each one of these definitions.
 S1. Can you please confirm your gender?


2.3 Understanding of the legal definition

Approximately a quarter of ADF female respondents (24.8%) reported having experienced some sort of sexual harassment at some point in their lives, identifying this experience from the legal definition provided during the interview.

The proportion for male respondents is 3.1%.

Figures for the National Survey show that 33% of women and 21% of men reported having experienced some sort of sexual harassment at some point in their lives - higher than the ADF respondents.

Figure 4 – Prevalence of sexual harassment based on legal definition (by gender)⁵



Base: ADF, all respondents (n=1,000); women (n=500); men (n=500).

⁵ Q1. Have you ever personally experienced sexual harassment?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012


Out of those, approximately four in five women (78.6%) and two thirds of men (66.7%) said that they had experienced this behaviour in the ADF workplace. When asked about the timeframe of the incident, 59% of female respondents and 81.8% of male respondents said that they had experienced this behaviour in the ADF more than 5 years ago.⁶

Out of those women who reported that they had not experienced sexual harassment when read the legal definition, approximately one in five (20.3%) later reported that they had experienced one or more of the listed behaviours which constitutes sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last five years.

Out of those men who reported that they had not experienced sexual harassment when read the legal definition, approximately one in ten (10.2%) later reported that they had experienced one or more of the listed behaviours in the ADF in the last five years.

⁶ It is important to note that the results regarding male respondents are based on small numbers and should be interpreted with care.

Figure 5 – Prevalence of sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years for those who did not recognise it based on legal definition (by gender)⁷



Base: ADF, respondents who did not report experiencing sexual harassment after being read the legal definition (n=962); women (n=464); men (n=498).

⁷ Q1. Have you ever personally experienced sexual harassment?
Q5a. Out of the following, how would you describe this harassment? Please answer yes or no to each one of these definitions.
Q5b. In the last five years, have you experienced any of the following in an Australian Defence Force workplace or at an Australian Defence Force work related event in a way that was unwelcome? Please answer yes or no to each one of these definitions.
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

2.4 *Prevalence of the sexual harassment behaviour in the same location*

ADF respondents who reported being aware of someone else who had been sexually harassed in the same location where they had experienced harassment were asked how common that type of behaviour was.


As shown in Figure 6, overall men in the ADF (70.1%) were slightly more likely than women (66%) to report that the type of behaviour they experienced was common or occurred sometimes in the location where they were harassed.

Men were also more likely than women to report sexual harassment behaviours as common or occurring sometimes in the Army and in the Air Force. The difference in the perception between men and women was highest in the latter, with 88.9% of men considering the type of sexual harassment experienced a relatively common occurrence in that workplace, compared to 68.7% of women.

The Navy was the only service where this perception was reversed, with 69.3% of women considering their experience as common compared to 57.2% of men.⁸

⁸ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).

Figure 6 – Prevalence of sexual harassment behaviour in the workplace where respondent experienced sexual harassment (by gender, by service)⁹



Bases: Respondents aware of someone else being sexually harassed in the same location where they had experienced sexual harassment (n=78); men (n=25); women (n=53). Navy, men (n=7); Navy, women (n=13). Army, men (n=9); Army, women (n=24). Air Force, men (n=9); Air Force, women (n=16).

⁹ Q6d. Thinking about your workplace at that time, would you say that this type of behaviour was very rare, rare, occurred sometimes or was common?
 S1. Can you please confirm your gender?
 S3. Which Service are you currently a member of?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

2.5 *Awareness of sexual harassment happening to someone else in the ADF*

This section investigates the experience of those who witnessed sexual harassment or became aware of someone else being sexually harassed, their reaction and the consequences of their actions.

ADF respondents who reported experiencing sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years were asked if they were aware of anyone else being sexually harassed in that same location where they had this experience.

Later in the questionnaire all respondents, not just those who had experienced sexual harassment, were asked if they were aware of sexual harassment happening to someone else in any – or any other – ADF workplace in the last five years.

The figures from these two questions were combined to produce a total figure for respondents who witnessed or knew of someone else being harassed across the whole ADF workplace. These results are presented in section 2.5.1.

The results of the observation of someone else being harassed in the same location where the respondent experienced sexual harassment are presented in section 2.5.2.


2.5.1 *Awareness of sexual harassment happening to someone else in the ADF workplace*

In the ADF as a whole, 45.7% of women and 43% of men were aware of someone else being sexually harassed in an ADF workplace.

In the Navy men and women were equally aware of sexual harassment happening to someone else in the ADF workplace – 46.9% and 46.3% respectively.

The greatest difference in awareness between men and women was in the Air Force, with 44.7% of women aware of sexual harassment happening to someone else in an ADF workplace compared to 40.1% of men.

Figure 7 – Total aware of someone else being harassed in the ADF workplace¹⁰



Base: ADF, all respondents (n =1,000); men (n=500); women (n=500). Navy, men (n=108); Navy, women (n=128). Army, men (n=235); Army, women (n=182). Air Force, men (n=157); Air Force, women (n=190).

Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF in the last five years were more aware of sexual harassment happening to someone else in the ADF workplace than those who had not been harassed (76% compared to 38%).


Men who were harassed were more likely to be aware of sexual harassment in the ADF than women who had been harassed (79.7% and 66.6% respectively).

Approximately two in five (38.7%) respondents who had not experienced sexual harassment in the ADF in the last five years were aware of sexual harassment happening in the ADF workplace in general, with no difference according to gender.

¹⁰ Q6b. Do you know if this happened to anyone else in that same location?
 Q21. Have you been aware of sexual harassment happening to someone else in an ADF workplace/ in an ADF workplace other than the workplace we have just discussed in general in the last 5 years?
 S1. Can you please confirm your gender?
 S3. Which Service are you currently a member of?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

Figure 8 – Awareness of someone else being sexually harassed in the ADF workplace (by gender, by experience of sexual harassment)¹¹



Base: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n= 53); women (n=128). Respondents who did *not* experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (n=819); men (n=447); women (n=372).


Figure 9 focuses specifically on the awareness of sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in general, excluding those episodes which occurred in the same place where the respondent reported being sexually harassed, which have been discussed in section 2.5.1. The chart shows how the respondent became aware of sexual harassment happening somewhere else in the ADF.

Out of those respondents who were aware of sexual harassment happening in general in the ADF (excluding episodes which occurred in the same location where respondents were harassed, when applicable), only a small group of men (6.5%) and women (6.7%) observed or witnessed the behaviour directly.

¹¹ Q6b. Do you know if this happened to anyone else in that same location?
 Q21. Have you been aware of sexual harassment happening to someone else in an ADF workplace/ in an ADF workplace other than the workplace we have just discussed in general in the last 5 years?
 S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Women in the ADF were more likely than men to have been told about the sexual harassment by the target (37.6% and 17.1% respectively), and were less likely than men to have heard about it from the media (18.5% compared to 37.0%).

Figure 9 – Source of awareness of sexual harassment happening somewhere else in the ADF (by gender)¹²



Base: ADF respondents aware of sexual harassment happening to someone else in the ADF, excluding episodes which occurred in the same place where the respondent reported being sexually harassed (n=442); men (n=214); women (n=228)

2.5.2 Observation of someone else being harassed in the same location where respondent experienced sexual harassment


Respondents who reported experiencing sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years were asked if they were aware of anyone else being sexually harassed at that same location where they had this experience.

Slightly more men than women were aware of someone else being harassed at the same location, respectively 46.5% and 41.5% as shown in Figure 10.

¹² Q21. Have you been aware of sexual harassment happening to someone else in an ADF workplace/ in an ADF workplace other than the workplace we have just discussed in general in the last 5 years?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

Figure 10 – Awareness of someone else being harassed in the same location¹³



Base: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in ADF in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n=53); women (n=128).


Looking at Service differences, men in the Air Force were most likely to be aware (52.9%).

Women in the Army were more likely to be aware than those in the Navy and Air Force (51.1% compared to around 35%).¹⁴

¹³ Q6b. Do you know if this happened to anyone else in that same location?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

¹⁴ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).

Figure 11 – Awareness of other cases of harassment in place where respondent experienced harassment¹⁵



Bases: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in ADF in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n=53); women (n=128). Navy, men (n=15); Navy, women (n=36). Army, men (n=21), Army, women (n=47). Air Force, men (n=17); Air Force, women (n=45).

¹⁵ Q6b. Do you know if this happened to anyone else in that same location?
 S1. Can you please confirm your gender?
 S3. Which Service are you currently a member of?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

3 The nature of sexual harassment

3.1 Introduction

This section provides an analysis of the nature of sexual harassment in the ADF workplace, including the types of sexual harassment experienced, characteristics of the target of sexual harassment, characteristics of the harasser and characteristics of the workplace where the sexual harassment happened.

3.2 Nature of sexual harassment

3.2.1 Types of sexual harassment

All respondents were asked to identify whether they had experienced any of the following sexual harassment behaviours, as listed below:

Unwanted sexual attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unwelcome touching, hugging, cornering or kissing • Inappropriate staring or leering that made you feel intimidated
Crude/offensive behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sexual gestures, indecent exposure or inappropriate display of the body • Sexually suggestive comments or jokes that made you feel offended • Sexually explicit pictures, posters or gifts that made you feel offended
Crude/offensive behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sexually explicit emails or SMS messages
Unwanted sexual attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repeated or inappropriate invitations to go out on dates • Intrusive questions about your private life or physical appearance that made you feel offended
Sexual assault	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate physical contact
Unwanted sexual attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repeated or inappropriate advances on email, social networking websites or internet chat rooms by a work colleague
Sexual coercion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests or pressure for sex or other sexual acts
Sexual assault	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any other unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature

This list was used to determine the overall figure for the prevalence of sexual harassment (as reported in Chapter 3), and is also of value in identifying the prevalence of specific behaviours.

Figure 12 shows that out of those respondents who experienced some sort of sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years, “sexually suggestive comments or jokes” was the most common type of behaviour experienced, reported by 56.5% of women and 40% of men.

Women appear to be generally more likely to experience most types of sexual harassment behaviours, with the exception of “sexually explicit pictures, posters or gifts”, “sexual gestures, indecent exposure or inappropriate display of the body” and “sexually explicit emails or SMS messages”.

These types of behaviour were more commonly experienced by men, with the difference particularly noticeable in the case of “sexually explicit emails or SMS messages”, experienced by 12% of women and 38.9% of men.

The most serious types of behaviour were not commonly experienced. “Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault” was reported by 3.5% of women who experienced sexual harassment, and no men.


It appears that the prevalence of behaviours (from more to less prevalent) aligns with the seriousness of behaviours (from less to more serious).

This conclusion is valid also for the types of sexual harassment reported in the National Survey.

Amongst men, there was no spike in the experience of “sexually explicit emails or SMS messages”, however this type of behaviour was more commonly experienced by men than women.

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

Figure 12 – Most common types of sexual harassment experienced in the ADF workplace in the last five years (by gender)¹⁶



Base: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n=53); women (n=128).

¹⁶ Q5a. Out of the following, how would you describe this harassment? Please answer yes or no to each one of these definitions.
 Q5b. In the last five years, have you experienced any of the following in an Australian Defence Force workplace or at an Australian Defence Force work related event in a way that was unwelcome? Please answer yes or no to each one of these definitions.
 S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

3.2.2 *Duration of sexual harassment*

All respondents who reported experiencing sexual harassment in the ADF in the last 5 years were asked how long the harassment lasted.

For almost half of men (47.7%) and about one-third of women (37.3%) the harassment was a one-off occurrence. One-fifth of women (19.9%) and 13.4% of men said that it lasted less than a month.

The numbers of respondents decreased as the duration of harassment increased, with only 1.6% of women reporting that it lasted more than a year.

However, harassment was ongoing for 6.7% of women and 5.6% of men.


Another 16.8% of men and 11.3% of women described the harassment as sporadic – an occasional incident or a series of one-off incidents at irregular intervals.

On average, harassment continued over a longer time period for women than for men, with the incidence for women exceeding that of men for all categories except those of small duration (one-off and sporadic).

The results appear to have a similar trend in the National Survey.

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

Figure 13 – Duration of sexual harassment in the ADF workplace, in the last 5 years (by gender)¹⁷



Base: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in ADF in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n=53), women (n=128).

¹⁷ Q6a. How long did the behaviour/behaviours go on for?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

3.2.3 *Perceived severity of sexual harassment*

In addition to experiencing sexual harassment over a longer period, women perceived the harassment as more offensive and more intimidating than male targets of harassment.

All respondents who reported experiencing sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years were asked to rate how offended and how intimidated the harassment made them feel on a scale from one to five (where one was “Not at all” and five was “Extremely”).

Figure 13 shows that most men did not feel intimidated – nearly 80% fell within the first two points of the scale and only 9% in the uppermost two points.


While more than half of ADF women (55%) also fell within the first two points of the scale, 22% – more than twice the figure for men – were at the extreme end of the scale (points four and five).

Both men and women in the ADF were more likely to feel offended than intimidated – although women at twice the rate of men (30% within points four and five of the scale compared to 15% of men).

Only about a third (36%) of women were not really offended, compared to 60% of men. The marked difference between responses for men and women implies a fundamental difference in perceptions of acceptable behaviour.

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

Figure 14 – Degree to which target was intimidated and offended¹⁸



Base: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in ADF in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n=53); women (n=128).

¹⁸ Q5c. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means not at all offended and 5 means extremely offended, overall how offended did the harassment make you feel?
 Q5d. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means not at all intimidated and 5 means extremely intimidated, overall how offended did the harassment make you feel?
 S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

3.3 Characteristics of the target of sexual harassment

3.3.1 Age of the target at the time of sexual harassment

Figure 15 shows a reverse relationship between age and experience of sexual harassment, with younger people more likely to experience this type of behaviour than older people.

Women appear to have experienced sexual harassment at a younger age than men: just over two thirds (71.5%) of women who were sexually harassed were under 30 years of age at the time of the harassment, and about two in five (44.5%) were between 18 and 24 years old. Given that just under half (48.9%) of women were aged under 30 at the time of the survey, this represents a disproportionately high number of young women who experienced harassment.


No women who experienced sexual harassment was aged 55 or over at the time she was harassed. Women in this age group make up less than 5% of the female ADF workforce.

Approximately half (50.4%) of men who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last five years were under 30 years of age at the time of the harassment. Out of those, 34.2% were aged between 18 and 24 years, and 16.2% between 25 and 29 years old. Again, this is disproportionate to the number of men in this age group in the ADF workforce, with 40.7% aged under 30.

On average, ADF respondents who experienced sexual harassment were 30 years old at the time of harassment.

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

Figure 15 – Age at the time of sexual harassment (by gender)¹⁹



Base: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n=53); women (n=128).


Figure 16 shows that the mean age at the time of harassment differs by gender, with women having experienced sexual harassment on average at the age of 27, and men at 31.

Looking at the differences across services, both men and women in the Navy experienced sexual harassment at a younger age than the ADF average and the other services.

¹⁹ Q6. How old were you when the harassment happened?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

The average age of sexual harassment in the Navy is 27 years old, with women aged on average 26 years at the time of sexual harassment and men 28 years.²⁰

Figure 16 – Mean age at the time when sexual harassment was experienced (by gender, by service)²¹



Bases: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in ADF in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n=53); women (n=128). Navy, men (n=15); Navy, women (n=36). Army, men (n=21), Army, women (n=47). Air Force, men (n=17); Air Force, women (n=45).

²⁰ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).

²¹ Q6. How old were you when the harassment happened?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?
S3. Which Service are you currently a member of?


Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

3.3.2 Employment base

Figure 17 shows that the vast majority of ADF respondents who experienced sexual harassment reported they were working full time at the time of the harassment (over 90% of both men and women). No respondent reported experiencing sexual harassment while working part time. To a large extent this is due to the fact that about 98% of ADF personnel are employed on a full-time basis and only 1% on a part-time basis.²²

A very small group of ADF men and women (about 4%) were sexually harassed during the recruitment process.

Figure 17 – Employment status at the time of sexual harassment (by gender)²³



Base: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n=53); women (n=128).

²² Source: 2011 Census Report.

²³ Q16a. At the time of harassment, were you working full time, part time or were you in the recruitment process?


S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

3.3.3 Length of time at the location before experiencing sexual harassment

ADF respondents who were working at the time of sexual harassment (and not in the recruitment process) were asked how long they had been posted to the location where the sexual harassment occurred.

Women in the ADF were more likely to experience sexual harassment earlier in their posting than men, with 66.5% of respondents harassed in their first year at the location and about half of these during the first three months. The situation is reversed for men, 61.7% of whom experienced sexual harassment after working at the location for more than a year.

Figure 18 – Length of time working at the location where sexual harassment occurred (by gender)²⁴



Bases: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in ADF in the last 5 years and who were working full/part time (n=171); men (n=51); women (n=120).

²⁴ Q17. At the time of the harassment how long had you been posted to your location?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

3.3.4 Category/trade or corps of the target


All ADF respondents who reported experiencing sexual harassment were asked about their category/trade or corp at the time they experienced sexual harassment. Responses were clustered under broad occupational groupings provided by the Department of Defence (Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research) to assist in analysing trends across occupational groups.

The responses were different depending on the service, with men in the Army more likely to have been in managerial roles (30%) compared to all other services.

In the Navy both women (30.3%) and men (35.7%) were more likely to have experienced sexual harassment in professional roles than any other role, compared to all other services.²⁵

²⁵ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).

Figure 19 – Category/trade or corp at the time of sexual harassment (by gender, by service)²⁶



Bases: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in ADF in the last 5 years and who were working full/part time (n=171); men (n=51); women (n=120). Navy, men (n=14); Navy, women (n=33). Army, men (n=20), Army, women (n=44). Air Force, men (n=17); Air Force, women (n=43).

²⁶ Q19a. What was your category/trade at the time the harassment occurred?
 Q19b. What was your corp at the time the harassment occurred?
 Q19c. What was your category/trade at the time the harassment occurred?
 S1. Can you please confirm your gender?
 S3. Which Service are you currently a member of?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

3.4 Characteristics of the harasser


In the vast majority of sexual harassment occurrences, the harassment was perpetrated by a male coworker aged between 20 and 40 years.

3.4.1 Gender of the harasser

Women in the ADF were more likely than men to have been harassed by a male (94.7% of women and 78.9% of men respectively).

Looking at the few cases in which the harassment was perpetrated by a woman, male respondents in the ADF were more likely to have been harassed by a woman than were females in the ADF (17.1% of men and 3.3% of women respectively).

Figure 20 – Gender of the harasser (by respondents’ gender)²⁷



Base: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n=53); women (n=128).

²⁷ Q12. Was the harasser male or female?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?


3.4.2 Age of the harasser

Overall, about three quarters (73.3%) of harassers were judged to be aged 40 years or less.

Figure 21 shows an inverse relationship for men in the ADF between age and propensity to perpetrate sexual harassment. Male harassers were more likely to perpetrate harassment at an early age, with 76.1% aged 40 years and younger and 45.7% between 21 and 30 years when committing the harassment.

The situation is slightly different for female harassers, who were more likely to perpetrate sexual harassment when over 30.²⁸

Figure 21 – Age of the harasser (by gender of the harasser)²⁹



Base: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (n=181); respondents harassed by male harasser (n=164); respondents harassed by female harasser (n=13).

²⁸ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).

²⁹ Q12. Was the harasser male or female?
Q13. About how old was the harasser?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012


3.4.3 Harasser's relationship to the target

As shown in Figure 20, in the majority of occurrences sexual harassment was perpetrated by an ADF co-worker. A more senior co-worker was the next most common.

In the Air Force this was the case in nearly 80% of occurrences, the highest of all the services.

In the Army, the harassment was perpetrated by a co-worker in 54% of occurrences, lower than any other service. The Army also had the highest proportion of respondents who were harassed, indicating a more senior co-worker (18.1%) or an ADF/Aps supervisor (14.4%) as the harasser.

Figure 22 – Harasser’s relationship to the target (by service)³⁰



Base: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (n=181); Navy (n=51); Army (n=68); Air Force (n=62).

3.4.4 Presence of multiple harasser or repeat harassers

Of those ADF respondents who reported being aware of someone else being sexually harassed in the same location where they experienced harassment, 59.1% of women and 55.7% of men reported that the harassment was perpetrated by the same harasser as the one who had targeted them.


This implies that 40.9% of women and 44.3% of men who were harassed in the ADF were harassed by a different harasser, indicating the presence of multiple harassers in the same unit or location where they were harassed.

³⁰ Q14. What was the harasser’s relationship to you?
S3. Which Service are you currently a member of?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

Women in the Air Force reported being aware of others being harassed by the same harasser who harassed them more than women in the other services (75%), while men in the Navy were more likely to report this (71.4%) than men in the other services.³¹

Figure 23 – Awareness of sexual harassment perpetrated by the same harasser on multiple people³²



Bases: Respondents aware of someone else being sexually harassed in the same location where they had experienced sexual harassment (n=78); men (n=25); women (n=53). Navy, men (n=7); Navy, women (n=13). Army, men (n=9); Army, women (n=24). Air Force, men (n=9); Air Force, women (n=16).

³¹ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).


³² Q6c1. And was the harasser the same person who harassed you or was it someone else?
 S1. Can you please confirm your gender?
 S3. Which Service are you currently a member of?

3.5 Characteristics of the workplace

Over half (58.5%) of women and about two thirds (65.3%) of men who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years were working in medium-sized locations (between 26 and 500 employees).

About one in five women (20.9%) and one in seven men (14.1%) reported experiencing sexual harassment in locations with over 500 employees, and 13.8% of women and 18.4% of men who experienced harassment worked in small workplaces (less than 25 employees).

Figure 24 – Size of the workplace where the sexual harassment occurred (by gender)³³



Base: Respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n=53); women (n=128).

³³ Q15. How many employees would there have been at your posting location in total?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

4 Addressing Sexual Harassment

4.1 Introduction

This section provides an analysis of the nature of the reporting of sexual harassment, the support and advice sought by ADF employees in regard to the sexual harassment they experienced, satisfaction with the overall complaint process, complaint finalisation, who received the complaints, the consequences for the target, harasser and ADF following the complaint, and the time it took for the harassment and for formal complaints to be raised.

All ADF employees were also asked about their most preferred sources of information about sexual harassment, with their first response and all other responses recorded.

It is worth noting that only a very small proportion (n=30) of those who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last five years made a formal report or complaint.

The sample is even smaller when taking gender into account (men: n=5; women: n=25) or service differences (Navy: men n=1, women n=11; Army: men n=2, women n=11; Air Force: men n=2, women n=3).


Because of such small sample sizes, the results are discussed in terms of a fraction (x/y) rather than a percentage (%). However, in the interests of consistency with the rest of the report, percentages are presented in the charts to the first decimal point.

4.2 Formal reports and complaints

All ADF respondents who reported experiencing sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years were asked whether they made a formal report or complaint.

One in five (21.2%) women and one in ten (9.2%) men made a formal complaint as shown in Figure 25.

Figure 25 – Formal Report/Complaint³⁴



Base: ADF, respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n=53); women (n=128).


Looking at service differences, women in the Navy (11/25) are more likely than men in other services to make a formal report or complaint about the sexual harassment. Compared to other services, the Air Force was the only service where men (2/5) were more likely than women (3/25) to make a formal report or complaint.³⁵

³⁴ Q7c. Did you formally report or make a complaint about the harassment to anyone?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

³⁵ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

Figure 26 – Formal Report/Complaint³⁶



Base: ADF, respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and made a formal report or complaint (n=30); men (n=5); women (n=25). Navy, men (n=1); Navy, women (n=11). Army, men (n=2), Army, women (n=11). Air Force, men (n=2); Air Force, women (n=3).


³⁶ Q7d. Did you formally report or make a complaint about the harassment to anyone?
 S1. Can you please confirm your gender?
 S3. Which Service are you currently a member of?

4.2.1 Complaint Recipients

Of those ADF respondents who were harassed and made a formal complaint or report, just under half of men (2/5) reported the incident to their Officer Commanding or other Senior Officer or Aps Manager compared to eight out of 25 women in the ADF.

Six out of 25 women reported the incident to the Equity Officer or sexual harassment contact officer compared to one out of five men in the ADF.³⁷

Figure 27 – Formal Report/Complaint³⁸



Base: ADF, respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and made a formal report or complaint (n=30); men (n=5); women (n=25).

³⁷ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).


³⁸ Q7d. Who did you report the incident to?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

Four out of the five men who made a formal complaint had the issue finalised between their Officer Commanding or other senior staff and themselves.

Four out of 25 women still have not had their sexual harassment complaint finalized.³⁹

Figure 28 – How the complaint was finalised⁴⁰



Base: ADF, respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and made a formal report or complaint (n=30); men (n=5); women (n=25).

³⁹ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).

⁴⁰ Q11a. How was your complaint finalised?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

4.2.2 Consequences of the complaint

(a) Consequences for the target following the complaint

The most common positive consequences for women in the ADF who made a formal complaint was “the harassment stopped” (12/25), “Officer Commanding apologised for failing to prevent the harassment” (4/25), and “received positive feedback for making complaint” (2/25), as shown in Figure 29a.


Compared to women in the ADF who made a formal complaint, the majority of men in the ADF had no consequences. Figure 29b shows that two out of five men reported that “the harassment stopped” and one out of five men was “transferred”.

The most common negative consequence for both men and women who made a formal complaint was that they were “ostracised, victimised, ignored by colleagues” (one out of five men and four out of 25 women).⁴¹

⁴¹ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012


Figure 29a – Consequences for women following the complaint⁴²



Base: ADF, female respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and made a formal report or complaint (n=25).

⁴² Q9a. What were the positive and/or negative workplace consequences for you, following your complaint?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Figure 30b – Consequences for men following the complaint⁴³



Base: ADF, male respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and made a formal report or complaint (n=5).


⁴³ Q9a. What were the positive and/or negative workplace consequences for you, following your complaint?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

(b) Consequences for the harasser following the complaint

There were no consequences for the harasser for two out of the five men and eight of the 25 women in the ADF who made a formal complaint about the sexual harassment that happened to them.

Figure 31 – Consequences for the harasser⁴⁴



Base: ADF, respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and made a formal report or complaint (n=30); men (n=5); women (n=25).


⁴⁴ Q9c. What were the consequences for the harasser following your complaint?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

(c) Consequences for the ADF following the complaint

The majority of men (2/5) and women (15/25) who made a formal complaint about the sexual harassment they experienced reported that there were no consequences for the ADF following their complaint.

In very few cases were training or educational sessions organised or practice or procedures changed.⁴⁵

Figure 32 – Consequences for the ADF following the complaint⁴⁶



Base: ADF, respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and made a formal report or complaint (n=30); men (n=5); women (n=25).

⁴⁵ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).

⁴⁶ Q9c. What were the consequences of your complaint for the ADF?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012


4.2.3 Timeframe of the Complaint

All ADF respondents who made a formal complaint about the sexual harassment that happened to them were asked how long it was between the sexual harassment that happened and reporting it.

Two in five men and ten out of 25 women made a formal complaint about the sexual harassment that happened to them immediately, the same day, or the next working day. Nine out of 25 women and two out of five men reported it in less than a month and 4 out of 25 women reported the harassment one to three months after it occurred.⁴⁷

The results follow a similar trend in the National Survey.

Figure 33 – Time period between harassment and reporting⁴⁸



Base: ADF, respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and made a formal report or complaint (n=30); men (n=5); women (n=25).

⁴⁷ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).


⁴⁸ Q10. What was the time period between when the harassment began and when you reported it?

S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Of the men in the ADF who made a formal complaint, two out of four had their complaint finalised in less than a month and one out of four finalised immediately.

It took one to three months for eight out of 21 women in the ADF who made a formal complaint to have their complaint finalised. A small proportion of women had their complaint finalised immediately (two out of 21).⁴⁹

Figure 34 – Time taken to finalise complaint⁵⁰



Base: ADF, respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and made a formal report or complaint (n=30); men (n=5); women (n=25).

⁴⁹ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).


⁵⁰ Q11b. How long did it take to finalise your complaint?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

4.2.4 Satisfaction with the Complaint Process

Most of the men (four out of five) in the ADF who made a complaint about the sexual harassment that happened to them were satisfied with the overall process of how their complaint was dealt with. Seven out of 21 women in the ADF were not at all satisfied with how their complaint was dealt with overall.⁵¹

Figure 35 – Satisfaction with overall complaint process⁵²



Base: ADF, respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and made a formal report or complaint and complaint finalised (n=25); men (n=4); women (n=21).

⁵¹ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).


⁵² Q11c. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 mean not at all satisfied and 5 means extremely satisfied/5 means extremely satisfied and 1 means not at all satisfied, how would you rate the overall process of dealing with your sexual harassment complaint?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

4.3 Advice and assistance

All ADF respondents who reported experiencing sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years were asked whether they sought support or advice about the harassment that happened to them.

Women (38.6%) were more likely than men (25.0%) in the ADF to seek support or advice about the harassment they experienced. These figures are similar to the National Survey.

Figure 36 – Whether sought support or advice about the sexual harassment that occurred⁵³




Base: ADF, respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n=53); women (n=128).

⁵³ Q7a. Did you seek any support or advice about this harassment that happened to you?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

More women in the Navy (42.7%) sought support about the sexual harassment that occurred than women in the other services. Similarly, men in the Navy (48.2%) were more likely than men in the other services and women in the Navy to seek support or advice.⁵⁴

Figure 37 – Seek support or advice about the sexual harassment that occurred⁵⁵



Base: ADF, respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years (n=181); men (n=53); women (n=128). Navy, men (n=15); Navy, women (n=36). Army, men (n=21), Army, women (n=47). Air Force, men (n=17); Air Force, women (n=45).

⁵⁴ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).

⁵⁵ Q7a. Did you seek any support or advice about this harassment that happened to you?
 S1. Can you please confirm your gender?
 S3. Which Service are you currently a member of?

4.3.1 Sources of Assistance/Advice

All ADF respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and sought advice were asked who they sought it from.


The most common source of assistance or advice for women in the ADF was the Officer Commanding or other Senior Officer or Aps Managers (30.7%), followed by co-worker (19.7%) and equity officer or sexual harassment contact officer (18.3%).

For men in the ADF, the most common source of advice was the ADF/Aps Supervisor (30.5%) followed by equity officer or sexual harassment contact (19.8%) and Officer Commanding or other Senior Officer (17.1%).⁵⁶

⁵⁶ These figures should be interpreted with caution, due to very small sample sizes (less than 20 respondents).

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

Figure 38 – Sources of Assistance/Advice⁵⁷



Base: ADF, respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and sought advice (n=61); men (n=13); women (n=48).

⁵⁷ Q7b. Who did you seek assistance or advice from?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

4.4 Reasons for not seeking advice or making a formal complaint


The most common reason for both men (26.7%) and women (27.2%) in the ADF for not seeking advice or making a formal complaint was because the target told the person(s) themselves that it was inappropriate or told them to stop it.

A small group of men (6.9%) and of women (7.4%) in the ADF said that the behaviour did not bother them, that they ignored it, brushed it off or laughed it off.

Another reason for not seeking advice or making a formal complaint was that 7.9% of men and 4.8% of women in the ADF felt that the sexual harassment behaviour they had experienced was only mildly offensive.

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012


Figure 39a – Ten most common reasons for women not seeking advice or making a formal complaint⁵⁸



Base: ADF, female respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and didn't make a formal complaint or didn't seek support (n=103).

⁵⁸ Q8. Why did you not seek support or advice or/report or make a complaint?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Figure 40b – Ten most common reasons for *men* not seeking advice or making a formal complaint⁵⁹



Base: ADF male respondents who experienced sexual harassment in the ADF workplace in the last 5 years and didn't make a formal complaint or didn't seek support (n=48).


⁵⁹ Q8. Why did you not seek support or advice or/report or make a complaint?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

4.5 Bystander actions

Out of those respondents who were aware of sexual harassment happening in general in the ADF (excluding episodes which occurred in the same location where respondents were harassed, when applicable), 58.1% of men took no action about this, compared to only 30.6% of women.

Figure 41 – Action taken (by gender)⁶⁰



Base: ADF respondents aware of sexual harassment happening to someone else in the ADF, excluding episodes which occurred in the same place where the respondent reported being sexually harassed (n=442); men (n=214); women (n=228).


Out of those who took action after becoming aware of sexual harassment, the majority talked or listened to the target of sexual harassment. Women in the ADF were more likely to do so than men (90.6% and 68.2% respectively). The second most common type of action was offering advice to the victim, by 70.9% of women and 54.6% of men.

Only 13.2% of women confronted the harasser directly, while men were more likely to do so (22.5%).

⁶⁰ Q22. Did you take any of the following actions after hearing about/ witnessing this?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Amongst the other types of actions taken, the most common was participating in the reporting or reporting the incident through the ADF internal mechanism, participating in education or discussions, providing support to the victim and reporting the incident through an external mechanism (i.e. civilian police).

Figure 42 – Type of action taken (by gender)⁶¹



Base: Respondents who took action after becoming aware of someone else being harassed (n=215) men (n=77); women (n=138).

In the general population, “talk or listen to the target of sexual harassment” was the most common action taken, followed by offering advice to the victim.

⁶¹ Q22. Did you take any of the following actions after hearing about/ witnessing this?
S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

(a) Consequences

In the vast majority of cases, there were no consequences for those who took action after hearing of or witnessing the occurrence of sexual harassment in the ADF workplace, with 95.2% of men and 92.7% of women reporting no consequences following their actions, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Consequences experienced by those who took action after witnessing or becoming aware of someone else being sexually harassed, in the ADF in general, by gender (top 6)

Australian Defence Force			
sample	TOTAL n=215	Men n=77	Women n=138
No Consequences	94.7%	95.2%	92.7%
Other	2.7%	2.4%	3.6%
Received Positive Feedback For Making Complaint	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%
Ostracised, Victimised, Ignored By Colleagues	0.3%	0%	1.3%
Harassment Stopped	1.2%	1.4%	0.7%
Disciplined	1.1%	1.4%	0%

Looking at the different services, the vast majority of respondents did not experience any sort of consequences for acting against sexual harassment.

Table 2 on the following page shows the types of consequences faced, with a break-down by service and gender.

Table 2: Consequences experienced by those who took action after witnessing or becoming aware of someone else being sexually harassed, by gender and service (top 6)

Royal Australian Navy			
sample	TOTAL n=54	Men n=20	Women n=34
No Consequences	95.5%	95.0%	97.1%
Received Positive Feedback For Making Complaint	3.8%	5.0%	0%
Harassment Stopped	3.8%	5.0%	0%
Disciplined	0%	0%	0%
Transferred	0%	0%	0%
Had Duty Roster Changed	0%	0%	0%
Australian Army			
sample	TOTAL n=86	Men n=36	Women n=50
No Consequences	95.3%	97.2%	86.0%
Received Positive Feedback For Making Complaint	0.7%	0%	4.0%
Harassment Stopped	0.3%	0%	2.0%
Ostracised, Victimised, Ignored By Colleagues	0.3%	0%	2.0%
Disciplined	2.3%	2.8%	0%
Transferred	0%	0%	0%
Royal Australian Air Force			
sample	TOTAL n=75	Men n=21	Women n=54
No Consequences	92.2%	90.5%	96.3%
Ostracised, Victimised, Ignored By Colleagues	0.6%	0.0%	1.9%
Other	3.9%	4.8%	1.9%
Received Positive Feedback For Making Complaint	0%	0%	0%
Disciplined	0%	0%	0%
Transferred	0%	0%	0%

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment in the ADF • 2012

4.6 Access to information

All respondents in the ADF were asked where they would prefer to source information about sexual harassment. The first source of information mentioned was recorded, followed by any other sources mentioned. Figure 41 shows the total mentions.

The most preferred source of information about sexual harassment for just over a third of men (37.3%) and two in five women (41.5) in the ADF was the Internet – including search engines such as Google and Yahoo – followed by the Defence Restricted Network or Defence Intranet (28.4% of men and 25.3% of women in the ADF), and Equity Officer or Sexual Harassment Contact Officer (17.9% of men).

Table 3: Total mentions of preferred sources of information about sexual harassment⁶²

Men		Women	
More than 20%			
Internet	37.3%	Internet	41.5%
Defence Restricted Network	28.4%	Defence Restricted Network	25.3%
10% to 20%			
Equity Officer	17.9%	Equity Officer	19.1%
Manager or Supervisor	13.6%	Manager or Supervisor	13.3%
Other	11.1%	Defence Instructions General	12.1%
5% to less than 10%			
Defence Instructions General	9.2%	Other	8.5%
Training	5.2%	Co-worker – more senior	5.1%
Co-worker – more senior	5%		
Less than 5%*			
Print media		Medical Centre	
Chaplain/padre		Counsellor/psychologist	
Annual training		Annual training	
Counsellor/psychologist		Co-worker	
Medical Centre		Print media	
Co-worker		Training	
Email		Chaplain/padre	
TV or radio		Employer/boss	
ADF publications		Brochures/pamphlets	
Telephone hotline		Telephone hotline	
Employer/boss		Friends or family	
Brochures/pamphlets		ADF publications	
Lawyer or legal service		Lawyer or legal service	
Divisional Systems		Australian Human Rights Commission	
Friends or family		Defence community organisation	
HR Manager or equivalent		Divisional Systems	
Australian Human Rights Commission		HR Manager or equivalent	
Library		TV or radio	
Defence community organisation		Email	
		Library	

Base: ADF, all respondents (n=1,000); men (n=500); women (n=500).

* These figures listed in order of preference.

⁶² Q24A/B. Where would be your preferred sources of information about sexual harassment? (total mentions).

S1. Can you please confirm your gender?

Appendix N.5 – Sexual harassment survey 2012 (ADF component)

Good [Morning/ Afternoon/ Evening]. My name is (SAY NAME) from Roy Morgan Research. May I please speak to (SAY RANK AND NAME OF RESPONDENT e.g. Lieutenant Smith).

IF NECESSARY, RE-INTRODUCE

My name is (SAY NAME) from Roy Morgan Research. We are conducting a social survey about sexual harassment in the Australian Defence Force workplace on behalf of Defence and in conjunction with the Australian Human Rights Commission, which is administering a similar survey in the Australian community. The results of the two surveys will be compared.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you can withdraw at any time. You can also choose not to answer any questions you are uncomfortable with.

This survey will take approximately 12 minutes and aims to determine the prevalence, nature and reporting of sexual harassment in the ADF.

When completing this survey, you will be asked whether or not you have experienced sexual harassment and to recall your or others' experiences of harassment.

We recognise and understand that some survey questions may be of a sensitive nature. If you require support following this survey, please contact an appropriate service. You should have received a list of Defence and non-Defence support services by mail. This information can be provided again during this phone survey. If this survey invokes a severe reaction in you, please be sure to contact Defence health personnel via the local Health Centre or clinic.

Your answers will remain strictly confidential. We will allocate your survey with a unique identifying number and will not record your name and telephone number with your responses. We will only use your name to track your survey if you wish to withdraw your participation at a later date. The de-identified survey data will be provided to the Australian Human Rights Commission. Only aggregated survey results will be reported.

Defence provided your contact details and allowed us to contact you to conduct this important study.

ASK ALL:

[Single]

I1. Would you like to participate?

IF NECESSARY SAY: *Is now a good time or would it be more convenient if I made an appointment to speak to you at another time?*

IF NECESSARY, MAKE AN APPOINTMENT.

1		YES, CONTINUE NOW
2		MAKE APPOINTMENT
3		NO

IF NO TERMINATE

Thank you for your time.

ENDIF

IF APPOINTMENT ON I1

ENDIF

ASK ALL:

[Single]

I2. This call may be monitored by a supervisor for training purposes. Supervisors are bound by the same confidentiality requirements as interviewers. Do you agree to this call being monitored?		
1		YES
2		NO

IF NO (CODE 2 ON I2) SAY:

INTERVIEWER: ALERT SUPERVISOR TO EXCLUDE FROM MONITORING – CONTINUE

ENDIF

[Single]

S0. Firstly, are you OVER 18?		
1		YES
2		NO

IF CODE 2 ON S0, SAY:

Thankyou but we need to speak to respondents aged 18 years or older.

ENDIF

ASK ALL:

Before we continue any further, I will just ask you a few preliminary questions.

[Single]

S1. Can you please confirm your gender? INTERVIEWERS NOTE: DO NOT READ IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE		
1		MALE
2		FEMALE
3	Openend	OTHER (SPECIFY)

Thank you for your time and assistance but we have spoken to enough #/males/females/.

[Single]

S1b. Which of these age groups are you in?		
INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ OUT		
2		18-29
3		30-39
4		40-49
5		50-64
6		65+

ASK ALL:

[Single]

S2. What is the main language spoken at home?		
INTERVIEWER NOTE: DO NOT READ LIST		
1		ENGLISH
2		ITALIAN
3		GREEK
4		CANTONESE
5		MANDARIN
6		ARABIC
7		VIETNAMESE
97	Openend	OTHER
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		REFUSED

[Single]

S3. Which Service are you currently a member of?		
INTERVIEWERS NOTE: DO NOT READ		
1		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN NAVY
2		AUSTRALIAN ARMY

3		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN AIR FORCE
99		NOT DISCLOSED

IF CODE 1 ON S3 (NAVY), ASK:

[Single]

<p>S4A. What is your rank? The responses will be combined into rank groups and will not be used in any way that could identify you.</p> <p>INTERVIEWER NOTE: DO NOT READ LIST</p> <p>IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE</p>		
1		RECRUIT
2		APPRENTICE
3		SEAMAN*
4		SEAMAN
5		ABLE SEAMAN
6		LEADING SEAMAN
7		PETTY OFFICER
8		CHIEF PETTY OFFICER
9		WARRANT OFFICER
10		MIDSHIPMAN
11		ACTING SUB LIEUTENANT
12		SUB LIEUTENANT
13		LIEUTENANT
14		LIEUTENANT COMMANDER
15		COMMANDER
16		CAPTAIN
17		COMMODORE
18		REAR ADMIRAL

19		VICE ADMIRAL
20		ADMIRAL
97	Openend	OTHER (SPECIFY)
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		NOT DISCLOSED

ENDIF

IF CODE 2 ON S3 (ARMY), ASK:

[Single]

<p>S4B. What is your rank? The responses will be combined into rank groups and will not be used in any way that could identify you.</p> <p>INTERVIEWER NOTE: DO NOT READ LIST</p> <p>IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE</p>		
1		RECRUIT
2		APPRENTICE
3		PRIVATE - TRAINEE
4		PRIVATE (OR EQUIVALENT)
5		PRIVATE - PROFICIENT (OR EQUIVALENT)
6		LANCE CORPORAL
7		CORPORAL (OR EQUIVALENT)
8		SERGEANT
9		STAFF SERGEANT
10		WARRANT OFFICER CLASS 2
11		WARRANT OFFICER CLASS 1
12		STAFF CADET / OFFICER CADET
13		2ND LIEUTENANT
14		LIEUTENANT

15		CAPTAIN
16		MAJOR
17		LIEUTENANT COLONEL
18		COLONEL
19		BRIGADIER
20		MAJOR GENERAL
21		LIEUTENANT GENERAL
22		GENERAL
97	Openend	OTHER (SPECIFY)
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		NOT DISCLOSED

ENDIF**IF CODE 3 ON S3 (AIR FORCE), ASK:**

[Single]

S4C. What is your rank? The responses will be combined into rank groups and will not be used in any way that could identify you.		
INTERVIEWER NOTE: DO NOT READ LIST		
1		RECRUIT
2		APPRENTICE
3		AIRCRAFTMAN/AIRCRAFTWOMAN - TRAINEE
4		AIRCRAFTMAN/AIRCRAFTWOMAN
5		LEADING AIRCRAFTMAN/AIRCRAFTWOMAN
6		CORPORAL
7		SERGEANT
8		FLIGHT SERGEANT
9		WARRANT OFFICER

10		OFFICER CADET
11		PILOT OFFICER
12		FLYING OFFICER
13		FLIGHT LIEUTENANT
14		SQUADRON LEADER
15		WING COMMANDER
16		GROUP CAPTAIN
17		AIR COMMODORE
18		AIR VICE-MARSHAL
19		AIR MARSHAL
20		AIR CHIEF MARSHAL
97	Openend	OTHER (SPECIFY)
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		NOT DISCLOSED

ENDIF

ASK ALL:

This is an important study of the prevalence and impact of sexual harassment. Firstly, I would like to read the definition of Sexual Harassment. I'd like to assure you that your answers to these questions are completely confidential.

“Sexual harassment is an unwelcome sexual advance, unwelcome request for sexual favours or other unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature which, in the circumstances, a reasonable person, aware of those circumstances, would anticipate the possibility that the person would feel offended, humiliated or intimidated.”

ASK ALL:

[Single]

Q1. Have you ever personally experienced sexual harassment?		
1		YES
2		NO
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		REFUSED

IF YES (CODE 1 ON Q1) ASK:

THE ANSWER PLACES TO Q2 WILL BE RANDOMISED

[Single] {Random}

<p>Q2. Where was that sexual harassment experienced?</p> <p>INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF PERSON STATES THEY HAD MULTIPLE EXPERIENCES ASK THEM ABOUT THE MOST RECENT EXPERIENCE</p> <p>INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ OUT:</p> <p>IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE</p>		
1		In an Australian Defence Force workplace
2		In or at an ADF work related event (eg social event, conference, mess activity)
3		As a recruit or trainee in an ADF training institution
4		During the recruitment process
5		In a workplace other than the ADF
97	Fixed Openend	Elsewhere (SPECIFY)
98	Fixed	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Fixed	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

IF CODE 5 ON Q2, ASK:

<p>Q2a. Out of the following, how would you describe this harassment? Please answer Yes or No to each one of these definitions.</p>
<p>STATEMENTS A-J WILL BE RANDOMISED: STATEMENTS K-M WILL APPEAR AT THE END</p>
<p>A. Unwelcome touching, hugging, cornering or kissing B. Inappropriate staring or leering that made you feel intimidated C. Sexual gestures, indecent exposure or inappropriate display of the body D. Sexually suggestive comments or jokes that made you feel offended E. Sexually explicit pictures, posters or gifts that made you feel offended F. Repeated or inappropriate invitations to go out on dates G. Intrusive questions about your private life or physical appearance that made you feel offended H. Sexually explicit emails or SMS messages I. Inappropriate physical contact J. Repeated or inappropriate advances on email, social networking websites or internet chat rooms by a work colleague K. Requests or pressure for sex or other sexual acts L. Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault</p>

[Single]

M. Any other unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature IF YES, HIGHLIGHT YES AND TYPE IN RESPONSE		
1	Openend	YES (SPECIFY)
2		NO
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		REFUSED

YOU HAVE NOT COMPLETED ALL QUESTIONS PLEASE GO BACK AND DO SO

[Single]

Q2b. Did you seek any support or advice about this harassment that happened to you?		
1		YES
2		NO
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		REFUSED

[Single]

Q2c. Did you formally report or make a complaint about the harassment to anyone?		
1		YES
2		NO
98	Single	DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	REFUSED

IF CODE 1 ON Q2C, ASK:

THE ANSWER PLACES TO Q2D WILL BE RANDOMISED

[Multiple] {Spread: 20 Random}

Q2D. What were the positive and/or negative workplace consequences for you, following your complaint?		
INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ LIST AND PROBE		
IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE		
HIGHLIGHT ALL MENTIONED		
1		Your employer apologised for failing to prevent the harassment
2	Openend	Your employer paid you compensation because of the harassment (ASK: How much?) (SPECIFY)
3		The harassment stopped
4		Your employer provided you with a reference
5		You received positive feedback for making the complaint
6		Your shifts were changed
7		You were transferred
8		You resigned
9		You were dismissed
10		You were demoted
11		You were disciplined
12		You experienced other negative outcomes i.e. denied training, no promotion etc
13		You were ostracised, victimised, ignored by colleagues
14		You were labelled a trouble-maker
15	Single	There were no consequences for me
97	Fixed Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

THE ANSWER PLACES TO Q2E WILL BE RANDOMISED

[Multiple] {Spread:20 Random}

<p>Q2e What were the consequences for the harasser following your complaint? INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ LIST AND PROBE IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE HIGHLIGHT ALL MENTIONED</p>		
1		The harasser was disciplined
2		The harasser was formally warned
3		The harasser was spoken to
4		The harasser was transferred
5		The harasser had his/her shifts changed
6		The harasser resigned
7		The harasser apologised
8	Openend	The harasser paid you compensation (ASK: How much?) (SPECIFY)
9		There were no consequences for the harasser
97	Fixed Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

THE ANSWER PLACES TO Q2F WILL BE RANDOMISED

[Multiple] {Spread:20 Random}

<p>Q2f Thinking about the medium to long term consequences for you of the sexual harassment would you say: INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ LIST AND PROBE IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE HIGHLIGHT ALL MENTIONED</p>		
1	Single	There were no long term consequences
2		It has negatively impacted on your employment / career / work

3		It had financial consequences for you (loss of job/ unemployment/in less well paid job)
4		It has impacted negatively on your relationships with partner/children/friends/ family
5		It has impacted on your self-esteem and confidence
6		It has impacted on your health and general well-being
7		There were some positive aspects to the experience, (PROMPT: greater assertiveness, confidence in managing difficult situations)
97	Fixed Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

THE ANSWER PLACES TO Q2G WILL BE RANDOMISED

[Single] {Random}

Q2g. How was your complaint finalised? INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ OUT: IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE		
1		Between your boss and yourself
2		Between your employer and yourself
3		With your union's involvement
4		With the involvement of the Australian Human Rights Commission or state or territory anti-discrimination agency
5		By your legal representative/lawyer
6		In Court
7	Fixed	Not finalised yet
97	Fixed Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)

98	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

ENDIF

ENDIF

IF (CODES 1 TO 4 ON Q2) ASK:

[Single]

Q4. When did this harassment start?		
INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ LIST IF REQUIRED:		
1		LESS THAN 1 YEAR AGO
2		BETWEEN 1 TO 2 YEARS AGO
3		BETWEEN 2 TO 3 YEARS AGO
4		BETWEEN 3 TO 4 YEARS AGO
5		BETWEEN 4 TO 5 YEARS AGO
6		MORE THAN 5 YEARS AGO
98		(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

ENDIF

ENDIF

IF CODES 1 TO 5 ON Q4, ASK:

Q5a. Out of the following, how would you describe this harassment? Please answer Yes or No to each one of these definitions.
--

ENDIF

IF CODE 2 98 OR 99 ON Q1 OR CODE 5 TO 99 ON Q2 OR CODE 2 TO 99 ON Q2C OR CODE 6 TO 99 ON Q4, ASK:

Q5b. In the last five years, have you experienced any of the following in an Australian Defence Force workplace or at an Australian Defence Force work related event in a way that was unwelcome? Please answer Yes or No to each one.
--

ENDIF

STATEMENTS A-J WILL BE RANDOMISED: STATEMENTS K-M WILL APPEAR AT THE END
<p>A. Unwelcome touching, hugging, cornering or kissing B. Inappropriate staring or leering that made you feel intimidated C. Sexual gestures, indecent exposure or inappropriate display of the body D. Sexually suggestive comments or jokes that made you feel offended E. Sexually explicit pictures, posters or gifts that made you feel offended F. Repeated or inappropriate invitations to go out on dates G. Intrusive questions about your private life or physical appearance that made you feel offended H. Sexually explicit emails or SMS messages I. Inappropriate physical contact J. Repeated or inappropriate advances on email, social networking websites or internet chat rooms by a work colleague K. Requests or pressure for sex or other sexual acts L. Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault</p>

[Single]

M. Any other unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature		
IF YES, HIGHLIGHT YES AND TYPE IN RESPONSE		
1	Openend	YES (SPECIFY)
2		NO
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		REFUSED

YOU HAVE NOT COMPLETED ALL QUESTIONS PLEASE GO BACK AND DO SO

IF AT LEAST ONE CODE 1 ON Q5A-Q5M, CONTINUE, OTHERS GO TO Q21

[Single]

Q5C. On a scale of 1 to 5, where #/1 means not at all offended and 5 means extremely offended/ 5 means extremely offended and 1 means not at all offended/, overall how offended did the harassment make you feel?		
INTERVIEWER NOTE: REPEAT SCALE IF NECESSARY		
1		1- NOT OFFENDED AT ALL
2		2
3		3
4		4

5		5- EXTREMELY OFFENDED
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		REFUSED

[Single]

<p>Q5D. On a scale of 1 to 5, where #/1 means not at all intimidated and 5 means extremely intimidated/ 5 means extremely intimidated and 1 means not at all intimidated/, overall how intimidated did the harassment make you feel?</p> <p>INTERVIEWER NOTE: REPEAT SCALE IF NECESSARY</p>		
1		1- NOT INTIMIDATED AT ALL
2		2
3		3
4		4
5		5- EXTREMELY INTIMIDATED
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		REFUSED

[Quantity] {Min: 1, Max: 99, Default Value:99}

<p>Q6. How old were you when the harassment happened?</p> <p>RECORD AGE IN YEARS</p> <p>IF DON'T KNOW OR CAN'T SAY, RECORD AS 99.</p>

[Single]

<p>Q6a. How long did the behaviour#//s/ go on for?</p> <p>INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ OUT:</p> <p>IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE</p>		
1		It was a one off
2		Less than 1 month
3		1 to 3 months

4		4 to 6 months
5		7 to 12 months
6		More than one year
7		Ongoing (continuous)
8		Sporadic (comes and goes)
97	Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)
98		(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

[Single]

Q6b. Do you know if this happened to anyone else in that same location?		
1		YES
2		NO
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		REFUSED

IF CODE 1 ON Q6B, ASK:

[Single]

Q6c1. And was the harasser the same person who harassed you or was it someone else?		
1		YES, IT WAS THE SAME HARASSER
2		NO, IT WAS SOMEONE ELSE
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		REFUSED

[Single]

<p>Q6d. Thinking about your workplace at that time, would you say that this type of behaviour was #/very rare, rare, occurred sometimes or was common/ common, occurred sometimes, rare or very rare/?</p> <p>INTERVIEWER NOTE: REPEAT SCALE IF NECESSARY</p>		
---	--	--

1		VERY RARE
2		RARE
3		OCCURRED SOMETIMES
4		COMMON
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		REFUSED

ENDIF

IF CODE 2 ON Q6b, OR ANY CODE ON Q6d, ASK:

[Single]

Q7a. Did you seek any support or advice about this harassment that happened to you?		
1		YES
2		NO
98		DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99		REFUSED

IF CODE 1 ON Q7A, ASK:

[Multiple] {Spread:20}

Q7b. Who did you seek assistance or advice from? INTERVIEWER NOTE: DO NOT READ OUT IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE HIGHLIGHT ALL MENTIONED		
1		FRIENDS OR FAMILY
2		OFFICER COMMANDING, COMMANDING OFFICER OR OTHER SENIOR OFFICER, APS MANAGER
3		ADF/APS SUPERVISOR
4		MENTOR
5		OTHER CO-WORKER MORE SENIOR THAN YOU

6		DUTY OFFICER
7		EQUITY OFFICER/ EQUALITY ADVISER / DEFENCE EQUITY ADVICE LINE/ SEXUAL HARASSMENT CONTACT OFFICER/ HARASSMENT CONTACT OFFICER
8		CO-WORKER
9		A DEFENCE LAWYER OR DEFENCE LEGAL SERVICE REPRESENTATIVE
10		AUSTRALIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION OR STATE OR TERRITORY ANTI-DISCRIMINATION AGENCY
11		COUNSELLOR/PSYCHOLOGIST/CHAPLAIN
12		THE INTERNET (INCLUDING SEARCH ENGINES SUCH AS GOOGLE AND YAHOO)
13		COMMUNITY BASED OR RELIGIOUS SERVICE
14		OMBUDSMAN
15		MILITARY POLICE /SERVICE POLICE
16		CIVILIAN POLICE
97	Openend	OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Single	DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	REFUSED

ENDIF**ANY CODE ON Q7b OR IF CODE 2 ON Q7a, ASK:**

[Single]

Q7c. Did you formally report or make a complaint about the harassment to anyone?		
1		YES
2		NO
98	Single	DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	REFUSED

IF CODE 1 ON Q7C, ASK:**THE ANSWER PLACES TO Q7D WILL BE RANDOMISED**

[Multiple] {Spread:20 Random}

<p>Q7d. Who did you report the incident to? INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ OUT: HIGHLIGHT ALL MENTIONED IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE</p>		
1		Officer Commanding, Commanding Officer or other senior officer, APS manager
2		ADF or APS supervisor
3		Other co-worker more senior than you
4		Duty Officer
5		Equity Officer or Equality Adviser or Defence Equity Advice Line or Sexual Harassment Contact Officer or Harassment Contact Officer
6		Co-worker at your level or junior to you
7		The person harassing you
8		A Defence lawyer or Defence legal service representative
9		Australian Human Rights Commission or to a state or territory anti-discrimination agency
10		Ombudsman
11		Military Police or Service Police
12		Civilian Police
97	Fixed Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

ENDIF

IF CODE 2 ON Q7C, ASK:

[Multiple] {Spread:20}

<p>Q8. Why did you not #/seek support or advice or/ report or make a complaint? DO NOT READ HIGHLIGHT ALL MENTIONED IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE</p>		
1		NOT AWARE OF HOW THE COMPLAINT PROCESS WORKED OR WHO TO REPORT TO
2		FAMILY/FRIENDS/CO-WORKERS ADVISED ME NOT TO
3		EASIER TO KEEP QUIET
4		THOUGHT I WOULD NOT BE BELIEVED
5		COMPLAINT PROCESS WOULD BE EMBARRASSING
6		COMPLAINT PROCESS WOULD BE DIFFICULT
7		WOULD NOT CHANGE THINGS / NOTHING WOULD BE DONE
8		SEXUAL HARASSMENT IS ACCEPTED IN MY WORKPLACE
9		DON'T TRUST THE PEOPLE I COULD COMPLAIN TO
10		LACK OF CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE COMPLAINT PROCESS
11		PERSON TOO SENIOR
12		TOO SCARED/FRIGHTENED
13		PEOPLE WOULD TREAT ME LIKE THE WRONGDOER
14		PEOPLE WOULD THINK I WAS OVER REACTING
15		THOUGHT I WOULD GET FIRED
16		AFRAID FOR MY CAREER ASPIRATIONS
17		THOUGHT MY REPUTATION WOULD BE DAMAGED
18		FEARED NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES FOR THE HARASSER
19		I MOVED TO ANOTHER PLACE OF WORK
20		HARASSER WAS ALREADY BEING DEALT WITH
21	Openend	DIDN'T THINK IT WAS SERIOUS ENOUGH (ASK:Why did you think it was not serious enough?) (SPECIFY)

22	Openend	TOOK CARE OF THE PROBLEM MYSELF (ASK: How did you take care of it?) (SPECIFY)
97	Openend	OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Single	DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	REFUSED

ENDIF

IF CODE 1 ON Q7C, ASK:

THE ANSWER PLACES TO Q9A WILL BE RANDOMISED

[Multiple] {Spread:20 Random}

<p>Q9a. What were the positive and/or negative workplace consequences for you, following your complaint?</p> <p>Any of the following?</p> <p>INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ LIST AND PROBE</p> <p>IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE</p> <p>HIGHLIGHT ALL MENTIONED</p>		
1		Officer Commanding, Commanding Officer or other senior officer, APS manager, ADF/APS supervisor apologised for failing to prevent the harassment
2	Openend	Defence paid you compensation because of the harassment. (ASK: How much?) (SPECIFY)
3		The harassment stopped
4		Defence provided you with a reference
5		You received positive feedback for making the complaint
6		Your duty roster was changed
7		You were transferred
8		You resigned
9		Your were discharged
10		You were demoted
11		You were disciplined

12		You experienced other negative outcomes i.e. denied training, no promotion etc
13		You were ostracised, victimised, ignored by colleagues
14		You were labelled a trouble-maker
15	Single	There were no consequences for you
97	Fixed Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

IF CODE 1 ON Q7C, ASK:

THE ANSWER PLACES TO Q9B WILL BE RANDOMISED

[Multiple] {Spread:20 Random}

<p>Q9b What were the consequences for the harasser following your complaint? Any of the following? INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ LIST AND PROBE IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE HIGHLIGHT ALL MENTIONED</p>		
1		The harasser was disciplined
2		The harasser was formally warned
3		The harasser was spoken to
4		The harasser was transferred to another unit
5		The harasser had his or her duty rosters changed
6		The harasser resigned
7		The harasser apologised
8	Openend	The harasser paid you compensation (ASK: How much?) (SPECIFY)
9		There were no consequences for the harasser

97	Fixed Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

IF CODE 1 ON Q7C, ASK:

THE ANSWER PLACES TO Q9C WILL BE RANDOMISED

[Multiple] {Spread:20 Random}

<p>Q9c What were the consequences of your complaint for the ADF? Any of the following? INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ LIST AND PROBE IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE HIGHLIGHT ALL MENTIONED</p>		
1		Defence or your Officer Commanding/ Commanding Officer or other senior officer, APS manager developed or changed the existing policy on sexual harassment
2		Defence or your Officer Commanding/ Commanding Officer or other senior officer, ADF/APS manager/supervisor changed a practice or procedure (e.g., complaints procedure)
3		Defence or your Officer Commanding/ Commanding Officer or other senior officer, APS manager, ADF/APS supervisor implemented training/education
4		There were no changes within the ADF workplace following your complaint
97	Fixed Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

THE ANSWER PLACES TO Q9D WILL BE RANDOMISED

[Multiple] {Spread:20 Random}

<p>Q9d Thinking about the medium to long term consequences for you of the sexual harassment or sexual harassment behaviours, would you say:</p> <p>INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ LIST AND PROBE</p> <p>IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE</p> <p>HIGHLIGHT ALL MENTIONED</p>		
1	Single	There were no long term consequences
2		It has negatively impacted on your employment / career / work
3		It had financial consequences for you (discharged/ affected your career)
4		It has impacted negatively on your relationships with partner/children/friends/ family
5		It has impacted on your self-esteem and confidence
6		It has impacted on your health and general well-being
7		There were some positive aspects to the experience, (PROMPT: greater assertiveness, confidence in managing difficult situations)
97	Fixed Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

[Single]

<p>Q10. What was the time period between when the harassment began and when you reported it?</p> <p>INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ OUT:</p> <p>IF OTHER HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND SPECIFY TIME PERIOD</p>		
1		Immediately/same day/next working day
2		Less than 1 month
3		1 to 3 months
4		4 to 6 months
97	Openend	Other (SPECIFY)

98	Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

THE ANSWER PLACES TO Q11A WILL BE RANDOMISED

[Single] {Random}

Q11a. How was your complaint finalised? INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ OUT: IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE		
1		Between your Officer Commanding, Commanding Officer or other senior officer, APS manager, ADF/APS supervisor and yourself
2		With the involvement of the Australian Human Rights Commission, or state or territory anti-discrimination agency
3		By your legal representative/lawyer
4		In Court
5	Fixed	Not finalised yet
97	Fixed Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

IF CODES 1 TO 4 OR 97 ON Q11A, ASK:

[Single]

Q11b. How long did it take to finalise your complaint? INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ OUT: IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE		
1		Immediately/same day/next working day
2		Less than 1 month
3		1 to 3 months

4		4 to 6 months
5		7 to 9 months
6		10 to 12 months
7		More than 12 months
97	Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

[Single]

<p>Q11c. On a scale of 1 to 5, where #/1 means not at all satisfied and 5 means extremely satisfied/5 means extremely satisfied and 1 means not at all satisfied/, how would you rate the overall process of dealing with your sexual harassment complaint?</p> <p>INTERVIEWER NOTE: REPEAT SCALE IF NECESSARY</p>		
1		NOT AT ALL SATISFIED
2		2
3		3
4		4
5		EXTREMELY SATISFIED
98	Single	DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	REFUSED

ENDIF

ENDIF

ANY CODE ON Q8, OR CODE 5 ON Q11a, OR ANY CODE ON Q11c, ASK:

[Single]

<p>Q12. Was the harasser male or female?</p> <p>INTERVIEWER NOTE: DO NOT READ</p>		
1		MALE
2		FEMALE

98	Single	DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	REFUSED

[Single]

Q13. About how old was the harasser?		
INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ LIST IF REQUIRED		
1		15 -20 years
2		21-30 years
3		31-40 years
4		41-50 years
5		51-64 years
6		65+ years
98	Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

[Single]

Q14. What was the harasser's relationship to you?		
INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ LIST IF REQUIRED		
IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE		
1		ADF/APS SUPERVISOR
2		OFFICER COMMANDING, COMMANDING OFFICER OR OTHER SENIOR OFFICER, APS MANAGER
3		MENTOR
4		INSTRUCTOR, TRAINER
5		ADF CO-WORKER
6		ADF CO-WORKER (MORE SENIOR)
8		OTHERS ASSOCIATED WITH WORKPLACE (E.G. APS, CONTRACTORS)
97	Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)

98	Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

Now I would like you to think specifically about your posting location when the sexual harassment took place.

[Single]

Q15. How many employees would there have been at your posting location in total? READ OUT		
1		Less than 25 employees
2		26 to 100 employees
3		Between 101 and 500 employees
4		Between 501 and 1000 employees
5		More than 1000 employees
98	Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

[Single]

Q16a. At the time of the harassment, were you working full time, part time or were you in the recruitment process? INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ OUT		
1		Working full-time
2		Working part-time
3		Undergoing the recruitment process
98	Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

IF CODE 1 OR 2 ON Q16A, ASK:

[Single]

Q17. At the time of the harassment how long had you been posted to your location?		
INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ OUT:		
1		Less than 3 months
2		More than 3 months but less than 12 months
3		More than 12 months but less than 3 years
4		3 or more years
98	Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

IF CODE 1 ON S3 (NAVY), ASK:

[Single]

Q19a. What was your category/trade at the time the harassment occurred?		
INTERVIEWER NOTE: DO NOT READ LIST		
IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE		
1		[UNKNOWN]
2		MARITIME TRADE OPERATIONS
3		ADMINISTRATION
4		NAVY AEROSPACE ENGINEER (ANY)
5		AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING
6		WEAPONS ELECTRICAL AIRCRAFT ENGINEER
7		NAVY AVIATION-NO (OFFICER) (ANY)
8		AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER
9		AIRCREW-OBSERVER
10		AVIATION-OBSERVER
11		IMAGERY SPECIALIST
12		MARINE AVIATION WARFARE OFFICER - TIME BASED
13		PILOT-SPECIALIST STREAMED

14		PILOT-TIME BASED
15		NAVY AVIATION-NS (NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICER/OTHER RANKS) (ANY)
16		AIRCREW
17		AVIATION SUPPORT
18		AVIATION TECHNICIAN AIRCRAFT
19		AVIATION TECHNICIAN AVIONICS
20		IMAGERY SPECIALIST
21		BANDMASTER
22		CHAPLAIN
23		NAVY COMMUNICATIONS (ANY)
24		COMMUNICATIONS INFO SYSTEMS
25		CRYPTOLOGIC LINGUIST
26		CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS
27		ELECTRONIC WARFARE
28		ELECTRONIC WARFARE OPERATOR-SUBMARINE
29		ELECTRONIC WARFARE SUBMARINES
30		SIGNALS YEOMAN-SUBMARINE
31		NAVY ENGINEER (ANY)
32		EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE ENGINEER
33		MARINE ENGINEERING
34		WEAPONS ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING
35		GENERAL EXPERIENCE
36		NAVY HEALTH SERVICES-NO (OFFICER) (ANY)
37		DENTAL TECHNICIAN
38		DENTIST

39		MEDICAL-O (OFFICER)
40		MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION
41		MEDICAL OFFICER
42		NURSE
43		NAVY HEALTH SERVICES-NS (NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICER/OTHER RANKS) (ANY)
44		DENTAL ASSISTANT
45		DENTAL ASSISTANT PREVENTIVE
46		DENTAL MANAGER
47		MEDICAL
48		INSTRUCTOR
49		NAVY INTELLIGENCE (ANY)
50		INTELLIGENCE
51		INTELLIGENCE NAVY INTELLIGENCE RESERVE
52		LEGAL
53		MANAGEMENT EXECUTIVE
54		MARINE TECHNICIAN
55		NAVY MARITIME WARFARE OFFICER (ANY)
56		ABOVE WATER WARFARE
57		ACOUSTIC WARFARE ANALYST-O (OFFICER)
58		BOATSWAIN-O (OFFICER)
59		CLEARANCE DIVER-O (OFFICER)
60		COMBAT SYSTEM MANAGER
61		COMMUNICATIONS & INFORMATION SYSTEMS
62		COMMUNICATIONS
63		FIRE FIGHTER-O (OFFICER)

64		HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY MANAGER-O (OFFICER)
65		MARITIME GEOSPATIAL HYDROGRAPHIC
66		MARITIME GEOSPATIAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY (METOC)
67		MINE WARFARE
68		MINE WARFARE CLEARANCE DIVING
69		NAVIGATION
70		PHYSICAL TRAINING
71		PRESCRIBED DUTIES
72		PRINCIPAL WARFARE OFFICER
73		PRINCIPAL WARFARE OFFICER AIRCRAFT DIRECTION
74		PRINCIPAL WARFARE OFFICER ANTI-SUBMARINE
75		PRINCIPAL WARFARE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS
76		PRINCIPAL WARFARE OFFICER FORCE WARFARE OFFICER
77		PRINCIPAL WARFARE OFFICER FORCE WARFARE OFFICER ABOVE WATER WARFARE
78		PRINCIPAL WARFARE OFFICER FORCE WARFARE OFFICER MINE WARFARE
79		PRINCIPAL WARFARE OFFICER FORCE WARFARE OFFICER NAVIGATION
80		PRINCIPAL WARFARE OFFICER FORCE WARFARE OFFICER SURFACE WARFARE
81		PRINCIPAL WARFARE OFFICER GUNNERY
82		PRINCIPAL WARFARE OFFICER MINE WARFARE
83		PRINCIPAL WARFARE OFFICER NAVIGATION
84		PRINCIPAL WARFARE OFFICER SURFACE WARFARE
85		SEAMAN
86		SIGNALS YEOMAN
87		SUBMARINER COMMAND POSTED

88		SUBMARINER COMMAND QUALIFIED
89		SUBMARINE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
90		SUBMARINER EXECUTIVE OFFICER QUALIFIED
91		SUBMARINER WATCH OFFICER
92		SUBMARINER
93		UNDERWATER CONTROL-O (OFFICER)
94		MUSICIAN
95		NAVY NAVAL POLICE COXSWAIN-O (ANY)
96		NAVAL POLICE COXSWAIN-O (OFFICER)
97		NAVAL POLICE COXSWAIN OFFICER
98		NAVY PRESCRIBED DUTIES (ANY)
99		ELECTRONIC WARFARE OPERATOR
100		MOTOR TRANSPORT DRIVER
101		NON-ALIGNED AIR TECHNICAL
102		NON-ALIGNED ELECTRICAL TECHNIC
103		NON-ALIGNED MARINE TECHNICAL
104		RADIO OPERATOR
105		RADIO OPERATOR SPECIAL
106		SIGNALS YEOMAN
107		SURVIVAL EQUIPMENT
108		UNDERWATER CONTROL
109		UNDERWATER WEAPONS
110		WORK STUDY
111		PSYCHOLOGIST
112		PUBLIC RELATIONS

113		NAVY SEAMAN-NS (NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICER/OTHER RANKS) (ANY)
114		ACOUSTIC WARFARE ANALYST
115		BOATSWAIN
116		BOATSWAINS MATE
117		CLEARANCE DIVER
118		COMBAT SYSTEMS MANAGER MINE WARFARE
119		COMBAT SYSTEMS OPERATOR MINE WARFARE
120		COMBAT SYSTEMS SUPERVISOR MINE WARFARE
121		COMBAT SYSTEM MANAGER
122		COMBAT SYSTEMS OPERATOR
123		COMBAT SYSTEMS OPERATOR ANTI-SUBMARINE AIRCRAFT CONTROLLER
124		COMBAT SYSTEMS SUPERVISOR
125		DIVER
126		ELECTRONIC WARFARE ANALYST SUB
127		HYDROGRAPHIC SYSTEMS MANAGER
128		HYDROGRAPHIC SYSTEMS OPERATOR
129		NAVAL POLICE COXSWAIN
130		PHYSICAL TRAINER
131		SENIOR OFFICER
132		NAVY SUPPLY-NO (OFFICER) (ANY)
133		COOK-O (OFFICER)
134		OPERATIONAL LOGISTICS
135		STEWARD-O (OFFICER)
136		STORES NAVAL-O (OFFICER)
137		SUPPLY

138		WRITER-O (OFFICER)
139		NAVY SUPPLY-NS (NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICER/OTHER RANKS) (ANY)
140		COOK
141		MOTOR TRANSPORT DRIVER-S
142		STEWARD
143		STORES NAVAL
144		WRITER
145		NAVY TECHNICAL OFFICER (ANY)
146		AVIATION TECHNICIAN AIRCRAFT
147		AVIATION TECHNICIAN AVIONICS
148		ELECTRONIC TECHNICAL COMMUNICATIONS
149		ELECTRONIC TECHNICIAN
150		MARINE TECHNICAL HULL
151		MARINE TECHNICAL PROPULSION
152		MARINE TECHNICIAN
153		NAVY TRAINING SYSTEMS (ANY)
154		TRAINING SYSTEMS
155		WORK STUDY-O (OFFICER)
156		NAVY WEAPONS ELECTRICAL ENG (ANY)
157		ELECTRONIC TECHNICIAN
158		NON-ALIGNED ELECTRICAL TECHNICIAN
159		WARRANT OFFICER OF THE NAVY
160		NONE
161		NAVY OFFICER UNDER TRAINING
162		NAVY SAILOR UNDER TRAINING

997	Openend	OTHER (SPECIFY)
999	Single	REFUSED

ENDIF**IF CODE 2 ON S3 (ARMY), ASK:**

[Single]

Q19b. What was your corps at the time the harassment occurred?		
INTERVIEWER NOTE: DO NOT READ LIST		
IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE		
1		[UNKNOWN]
2		ARMY ARMoured CORPS (ANY)
3		ARMY ARMoured OFFICER
4		CAVALRYMAN
5		LIGHT CAVALRY SCOUT
6		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ARMoured CORPS ASSISTANT ADMIN
7		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ARMoured CORPS ASST INSTRUCTOR
8		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ARMoured CORPS REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
9		SUPERVISOR SQUADRON OPERATIONS
10		TANK CREWMAN
11		ARMY ARTILLERY REGIMENT (ANY)
12		ARMY AIR DEFENCE OFFICER
13		ARMY FIELD ARTILLERY OFFICER
14		ARMY OPERATOR RADAR
15		ARTILLERY COMMAND SYSTEM OPERATOR
16		ARTILLERY GUNNER
17		ARTILLERY LIGHT GUNNER

18		ARTILLERY OBSERVER
19		GROUND BASED AIR DEFENCE
20		MANAGER SURVEY, TARGET ACQUISITION
21		OFFENSIVE SUPPORT
22		OPERATOR UNMANNED AERIAL SYS
23		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ARTILLERY RECRUIT INSTRUCTOR (1RTB - 1 RECRUIT TRAINING BATTALION)
24		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ARTILLERY REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
25		ARMY AVIATION CORPS (AAVN) (ANY)
26		AUSTRALIAN ARMY AVIATION ASSISTANT INSTRUCTOR
27		AUSTRALIAN ARMY AVIATION RECRUIT INSTRUCTOR (1RTB - 1 RECRUIT TRAINING BATTALION)
28		AUSTRALIAN ARMY AVIATION REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
29		AIRCREWMAN
30		ARMY AVIATION OFFICER
31		GROUNDCREWMAN AIRCRAFT SUPPORT
32		GROUNDCREWMAN MISSION SUPPORT
33		ARMY BAND CORPS (AABC) (ANY)
34		AUSTRALIAN ARMY BAND CORPS ASSISTANT ADMIN
35		AUSTRALIAN ARMY BAND CORPS PIPER DRUM BUGLER
36		AUSTRALIAN ARMY BAND CORPS REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
37		ARMY BAND OFFICER
38		ARMY MUSICIAN
39		ARMY CATERING CORPS (AACC) (ANY)
40		AUSTRALIAN ARMY CATERING CORPS RI (1RTB - 1 RECRUIT TRAINING BATTALION)
41		ARMY CATERING OFFICER

42		ARMY COOK
43		OPERATOR CATERING
44		ARMY CHAPLAIN ANY DENOMINATION
45		ARMY DENTAL CORPS (RAADC) (ANY)
46		ARMY DENTAL OFFICER
47		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ARMY DENTAL CORPS DENTAL ASSISTANT
48		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ARMY DENTAL CORPS RI (1RTB - 1 RECRUIT TRAINING BATTALION)
49		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ARMY DENTAL CORPS REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
50		ARMY EDUCATION OFFICER
51		AIRCRAFT LIFE SUPPORT FITTER
52		AIRCRAFT STRUCTURAL FITTER
53		ARMY ARTIFICER ELECTRONIC
54		ARMY METALSMITH
55		ARMY ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ARMY ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL ENGINEER (RAEME) OFFICER
56		ARTIFICER AIR
57		ARTIFICER GROUND
58		ARTIFICER MECHANICAL
59		FITTER ARMAMENT
60		MECHANIC RECOVERY
61		MECHANIC VEHICLE
62		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ARMY ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL ENGINEER ASST ADMIN
63		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ARMY ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL ENGINEER ASSISTANT INSTRUCTOR

64		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ARMY ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL ENGINEER REGIMENTAL SERGEANT
65		MAJOR
66		TECHNICIAN AIRCRAFT
67		TECHNICIAN AVIONICS
68		TECHNICIAN ELECTRICAL
69		TECHNICIAN ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS
70		AIRCRAFT LIFE SUPPORT FITTER
71		ARMY ENGINEER OFFICER
72		ARMY MANAGER WORKS
73		BUILDING SERVICES
74		CARPENTER
75		CLERK ENGINEERS
76		COMBAT ENGINEER
77		DRAUGHTSMAN
78		ELECTRICIAN
79		ENGINEERING SERVICES
80		EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL
81		GEOSPATIAL TECHNICIAN
82		MULTIMEDIA TECHNICIAN
83		OPERATOR EMERGENCY RESPONSE
84		OPERATOR PLANT
85		PLUMBER
86		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ENGINEERS ASSISTANT INSTRUCTOR
87		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ENGINEERS RECRUIT INSTRUCTOR (1RTB - 1 RECRUIT TRAINING BATTALION)

88		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN ENGINEERS REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
89		STOREMAN ENGINEERS
90		ARMY ENGINEER OFFICER
91		ARMY INFANTRY CORPS (RAINF) (ANY)
92		ARMY COMMANDO
93		ARMY INFANTRY OFFICER
94		ARMY SPECIAL AIR SERVICE (SAS) TROOPER
95		INFANTRY OPERATIONS CLERK
96		INFANTRY RESOURCE STOREMAN
97		PATROLMAN
98		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN INFANTRY ASSISTANT INSTRUCTOR
99		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN INFANTRY RECRUIT INSTRUCTOR (1RTB - 1 RECRUIT TRAINING BATTALION)
100		ROYAL AUSTRALIAN INFANTRY REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
101		RIFLEMAN
102		ARMY INTELLIGENCE CORPS (AUST INT) (ANY)
103		ANALYST INTELLIGENCE OPS
104		ARMY INTELLIGENCE OFFICER
105		ARMY INTELLIGENCE CORPS REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
106		INT RECRUIT INSTRUCTOR (1RTB - 1 RECRUIT TRAINING BATTALION) (INTELLIGENCE RECRUIT INSTRUCTOR)
107		ARMY LEGAL CORPS (ANY)
108		ARMY LEGAL LEVEL 1 OFFICER
109		ARMY LEGAL LEVEL 2 OFFICER
110		ARMY LEGAL LEVEL 3 OFFICER
111		ARMY LEGAL LEVEL 4 OFFICER

112		ARMY LEGAL LEVEL 5 OFFICER
113		ARMY MEDICAL CORPS (RAAMC) (ANY)
114		ARMY MEDICAL OFFICER
115		ARMY PHARMACEUTICAL OFFICER
116		ARMY RADIOGRAPHER OFFICER
117		ARMY SCIENTIFIC OFFICER
118		ARMY TECHNICIAN LABORATORY
119		ARMY THERAPEUTICAL OFFICER
120		COMBAT MEDICAL ATTENDANT
121		MEDICAL OPERATOR
122		PHYSICAL TRAINING INSTRUCTOR
123		PREVENTIVE MEDICINE
124		RAAMC ASSISTANT INSTRUCTOR
125		RAAMC RECRUIT INSTRUCTOR (1RTB - 1 RECRUIT TRAINING BATTALION)
126		RAAMC REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
127		ARMY MILITARY POLICE CORPS (RACMP) (ANY)
128		ADF INVESTIGATOR
129		ARMY MILITARY POLICE
130		ARMY MILITARY POLICE OFFICER
131		RACMP RECRUIT INSTRUCTOR (1RTB - 1 RECRUIT TRAINING BATTALION)
132		RACMP REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
133		ARMY NON-CORPS (ANY)
134		ARMY GENERAL ENLISTMENT
135		ARMY OFFICER UNDER TRAINING
136		MILITARY PERSONNEL

137		ARMY NURSING OFFICER
138		ARMY ORDNANCE CORPS (RAAOC) (ANY)
139		ARMY ORDNANCE OFFICER
140		ARMY TECHNICIAN AMMUNITION
141		HANDLER PETROLEUM GENERAL RESERVE
142		OPERATOR ADMINISTRATIVE
143		OPERATOR PETROLEUM
144		OPERATOR SUPPLY
145		OPERATOR SUPPLY CHAIN
146		OPERATOR UNIT SUPPLY
147		RAAOC RECRUIT INSTRUCTOR (1RTB - 1 RECRUIT TRAINING BATTALION)
148		RAAOC REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
149		RIGGER PARACHUTE
150		ARMY PAY CORPS (RAAPC) (ANY)
151		ARMY PAY OFFICER
152		CLERK FINANCE
153		RAAPC ASSISTANT ADMIN
154		RAAPC RECRUIT INSTRUCTOR (1RTB)
155		RAAPC REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
156		ARMY PSYCHOLOGY CORPS (AAPSYCH) (ANY)
157		ARMY EXAMINER PSYCHOLOGICAL
158		ARMY PSYCHOLOGY OFFICER
159		ARMY PUBLIC RELATIONS SERVICE (AAPRS) (ANY)
160		ARMY PHOTOGRAPHER PUBLIC RELATIONS
161		ARMY PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER

162		ARMY REPORTER
163		ARMY REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR OF THE ARMY
164		ARMY SENIOR OFFICER
165		ARMY SIGNALS CORPS (RA SIGS) (ANY)
166		ARMY SIGNALLER COMBAT
167		ARMY SIGNALS OFFICER
168		COMBAT SIGNALLER
169		COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS
170		ELECTRONIC WARFARE OPERATOR
171		INFORMATION SYSTEMS
172		OPERATOR COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEMS
173		OPERATOR BEARER SYSTEMS
174		OPERATOR COMMUNICATIONS
175		OPERATOR ELECTRONIC WARFARE
176		RA SIGS REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
177		TECHNICIAN TELECOMM SYSTEMS
178		TELECOMMUNICATION SYSTEMS
179		ARMY TRANSPORT CORPS (RACT) (ANY)
180		AIR DISPATCHER
181		ARMY TRANSPORT OFFICER
182		CARGO SPECIALIST
183		DRIVER
184		MARINE SPECIALIST
185		OPERATOR MOVEMENTS
186		RACT ASSISTANT ADMIN

187		RACT RECRUIT INSTRUCTOR (1RTB - 1 RECRUIT TRAINING BATTALION)
188		RACT REGIMENTAL SERGEANT MAJOR
189		ARMY LOCAL OBSERVER
190		ARMY SOLDIER UNDER TRAINING
997	Openend	OTHER (SPECIFY)
999	Single	REFUSED

ENDIF

IF CODE 3 ON S3 (AIR FORCE), ASK:

[Single]

<p>Q19c. What was your category/trade at the time the harassment occurred? INTERVIEWER NOTE: DO NOT READ LIST IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE</p>		
1		[UNKNOWN]
2		WARRANT OFFICER OF THE AIR FORCE (EXEC WOFF)
3		RAAF AIRCRAFT (ANY)
4		ADVANCED AIRCRAFT TECHNICIAN
5		AIRCRAFT FITTER
6		AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS TECHNICIAN
7		AIRCRAFT TECHNICIAN
8		NON DESTRUCTIVE INSPECTIONS TECHNICIAN
9		AIRCRAFT LIFE SUPPORT FITTER
10		AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES
11		AIRCRAFT SURFACE FINISHER
12		RAAF AIRCREW (ANY)
13		AIR COMBAT OFFICER
14		PILOT

15		RAAF AIRMEN AIRCREW (ANY)
16		AIRBORNE ELECTRONICS ANALYST
17		CREW ATTENDANT
18		FLIGHT ENGINEER
19		LOAD MASTER
20		RAAF ARMAMENT (ANY)
21		ARMAMENT FITTER
22		ARMAMENT TECHNICIAN
23		RAAF AVIONICS (ANY)
24		ADVANCED AVIONICS TECHNICIAN
25		AVIONICS FITTER
26		AVIONICS SYSTEM TECHNICIAN
27		AVIONICS TECHNICIAN
28		COOK
29		CLERK
30		COMMUNICATIONS AND INFO SYSTEMS CONTROLLER
31		RAAF COMMUNICATION ELECTRONIC (ANY)
32		COMMUNICATION ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS TECH
33		COMMUNICATIONS ELECTRONIC FITTER
34		COMMUNICATIONS ELECTRONIC TECHNICIAN
35		RAAF DEFENCE AND DISCIPLINARY (ANY)
36		AIR BASE PROTECTION
37		AIRFIELD DEFENCE GUARD
38		FIRE SERVICES
39		PHYSICAL TRAINING

40		SECURITY POLICE
41		WARRANT OFFICER DISCIPLINARY
42		RAAF DENTAL (ANY)
43		DENTAL ASSISTANT
44		SENIOR DENTAL ASSISTANT (SNR DENTASST)-PREVENTATIVE
45		RAAF ENGINEERING & LOGISTICS (ANY)
46		AERONAUTICAL ENGINEER
47		AIRFIELD ENGINEER
48		ARMAMENT ENGINEER
49		ELECTRONICS ENGINEER
50		LOGISTICS OFFICER
51		RAAF FACILITIES (ANY)
52		CARPENTER
53		ELECTRICIAN
54		GENERAL HAND
55		PLANT OPERATOR
56		PLUMBER
57		WORKS SUPERVISOR
58		RAAF GROUND ENGINEERING (ANY)
59		GROUND MECHANICAL ENGINEER FITTER
60		GROUND MECHANICAL ENGINEER TECHNICIAN
61		GROUND SUPPORT ENGINEER MANAGER
62		GROUND SUPPORT ENGINEER TECHNICIAN
63		GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT FITTER
64		GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT TECH

65		RAAF HEALTH SERVICES (ANY)
66		ALLIED HEALTH PRACTITIONER
67		DENTAL OFFICER
68		ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER
69		LABORATORY OFFICER
70		MEDICAL OFFICER
71		NURSING OFFICER
72		PHARMACY OFFICER
73		PSYCHOLOGIST
74		RADIOGRAPHER
75		RAAF INTELLIGENCE (ANY)
76		AIR SURVEILLANCE
77		GEOSPATIAL IMAGE INTELLIGENCE ANALYST
78		PHOTOGRAPHY
79		SIGNALS OPERATOR
80		SIGNALS OPERATOR LINGUIST
81		SIGNALS OPERATOR TECHNICAL
82		RAAF MEDICAL (ANY)
83		ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SURVEYOR
84		LABORATORY TECHNICIAN
85		MEDICAL ASSISTANT
86		MUSICIAN
87		RAAF OPERATIONS (ANY)
88		AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL OFFICER
89		GROUND DEFENCE OFFICER

90		INTELLIGENCE OFFICER
91		OPERATIONS
92		SECURITY POLICE OFFICER
93		RAAF SENIOR OFFICER (ANY)
94		ADMINISTRATION OFFICER
95		AERONAUTICAL ENGINEER
96		AIR COMBAT OFFICER (NAV)
97		AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL OFFICER
98		AIRFIELD ENGINEER
99		ARMAMENT ENGINEER
100		EDUCATION OFFICER
101		ELECTRONICS ENGINEER
102		GROUND DEFENCE OFFICER
103		INTELLIGENCE OFFICER
104		LOGISTICS OFFICER
105		NURSING OFFICER
106		PILOT
107		RAAF SENIOR OFFICER
108		RAAF SUPPLY (ANY)
109		MOTOR TRANSPORT DRIVER
110		MOVEMENTS
111		SUPPLY
112		RAAF SUPPORT OPERATIONS (ANY)
113		ADMINISTRATION OFFICER
114		CHAPLAIN

115		EDUCATION OFFICER
116		LEGAL OFFICER
117		PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICER
118		RAAF AIRMEN UNDER TRAINING
119		RAAF OFFICER UNDER TRAINING
997	Openend	OTHER (SPECIFY)
999	Single	REFUSED

ENDIF

ENDIF

ENDIF

THE ANSWER PLACES TO Q21 WILL BE RANDOMISED

[Multiple] {Spread:20 Random}

<p>Q21. Have you been aware of sexual harassment happening to someone else in an ADF workplace #/ other than the workplace we have just discussed, /in general / in the last five years?</p> <p>INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ OUT:</p> <p>IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE</p> <p>HIGHLIGHT ALL MENTIONED</p>		
1		Yes, I observed or witnessed sexual harassment myself
2		Yes, another person who was sexually harassed told me about it
3		Yes, I heard about a person who was sexually harassed on the ADF workplace grapevine
4	Fixed Openend	Yes, I found out some other way (SPECIFY)
5	Fixed Single	No
98	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Fixed Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

IF CODES 1 TO 4 ON Q21, ASK:

Q22A-Q22D WILL BE RANDOMISED

Q22. Did you take any of the following actions after #/hearing about// #/ or// #/witnessing/ / this?
Q22A. Confront the harasser Q22B. Report the harassment to your employer Q22C. Talk/Listen to the victim Q22D. Offer advice to the victim

[Multiple] {Spread:20}

Q22E. Take any other action		
1	Openend	YES (SPECIFY)
2	Single	NO
98	Single	DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	REFUSED

YOU HAVE NOT COMPLETED ALL QUESTIONS PLEASE GO BACK AND DO SO

IF ANY CODE 1 ON Q22A-22E, ASK:

[Multiple] {Spread:20}

Q23 Were there any consequences for you in taking these actions? INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ OUT IF NECESSARY IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE HIGHLIGHT ALL MENTIONED		
1		YOU RECEIVED POSITIVE FEEDBACK FOR MAKING THE COMPLAINT
2		YOU WERE DISCIPLINED
3		YOU WERE TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER UNIT
4		YOU HAD YOUR DUTY ROSTER CHANGED
5		YOU RESIGNED
6		YOU WERE DISCHARGED
7		THE HARASSMENT STOPPED

8		YOU WERE DEMOTED
9		YOU WERE OSTRACISED, VICTIMISED, IGNORED BY COLLEAGUES
10	Single	THERE WERE NO CONSEQUENCES FOR ME
97	Openend	(DO NOT READ) OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

ENDIF

ENDIF

ASK ALL:

Now just a few questions about your current situation

[Single]

<p>Q24A. Where would be your preferred sources of information about sexual harassment? INTERVIEWER NOTE: ONLY RECORD FIRST MENTION HERE. RECORD OTHER MENTIONS ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTION INTERVIEWER NOTE: PROBE, DO NOT READ LIST. IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE</p>		
1		FRIENDS OR FAMILY
2		INTERNET INCLUDING SEARCH ENGINES SUCH AS GOOGLE OR YAHOO
3		MANAGER/SUPERVISOR AT WORK
4		EMPLOYER/BOSS
5		HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER OR EQUIVALENT AT WORK
6		EQUITY OFFICER/SEXUAL HARASSMENT CONTACT OFFICER/ HARASSMENT CONTACT OFFICER
7		CO-WORKER
8		CO-WORKER MORE SENIOR THAN YOU
9		A UNION OR EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVE
10		A LAWYER OR LEGAL SERVICE

11		AUSTRALIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION OR A STATE OR TERRITORY ANTI-DISCRIMINATION AGENCY
12		LIBRARY
13		COUNSELLOR/PSYCHOLOGIST
14		PRINT MEDIA SUCH AS NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES
15		TV OR RADIO
97	Openend	OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Single	DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	REFUSED

IF GAVE A FIRST MENTION (CODES 1 TO 97 ON Q24A), RECORD OTHER MENTIONS:

ANSWER CODES SELECTED IN Q24A WILL NOT APPEAR IN Q24B.

[Multiple] {Spread:20}

Q24B. INTERVIEWER: RECORD OTHER MENTIONS HERE (Where would be your preferred sources of information about sexual harassment?) INTERVIEWER NOTE: PROBE, DO NOT READ LIST. RECORD ALL OTHER MENTIONS IF OTHER, HIGHLIGHT OTHER AND TYPE IN RESPONSE		
1		FRIENDS OR FAMILY
2		INTERNET INCLUDING SEARCH ENGINES SUCH AS GOOGLE OR YAHOO
3		MANAGER/SUPERVISOR AT WORK
4		EMPLOYER/BOSS
5		HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER OR EQUIVALENT AT WORK
6		EQUITY OFFICER/SEXUAL HARASSMENT CONTACT OFFICER/ HARASSMENT CONTACT OFFICER
7		CO-WORKER
8		CO-WORKER MORE SENIOR THAN YOU
9		A UNION OR EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVE
10		A LAWYER OR LEGAL SERVICE

11		AUSTRALIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION OR A STATE OR TERRITORY ANTI-DISCRIMINATION AGENCY
12		LIBRARY
13		COUNSELLOR/PSYCHOLOGIST
14		PRINT MEDIA SUCH AS NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES
15		TV OR RADIO
96	Single	NONE - NO OTHER MENTIONS
97	Openend	OTHER (SPECIFY)
98	Single	DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	REFUSED

ENDIF

ASK ALL:

The following questions will only be used to ensure that we have a representative sample and will not be used in any way that could identify you.

[Single]

Q25. What is your total annual HOUSEHOLD income from all sources before taxes? Would it be...		
INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ LIST		
1		Less than \$15,000 per year
2		\$15,000 up to \$24,999 per year
3		\$25,000 up to \$34,999 per year
4		\$35,000 up to \$44,999 per year
5		\$45,000 up to \$55,999 per year
6		\$55,000 up to \$74,999 per year
7		\$75,000 up to \$99,999 per year
8		\$100,000 up to \$149,999 per year
9		\$150,000 up to \$199,999 per year
10		\$200,000 and over

98	Single	(DO NOT READ) DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	(DO NOT READ) REFUSED

[Single]

Q26. Are you of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander descent? INTERVIEWER NOTE: DO NOT READ - PROMPT IF NECESSARY (I.E. IF SAYS 'YES' ASK "ARE YOU ABORIGINAL, TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER OR BOTH?")		
1		ABORIGINAL
2		TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER
3		BOTH
4		NO
98	Single	DON'T KNOW/ CAN'T SAY/ UNSURE
99	Single	REFUSED

Ok, the interview is now finished.

Please note that your survey responses about any sexual harassment you may have experienced do not constitute a formal report of that sexual harassment. If you would like to make a formal report of sexual harassment, you may do so by contacting a supervisor, commander or manager or alternatively, the Australian Human Rights Commission or relevant state/territory based equal opportunity bodies identified in the support contact list that was sent to you. If you wish to report an act of indecency or a sexual assault, contact the Australian Defence Force Investigative Service (ADFIS) or the Police. The support contacts list can be provided to you again if required.

Thank you for your time. You made a valuable contribution to the success of this important study.

END-OF-QUESTIONNAIRE

Appendix N.6 – Information provided by 1800RESPECT National Sexual Assault, Domestic Family Violence Counselling Service at <http://www.1800respect.org.au/1800RESPECT-online.html>

State or National	Service	Website	Phone
NATIONAL	1800RESPECT National Sexual Assault, Domestic Family Violence Counselling Service	www.1800respect.org.au	1800 737 732
NATIONAL	Relationships Australia	www.relationships.com.au	1300 364 277
NATIONAL	Mensline Australia	www.menslineaus.org.au	1300 789 978
ACT	Domestic Violence	www.dvcs.org.au	02 6280 0900
ACT	Sexual Assault	www.rapecrisis.org.au	02 6247 2525
NSW	Sexual Assault	www.nswrapecrisis.com.au	1800 424 017
NT	Domestic Violence	www.dawnhouse.org.au	08 8945 6200
NT	Sexual Assault	www.health.nt.gov.au/Service_Locator/Sexual_Assault_Referral_Centres/index.aspx	08 8922 6472
QLD	Domestic Violence	www.dvconnect.org	1800 811 811
SA	Sexual Assault	www.yarrowplace.sa.gov.au	1800 817 421
TAS	Domestic Violence	www.justice.tas.gov.au/victims	1800 608 122
TAS	Sexual Assault	www.sass.org.au	03 6231 1811
VIC	Domestic Violence	www.dvrcv.org.au/	03 9486 9866
VIC	Sexual Assault	www.casa.org.au	1800 806 292
WA	Domestic Violence	www.womenscouncil.com.au/	1800 007 339
WA	Sexual Assault	www.kemh.health.wa.gov.au/ services/sarc	08 9340 1828

Appendix O

Chapter 8: Adequacy and Accessibility of Support Mechanisms

Appendix O.1 – Health and fitness monitoring, support and services

Health and fitness is monitored by the Medical Employment Classification (MEC) system, a consistent tri-service approach that determines the employability, deployability and rehabilitation of a member.

The MEC system involves regular physical examinations and patient questionnaires that assess individual fitness for service. Members are assigned a classification which then impacts upon 'employment, postings, trainings, occupational rehabilitation, transfers between employment categories, payment of specialist allowances and retention in the ADF.'²⁸¹

The MEC system comprises five broad categories:

- MEC1: Fully Employable and Deployable
- MEC2: Employable and Deployable with Restrictions
- MEC3: Rehabilitation
- MEC4: Employment Transition
- MEC5: Separation.²⁸²

The MEC system is a personnel management system, not a patient management tool, and defers to other bodies in the ADF (including Joint Health Command, Regional Health Directors, a member's chain of command, Medical Employment Classification Review Board, Career Management Agencies/Personnel Management Agencies and the member themselves) to administer to the needs associated with the classifications assigned.²⁸³

Among these is Joint Health Command, which is responsible for the provision of health care to non-deployed members of the ADF, and for the operational preparedness of the force from a health perspective.²⁸⁴ It 'conducts strategic health research, develops strategic health policies, provides strategic level health advice, and exercises technical and financial control of ADF health units.'²⁸⁵ Joint Operations Command and the single Services are responsible for health support on operations.²⁸⁶

Joint Health Command provides facilities located at ADF workplaces and 'Defence health units' around Australia, including primary health care, theatre capability, in-patient capability, dental, physiotherapy, radiology, mental health, rehabilitation and pharmacy services.²⁸⁷ ADF members can be referred to one of these, or an appropriate civilian service, through an after-hours advice and triage style phone service.²⁸⁸ Permanent ADF members do not require Medicare cards to access these services, but are invoiced or billed and then reimbursed.

Families of ADF personnel are not currently entitled to health subsidies as a matter of course, however, the Australian Defence Force Family Health Trial is providing ADF families residing in regional areas with benefits including reimbursing Medicare gap charges and an allied health allowance of \$330 per dependent per year.²⁸⁹

Regular publications keep ADF personnel updated about health and support news. *Defence family matters* is a tri-annual magazine sent to all permanent ADF members and those on continuous full-time service who have one or more dependents, and any other personnel who have requested a free subscription.²⁹⁰ Joint Health Command has also produced a series of concise fact sheets, available online and in places of work, to inform members about issues, policy and services in areas including depression, grief, alcohol and drug issues.²⁹¹

Beyond Joint Health Command there are two primary organisations that provide assistance and information to ADF members and their families: the Defence Community Organisation and Defence Families of Australia.

The Defence Community Organisation is run by ADF personnel, and provides services and information to Defence families. The services provided include support from social workers, education and employment, childcare and transition assistance.²⁹² The Defence Community Organisation also has a website and administers the Defence Family Helpline, which ADF members can access 24 hours a day.²⁹³

Defence Families of Australia is a Ministerial appointed group that represents the views of Defence families by reporting, making recommendations and influencing policy that directly affects families.²⁹⁴ Defence Families of Australia receives its funding from Defence and external sponsorship, and currently has a civilian executive and a number of ADF members as delegates.²⁹⁵ In addition to offering input at the policy level, Defence Families of Australia maintains an accessible and informative website offering advice for families and partners in a series of areas including health, money and education.

Appendix O.2 – Mental health research and initiatives

The ADF has undertaken a number of studies and initiatives over the previous decade. In 2002, the ADF Mental Health Strategy developed an agenda for the planning and provision of mental health care.²⁹⁶ In 2009, Professor David Dunt's *Review of Mental Health Care in the ADF and Transition through Discharge* was submitted to the ADF.²⁹⁷ The *2010 ADF Mental Health Prevalence and Wellbeing Study* established 'baseline data' to 'enable Defence to better inform and prioritise initiatives in the ADF Mental Health Reform Program'.²⁹⁸ This led to the *2011 ADF Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy* which provides a blueprint for the development of the 2012-2015 Mental Health and Wellbeing Action Plan.²⁹⁹ The Plan seeks to finalise 'Dunt Review recommendations, align of Defence with the national mental health reform agenda, and put in place a system that is self-monitoring and continuously improving'.³⁰⁰

The *Review of Mental Health Care in the ADF and Transition through Discharge* (Dunt Report) was submitted on 4 February 2009. Its major recommendations were:

1. Expanding the mental health workforce
2. Improving mental health training
3. Making prevention strategies (including stress management and positive coping strategies) a core component of military training
4. Improving mental health governance (including with e-health data management)
5. Improving mental health policy, with a focus on rehabilitation
6. Enhancing research and surveillance, and mental health screening
7. Enhancing rehabilitation and return to work programs
8. Enhancing military to civilian transition services
9. Including and informing families about mental health issues
10. Developing new and improved facilities.³⁰¹

The ADF then set about collecting baseline data to inform the implementation of these recommendations and policy changes through the *2010 ADF Mental Health Prevalence and Wellbeing Study*.

This was the first comprehensive investigation of the mental health of an ADF serving population, and has been described by Professor Ian Hickie of the Brain and Mind Research Institute as a world's best practice study.³⁰² Nearly 49% of ADF current serving members participated between April 2010 and January 2011.³⁰³

The study found that 22% of the ADF population experienced a mental disorder in the past 12 months, a prevalence rate similar to the Australian community. ADF lifetime prevalence rates, however, are higher than the wider community's.³⁰⁴

It also found that anxiety disorders are the most common type of medical disorder in the ADF. There was a higher prevalence of anxiety disorders among women compared to men, and among other ranks compared to officers.³⁰⁵ ADF males experience higher rates of mood disorders than the wider community, mostly accounted for by depressive episodes. Officers were as likely to experience affective disorders as other ranks.³⁰⁶

According to the study, there were high levels of alcohol use, but alcohol disorder was significantly lower in the ADF than in the wider community. Most disorder was in males in the 18-27 age group. ADF Females 18-27 had lower rates than their community counterparts. There were no significant differences between the Services with regards to alcohol dependence disorder, but members of Navy and Army were significantly more likely than Air Force to experience alcohol harmful use disorder.³⁰⁷

ADF personnel reported thinking about and planning suicide at a higher rate than the community. The number of suicide attempts is not significantly greater than in the general community, and the number of reported deaths by suicide is lower.³⁰⁸

43% of ADF members reported multiple deployments, 19% had one and 39% had never been deployed. Deployed personnel did not report greater levels of mental disorder, but were 10% more likely to seek care for mental health or family problems.³⁰⁹

In the previous year 17.9% of ADF members sought help for stress, emotional, mental health or family problems. Two main factors contribute to the low uptake of mental health services: the fear of stigma, and perceived barriers.³¹⁰ The most cited barrier was a concern that seeking help would reduce their deployability (39.6% of respondents). The most cited stigmas were a fear of being treated differently (27.6%) and of harm to career (26.9%).³¹¹

Based on these findings, the 2012-2015 Mental Health and Wellbeing Action Plan is currently being finalised. Defence senior leadership has identified the following seven priority areas for immediate action:

- a communications strategy to address stigma and barriers to care
- enhanced service delivery
- development of e-mental health approaches
- up-skilling health providers
- improving pathways to care
- strengthening the mental health screening continuum and
- developing a comprehensive peer support network.³¹²

This plan will aim to 'align Defence with the national mental health reform agenda, and put in place a system that is self-monitoring and continuously improving.'³¹³

Appendix P

Chapter 9: International Trends and Lessons Learned: A Review of Practices in Comparable Militaries

Examples of promising initiatives by other international militaries

A number of promising practices and programs across comparable international defence forces have been identified and these are detailed below according to five overarching principles.

Principle 1: Strong leadership drives reform

1. *Links to international imperatives*

In broad terms, NATO has made clear the benefits to the mission both of involving female personnel and of developing a greater understanding of gender issues at the operational level.³¹⁴ Accordingly, the Committee for Women In NATO Forces (CWINF) recommends, amongst other things, that member states establish an institution or committee responsible for issues regarding military and civilian women create a gender advisor for gender issues within the force and ensure high level recognition of significant contributions to the promotion of gender equality.³¹⁵

The vast majority of NATO member states have developed National Action Plans (NAP) for the implementation of UN Resolution 1325. Norway stands out as one of the few nations to include the increase in representation of women in their national forces in their NAP.³¹⁶

2. *Commitment to diversity built into public mechanisms*

Following a period of public debate and trials of women in combat roles, in 1989 the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal ordered that all roles in the Canadian Forces (CF) be open to women with a phased implementation period of ten years. Following that, what has come to be known as the Ministerial Board on Gender Integration and Employment Equity was established to oversee gender integration policy, with regular reporting conducted and targets set by the Human Rights Commission.³¹⁷ This means that an external imperative was built into the public mechanisms that surround the CF.

This compliance approach could perhaps be viewed as the ‘stick’ forcing Services to reform. The ‘carrot’, however, is the commitment from within defence to equity and inclusion as *operational* imperatives. This includes the Defence Ethics Program at the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, referred to in all relevant CF policy and guidelines, which emphasises that the values of the CF include what are described as fundamentally Canadian values, including respect for the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and refers to the ‘societal trust’ in the CF that must not be disappointed.³¹⁸

Meanwhile the Doctrine Manuals of the CF leadership, specifically the doctrine *Duty with Honour – the Profession of Arms in Canada*, identifies military values as core Canadian values, stressing that these include diversity, equality and human rights.³¹⁹ Further, the CF’s *Canada First* strategy notes that the CF is fostering a culture that will ‘place a renewed emphasis on recognition, fairness, consideration and respect for members and their families’.³²⁰

It is important to note that numerous commentators suggest that, while the commitment is clearly there in the CF leadership, there is a gap between this and the perception of what has actually been achieved.³²¹ Nevertheless, as observed at various stages throughout this paper, the CF is regarded as a model for other defence Services, with particular reference made to its compulsory training of all personnel in issues of diversity and equality.³²²

3. *Civilian and Defence Collaboration*

Canada, of course, is not the only environment examined by the Review that has an overt commitment to the increased participation and promotion of women. The Netherlands, in particular, has taken significant steps to emphasise the operational value of women’s participation, releasing joint departmental and Service policies that outline the benefits to the mission.

Specifically, the Netherlands Gender Action Plan 2004 and Department of Defence project *Gender Force*, represent a combined commitment to improving the contribution of women to the Netherlands defence mission, the latter putting particular emphasis on the concept of 'Gender Mainstreaming'.³²³

Similarly, Swedish defence organisations have partnered with the Swedish Police, the Swedish Rescue Services Agency, the Association of Military Officers in Sweden (a form of trade union) and civilian bodies to develop their own *Genderforce* project. Its mission is 'to establish gender equality in Sweden's international...missions' with an emphasis on gender mainstreaming across all policies.³²⁴

Further, consistent with the combined approach noted above, the UK Ministry of Defence Senior Officer and Civil Servants Diversity and Equity Awareness program for general/flag officers and senior executives emphasises the value of a united approach to diversity across the defence environment.³²⁵

Similarly, a joint video presentation from military and civilian leadership in the US Air Force signals to personnel a united front on the 'value of the unique qualities of each individual in the total Air Force'.³²⁶

4. Inspiration from and for leaders

Both *Genderforce* projects have sought to harness the power of leadership. In the Netherlands the specific identification of Gender Champions – high ranking generals that champion gender and diversity issues across the Services – indicate to personnel that issues of gender integration are viewed as an imperative by military leadership, as well as by the civilian agencies that support it.³²⁷ The Review's observations from its discussions with US defence representatives confirmed that a specific champion (such as the US Vice Chief of Naval Operations, for example) is an essential ingredient in an initiative's success.³²⁸

Meanwhile, Swedish defence Services have implemented a program of Gender Coaching under which specialists in gender issues – with backgrounds ranging from equal opportunity bodies, business, academia, to defence environments – are appointed as a kind of personal trainer for a dozen senior officers across the Swedish Armed Forces, the Police and Association of Military Officers.³²⁹ Though at an early stage, this program acknowledges that the pragmatics of diversity are not always immediately apparent and that leaders need to maximise their limited time. The ongoing coaching relationship of regular monthly meetings allows rapport to develop, so that frank and effective discussion occurs.

5. Accessible language, contextualising diversity

In the same way, best practice requires that formal commitment at the leadership level is communicated effectively to personnel. The UK *Chief of General Staff's Equality & Diversity Directive* employs accessible language, explaining that '[Diversity] values the inherent qualities in every individual, respects their differences, and enables them to make the selfless commitment that the Army demands in the knowledge that they will be treated fairly'.³³⁰

Meanwhile, publications such as the *Equality & Diversity Newsletter for Armed Forces* disseminate practical information and case studies³³¹ and the booklet, *Basically Fair – Respect for Others in the British Army* – notes Army values as including the courage to 'do the right thing, not the easy thing'.³³² Further, a Service wide website, *Proud2Serve*, promotes issues affecting gay and lesbian personnel and was recently recognised in the inaugural European Diversity Awards.³³³

6. Rendering difference unremarkable

Of particular note to the Review, the Netherlands *Gender Force* project, mentioned above, stands out for its commitment to mainstreaming the concept of 'gender' across the whole of the defence Service – embedding discussions of gender, diversity, equity and integrity into all aspects of defence training, rather than leaving it as an annual, obligatory venture.

Its sub-project, *Gender in training*, enables all defence personnel to be introduced to gender issues and understand how important the subject is in terms of military operations. In addition, the Dutch Services have commenced a 'Train the Trainer' course for core instructors who then serve as points of

contact on gender issues and train new instructors – cementing the imperative in operational, as well as strategic, leadership.³³⁴

7. Leading cultural change

Despite Congressional impetus, US Service branches have been slightly later to make overt commitments to the value of diversity as an operational imperative. Nevertheless, all have now mapped out a blueprint for working towards greater diversity, the Army's Diversity Roadmap being perhaps the most recent, released in December 2010. Committing the Army to becoming an Employer of Choice, the Roadmap notes that 'the diversity of our people is a source of strength' and that the Army is 'already viewed in awe by many nations that see our committed men and women from different backgrounds supporting our global efforts in defense of democracy....'³³⁵

Along similar lines, the *US Air Force Diversity Roadmap* sets out the responsibilities of all personnel, and builds in clear mechanisms for evaluation, training, mentoring and professional development – emphasising the need for cultural change. The Roadmap explains that: '*Diversity is a military necessity. Air Force decision-making and operational capabilities are enhanced by diversity...helping make the Air Force more agile, innovative and effective. It opens the door to creative solutions to complex problems and provides... a competitive edge...*'³³⁶

Similarly emphasising cultural change, and discussed later in this paper, was the former US Navy's Chief of Naval Operations announcement in 2003 that he was determined to create a 'mentoring culture' across the naval Service and assign a mentor for every Service member.³³⁷

Meanwhile, the US Air Force, Navy and Coast Guard were all recognised in the Top 20 of US Government Employers in the *Workforce Diversity Awards*, suggesting that they are well on their way to their identified goal of becoming employers of choice.³³⁸

Principle 2: Diversity of leadership increases capability

1. Addressing historical inequity

The CF has been recognised for creating five special positions for women on its Joint Command & Staff course to acknowledge women's historical absence from combat positions and the time necessary for women who have more recently gained combat experience to reach flag officer level. For example, despite women's participation across all roles in the Canadian Navy for the last 25 years, it was only in 2008/09 that a woman was appointed to command a major naval warship.³³⁹

Despite being noted as a 'best practice' by commentators,³⁴⁰ it is also described as 'universally condemned' by CF officers – women unwilling to go to the CF Command Course in a 'pink seat' as it would be perceived to undermine their credibility. Many women are reported to have refused it when offered, prompting calls for re-evaluation of this particular initiative as having outgrown its usefulness.³⁴¹

Similarly, two seats are reserved specifically for women to assume flag officer level in the Netherlands while modest targets have also been set for officer ranks.³⁴² Despite the stagnation of women's representation across the Dutch armed forces, however, a recent report indicates opposition from Dutch female personnel to any initiatives which were perceived by others as giving special or favourable treatment to women.³⁴³

2. Advocating for diversity

Nominated in literature as best practice, the Netherlands DEFENCE Women's Network objectives include '...to strengthen the position of Defence women and stimulate their advancement to higher positions....'³⁴⁴ DEFENCE is described as having been influential in the renewed focus on gender issues within the Netherlands in recent years.³⁴⁵

On an individual level, UK Royal Navy Lieutenant Commander Mandy McBain was nominated as one of the 100 most influential gay and lesbian people in the UK in 2010's national Pink List and widely publicised by the Royal Navy as a role model for all personnel.³⁴⁶

3. Political imperative

The US Congress recognised a palpable need to increase the diversity of US military leadership by establishing the Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC). Created to assess opportunities for the promotion and advancement of minority members of the Armed Forces, at the end of 2010 the MLDC delivered 20 recommendations to improve diversity, all of which are reported to have met with support from the US Service Chiefs.³⁴⁷

As mentioned above, this included recommending the phased removal of the last combat exclusions. In addition to this, however, the MLDC also recommended improving diversity of leadership by developing a 20-30 year pipeline of personnel. To do so, the Commission found that the necessary steps included:

- improving recruiting, mentoring and retention
- maintaining transparent promotion processes
- tracking regional and cultural expertise
- considering all qualified candidates for 3 and 4 star general and, if no women or minority candidates, submit a statement to the Senate
- regular auditing and reporting
- well-resourced strategic plans
- accountability reviews
- barrier analysis and
- internal and external monitoring.

The Review understands that the US Services are currently developing a formalised response.

4. Visible leaders

While a handful of women in visible positions should not be read as a critical mass, it is nevertheless crucial that other female personnel are able to identify role models.³⁴⁸ This means ensuring that potential candidates are identified by leadership and encouraged to take assignments that will open further opportunities.

Principle 3: Increasing numbers requires increasing opportunities

1. Understanding recruitment

In the Canadian context, the CF recently conducted an evaluation of recruiting techniques via a survey. Given that recruiters are one of the most influential factors in the decision of potential personnel to join an organisation, understanding the recruitment process is valuable to building a more diverse defence environment.³⁴⁹ The survey confirmed that recruiters had been the most informative out of all listed CF information sources. Female respondents to the survey demonstrated no real palpable difference to male respondents, indicating that their reasons for joining the CF included 'career opportunities', 'challenging work', 'education opportunities', and 'the opportunity to make a difference'.³⁵⁰

Along these lines, in the Netherlands women have specifically been appointed as recruiting officers, visiting secondary schools to raise the profile of a defence career amongst potential future personnel. Further, young people are given the opportunity to upgrade their physical fitness in the pre-recruitment phase, thus improving their chances of their applications being accepted, and of continuing to meet the requirements of the job as they progress.³⁵¹

Additionally, in the UK, the Royal Air Force and Royal Navy have been recognised in the prestigious Stonewall Awards as among the top employers for 2012,³⁵² with the RAF also nominated as Lesbian

Recruiter of the Year by a popular magazine – indications that the UK Services are proactively recruiting in the gay and lesbian communities.³⁵³

Meanwhile, the US Navy has set an overall recruitment goal of 23% women – a further acknowledgment that a critical mass is essential if change is to be achieved.³⁵⁴

2. Raising the profile of women in the field

The role of Gender Adviser has been established in international deployments in the Netherlands, Norwegian and Swedish forces, and has shown to increase awareness of how gender works as an operational factor in theatre, as well as demonstrating the benefits of an increase in the presence and experience of women within the force.³⁵⁵ Meanwhile, in 2009 the Netherlands deployed the first all-female foot patrol in Uruzgan Province, Afghanistan – formally assigned to a combat role, rather than ‘attached’.³⁵⁶

3. Raising the profile of roles in the field

In the CF, opportunities for women in non-traditional occupations – whether combat or non-combat – have also been highlighted, one example being the role of Traffic Technician in the Mobile Air Mobility Support. Despite being a role requiring significant upper body strength and the capacity to move extremely heavy loads, 21% of personnel in this occupation are women, with the trade now having its first female Chief Warrant Officer.³⁵⁷

Meanwhile, the RAF has won a national *Inspiring Women in the Workforce Award* for proactively seeking out potential young female recruits and encouraging them to consider a career in engineering, rather than a more traditional occupation³⁵⁸ with a female UK Apache Officer recently being named Young Woman Engineer of the Year.³⁵⁹

4. Directing women into non-traditional roles, including successful transition into combat roles

Of particular interest, the US Navy reported using a temporary special measure to direct women into technical – or seagoing – occupations. This was because of an identified operational imperative to fill berths on US Navy ships and was achieved by closing the number of administrative or medical roles available to women and redirecting recruits into the seagoing roles that needed to be filled.

This initiative involved setting direct quotas for women in seagoing occupations, and increasing the quotas for those 20 roles identified as having the lowest representation of women. Inherent in doing so was a recognition that these occupations contributed to defence career progression.³⁶⁰ This initiative is now being evaluated in terms of its impact on the retention of women in these particular roles.

5. Supporting women in non-traditional roles

While the ADF has committed to the opening of combat roles for women, it may be useful to draw on the recommendations of the Defense Advisory Committee On Women In The Services (DACOWITS) 2011 Report regarding the potential opening of roles in the US. Reiterating its previous recommendation that gender based restrictions on military assignment should end, the Committee also emphasised that, in doing so, the US Department of Defense (DoD) and the Services should develop appropriate physical standards for each role, relating to the job performed, rather than ‘using or establishing standards to judge women’s qualifications that have not been validated, even for men.’³⁶¹

Meanwhile, CF representatives emphasised the importance of developing training standards for the full range of capabilities required in the field. Rather than merely focusing on a single 20 mile run, then, CF representatives suggested that endurance in the field was an equally essential, and very different, capability.³⁶²

Further, DACOWITS recommended that, ‘in addition to a general increase in quality of pre-deployment weapons training, the Services should ensure that deployed Service members receive appropriate in-country weapons training on the weapons used by the units in which they are serving in theatre.’³⁶³

This recommendation follows findings by the Committee that pre-deployment weapons training often did not match the equipment provided in theatre.

6. *Getting the gear right*

Female personnel in the ADF are reporting ill-fitting or inadequate equipment and uniforms in the field, relying on the luck of the draw to be provided with smaller sizes of uniforms designed specifically for men. The US Service branches are all acknowledging this concern, the Air Force having designed a women's flight suit, the Army also currently testing a new Women's Army Combat Uniform³⁶⁴ and the US Navy describing the design of an appropriate uniform as a 'physical commitment to women that you are serious about them being in Service'.³⁶⁵

However, the DACOWITS 2010 Report recommends that, rather than drawing overt and visible attention to women's differences, that Services support the development of uniforms that are appropriate for both men and women – an initiative echoed by the US Marine Corps undertaking of an anthropomorphic survey to develop a database of body measurements to support better uniform design. The DACOWITS also recommended the urgent delivery of properly designed and fitting combat-related equipment, such as flak jackets, by the end of 2011.³⁶⁶

7. *Acknowledging women's health needs*

The DACOWITS 2010 Report recommends the identification of gender-specific aspects related to PTSD and the development of targeted and accessible treatment programs available to both genders.³⁶⁷

Following the results of the 2005 Navy's Pregnancy and Parenthood Survey, the Independent Duty Corpsman (IDC) Women's and Sexual Health training model had been expanded from two to six weeks. The 2008 survey indicated that significantly more respondents felt comfortable discussing and obtaining birth control from IDC and medical personnel aboard ship than did in 2005, a tangible example of the way in which information gathering and measurement mechanisms can improve the defence experience for female personnel.³⁶⁸

The US Army Surgeon General's Women's Health Task Force confirmed the need for better provision of information, particularly so that women can better prevent and address health problems experienced in the field. Initial information sessions – particularly for young recruits self-diagnosis kits (such as for urinary tract infections) and equipment such as Female Urinary Devices are helping female personnel manage their health more autonomously.³⁶⁹

8. *Building a cohort*

In relation to the lifting of gender restrictions on combat roles, the DACOWITS has recommended as best practice approaches the visible support of leaders of the kind that had been evident in the repeal of the Don't Ask Don't Tell policy and a phased approach to integration in which, at a minimum, several women should be integrated into units at a time.³⁷⁰

The US Navy has adopted an information technology mechanism that flagged when the cohort of women at any particular base was reaching less than 15%.³⁷¹ This stands in contrast, however, with the proposed approach of the US Marines of introducing women into non-traditional roles only one or two at a time. It should be noted, however, that the US Service branches are currently engaged in research regarding the potential success of introducing women into combat related roles, rather than the formal implementation of policy as in the Australian context.³⁷²

When first opening combat roles for women, the CF sought new recruits, rather than Corps transfers. Reservations were expressed by CF representatives about Corps transfers being seen as giving women 'free passes' or alternatively as being unattractive to women who did not want to relinquish the inroads they had made in their existing roles.³⁷³

Principle 4: Greater flexibility will strengthen the ADF

1. *Supporting personnel, supporting families*

The Family Wellbeing Initiatives under the CF Family Covenant recognise the impact on defence family life and the value of supporting defence families in retaining personnel.³⁷⁴ Accordingly, the CF offers maternity leave of a maximum of 17 weeks followed by a further 37 weeks parental leave which can be divided between the parents, with an entitlement of up to 93% of regular pay.³⁷⁵ Some personnel perceive taking parental leave as detrimental to future promotional opportunities.³⁷⁶ Meanwhile, other opportunities exist for improvement, such as allowing personnel to use extended Leave Without Pay to raise their family and then return³⁷⁷ and the more active use of flexible work practices for Regular Force personnel.³⁷⁸

In the US, personnel not on deployment can make use of federally legislated *Alternative Working Schedules* that can include Flexitours, Gliding Schedules and Compressed Schedules. This is subject to the approval of command and is only considered realistic at particular locations, such as at the Washington office of the Department of Transportation and Maritime Administration, for example.³⁷⁹

Further, the US Coast Guard and Army offer a Child Care Subsidy Benefit program for Active Duty Members and Active Reservists called to action who do not have access to a Federal Child Development Centre or centre on a military base.³⁸⁰ Additionally, the US Navy has put particular emphasis on providing access to child care – including after hours occasional care – in all home ports and bases.³⁸¹

Elsewhere, in addition to comparatively generous maternity leave, the Dutch armed forces also offers contracts with local agencies to provide subsidised child care and offers personnel absent owing to duties at sea, in the air, or upon deployment for over one month compensation for additional childcare costs if childcare is not available at barracks.³⁸² Further, the Netherlands provides personnel with a right of re-entry up to six years after leaving the military and to be exempt from deployment in Peace Support Operations or compulsory naval exercises when they have children up to age four. The Review notes, however, a similar concern that Dutch women do not always feel comfortable making use of these arrangements.³⁸³

The CF has embarked upon the 2011-2012 CF Employment Systems Review Project to identify barriers that may contribute to continued under-representation of Designated Group Members (women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible Minorities and Persons with Disabilities). Using focus groups, interviews with senior CF leaders and a CF wide survey, the project intends to elicit qualitative information from a broad cross-spectrum of personnel strengthen understanding of statistical data about minority representation assess employment systems and conduct relevant surveys.³⁸⁴

2. *Flexible careers*

Of particular note is the US Navy's recent commitment to 'Navy *and* family', rather than Navy *or* family.³⁸⁵ Specifically, the US Navy Career Intermission Pilot Program enables personnel to 'pursue personal or professional growth outside the Service while providing a mechanism for seamless return to active duty...'³⁸⁶ Recently extended to 2015, personnel may be released from active duty to the Individual Ready Reserve for up to 3 years. With quite strenuous conditions attached, personnel retain certain active duty benefits and must return at the end of their inactive period. Currently up to 40 personnel can apply each year and must then serve two months for every month of program participation. If they are not able to meet these obligations, they must pay back any entitlements received while inactive and may risk an 'other than honourable discharge'.³⁸⁷

Despite these qualifications, some of which are under review,³⁸⁸ discussions with US Navy representatives confirm that this initiative is being looked upon with great expectation. At present, however, there has been limited take up (currently 24 personnel are involved), with few yet to return from their absence from active duty.

According to the US Navy, this relatively small take up is partly the result of concerns by personnel that a break from service would result in skills degradation, leaving them to compete against a younger, more up to date cohort upon their return. However, the Navy is hopeful that, as more personnel return from their intermission, and as greater numbers take up the opportunity, that this break from Service will be 'normalised', with the concept of 'changing lanes', rather than taking 'on ramps and off ramps' becoming common parlance.³⁸⁹ To this extent, the majority of personnel involved in the program to date have been men – confirmation that programs initially envisaged to benefit women can benefit an entire force.³⁹⁰

Further, the US Navy is attempting to build more flexibility into when personnel are expected to meet specific milestones in their careers.³⁹¹ Specifically, career patterns have been realigned so that surface warfare officers now have two four year breaks in their careers during which they are predominantly ashore – allowing them to identify periods when they can start and raise a family.³⁹² Further, the US Navy funds up to 75% of the costs of IVF egg freezing, allowing female personnel to defer childbearing until suitable intervals in their career.³⁹³

In cases where it was possible, the US Navy has encouraged 'teleworking targets' – encouraging a proportion of personnel to work from home.³⁹⁴ Service wide, the DoD is also encouraging telework options where possible, including the concept of 'Virtual Commands' to minimise the cost of relocation and enable senior personnel and their families to retain geographic stability.³⁹⁵

3. *Transparent processes*

An independent Defence Review in the UK has recommended building more transparency and standardisation into career progression, including by keeping senior personnel in posts for longer providing for independent representation on promotion and appointment boards and putting greater emphasis on recruiting or developing people with the right skills and expertise.³⁹⁶

The UK Ministry of Defence is currently developing a New Employment Model (NEM) that ensures 'that service in the Armed Forces remains an attractive option in a rapidly evolving employment market' and that 'better balances the demands placed on our people and their families' – including providing greater domestic stability where possible.³⁹⁷ The NEM is expected to be released later this year, with implementation in 2014/2015.

4. *Learning from personnel*

The US Navy Pregnancy and Parenthood Survey 2008 reported almost half of female personnel (and about 10% of male personnel) indicating that the recent change to a 12 month post-partum operational deferment would motivate them to remain in the Navy. This served as the first confirmation that an increased focus on life/work balance policies was having the desired retention effect in the Fleet.³⁹⁸

In addition, in the 2010 Survey, almost a third of personnel indicated that opening the operational deferment up to fathers would further motivate them to stay in the Navy.³⁹⁹ Despite the US Navy's hopes for the Career Intermission Program, the Survey indicated that the program had little impact either way on the motivation of personnel to stay in the Navy.⁴⁰⁰

5. *Individual Mentoring*

Mentoring is promoted as a priority in many of the forces examined, with the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute publishing a Mentoring Handbook to assist personnel in maximising the benefits of mentoring relationships.

Meanwhile, the US Navy's mentoring programs have been recognised as setting the pace with a formalised, Navy-wide program that creates an obligation on those in leadership positions to ensure that every sailor has a mentor.⁴⁰¹ While the program employs a suite of initiatives, one particularly relevant example includes the Navy Women eMentoring pilot, which used a web-based matching tool for mentees to find potential mentors.

The program proved exceptionally popular but was costly and unable to be sustained in its initial format.⁴⁰² Nevertheless, a Navy wide e-mentoring program is currently being considered,⁴⁰³ the success of the pilot program attributable in part to the fact that mentors and mentees were very carefully and specifically matched. Anecdotal examples of its application include a junior female officer using Skype to role play difficult leadership situations with her mentor, and then enacting these with her personnel the following day.⁴⁰⁴

The Air Force mentoring program is also mandated and supervisory, with all officers required to act as mentor to the officer immediately below them in the chain of command and a web-based program, *My Development Plan*, used to support it.⁴⁰⁵ In contrast, the US Army's approach is voluntary.⁴⁰⁶

6. **Mentoring networks**

Of further interest is the fostering of developmental networks, or 'mentoring constellations', with Employee Resource Groups in the US Navy offering another form of professional support in a small group environment while 'Affinity Groups' are professional networks that provide an advocacy and mentoring role for a large group of peers.⁴⁰⁷

The National Naval Officers Association is one wider example – a non-profit organisation, but endorsed by the Secretaries of Transportation and the Navy the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandants of the Coast Guard and Marine Corps the NNOA's mission is to 'encourage maximum minority participation in all areas of the sea services and related organisation.'⁴⁰⁸

More specific to female personnel, Women Military Aviators is a non-profit body with no affiliation to DoD – formed 'to educate the public about the roles of women aviators and bond women together to let them know that there are other people experiencing the same things they are'.⁴⁰⁹ Recently female aviators also gathered at a Women in Aviation International Conference which included a 'speed mentoring' session and a 'Bring Your Daughter to the Conference' day to encourage members of defence families to consider aviation.⁴¹⁰

Academy Women is a non-affiliated Service wide association 'supporting all current, former and future women military officers in reaching their full potential as leaders' which also operates an eMentoring Leadership Program encouraging members to 'Connect. Share. Excel.'⁴¹¹

The Joint Women's Leadership Symposiums held by the Sea Service Leadership Association – another affinity group established under the Navy's auspices with a focus on female Service members – are particularly successful mentoring opportunities.⁴¹²

Formal or informal, a combination of mentoring programs may perhaps be most effective, one study identifying developmental networks as 'more powerful than one-one-one mentoring alone', emphasising the value of multiple short-term mentors, peer mentors, mentoring groups and online support communities. The study suggests that the more diverse a Service member's support network, the greater the depth and breadth of career support that the individual will receive.⁴¹³

Principle 5: Gender based harassment and violence ruins lives, divides teams and damages operational effectiveness

1. **Signalling Zero Tolerance**

Gender-based violence damages operational effectiveness as well as individual lives.

Recognition of this was boosted by the decision to replace a civilian with a Two-Star Ranked Officer in the position of Director of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office (SAPRO). This change was hailed by commentators as an important signal – giving kudos to what may have previously been perceived as a civilian imperative. As the Service Women's Action Network noted at the time:

...when SAPRO now speaks, commanders have to listen....When the military wants to get things done, it puts a General in charge.⁴¹⁴

Initiatives delivered under the auspices of SAPRO, meanwhile, have been recognised as examples of best practice, with Victims Advocates (VAs) available to nearly every Service member, and standardized certification for Sexual Assault Response Co-ordinators and VAs across the Services.⁴¹⁵

In particular, the US Navy has invested significant effort into implementing effective sexual assault prevention and intervention training – programs which have been found to be achieving a real shift in attitudes, both in terms of preventing men from committing sexual assault and encouraging men to intervene as bystanders if they see concerning behaviour taking place.⁴¹⁶ The Navy was also recognised by the US Defence Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services as ‘pioneering’ in this regard⁴¹⁷ and regularly conducts ‘stand-downs’ – days during which all Service members in a particular organisation are expected to engage in sexual assault training.⁴¹⁸

Equally important are other programs that aim to achieve positive cultural change, such as the Navy’s Coalition of Sailors Against Destructive Decisions – an outreach program addressing issues such as suicide and alcoholism, as well as sexual assault. Similarly, an outreach program run under the auspices of Air Force Command encourages the development of a Culture of Responsible Choices.⁴¹⁹

2. Supportive Responses to Sexual Assault and Harassment

Cultural change requires that personnel have confidence in the system. Defence personnel in any context aren’t necessarily aware of the extent to which sexual assault reports are pursued. Consequently, the DACOWITS 2011 Report recommends publicizing the outcomes of sexual assault cases more broadly – specifically, ‘that DoD should publicize reports of sexual assault and their dispositions in a simple format accessible to a wide military audience, to be used in required training and other venues.’⁴²⁰

In addition, DACOWITS recommends that DoD should consider requiring local commanders to publicize this same information, including information on reports and dispositions at their specific installations and that this should include the number of reports, type of disciplinary actions taken as a result, and reasons why disciplinary action is not taken.⁴²¹

Further, DACOWITS recommends that DoD should include measures of sexual assault and sexual harassment in command climate assessments to help ensure that prevention becomes a command priority and indicated that it would consider recommending the inclusion of such measures in individual performance evaluations of commanders in the future.

A best practice example of immediate support accessible to all personnel, are the 24 hour, 7 day a week confidential hotlines available to members of the UK, CF and Netherlands and more recently to the US armed forces. In the Netherlands these confidential counsellors help with reporting punishable behaviour, or register complaints anonymously for statistical purposes.⁴²²

Extensions of this external form of support are the partnerships increasingly being forged between Defence Services and community support agencies, such as the CF National Investigation Service partnerships with civilian policing agencies.⁴²³ In Canada, a significant amount of work has been invested in the response to sexual assault, with the Victims Assistance Program and ‘Victims Choice Package’ provided by the CF National Investigation Service unit being identified as best practice in an Australian study of international responses to sexual assault in the military.⁴²⁴

Additionally in the US, further emphasis is being put on supporting victims through the legal process, as well as on expedited transfer options that require command to give proper consideration to any request for transfer by a victim of sexual assault within 72 hours of that request being made⁴²⁵ In the US Marines, procedures exist that allow command to temporarily set aside issues of collateral misconduct, meaning that victims are less likely to be discouraged from reporting because they fear disciplinary action for offences related to alcohol consumption, for example.⁴²⁶

3. *Restricted Reporting*

The US environment further distinguishes itself, however, by making different reporting options available to victims of sexual assault. Assessed by the DoD Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military, 2010, as a ‘critical addition’ to the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program, restricted reporting allows victims to report an incident confidentially to certain personnel such as Sexual Assault Response Co-ordinators and Victim Advocates, accessing medical and counselling support (including forensic examination) without disclosing names or initiating an investigation.⁴²⁷ An Executive Order creating a Victims Advocate privilege ensures that personnel to whom restricted reports are made are not compelled to disclose these in any prosecution.⁴²⁸

While restricted reporting has been criticised in some quarters as allowing perpetrators to remain unaccountable, this victim-centred approach allows personnel to access support and assistance that they would otherwise go without, given the well-documented reluctance to come forward. Restricted reporting also provides command with information about rates of sexual assault and the chance to effect environmental change. Victims can later elect to convert to an Unrestricted Report, usually within a year, at which point the matter is referred for formal investigation.⁴²⁹ Documents concerning restricted reports are kept for up to five years, after which it is harder to guarantee confidentiality. Where a report has been converted to unrestricted, documents are retained for up to 50 years.⁴³⁰

While sexual assault cases (like other criminal offences in the defence environment) are dealt with by the US Uniform Code of Military Justice, criminal offences are dealt with by the civil legal systems in other nations – many of whom, like Australia, proscribe mandatory reporting.

The Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office, as well as the various Service branches confirmed the usefulness of the restricted reporting mechanism. Upon receiving multiple restricted reports concerning a particular offender, Sexual Assault Response Co-ordinators are compelled to advise the chain of command to ensure that other personnel do not continue to be at risk from a serial sexual predator.⁴³¹

Veterans in the US are able to access benefits for Military Sexual Trauma on the basis of a restricted report, with the VA increasingly emphasising flexibility in the assessments made by their health providers.⁴³²

4. *Flexibility*

Flexibility and choice is hallmark of best practice policy. For example, while it is certainly essential to ensure ownership by command, commentators observe the value of alternative routes to resolve disputes.⁴³³ One route traditionally considered as ‘alternative’, mediation and other forms of conciliation are increasingly being offered in the defence context, with a growing emphasis on resolving complaints at the lowest level possible.⁴³⁴

An additional route described in the Service Complaints Booklet provided to all UK personnel is to lodge a complaint with the Military Complaints Commissioner. The Commissioner can receive complaints from personnel and/or their families about harassment, discrimination, bullying or other forms of unfavourable treatment. It should be noted, however, that the emphasis of the Service Complaints Booklet remains the chain of command.⁴³⁵

5. *Training*

While all Services examined conduct sexual assault and harassment training, some international forces purchase specialist training from civilian organisations.⁴³⁶ Further, training is far more likely to be effective when it is conducted in small, interactive groups, rather than large lectures.⁴³⁷ In fact, some commentators observe that equity and diversity training can backfire when not targeted appropriately to the audience, instead producing a ‘rebound effect’ of increasing rape-supportive attitudes.⁴³⁸

The US defence environment confirmed the importance of standardised and professionalised training for all personnel. This includes those in senior positions, in dedicated sexual assault response roles, and those at the NCO level who, in many cases, have the most contact with defence personnel on a day to day basis⁴³⁹ and who may be in the best position to advise young personnel how to avoid – or intervene in – damaging behaviour and situations.⁴⁴⁰

6. Accountability

In addition to effective training, policies and practices need to be evidence based and regularly assessed to determine whether they are being successful. Certainly, the MLDC has recommended regular auditing and reporting, well-resourced strategic plans, accountability reviews, barrier analysis and internal and external monitoring.

International forces conduct a range of surveys to determine the extent to which diversity is valued and gender integration is being achieved. UK active defence personnel are regularly surveyed regarding sexual assault and harassment,⁴⁴¹ while the US distinguishes itself by conducting congressionally-mandated surveys and reviews of relevant policies and regulations.⁴⁴²

The CF is currently undertaking the first comprehensive survey regarding harassment across the CF since 1998. The Review has been told that its goal will be to update prior research, examine awareness of CF harassment policy and programs, as well as measure the prevalence of harassment in the organisation.⁴⁴³

The US SAPRO has recently taken steps to establish a Service wide data base of sexual assault and harassment information – a crucial move, given the inconsistent approaches that have existed to date. Additionally, all US Services are now moving to include assessments of sexual assault responses in command climate surveys.⁴⁴⁴

Appendix Q

Referencing documents received from Defence Liaison Officers

Any information referenced as “provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood”, “provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James”, “CMDR A Westwood, email to Review” or “SQNLDR F James, email to Review” was sent to the Review by the Defence Liaison Officers. In fulfilling the Review’s requests for information, we understand that the Defence Liaison Officers sourced information from the following:

- Office of the Secretary and CDF: Judge Advocate General, Director of Military Prosecutions, Strategic Reform Program, ADF Investigative Service, IGADF
- Vice Chief of the Defence Force Group: Cadet, Reserve and Employer Support Division, Joint Health Command, Australian Defence College
- Joint Operations Command: Headquarters Joint Operations Command
- Navy: Navy Strategic Command, Fleet Command, Director General Navy People, Director General Reserves – Navy, New Generation Navy Program
- Army: Forces Command, Army Headquarters, Career Management – Army, Director General Reserves – Army
- Air Force: Air Command, Director General Personnel –Air Force, Director General Reserves – Air Force, Director Personnel – Air Force
- Defence People Group: Workforce Planning Branch, Defence Force Recruiting, People Strategy and Culture Branch, People Policy and Employment Conditions Branch, Workplace Health and Safety Branch, Human Resources Shared Services Branch, Values, Behaviours & Resolutions Branch, People Systems Division
- Defence Support Group: Defence Community Organisation, Directorate of Relocations and Housing, Major Infrastructure Partnership Branch
- Chief Finance Officer Group: Resource Assurance and Analysis Branch
- Chief Information Officer Group: Corporate Information Systems Branch, Information and Communications Technology, Reform Division
- Defence Science and Technology Organisation
- Department of Veterans’ Affairs

The Review’s Defence Liaison Officers were assisted by the following people in responding to our requests for information and the Review wishes to thank them:

WGCDR Karen Ashworth, Dan Barwick, LTCOL Margie Beavan, Sylvana Bell, Bev Blyth, Amber Brentnall, Steve Briggs, Emily Chalker, CMDR Christine Clarke, Amanda Desalis, LCDR Donna Douglas, CMDR Russell Dowrick, LTCOL Ana Duncan, LTCOL Mona Goldsmith, WGCDR Bruce Graham, WGCDR Deb Greig, Anna Hackett, Michelle Hannaford, GPCAPT Geoff Harland, WGCDR Shane Hellman, CMDR Jenni Heymans, CDRE Vicki McConachie, CAPT Cameron McCracken, LTCOL David McGarry, LCDR Anne Mena, CMDR John Merton, Vanessa Murray, LCDR Kate Nash, GPCAPT Graeme Peel, Peter Redston, Jerome Reid, Silvana Salafia, Ellen Swavley, LTCOL Griff Thomas, Emma Turner and CAPT Nick Youseman.

- 1 JNCO (Junior Non-Commissioned Officers) includes all ranks from Recruit to Corporal (E); SNCO (Senior Non-Commissioned Officers) includes all ranks from Sergeant to Warrant Officer (E); Junior Officers are all ranks from Cadet to Major (E); Senior Officers are Lieutenant Colonel (E) and above.
- 2 The Survey was completed in this form by focus group participants. There were two differences for online survey respondents: 1) Online respondents were not asked for their age 2) Online respondents could only note their length of service for their current service type (ie Permanent or Reserves), not both.
- 3 United Nations, *Women and Armed Conflict*, Fact Sheet 5. At <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/followup/session/presskit/fs5.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012).
- 4 See Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, *Australian National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security 2012–2018*. At <http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/our-responsibilities/women/publications-articles/government-international/australian-national-action-plan-on-women-peace-and-security-2012-2018> (viewed 27 June 2012) ('*Australian National Action Plan*').
- 5 *Australian National Action Plan*, note 4, p 17.
- 6 *Australian National Action Plan*, note 4, pp 10-14.
- 7 The National Action Plan was developed by a 'Women, Peace and Security Inter-Departmental Working Group' consisting of the Office for Women, Defence, AusAID; DFAT, AFP, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet and Attorney General's Department and the Asia-Pacific Civil-Military Centre of Excellence. Non-government organisations have played an instrumental role in developing the National Action Plan and will have ongoing involvement in its implementation and monitoring.
- 8 *Australian National Action Plan*, note 4, p 15.
- 9 *Australian National Action Plan*, note 4, p 27.
- 10 *Australian National Action Plan*, note 4, pp 33-34.
- 11 *Australian National Action Plan*, note 4, p 39.
- 12 *Australian National Action Plan*, note 4, p 9. Additional Security Council Resolutions UNSCR 1820 (2008), UNSCR 1888 (2009), UNSCR 1889 (2009) and UNSCR 1960 (2010) are available at: <http://www.un.org/documents/scres.htm>.
- 13 UN INSTRAW, *Peace and Security – Programme Description* (2010). At <http://www.un-instraw.org/aid-effectiveness/general/programme-description.html> (viewed 19 June 2012).
- 14 *Australian National Action Plan*, note 4, pp 21-25, 28-29.
- 15 CMDR D Hardy, email to the Review, 14 March 2012.
- 16 Department of Defence, 'Action Plan for Improving Recruitment and Retention of Women', Chiefs of Service Committee, Agendum Paper 04/09 (21 July 2009) Attachment 3, Enclosure 1, para 14, provided to the Review by B Efrossynis, 19 May 2011.
- 17 'CDF Action Plan April 2011 Quarterly report', COSC Agendum 99-11, Annex B, provided to the Review by T WGCDR T Saunder, 2 May 2011.
- 18 Army reported that: 'From the [DFR Pre-enlistment Fitness Assessment] register and taken from the results from 1200 filtered records from all [Defence Force Recruiting Centres] (except Brisbane) the failure rate for female Army candidates is 30.34% compared to Army male candidates at 3.26%. The female average age who passed was 21.3 years and average age who failed was 22.6 years. Of the 30.34% failure group, the largest training gap is within the Beep test where the average achieved 5.8 however the standard required in 7.5': see 'Annex D (Army) input to CDF Action Plan April 2011 Quarterly report', COSC Agendum 99-11, provided to the Review by T WGCDR T Saunder, 2 May 2011.
- 19 In 2011 it was reported that there was 'feasibility and scoping work underway for establishment of a number of initiatives': 'CDF Action Plan April 2011 Quarterly report', note 17.
- 20 Department of Defence, 'Action Plan for Improving Recruitment and Retention of Women', note 16.
- 21 'CDF Action Plan Working Group Meeting Minutes', 10 November 2011, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 7 December 2011.
- 22 The Navy Women's Strategic Adviser role was created to 'develop, manage and implement initiatives to further promote and improve the retention and participation of women in the Navy', in accordance with the Action Plan and Navy People Plan. The Adviser is intended to act as a Navy point of contact, liaising with the other Services and external community on any programs, initiatives and action plans relating to retention and employment of women. Particular priorities for the role are listed as: raising the Navy profile on female participation (eg through media and networking opportunities to promote visibility of female participation within and outside Navy); operationalising gender balance requirements in the workforce (providing creative and strategic advice and guidance to Navy command to increase female participation rates for maximum operational effectiveness); and driving an understanding of gender balance issues among senior leaders and managers (eg by linking female participation and associated initiatives with the Action Plan and Navy People Plan): see RADM Jones, Head Navy People and Reputation, *Commander's Intent for Navy Women's Strategic Adviser*, 22 October 2010, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 11 January 2012.
- 23 Public submission 26 Heymans.
- 24 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 30 November 2012.
- 25 'CDF Action Plan Working Group Meeting Minutes', note 21.
- 26 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 23 January 2012: Defence advised that the administration of Defence is regulated by a series of policy and procedural documents (the 'System of Defence Instructions' (SoDI)). Defence advises that the SoDI framework organises administrative policy documents into a three-tiered hierarchy, determined by risk and authority, and includes:
 - Defence Instructions (General)
 - Single Service Defence Instructions
 - Chief Executive Instructions

- Defence Interim Instructions
 - Standing Instructions
 - Defence Manuals
 - Departmental Manuals and Instructions.
- 27 'CDF Action Plan Working Group Meeting Minutes', note 21.
- 28 'CDF Action Plan Working Group Meeting Minutes', note 21.
- 29 Under the *Defence Collective Agreement 2006-2009* (DeCA).
- 30 'CDF Action Plan Working Group Meeting Minutes', note 21.
- 31 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 11 January 2012.
- 32 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review 24 January 2012.
- 33 'CDF Action Plan April 2011 Quarterly report', note 17; Department of Defence, 'Action Plan for Improving Recruitment and Retention of Women', note 16.
- 34 Department of Defence, 'Action Plan for Improving Recruitment and Retention of Women', note 16.
- 35 'CDF Action Plan April 2011 Quarterly report', note 17; Department of Defence, 'Action Plan for Improving Recruitment and Retention of Women', note 16.
- 36 'CDF Action Plan Working Group Meeting Minutes', note 21.
- 37 'CDF Action Plan Working Group Meeting Minutes', note 21.
- 38 'CDF Action Plan Working Group Meeting Minutes', note 21.
- 39 CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 20 December 2011.
- 40 Department of Defence, 'Action Plan for Improving Recruitment and Retention of Women', note 16.
- 41 At the November 2011 Working Group meeting it was reported that the Values, Behaviour and Resolution Branch (formerly Fairness and Resolution Branch) were developing a diversity manual and information on flexible workplace policy will be included in this. The new Diversity manual was expected to be completed in 2012, however the Review has received no further update on this.
- 42 C McLoughlin, *Women's Participation in the Navy*, Report of the Participation of Women in New Generation Navy Review, 7 October 2009, provided to the Review (the CDF appointed McLoughlin to conduct a review into the participation of women in the Royal Australian Navy in response to a request by Senator the Hon J Faulkner, Minister for Defence).
- 43 'ADF Enlistments by Classification FY2003 to FY1011 v2.xls' provided to the Review by E Chalker, 15 November 2011; 'ADF Separations by Rank' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 4 December 2011.
- 44 'ADF Enlistments by Classification FY0203 to FY1011 v2.xls', above; Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012, 16 July 2012.
- 45 'ADF Enlistments by Classification FY0203 to FY1011 v2.xls', above; Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012, 16 July 2012.
- 46 'ADF Enlistments by Classification FY0203 to FY1011 v2.xls', above; Advice received from the ADF, 16 July 2012, 16 July 2012.
- 47 Financial Year 2011-12 is only up to 30 October 2011: Defence Force Recruiting, 'Response to Request for Information (RFI) Number 45 – RFI 45 – Detailed data from each Service about enquiries, recruitment, performance in physical tests by gender last 5 years' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 9 December 2011. Blank column indicates that at the time of enquiry, these candidates did not have a preferred Service selected. Note that prior to 2009/10 the online enquiry system did not collect gender information.
- 48 Defence Force Recruiting, 'Response to Request for Information (RFI) Number 45 – RFI 45 – Detailed data from each Service about enquiries, recruitment, performance in physical tests by gender last 5 years', above. Financial Year 2011-12 is only up to 30 October 2011 (annual target as at December 2011 was set at 6810). This Table shows data for all candidates managed by DFR and includes ab initio, reserves, previous Service and in Service (i.e General Entry applying for Officer). This does not include lateral and in-service recruiting activities, which are managed by the Services. The blank column indicates that at the time of assessment these candidates did not have a Service selected on their application. Defence have advised that data was not available prior to 2003.
- 49 Defence Force Recruiting, 'Background Brief: Defence Force Recruiting Expenditure and the Cost of ADF Recruiting, Attachment 2 to RFI 366' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 20 March 2012.
- 50 Defence Force Recruiting, 'Background Brief: Defence Force Recruiting Expenditure and the Cost of ADF Recruiting, Attachment 2 to RFI 366', above.
- 51 Defence Force Recruiting, 'Background Brief: Defence Force Recruiting Expenditure and the Cost of ADF Recruiting, Attachment 2 to RFI 366', above.
- 52 Defence Force Recruiting, 'Attachment 1 to Defence response to RFI 366' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 20 March 2012.
- 53 Australian National Audit Office, *Contracting for Defence Force Recruiting Services*, Audit Report No. 45 (2005), pp 47-8. At <http://www.anao.gov.au/Publications/Audit-Reports/2009-2010/Contracting-for-Defence-Force-Recruiting-Services> (viewed 31 May 2012).
- 54 Australian National Audit Office, *Contracting for Defence Force Recruiting Services*, above, p 48, 'Table 2.1: DFR Recruitment targets and actual achievement 2007-08 to 2009-10'.
- 55 Australian National Audit Office, *Contracting for Defence Force Recruiting Services*, above, pp 47-8.

- 56 Other DFR reforms included a 'Job Options Service' to encourage retention and reenlistment through access to independent remuneration and career advice about realistic opportunities for employment in the ADF and expectations for transitioning to the civilian world (note that implementation of this has been 'shelved' over the period 2008-09 to 2013-14, in order to provide SRP savings). A further initiative, also cancelled to provide SRP savings, was a Financial Advice Scheme: Department of Defence, People Strategies and Policy Group, *Review of the Australian Defence Force Retention and Recruitment (R2) Program* (2010) vol 2, p 5. At http://www.defence.gov.au/foi/docs/disclosures/234_110520_PSPG_Review_August_2010_V1andV2.pdf (viewed 27 October 2011).
- 57 Department of Defence, *Workforce Outlook* (25 July 2011), p 17, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 4 October 2011. Department of Defence, People Strategies and Policy Group, *Review of the Australian Defence Force Retention and Recruitment (R2) Program*, above, vol 2, p 2.
- 58 'DFR responses to RFls 301 & 302' provided to the Review by SQLDR F James, 7 March 2012. On the other hand, targeted branding and attraction strategies are increasingly being used by companies, such as Telstra's creation of a 'segmented employment brand for women': see Australian Human Rights Commission, 'Our experiences in elevating the representation of women in leadership. A letter from business leaders' (October 2011), pp 20-1. At http://www.humanrights.gov.au/sex_discrimination/publication/mcc/index.html (viewed 2 May 2012).
- 59 This includes a Defence Technical Scholarship for year 11 and 12 students undertaking technically-oriented subjects, and a Candidate Referral Program allowed specialist providers to source, screen and refer technical trade candidates to DFR.
- 60 Department of Defence, People Strategies and Policy Group, note 56, vol 1, p 26.
- 61 Open Mind Research Group, *Attracting Women to the Defence Forces*, Research report prepared on behalf of Defence Force Recruiting (21 November 2005), provided to the Review by DFR Representatives, 16 November 2011.
- 62 GfK Bluemoon, *Women and the ADF* (2010), provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 15 November 2011.
- 63 Department of Defence, *Defence Personnel Environment Scan 2025* (2006), ch 3, p 37. At http://www.defence.gov.au/dpe/dpe_site/publications/DPES2025/index.htm (viewed 19 June 2012).
- 64 Meeting with Defence personnel on CDF Action Plan.
- 65 GfK Bluemoon, note 62.
- 66 A library of profiles has been developed; a women's microsite has been incorporated into the Defencejobs web site www.defencejobs.gov.au/womenintheadf/. Marketing materials have also been produced including a DVD which highlights the realities of life for women in the ADF. 'Women in the ADF' branded merchandise has also been developed and is being distributed nationally. A new marketing booklet is also being developed profiling currently serving women in the ADF aiming to show real life examples of successful ADF women. See for eg: 'CDF Action Plan April 2011 Quarterly report', note 17.
- 67 The fitness initiatives are directed towards providing resources and information to encourage a higher level of health and fitness for ADF entry. A key development is a 'Women in the ADF' interactive phone application, containing information on fitness and nutrition, increasing awareness of the ADF. Other initiatives include fitness merchandise, information on the Women in the ADF website and marketing and advertising for the fitness initiatives with RoWS branding.
- 68 The collaboration is defined by the terms of a Collaborative Contract for the Provision of Recruiting Services to the Australian Defence Force between the Commonwealth of Australia and Manpower Services (Australia) Pty Ltd dated 14 November 2002: Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 29-1, 'Defence Force Recruiting'*, 6 August 2003, para 1 ('DI(G) PERS 29-1').
- 69 'Paying Attention to More Numbers', *Sunday Times Perth*, Sunday 13 May 2012, p 58.
- 70 'Defence Force Recruiting Branch Background' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 15 November 2011.
- 71 Australian National Audit Office, *Contracting for Defence Recruiting Services*, note 53, p 11.
- 72 'Defence Force Recruiting Branch Background', note 70.
- 73 DI(G) PERS 29-1, note 68.
- 74 Australian National Audit Office, *Contracting for Defence Recruiting Services*, note 53, p 11.
- 75 DI(G) PERS 29-1, note 68, para 9.
- 76 The Defence Alternative Educational Entry Scheme, launched in 2007, allows for aptitude testing of candidates where they may be lacking documentation or proof of their previous education. The scheme was established after discovering that around 250 applicants a year were lost because of lack of documentation. In its first year, 190 out of 307 applicants successfully enlisted through this scheme.
- 77 'Defence Force Recruiting – Service Delivery Model', Diagram 1, provided to the Review by Defence Force Recruiting representatives.
- 78 'Defence Force Recruiting – Service Delivery Model', above, p 2.
- 79 'Presentations from Defence Force Recruiting and CRMC' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 12 December 2011.
- 80 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 5-10, 'Australian Defence Force Gap Year'*, 27 May 2011, Annex B.
- 81 Noetic Solutions, *Evaluation of the Australian Defence Force Gap Year Program* (21 April 2010), p 23, provided to the Review by SQLDR F James, 30 January 2012.
- 82 Australian Human Rights Commission, note 58, pp 23, 25.
- 83 'PTS by Gender 1 May 2012 – Full Breakdown.xls' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 1 June 2012.
- 84 'Response to Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 428' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 1 June 2012. Note, the sample size varies greatly by sex: male n=9,668; female n=1,704.
- 85 Sample size n=2.
- 86 'Response to Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 283' provided to the Review by SQLDR F James, 10 April 2012.
- 87 'Project LASER- Retention 2010 Cohort Results' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 16 March 2012.
- 88 'Project LASER- Retention 2010 Cohort Results', above.

- 89 Department of Defence, People Strategies and Policy Group, *Review of the Australian Defence Force Retention and Recruitment (R2) Program*, note 56, vol 1, p 26.
- 90 'Section 1 Executive Summary 111223', 'Section 2 Case for Change and Future Vision FINAL', 'Section 3 Change Overview FINAL' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 14 February 2012; Meeting with Plan SUAKIN Representatives.
- 91 'SC FEG crewing options paper final.DOC' and 'FIFO issues brief.DOC' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 12 June 2012.
- 92 CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 12 March 2012.
- 93 Royal Australian Navy, *Sea Talk Spring 2007/Navy Sea Change Program*, http://www.navy.gov.au/Publication:Sea_Talk_Spring_2007/Navy_Sea_Change_Program (viewed 6 July 2012). See also CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 12 March 2012.
- 94 'Sea Talk Article – Harbour Watch Reform pdf; http://intranet-defence-gov-au_navyweb_sites_chkDoc-asp_S_9586_D_92808_URL_docs_FC_Personal_Memo_08-08-Minimum_Duty-Watch.pdf' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 29 May 2012.
- 95 CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 12 March 2012.
- 96 See for example, 'WAR FCT Exit Report' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 12 June 2012.
- 97 Royal Australian Navy, *Navy's Response to the Submarine Workforce Sustainability Review* (Moffitt Report), 8 April 2009. At http://www.navy.gov.au/Publication:Submarine_Workforce_Sustainability_Review (viewed 15 June 2012). Also provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 12 February 2012.
- 98 Royal Australian Navy, *Navy Action Plan Unveiled to Strengthen Submarine Fleet*, http://www.navy.gov.au/Navy_Action_Plan_Unveiled_to_Strengthen_Submarine_Fleet (viewed 15 June 2012).
- 99 See for example, 'NWPC FIFO Paper.DOC' and 'FIFO Issues brief.DOC' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 12 June 2012.
- 100 '120411 – Decision Brief for CAF – Air Force Women Pilot Recruitment Strategy – Graduate Pilot Scheme (GPS).pdf' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 30 May 2012; '120524 – Brief for CAF – Women in Non Traditional Employment Roles (Winter) Marketing Campaign.pdf', provided to Review by SQNLDR F James, 30 May 2012.
- 101 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 30 May 2012.
- 102 Recommended approach from DNPCMA, CAPT S Ottaviano, *Brief for 2012 QBB Members*, 19 March 2012, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 3 April 2012.
- 103 Recommended approach from DNPCMA, CAPT S Ottaviano, *Brief for 2012 QBB Members*, above.
- 104 RADM T N Jones, *2012 Promotion Board Guidance*, 29 March 2012, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 3 April 2012.
- 105 There were four ranking categories. Number 2 signified 'An officer who has satisfactorily demonstrated Navy signature behaviours and is rated among the majority of their peers'. Category 1 was for those ranked 'among the best' and category 3 for those 'below the majority'.
- 106 MAJ P O'Donnell, 'SO2 Selections, Appointments and Transitions', *Briefing to the Review*, 22 March 2012.
- 107 MAJ P O'Donnell, 'SO2 Selections, Appointments and Transitions', above.
- 108 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Tasks 378 and 380 – questions IRT Army Promotion Board visit' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 4 April 2012.
- 109 COL G J Reynolds, CCM-A, *Army Officer Career Pathway Strategy – Foundation Career Management Group*, 23 Oct 2009, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 4 April 2012.
- 110 'ADO High Level v1.xls' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 30 January 2012.
- 111 'ADF Specialisation RFI 155.xls' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 24 January 2012. In 2011 there are no personnel in the following categories: Seaman NO, Marine Trade Operations, Psychology and Public Relations.
- 112 These graphs represent the distribution of ranks (of non-training personnel) up to the Captain (Navy), Colonel (Army) and Group Captain (Air Force): 'ADO High Level v1.xls', note 110.
- 113 Director General Personnel – Army, Minute, 'Trial of 12 months IMPS for selected ARA trades', 12 April 2012, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 18 April 2012.
- 114 '120411 – Decision Brief for CAF – Air Force Women Pilot Recruitment Strategy – Graduate Pilot Scheme (GPS).pdf', note 100; '120524 – Brief for CAF – Women in Non Traditional Employment Roles (Winter) Marketing Campaign.pdf', note 100.
- 115 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 18 April 2012.
- 116 *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth), s 43.
- 117 *Sex Discrimination Regulations 1984* (Cth), reg 3.
- 118 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 32-1 'Employment of Women in the Australian Defence Force'*, 31 January 2004 ('DI(G) PERS 32-1').
- 119 *Sex Discrimination Regulations 1984* (Cth), reg 3.
- 120 DI(G) PERS 32-1, note 118.
- 121 CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 7 November 2011.
- 122 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 1 February 2012: Defence also advised that there are restrictions currently in place on the women working in the Military Working Dog Handler mustering. Women, who comprise 22.5% of the MWDH mustering have been employed in this role since 1985, but have been unable to fulfil the Direct Combat Duties aspects of their role (specifically offensive or close combat operations). Defence stated that the removal of gender restrictions 'means those women will be able to fulfil the entire compliment of their roles. This will almost instantly provide an enhanced capability to Air Force. The majority of MWDH women involved in research and focus ... were very excited by the opportunity to perform this aspect of their role, having already proven themselves in this field'.

- 123 Female soldiers and officers may serve in the Royal Australian Artillery (RAA) Corps within Surveillance Aircraft Operator, Operator Weapon Locating Radar, Artillery – Air Defender or related RAA officer employments currently only within Surveillance, Targeting and Acquisition. Full Time Combat Engineers (Combat Engineers are defined as those employed in Combat Engineer Regiments and does not include Construction Units, Engineer Design Units and Facilities Management Units, Geomatic Engineers and Illustrators).
- 124 S D Blake-Beard, 'Taking a hard look at formal mentoring programs' (2001) 20(4) *The Journal of Management Development* 331, p 333.
- 125 S D Blake-Beard, above, p 333.
- 126 C A Schipani, T M Dworkin, A Kwolek-Folland and V G Maurer, 'Pathways for women to obtain positions of organizational leadership: the significance of mentoring and networking' (2009) 89 (16) *Duke Journal of Gender Law and Policy* 123, pp 123-4.
- 127 Australian Human Rights Commission, note 58, p 19. At http://www.humanrights.gov.au/sex_discrimination/publication/mcc/index.html (viewed 2 May 2012).
- 128 Australian Human Rights Commission, note 58, p 19. At http://www.humanrights.gov.au/sex_discrimination/publication/mcc/index.html (viewed 2 May 2012).
- 129 S Wadia-Fascetti and PG Leventman, 'E-mentoring: A longitudinal approach to mentoring relationships for women pursuing technical careers' (2000) *Journal of Engineering Education* 295-300.
- 130 Headlam-Wells, et al, above.
- 131 Headlam-Wells, et al, above.
- 132 Headlam-Wells, et al, above, p 456.
- 133 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA. The pilot program was sunset in September 2011, however given its success, consideration was being given to developing a new program 'to align resources to benefit a larger population': LTCOL G Cassperson, email to the Review, 14 June 2012.
- 134 This includes the Women and Leadership Australia Australian Women's Leadership Symposium (15 positions), Women's Leadership Journey workshop (ten), Australian Applied Management Colloquium (four) and three half-day Forum Sessions (60). In addition, the Program will fund one position on the Avril Henry Executive 'Great Leaders are Made' (GLAM) women's leadership program in Sydney (for CMDR/CAPT), and 12 positions in Darwin and Cairns on the SkillPath 'Conference for Women' (all ranks): Department of Defence, Information DEFGRAM No 741/2011 '2012 Navy Women's Leadership and Mentoring Program', 10 November 2011, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 1 December 2011.
- 135 Department of Defence, Information DEFGRAM No 741/2011 '2012 Navy Women's Leadership and Mentoring Program', above.
- 136 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 73 – women's mentoring and coaching programs' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 1 December 2011.
- 137 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 1 December 2011.
- 138 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 1 December 2011. The Army Women's online forum is available through the Defence intranet.
- 139 'My Mentor Trial Program–Air Force: Interim Report' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 1 December 2011.
- 140 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 1 December 2011.
- 141 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 1 December 2011.
- 142 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 1 December 2011.
- 143 'Brief for DGPERS-AF – Developing Senior Air Force Women', 7 August 2011, provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 16 February 2011.
- 144 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, Department of Defence. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/dpe/pac/> (viewed 12 June 2012), Division 5.4.6.
- 145 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Divisions 5.4.3, 5.4.13, 5.4.14 and 5.4.18.
- 146 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Division 5.4.15.
- 147 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Division 5.4.21.
- 148 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Division 5.4.12.
- 149 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 16 March 2012.
- 150 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Division 5.5.3 and 5.5.4.
- 151 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, above, Divisions 5.5.3 and 5.5.4. It is noted that a total of only 52 weeks' maternity leave (including four weeks' paid leave) is available to eligible members compared to a total of 66 weeks' parental leave (including two weeks' paid leave). The ADF has explained that this is due to legislation and industrial relations cases related to entitlement to maternity and parental leave. As explained by the ADF, 'The Maternity Leave (Commonwealth Employees) Act 1973 provides for 52 weeks of unpaid leave. The ADF has adopted this level of assistance in the PACMAN. In line with DECA, 14 weeks of this period can be paid leave. The 66 weeks of unpaid parental leave was put in place by the Australian Industrial Relations Commission (now Fair Work Australia) in about 1990 through a negotiation process as a result of a parental leave test case. This 66 week period was placed into the General Employment Conditions Award and subsequently into the Australian Public Service Award. This 66 week period was adopted as the appropriate level of assistance for ADF members through the PACMAN. Two weeks of this period of leave can be paid': SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 16 March 2012.
- 152 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 16 March 2012.
- 153 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.4.12; SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 16 March 2012.
- 154 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.4.7.
- 155 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.4.4.
- 156 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.4.14.

- 157 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.4.16.
- 158 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.5.3.
- 159 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Divisions 5.5.4, 5.5.6.
- 160 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Divisions 5.5.3 and 5.5.5.
- 161 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.4.19.
- 162 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.4.10.
- 163 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Divisions 5.4.23 and 5.4.24. Different requirements apply if the member has a birth or termination earlier than six weeks before the expected date of birth, in which case the required absence is for six weeks starting on the date of birth or termination.
- 164 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.4.25.
- 165 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Divisions 5.4.26-5.4.27.
- 166 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 2 March 2012.
- 167 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Divisions 5.4.30 and 5.4.31.
- 168 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.5.6.
- 169 Family Assistance Office, *Paid Parental Leave scheme for working parents*, <http://www.familyassist.gov.au/payments/family-assistance-payments/paid-parental-leave-scheme/> (viewed 15 June 2012); People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Part 5.4A.
- 170 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.4A.4.
- 171 Department of Defence, *Information DEFGRAM No 468/2011: Paid Parental Leave*, 8 July 2011, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 6 November 2011; People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Divisions 5.5.10 and 5.4A.3.
- 172 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 49-4, 'Flexible work arrangements for members of the Australian Defence Force'*, 8 May 2012, p 2 ('DI(G) PERS 49-4').
- 173 DI(G) PERS 49-4, above, p 2.
- 174 DI(G) PERS 49-4, above, p 2.
- 175 DI(G) PERS 49-4, above, p 5.
- 176 DI(G) PERS 49-4, above, p 3.
- 177 DI(G) PERS 49-4, above, p 2.
- 178 DI(G) PERS 49-4, above, Annex A; People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.8.10.
- 179 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, pp 3-5.
- 180 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, Annex F.
- 181 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, Annex F.
- 182 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, Annex F.
- 183 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, Annex F.
- 184 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 5.
- 185 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 1 March 2012.
- 186 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 6.
- 187 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, clauses p 6.
- 188 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 6.
- 189 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 7.
- 190 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 7.
- 191 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 7.
- 192 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 10.
- 193 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 10.
- 194 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 10.
- 195 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 7.
- 196 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 7. Commanding Officers/supervisors are to provide clear direction to any member on a flexible working arrangement to ensure that the member understands what is expected of them, and are also expected to include the member on other workplace communications (whether formal or informal), such as briefings, orders and notices. A member on a flexible working arrangement is expected to seek regular information from their workplace and to regularly provide reports to their supervisor on the work they are undertaking. This is to ensure that 'an accurate and comprehensive performance evaluation can be undertaken'.
- 197 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 8.
- 198 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 27 February 2012.
- 199 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 8.
- 200 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 10; People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.8.12.
- 201 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 10.
- 202 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p.10.
- 203 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 10.
- 204 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 3.2.8.
- 205 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.8.16.
- 206 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p.11; People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.8.14-5.8.18.
- 207 People Strategies and Policy, *Pay and Conditions Manual*, note 144, Division 5.8.15.
- 208 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, p 11.

- 209 DI(G) PERS 49-4, note 172, pp 8-10.
- 210 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 24 January 2012.
- 211 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 24 January 2012; 'Copy of 120120 DCCB Input for Broderick Review RFI' provided to the Review by SQNLDR F James, 19 April 2012; Defence Community Organisation, *Childcare*, <http://www.defence.gov.au/dco/childcare.htm> (viewed 8 June 2012 and 18 July 2012).
- 212 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 24 January 2012.
- 213 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 1 March 2012.
- 214 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 24 January 2012.
- 215 SQNLDR F James, email to the Review, 1 March 2012.
- 216 From Department of Defence, *Defence Personnel Executive Minute: 'Defence Priority of Access Guidelines'*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/dco/childcare.htm> (viewed 30 April 2012).
- 217 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-3, 'Management and Reporting of Unacceptable Behaviour'*, 28 June 2009 ('DI(G) PERS 35-3').
- 218 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 217, Annexure A.
- 219 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 217, Annexure B.
- 220 Acting Commonwealth and Defence Force Ombudsman, *Australian Defence Force: Management of Complaints about Unacceptable Behaviour*, Report No 4 (2007).
- 221 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 34-2, 'Complaints of discrimination and harassment through the Australian Human Rights Commission'*, 18 April 2009.
- 222 The same recommendation was made in the report on the Review into the Treatment of Women at the Australian Defence Force Academy.
- 223 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 217, Annexure B, para 22.
- 224 On 21 June 2011 by the *Sex and Age Discrimination Legislation Amendment Act 2011* (Cth).
- 225 Australian Human Rights Commission, *Federal Discrimination Law* (2011), p 53. At <http://www.hreoc.gov.au/legal/FDL/index.html> (viewed 13 June 2012).
- 226 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 217, Annexure B, para 26.
- 227 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) ADMIN 67-2, 'Quick Assessment'*, 7 August 2007.
- 228 Inspector General Australian Defence Force, *Review of the Management of Incidents and Complaints in Defence including Civil and Military Jurisdiction* (2011), p 9.
- 229 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 45-5, 'Defence Whistleblower Scheme'*, 1 July 2002.
- 230 The 2007 Ombudsman Report noted that in its focus group consultations, a claim was made that on occasions one unit had discouraged members raising complaints outside the immediate chain of command regardless of the circumstances. The Ombudsman recommended that Defence promote awareness of the Whistleblower scheme in *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-3, 'Management and Reporting of Unacceptable Behaviour'*. This was done in the 2009 review of the Instruction.
- 231 *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* (Cth), *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth), *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* (Cth) and *Age Discrimination Act 2004* (Cth).
- 232 *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth), s 106(2).
- 233 *Cooke v Plauen Holdings Pty Ltd* [2001] FMCA 91, [35].
- 234 [2007] FMCA 59.
- 235 [2007] FMCA 59, [158]. The Court accepted that the matter involved very significant pain, suffering, hurt and humiliation for the applicant and awarded \$100,000 in unspecified damages to be paid jointly by the four respondents that included Smith and the Department of Defence. In *Lee v Smith (No 2)* [2007] FMCA 1092, further orders were made regarding the damages to be awarded to the applicant. In relation to past economic loss, the Court awarded Ms Lee the sum of \$232,163 together with interest. In addition to awards made for past and future medical expenses, the Court awarded the sum of \$30,000 for future loss of income.
- 236 *Work Health and Safety Act 2011* (Cth), ss 19(1), (3)(a).
- 237 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-4, 'Management and Reporting of Sexual Offences'*, 22 November 2011.
- 238 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (General) ADMIN 45-2, 'The Reporting and Management of Notifiable Incidents'*, 26 March 2010.
- 239 The current Instruction incorporates DEFGRAM No.35/2009, an interim amendment to the Instruction made on 30 January 2009. This amendment required that all alleged sexual offences are to be immediately reported to ADFIS, that ADFIS is to take into account the range of jurisdictional and operational considerations and, where appropriate, report the alleged offence to civilian police regardless of the wishes of the complainant. At the time that the Review into the Treatment of Women at the Australian Defence Force Academy was provided to the Minister, the consolidation of *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-4, 'Management and Reporting of Sexual Offences'* had not occurred. The Review was critical in its report of a number of aspects of the 2004 version of *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-4, 'Management and Reporting of Sexual Offences'* and the significant period of time that had elapsed since the important changes brought about by the DEFGRAM interim amendment were introduced. This created the potential for confusion on the part of commanders and managers in the correct application of policy concerning reports of sexual misconduct.
- 240 DI(G) PERS 35-4, note 237, para 2.
- 241 Namely, *Form AC 875-4 and Annexure B – Flowchart for Managing Complaints of Sexual Offences and the Sexual Offence Management Guide*.

- 242 The relevant forms for reporting unacceptable behaviour or sexual offences are *Form AC 875-1 Initial Complaint Report – Unacceptable Behaviour or Sexual Offence*; *Form AC 875-2 Progress Report – Unacceptable Behaviour or Sexual Offence*; and *Form AC 875-3 Final Outcome Report – Unacceptable Behaviour or Sexual Offence*. These Forms are only annexed to *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-4, 'Management and Reporting of Sexual Offences'* – not *Defence Instruction (General) PERS 35-3, 'Management and Reporting of Unacceptable Behaviour'* – although the *Flow Chart to Management and Reporting of Unacceptable Behaviour Complaints* makes reference to these Forms.
- 243 This structure has been in place since the decision in *Lane v Morrison & Anor* (2009) 239 CLR 230 that struck down as unconstitutional that part of the DFDA that purported to create the former Australian Military Court. The Review notes that legislation has been introduced into the Parliament to establish a new military court under Chapter III of the Constitution: B Nicholson, 'New military court ready to advance', *The Australian*, 22 June 2012. At <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/defence/new-military-court-ready-to-advance/story-e6frg8yo-1226404825620> (viewed 27 June 2012).
- 244 A general court martial comprises a President who is not below the rank of Colonel or equivalent, and not less than four other members.
- 245 A restricted court martial comprises a president, who is not below the rank of Lieutenant Colonel, and not less than two other members. Only military officers can be members of either general or restricted courts martial. Such courts always include a legal officer acting as Judge Advocate.
- 246 Appeals from decisions made by Defence Force Magistrates and Courts Martial may be made to the Defence Force Appeal Tribunal, the Federal Court or the High Court of Australia.
- 247 Section 60(1) of the DFDA provides that 'A defence member is guilty of an offence if the member does an act that is likely to prejudice the discipline of, or bring discredit on, the Defence Force.'
- 248 *Crimes Act 1900* (ACT), s 58.
- 249 *Crimes Act 1900* (ACT), s 59.
- 250 *Crimes Act 1900* (ACT), s 60.
- 251 *Defence Force Discipline Act 1982* (Cth), s 61.
- 252 In respect of service offences committed overseas, a potential conflict of jurisdiction may arise between the DFDA and the foreign nation's criminal law. In most cases, jurisdictional disputes between foreign nations and the ADF will be resolved by reference to foreign visiting forces legislation or Status of Forces Agreements: Director of Military Prosecutions, *Director of Military Prosecutions Directive 02/2009 – Prosecution and Disclosure Policy*, 1 October 2009, para 30. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/legal/pdf/ddcs/dmp-2-2009.pdf> (viewed 6 July 2012).
- 253 Further guidance is provided in relation to resolving jurisdictional conflicts between the civil, criminal and military discipline systems in the Director of Military Prosecutions memorandum of understanding with the Commonwealth, State and Territory Directors of Public Prosecutions dated 22 May 2007: Director of Military Prosecutions, *Director of Military Prosecutions Directive 02/2009 – Prosecution and Disclosure Policy*, above, para 6.
- 254 *Re Tracey Ex parte Ryan* (1989) 166 CLR 518; *Re Nolan Ex parte Young* (1991) 172 CLR 460; *Re Tyler Ex parte Foley* (1994) 181 CLR 18.
- 255 Director of Military Prosecutions, *Director of Military Prosecutions Directive 02/2009 – Prosecution and Disclosure Policy*, 1 October 2009, para 14.
- 256 *Defence Force Discipline Act 1982* (Cth), s 63(1).
- 257 *Defence Force Discipline Act 1982* (Cth), s 63(1)(a)(i).
- 258 *Defence Force Discipline Act 1982* (Cth), s 63(1)(a)(ia).
- 259 Described in s 51(1) of the *Crimes Act 1900* (ACT) as the infliction of 'grievous bodily harm on another person with intent to engage in sexual intercourse with that other person, or with a third person who is present or nearby' and 'acting in company' to do the same (s 51(2)).
- 260 Described in s 52(1) of the *Crimes Act 1900* (ACT) as the infliction of 'actual bodily harm on another person with intent to engage in sexual intercourse with that other person, or with a third person who is present or nearby' and 'acting in company' to do the same' (s 52(2)).
- 261 Described in s 53(1) of the *Crimes Act 1900* (ACT) as a person who 'unlawfully assaults, or threatens to inflict grievous or actual bodily harm on, another person with intent to engage in sexual intercourse with that other person, or with a third person who is present or nearby' and 'acting in company' to do the same (s 53(2)).
- 262 *Crimes Act 1900* (ACT), s 54.
- 263 *Crimes Act 1900* (ACT), s 55.
- 264 DI(G) PERS 35-4, note 237, para 29.
- 265 Inspector General Australian Defence Force, note, p 37, [150].
- 266 DI(G) PERS 35-4, note 237, para 29. These offences are set out in the *Crimes Act 1900* (ACT) as follows: act of indecency in the first degree (s57), acts of indecency with young person (s61), incest and similar offences (s62), abduction (s63), use of young persons for pornographic purposes (s64), possession of child pornography (s65), using the Internet etc to deprave young people (s66).
- 267 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 217, para 43.
- 268 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 217, Annexure F, para 3.
- 269 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 217, Annexure F, para 4.
- 270 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 217, Annexure F, para 7.
- 271 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 217, Annexure E.
- 272 DI(G) PERS 35-3, note 217, Annexure F, para 8.
- 273 *Defence (Personnel) Regulations* (2002), reg 85(1)(d).

- 274 *Defence (Personnel) Regulations* (2002), reg 87(1)(g).
- 275 *Defence (Personnel) Regulations* (2002), regs 85(2) and 87(2).
- 276 *Defence (Personnel) Regulations* (2002), reg 7(2).
- 277 Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (Army) PERS 116-5*, 'Separation of Regular Army soldiers, Army Reserve soldiers and soldiers on full-time service – policy and procedures', 20 December 2005, para 78 ('DI(A) PERS 116-5').
- 278 DI(A) PERS 116-5, above, para 79.
- 279 Mobile phone numbers were only included for the sample when the member had provided their mobile phone as their main contact.
- 280 This figure includes personnel who declined to participate and those who did not answer telephone calls.
- 281 Department of Defence, *HLTHMAN*, volume 3, chapter 1, 1.2, provided to the Review. Guidelines for the administration of the MEC system are laid out in HLTHMAN and Department of Defence, *Defence Instruction (Army) PERS 16-15*, 'Australian Defence Forces Medical Employment Classification System', 1 July 2011 ('DI(A) PERS 16-15').
- 282 DI(A) PERS 16-15, above.
- 283 Department of Defence, *HLTHMAN*, volume 3, chapter 1, 1.12.
- 284 Joint Health Command, *About*, <http://www.defence.gov.au/health/about/i-organisation.htm> (viewed 26 March 2012).
- 285 Joint Health Command, *Strategic Plan 2010-12* (2010), p 56.
- 286 Australian National Audit Office, *Defence's Management of Health Services to Australian Defence Force Personnel in Australia* (2010), p 16.
- 287 Australian Defence Force, 'JHC Facilities' provided to the Review by CMDR Alison Westwood, 18 January 2012.
- 288 Joint Health Command, *1800 IMSICK (1800 467 425)*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/health/contacts/i-imsick.htm> (viewed 4 June 2012).
- 289 Joint Health Command, *Australian Defence Force Family Health (ADFFH) Trial*. At http://www.defence.gov.au/health/Dependant_Healthcare/i-healthcare.htm (viewed 4 June 2012).
- 290 Defence Community Organisation, *Defence Family Matters*, <http://www.defence.gov.au/dco/dfm.htm> (viewed 5 June 2012).
- 291 See factsheets at Joint Health Command, *Fact sheets*, http://www.defence.gov.au/health/DMH/i-dmh_factsheets.htm (viewed 26 March 2012); Department of Defence, *Health Care Related Complaints and Compliments in the ADF*, 28 August 2009.
- 292 See Defence Community Organisation, *Defence Family Forum*, <http://www.defence.gov.au/dco/Forum.html> (viewed 5 June 2012).
- 293 Defence Community Organisation, *Welcome to the Defence Community Organisation*, <http://www.defence.gov.au/dco/> (viewed 5 June 2012); Defence Community Organisation, *Defence Family Helpline now open for business*, http://www.defence.gov.au/dco/national_family_helpline.htm (viewed 5 June 2012).
- 294 Defence Families of Australia, *About Us*, <http://dfa.org.au/about-us-0> (viewed 5 June 2012).
- 295 Meeting with Defence Families of Australia.
- 296 Department of Defence, *Capability through mental fitness: 2011 Australian Defence Force Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy* (2011), p 1. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/health/DMH/docs/2011%20ADF%20Mental%20Health%20and%20Wellbeing%20Strategy%20.pdf> (viewed 30 March 2012).
- 297 LTCOL S Hodson, L Moore and MAJ J McGrogan, 'The Mental Health Reform Health Process (Dunt Report): A Support System for ADF Personnel' (2009) 10(1) *ADF Health* 21-22.
- 298 S Hodson, A C McFarlane, M Van Hooff and C Davies, *Mental Health in the Australian Defence Force – 2010 ADF Mental Health Prevalence and Wellbeing Study: Executive Report* (2011), p 1.
- 299 Department of Defence, *Capability through mental fitness: 2011 Australian Defence Force Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy* (2011). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/health/DMH/docs/2011%20ADF%20Mental%20Health%20and%20Wellbeing%20Strategy%20.pdf> (viewed 30 March 2012).
- 300 Joint Health Command, *Mental Health Strategy*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/health/DMH/i-dmhs.htm> (viewed 30 March 2012).
- 301 Hodson, Moore and McGrogan, note 297.
- 302 Department of Defence, *Defence leads the way on mental health research*, 24 October 2011. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/defencenews/stories/2011/oct/1024.htm> (viewed 6 June 2012).
- 303 Hodson, McFarlane, Van Hooff, Davies, note 298, Key Findings.
- 304 Hodson, McFarlane, Van Hooff, Davies, note 298, Key Findings.
- 305 Hodson, McFarlane, Van Hooff, Davies, note 298, Key Findings.
- 306 Hodson, McFarlane, Van Hooff, Davies, note 298, Key Findings.
- 307 Hodson, McFarlane, Van Hooff, Davies, note 298, Key Findings.
- 308 Hodson, McFarlane, Van Hooff, Davies, note 298, Key Findings.
- 309 Hodson, McFarlane, Van Hooff, Davies, note 298, Key Findings.
- 310 Hodson, McFarlane, Van Hooff, Davies, note 298, p 17.
- 311 Hodson, McFarlane, Van Hooff, Davies, note 298, Key Findings.
- 312 'Broderick Review Phase 2 Task 97 – Mental Health' provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 12 November 2011.
- 313 Joint Health Command, *ADF Mental Health Strategy*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/health/DMH/i-dmhs.htm> (viewed 6 June 2012).
- 314 NATO and CIMIC Centre of Excellence, *Gender Makes Sense* (2008). At http://www.nato.int/ims/2008/win/opinions/gender_booklet_ccoe_v12.pdf (viewed 22 June 2011).
- 315 Committee for Women in NATO Forces, *Improving the Gender Balance: A Selected List of Best Practices*, CWINF 2008 (2008). At www.nato.int/issues/women_nato/2008-11-gender_balance.pdf (viewed 30 March 2012).

- 316 A Schjolset, 'NATO and the Women: Exploring the Gender Gap in the Armed Forces', Peace Research Institute Oslo (2010), p 35. At www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Publication/?oid=192310 (viewed 19 November 2011).
- 317 The Canadian Human Rights Commission has set an ultimate target of 19.5% female representation in the CF. See D Noppe, *Diversity in the CF*, 18 March 2009. At www.forces.gc.ca/site/commun/ml-fe/article-eng.asp?id=5200 (viewed 27 March 2012).
- 318 'Defence Ethics Program, Fundamentals of Canadian Defence Ethics', January 2002, point 14, provided to the Review by Dr A Okros, Royal Military College, Kingston.
- 319 National Defence and the Canadian Forces, *Canadian Forces Leadership Institute*, <http://www.cda.forces.gc.ca/au-ns/wewewc/cfli-eng.asp> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 320 National Defence and Canadian Forces, *Canada First Strategy, Retention*, <http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/pri/1/retentio-mp-eng.asp> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 321 See generally, K Davis (ed), *Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Perspectives and Experience* (2009).
- 322 Schjolset, note 316, p 37.
- 323 E Jansen and WO=MEN WG 1325, Dutch Gender Platform, *UNSCR 1325 In-country monitoring report – The Netherlands*, Global Network of Women Peace-builders (October 2010), p 9. At <http://www.wo-men.nl/cms/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/UNSCR-1325-monitoring-report-The-Netherlands-20101.pdf> (viewed 25 June 2012).
- 324 European Commission, *Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities, EQUAL, Practical examples – Equal Opportunities*, http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/equal/practical-examples/opport-06-se-genderforce_en.cfm (viewed 28 March 2012).
- 325 G Scoppio, 'Diversity Best Practices in Military Organizations in Canada' (2009) 9(3) *Canadian Military Journal* 17, p 27. At www.journals.dnd.ca/vo9/no3/doc-05-scoppio-eng.pdf (viewed 6 June 2011).
- 326 A Lyle, *Senior leaders speak out on diversity, equal opportunity*, 23 March 2009. At <http://www.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123140370> (viewed on 30 March 2012).
- 327 R Moelker and J Bolsch, *Hidden Women: Women in the Netherlands Armed Forces*, Publications of the Faculty of Military Science, No. 2008/0, Netherlands Defence Academy (2008), pp 30-33. At hbo-kennisbank.uvt.nl/cgi/nda/show.cgi?fid=1721 (viewed 25 June 2012).
- 328 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 329 Jamstall.nu, *About Gender Mainstreaming*, www.jamstall.nu/inenglish/toolbox/tools_and_exercises/gender_coach1 (viewed 27 March 2012).
- 330 UK Chief of the General Staff, *Equality and Diversity Directive for the Army*, Army Code 64340, April 2008, p 1. At http://www.army.mod.uk/documents/general/CGS_ED_Directive-Apr_08.pdf (viewed 3 July 2011).
- 331 UK Ministry of Defence, *Equality and Diversity in the British Army Newsletter* Autumn 2008. At www.army.mod.uk/documents/general (viewed 18 July 2011).
- 332 UK Ministry of Defence, *Basically Fair: Respect for Others in the British Army* AC 64325 Edition 4 10/08, provided to the Review.
- 333 Proud2Serve, British Armed Forces LGBT e-network, www.proud2serve.net (viewed 15 February 2012).
- 334 LCDR E van den Heuvel and CDR M Meijer, 'Gender Force in the Netherlands Armed Forces', NATO OTAN, RTO-MP-HFM-158 (undated), p 2-1. At <http://www.docstoc.com/docs/75589982/Gender-Force-in-the-Netherlands-Armed-Forces> (viewed 23 August 2011).
- 335 US Army, *United States Army Diversity Roadmap*, Diversity & Leadership Directorate (December 2010). At www.armydiversity.army.mil/document/Diversity_Roadmap.pdf (viewed 1 February 2012).
- 336 Air Force Diversity Operations, *United States Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap: A Journey to Excellence*, AF/A1DV, 19 October 2010, p 3. At www.af.mil/shared/media/document/AFD-101117-010.pdf (viewed 4 February 2012).
- 337 ADM V Clark, 'CNO Guidance for 2003' cited in W B Johnson and G R Anderson, 'Formal Mentoring in the US Military- Research Evidence, Lingering Questions and Recommendations' (2010) 63(2) *Naval War College Review* 113.
- 338 Equal Opportunity Publications, *Readers' Choice Awards*, www.eop.com/awards-WD.php (viewed 5 February 2012).
- 339 Canadian Forces, *National Report to the Committee for Women in NATO Forces* (2007), p 2. At www.nato.int/ims/2007/win/pdf/canada-2007.pdf (viewed 4 July 2011).
- 340 See, for example, Scoppio, note 325, p 27.
- 341 MAJ A Reiffenstein, 'Gender Integration – An Asymmetric Environment' in Davis (ed), note 321, p 8. See also 'Request for information, Australian Defence Staff: Recruitment and retention of women in the Norwegian armed forces (NAF) – evaluations and reports', Response from the Norwegian Ministry of Defence, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 4 March 2012, which notes similar perceptions that women are there because of 'affirmative action', not their capabilities.
- 342 The target is for 6% for Major and higher and 3% for full Colonel and higher. See Moelker and Bolsch, note 327, p 30.
- 343 Translated version of *Jaarverslag 2009*, Inspector General of Armed Forces, *Annual Report* (2009), p 75, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 4 May 2012.
- 344 Moelker and Bolsch, note 327, pp 28-36.
- 345 Moelker and Bolsch, note 327, p 36.
- 346 UK Ministry of Defence, *Royal Navy officer rises up the Pink List*, <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/DefenceNews/PeopleInDefence/RoyalNavyOfficerRisesUpThePinkList.htm> (viewed 4 February 2012).
- 347 Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC) Report Summary, Defence Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS), *Annual Report* (2011), p 13. At <http://dacowits.defense.gov/Reports/2011/> (viewed 14 January 2012).
- 348 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 349 Cited in L Williams, M LeBlanc, T Takas, *Canadian Forces Recruiting Survey: Results for the First Quarter of 2011*, Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis, Technical Memorandum, DGMPPRA TM 2012-003, February 2012, p 21, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 4 March 2012.
- 350 Cited in Williams, et al, above.

- 351 Moelker and Bolsch, note 327, p 30.
- 352 UK Ministry of Defence, *Navy and RAF among top 100 employers of gay people*, <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/DefenceNews/DefencePolicyAndBusiness/NavyAndRafAmongTop100EmployersOfGayPeople.htm>. (viewed 4 February 2012).
- 353 UK Ministry of Defence, *RAF Nominated for Lesbian Recruiter of the Year Award* <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/DefenceNews/DefencePolicyAndBusiness/RafNominatedForLesbianRecruiterOfTheYearAward.htm>. (viewed 4 February 2012).
- 354 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 355 Buy-in from leadership is described as essential by the first Gender Adviser sent by the Netherlands to the NATO mission in Kabul, her role being to position gender awareness as making operations more successful: van den Heuvel and Meijer, note 334, p 2-1.
- 356 E van Middelkoop, Dutch Minister of Defence, (Paper for the Women in War Zones Conference, The Hague, 3 December 2009), p 6. At <http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/bestanden/documenten-en-publicaties/toespraken/2009/12/03/toespraak-minister-tijdens-conferentie-women-in-warzones/speech-women-in-warzones-op-geel-def.pdf> (viewed 22 June 2011).
- 357 MAJ D Manson, 'Canadian Forces "MAMS" – Mobile Air Mobility Support – Women Traffic Technicians at Work on Domestic and Deployed Operations' in Davis (ed), note 321, p 59.
- 358 UK Ministry of Defence, *RAF wins award for inspiring women in the workforce*, <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/DefenceNews/HistoryAndHonour/RafWinsAwardForInspiringWomenInTheWorkforce.htm> (viewed 4 February 2012).
- 359 UK Ministry of Defence, *Apache Officer wins Young Woman Engineer of the Year*, <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/DefenceNews/PeopleInDefence/ApacheOfficerWinsYoungWomanEngineerOfTheYear.htm> (viewed 4 February 2012).
- 360 Meeting with Navy Personnel Office of Diversity and Inclusion.
- 361 DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2011), note 347, p iii. At <http://dacowits.defense.gov/Reports/2011/> (viewed 14 January 2012).
- 362 Meeting with Canadian Commanders.
- 363 DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2011), note 347, p iii.
- 364 Defence Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS), *Annual Report* (2010), p 6. At <http://dacowits.defense.gov/Reports/2010/> (viewed 14 January 2012).
- 365 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 366 DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2010), note 364, p ii.
- 367 DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2010), note 364, p 7.
- 368 Navy Personnel Research Studies & Technology, *2008 Pregnancy and Parenthood Survey*, Findings. At www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA503230 (viewed 3 February 2012).
- 369 Meeting with Army Surgeon General's Women's Health Task Force.
- 370 DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2011), note 347, p 21. The Committee recommended that the integration should occur in the combat engineers, artillery, and armor, followed by the infantry. The Committee further suggests learning from the experience of the US Navy who, in 2011, opened submarine Service to the first class of female submariners.
- 371 Meeting with Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity, Office of the Secretary of Defense, USA.
- 372 Meeting with Manpower Plans and Policy, United States Marine Corps.
- 373 Meeting with Canadian Commanders.
- 374 MAJ L Bourgon, 'The CF as an Employer of Choice: The Key for a Successful Gender Integration', JCSP 33, Exercise New Horizons (2007), p 5. At <http://www.cfc.forces.gc.ca/259/290/293/287/bourgon.pdf> (viewed 4 June 2011).
- 375 Canadian Forces, *National Report to the Committee for Women in NATO Forces* (2009), p 6. At http://www.nato.int/issues/women_nato/meeting-records/2009/national-reports/canada-national-report-2009.pdf (viewed 25 June 2012).
- 376 I Goldenberg, *Your Say Diversity & Employment Equity Focus Section – Gender Integration Analyses*, DRDC CORA TM 2006-43, December 2006, p iv. At <http://pubs.drdc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc59/p527537.pdf> (viewed 24 June 2011).
- 377 Bourgon, note 374, p 22.
- 378 Bourgon, note 374, p 20.
- 379 US Department of Transportation and Maritime Administration, Office of Human Resources, *Alternative Work Schedules (AWS) Guide*, MAR-360. At http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/mao_760-640-0-H.pdf (viewed 5 February 2012).
- 380 US General Services Administration, *US Coast Guard Child Care Subsidy Program*, <http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/102063> (viewed 30 March 2012); and US General Services Administration, *GSA and U.S. Army Partnership for Affordable Child Care*, <http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/100862> (viewed 30 March 2012).
- 381 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 382 Moelker and Bolsch, note 327, p 32.
- 383 Moelker and Bolsch, note 327, p 33.
- 384 Information from the CF provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 2 March 2012.
- 385 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 386 'OPNAV INSTRUCTION 1330 2A N134', 30 August 2010, provided to the Review by CMDR A Westwood, 8 March 2012.
- 387 'OPNAV INSTRUCTION 1330 2A N134', above. See also A Daniel, 'Career Intermission Pilot Program Renewed for Three Years', America's Navy website, 16 March 2012. At http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=65933 (viewed 30 March 2012). Temporary Separation is also available for up to 2 years in the Coast Guard. It is not clear, however, that this attracts the benefits of the CIPP: US Coast Guard, *Command Guide to Pregnancy Policies*. At http://www.uscg.mil/diversity/docs/Resource%20Documents/Command_Guide_Pregnancy_policies.pdf (viewed 30 March 2012).
- 388 Meeting with Navy Personnel Office of Diversity and Inclusion, USA.
- 389 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 390 Meeting with Navy Personnel, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, USA.
- 391 Meeting with Navy Personnel, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, USA.

- 392 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 393 Meeting with Navy Personnel, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, USA.
- 394 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 395 Meeting with Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity, Office of the Secretary of Defense, USA.
- 396 'Defence Reform: An independent report into the structure and management of the Ministry of Defence', June 2011, provided to the Review by MAJGEN C Orme, 21 March 2012.
- 397 UK Ministry of Defence, *New Employment Model*, <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/AboutDefence/WhatWeDo/Personnel/NEM/> (viewed 16 May 2012); see also CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 20 April 2012.
- 398 Navy Personnel Research Studies and Technology, *Pregnancy and Parenthood in the Navy: Results of the 2008 Survey* (June 2009), Findings. At www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA503230 (viewed 3 February 2012).
- 399 Navy Personnel Research Studies and Technology, above.
- 400 Navy Personnel Research Studies and Technology, above.
- 401 Clark, note 337.
- 402 Meeting with Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity, Office of the Secretary of Defense, USA.
- 403 Military Leadership Diversity Commission, *Mentoring Programs Across the Services*, Issues Paper No. 33, Branches & Assignments, April 2010, p 4. At <http://diversity.defense.gov/Resources/Commission/docs/Issue%20Papers/Paper%2033%20-%20Mentoring%20Programs%20Across%20Services.pdf> (viewed 25 June 2012). See also Meeting with Navy Personnel Office of Diversity and Inclusion, USA.
- 404 Meeting with Navy Personnel Office of Diversity and Inclusion USA, 16 April 2012.
- 405 Military Leadership Diversity Commission, note 403, p 2.
- 406 Johnson and Anderson, note 337.
- 407 Military Leadership Diversity Commission, note 403, p 4. The Navy's mentoring scheme has been noted as best practice by commentators: Scoppio, note 325, p 27.
- 408 MAJ D Adams, 'Mentoring Women and Minority Officers in the US Military', Research Department, Air Command and Staff College (March 1997), p 29. At www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/acsc/97-0607b.pdf (viewed 5 January 2012).
- 409 Adams, above, p 20.
- 410 A Daniel, 'Aviators Network, Mentor at the 2012 Women in Aviation International Conference', *America's Navy*, 15 March 2012. At http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=65891 (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 411 Academy Women, *E-mentor Leadership Program*, <http://academywomen.org/e-mentorprogram.php> (viewed 30 March 2012).
- 412 Meeting with Navy Personnel Office of Diversity and Inclusion USA; Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 413 Johnson and Anderson, note 337, p 123.
- 414 Service Women's Action Network, 'Department of Defense Appoints General to Head Sexual Assault Office' (Media Release, 12 September 2011). At http://Servicewomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/SAPRO-Press-Release-9_12_11.pdf (viewed 3 February 2012). The Review's discussions with the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office further confirmed that not only was this authority important, but that the position enabled the office greater access to the Services: Meeting with Sexual Assault and Prevention Office.
- 415 Meeting with Sexual Assault and Prevention Office.
- 416 A Ballard, *Report on Sexual Assault Prevention and Intervention in a Military Environment* (2009), pp 29, 56. At http://www.churchilltrust.com.au/site_media/fellows/2009_Ballard_Angela.pdf (viewed 27 June 2012) recognises US Navy programs as particularly effective. See also T J Rau, L L Merrill, S K McWhorter, V A Stander, C J Thomsen, C W Dyslin, M M Rabenhorst and J S Milner, 'Evaluation of A Sexual Assault Education/Prevention Program for Male US Navy Personnel' (2010) 175(6) *Military Medicine* 429.
- 417 USA Department of Defense, *Report of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services* (2009). At www.quantico.usmc.mil/download.aspx?Path=:/Uploads/Files/SAPR_DTFSAMS_Report_Dec_09.pdf (viewed 21 June 2011).
- 418 Meeting with ADM M Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, USA.
- 419 USA Department of Defense, *Report of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services*, note 417.
- 420 DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2011), note 347, p 14.
- 421 All such information should be in aggregate form, as necessary to conform to any applicable privacy or other legal requirements, taking into account the needs of the victim as appropriate: DACOWITS, *Annual Report* (2011), note 347, p i.
- 422 Van den Heuvel and Meijer, note 334, p 2-1. The US DOD is in the process of establishing a similar hotline and developing a comprehensive advertisement campaign to establish awareness. US Department of Defense, *Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military, Fiscal Year 2010* (March 2011). At http://www.sapr.mil/media/pdf/reports/DoD_Fiscal_Year_2010_Annual_Report_on_Sexual_Assault_in_the_Military.pdf (viewed 23 August 2011).
- 423 Ballard, note 416p 35. At http://www.churchilltrust.com.au/site_media/fellows/2009_Ballard_Angela.pdf (viewed 27 June 2012). See also Canadian Forces, *Canadian Forces Provost Marshal Annual Report 2000*. At <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/D3-13-2000E.pdf> (viewed 7 June 2011).
- 424 Ballard also notes the Military Family Resource Centre (MFRC) social worker who works with police and hospital staff as part of provincial Sexual Assault Response Teams as well as the use of Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners (SANE) to ensure the chain of custody of evidence is preserved when law enforcement agencies are not involved). The report recommended the ADF adopt a similar multiagency response: Ballard, note 416, p 55.
- 425 Meeting with Sexual Assault and Prevention Office.
- 426 Meeting with Manpower Plans and Policy, United States Marine Corps.
- 427 US Department of Defense, *Department of Defense Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military*, note 422 .

- 428 Meeting with Sexual Assault and Prevention Office.
- 429 It is important to distinguish between the perceived success of this mechanism and confidential reporting available at the USAFA during the 1990s which, rather than encouraging reports, tended to mask offence rates and absolve command of responsibility. See T K Fowler, J Bunting III, M J Nardotti Jr., A M Carpenter, J W Ripley, *Final Report of the Panel to Review Sexual Misconduct Allegations at the United States Air Force Academy* (2003). At www.defense.gov/news/Sep2003/d20030922usafareport.pdf (viewed 3 July 2011). See also Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, *Evaluation of Sexual Assault, Reprisal, and Related Leadership Challenges at the United States Air Force Academy*, Report No. IPO2004C003, (2004). At www.defense.gov/news/Dec2004/d20041207igsummary.pdf (viewed 16 June 2011).
- 430 Meeting with Sexual Assault and Prevention Office.
- 431 Meeting with Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office.
- 432 Meeting with Veterans Affairs USA.
- 433 Angela Ballard, in particular, notes the value of multi-agency support, in which defence partners with external or civilian agencies to provide the most comprehensive response: Ballard, note 416, pp 34-35.
- 434 In fact, the CF Harassment Adviser Reference Manual identifies what it calls a new emphasis on prevention and early resolution, including what is labelled 'self-help', being an attempt by the complainant to resolve the matter as the first port of call: Canadian Forces, *CF/DND Harassment Prevention and Resolution Guidelines*, A-PM-007-000/FP-001 (2004); and *DND Harassment Advisor Reference Manual*, 15 March 2005, provided to the Review by Royal Military College, Kingston. Information regarding ADR mechanisms is also accessible via the CF/DND homepage, National Defence and the Canadian Forces, *Alternative Dispute Resolution*, <http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/adr-marc/index-eng.asp> (viewed 27 June 2012).
- 435 UK Ministry of Defence, *Redress of Individual Grievance: Service Complaints* (2010). At http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/88E9A07C-9864-43FF-AF62-C8AFA6A01BB4/0/jsp831_v22.pdf (viewed 23 August 2011).
- 436 The UK Armed Services and CF purchase civilian training in sexual assault and second staff to specialist civilian organisations to develop expertise. See Ballard, note 416, pp 34-37, 54.
- 437 Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, note 429, p 8.
- 438 CAPT M N Schmid, 'Comment: Combating a Different Enemy – Proposals to Change the Culture of Sexual Assault in the Military' (2010) 55(2) *Villanova Law Review* 495. See also D M Hollywood, 'Creating a True Army of One: Four Proposals to Combat Sexual Harassment in Today's Army' (2007) 30 *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender* 151, p 164.
- 439 Meeting with Sexual Assault and Prevention Office.
- 440 Meeting with Manpower Plans and Policy, United States Marine Corps.
- 441 See S Rutherford, R Schneider and A Walmsley, 'Quantitative and Qualitative Research into Sexual Harassment in the Armed Forces' (2006). At <http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/538E55EE-9CA4-4177-9A0B-6853A431B283/0/20060522SRReport.pdf> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- 442 SAPRO enlists the support of the Defence Manpower and Data Center to conduct either focus groups or a survey (alternating every year) on gender relations in both the active duty forces and at training institutions. Initially limited to sexual assault, the survey has expanded to include sexual harassment and wider questions on gender relations. See, as examples, P Cook, A Jones, R Lipari, A Lancaster, *Service Academy 2005 Sexual Harassment and Assault Survey*, Defense Manpower Data Center, DMDC Report No 2005-018 (2005), p v. At <http://www.airforce-magazine.com/SiteCollectionDocuments/TheDocumentFile/Personnel%20Issues/AcademySurvey2005.pdf> (viewed 23 August 2011). The data from 2010, in contrast, suggests that this confidence is gradually increasing. Department of Defense, *Report on Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies: Academic Program Year 2009-2010*, p 7. At www.sapr.mil/media/pdf/reports/FINAL_APY_09-10_MSA_Report.pdf (viewed 21 June 2011).
- 443 CMDR A Westwood, email to the Review, 4 March 2012.
- 444 Meeting with Sexual Assault and Prevention Office; Meeting with Manpower Plans and Policy, United States Marine Corps.

Select Bibliography

Australia Bureau of Statistics, *Cultural Diversity in Australia: Reflecting a Nation: Stories from the Census*, cat no 2071.0, ABS, Canberra. At <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2071.0main+features902012-2013> (viewed 26 June 2012).

Australian Centre for the Study of Sexual Assault, *International Violence Against Women Survey: the Australian Component* and other Victimisation surveys. At <http://www.aifs.gov.au/acssa/statistics> (viewed 28 June 2012).

Australian Strategic Policy Institute, *Australian Defence Almanac 2011-2012*. At http://www.aspi.org.au/publications/publication_details.aspx?ContentID=303&pubtype=-1 (viewed 9 July 2012).

Australian Human Rights Commission, *On the record: Guidelines for the prevention of discrimination in employment on the basis of criminal record*, Australian Human Rights Commission (2012). At http://www.hreoc.gov.au/human_rights/criminalrecord/on_the_record/contents.html (viewed 28 June 2012).

Australian Human Rights Commission, *Our experiences in elevating the representation of women in leadership: A letter from business leaders* (2011). At www.hreoc.gov.au/sex_discrimination/publication/mcc/index.html (viewed 26 June 2012).

Australian Human Rights Commission, *Report on the Review into the Treatment of Women at the Australian Defence Force Academy*, Australian Human Rights Commission (2011).

Australian Human Rights Commission, *Sexual harassment: Serious business – Results of the 2008 Sexual Harassment National Telephone Survey*, Australian Human Rights Commission (2008). At www.hreoc.gov.au/sexualharassment/serious_business/SHSB_Report2008.pdf (viewed 13 June 2012).

Australian Law Reform Commission, *Family Violence – A National Legal Response*, ALRC Report 114 (2010). At www.alrc.gov.au/publications/family-violence-national-legal-response-alrc-report-114 (viewed 13 June 2012).

Australian National Audit Office, *Defence's Management of Health Services to Australian Defence Force Personnel in Australia*, Attorney-General's Department (2010).

Australian National Audit Office, *Contracting for Defence Recruiting Services*, Audit Report No. 45 Attorney-General's Department (2010). At www.anao.gov.au/Publications/Audit-Reports/2009-2010/Contracting-for-Defence-Force-Recruiting-Services (viewed 31 May 2012).

Baird M, Charlesworth S and Heron A, *Flexible and part time work in Australia: some responses to the need for work/life balance* (English version of a paper to the 'Egalite homes/femmes et articulation travail/famille: vers un nouveau modele?' Conference, Paris, 30 September-1 October 2010).

Ballard A, *Report on Sexual Assault Prevention and Intervention in a Military Environment* (2009). At www.churchilltrust.com.au/site_media/fellows/2009_Ballard_Angela.pdf (viewed 31 May 2012).

Bartone P, Snook S and Tremble Jr T, 'Cognitive and Personality Predictors of Leader Performance in West Point Cadets' (2002) 14(4) *Military Psychology* 321.

Blackburn R M, Jarman J, and Brooks B, 'The Puzzle of Gender Segregation and Inequality: A Cross-National Analysis' (2000) 16(2) *European Sociological Review* 119.

Blake-Beard SD, 'Taking a hard look at formal mentoring programs' (2001) 20(4) *The Journal of Management Development* 331.

Burton C, *Women in the Australian Defence Force: Two Studies* (1996).

Callahan J, 'Manifestations of Power and Control: Training as the Catalyst for Scandal at the United States Air Force Academy' (2009) 15 *Violence Against Women* 1149.

Canadian Forces, *National Report to the Committee for Women in NATO Forces* (2007). At www.nato.int/ims/2007/win/pdf/canada-2007.pdf (viewed 4 July 2011).

- Canadian Forces, *National Report to the Committee for Women in NATO Forces* (2009). At http://www.nato.int/issues/women_nato/meeting-records/2009/national-reports/canada-national-report-2009.pdf (viewed 21 June 2012).
- Carmody M, Evans S, Krogh C, Flood M, Heenan M and Ovenden G, *Framing best practice: National Standards for the primary prevention of sexual assault through education, National Sexual Assault Prevention Education Project for NASASV* (2009).
- Cawkill P, Rogers A, Knight S and Spear L, *Women in Ground Close Combat Roles: The Experiences of other Nations and a Review of the Academic Literature* (2009). At http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/7A18C2A3-C25B-4FA1-B8CB-49204A109105/0/women_combat_experiences_literature.pdf (viewed 17 June 2012).
- Centre for Defence Leadership Studies, *Executive Series ADDP 00.6: Leadership in the Australian Defence Force* (2007). At www.defence.gov.au/adcdocs/Publications/ADDP%2000.6-Leadership.pdf (viewed 21 May 2012).
- Chandler D E, 'The Maven of Mentoring Speaks: Kathy E. Kram Reflects on Her Career and the Field' (2011) 20(1) *Journal of Management Inquiry* 24.
- Chapman S, 'Increasing the Operational Effectiveness of Women in the Australian Defence Force' (1999) 139 *Australian Defence Force Journal* 25.
- Charlesworth S, Keen M and Whittenbury K, 'Integrating part-time work in policing services: policy, practice, and potential' (2009) 10(1) *Police Practice and Research* 31.
- Cohen P N, 'The Gender Division of Labor: "Keeping House" and Occupational Segregation in the United States' (2004) 18(2) *Gender and Society* 239.
- Committee for Women in NATO Forces, *Improving the Gender Balance: A Selected List of Best Practices* (2008). At www.nato.int/issues/women_nato/2008-11-gender_balance.pdf (viewed 30 March 2012).
- Conger J A and Fulmer R M, 'Developing your leadership pipeline' (2003) *Harvard Business Review* 76.
- Davis K (ed), *Women and Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Perspectives and Experience* (2007).
- Defence Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS), *Annual Report* (2010). At <http://dacowits.defense.gov/Reports/2010/> (viewed 14 January 2012).
- Defence Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS), *Annual Report* (2011). At <http://dacowits.defense.gov/Reports/2011/> (viewed 14 January 2012).
- Deloitte and Women & Leadership Australia, *Impacting Gender Diversity, Exploring the Challenges and generating strategies for Change* (2011). At <http://www.deakin.edu.au/equity-diversity/assets/resources/impacting-gender-diversity-2011.pdf> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- Deloitte, *Building the Lucky Country: Business Imperatives for a prosperous Australia – Where is your next worker?* (2011). At http://www.deloitte.com/view/en_AU/au/news-research/luckycountry/whereisyournextworker/index.htm (viewed 26 June 2012).
- Deloitte, *The gender dividend: Making the business case for investing in women* (2010). At <http://www.deloitte.com/investinginwomen> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- Deloitte, *Only Skin Deep? Re-Examining the Business Case for Diversity* (2011). At http://www.deloitte.com/view/en_AU/au/More/index.htm?key_modCount=82&moreChannelId=8f0a16a77a49f210VgnVCM3000001c56f00aRCRD&key_DPMComponentId=a57d586f514bf210VgnVCM3000001c56f00aRCRD (viewed 26 June 2012).
- Department of Defence, *Capability through mental fitness: 2011 Australian Defence Force Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy* (2011).
- Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2001-2002* (2002). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/01-02/dar/index.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2002-2003* (2003). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/02-03/dar/index.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2003-2004* (2004). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/03-04/dar/index.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2004-2005* (2005). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/04-05/dar/index.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2005-2006* (2006). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/05-06/dar/index.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2006-2007* (2007). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/06-07/dar/index.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2007-2008* (2008). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/07-08/dar/vol1/online.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2008-2009* (2009). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/08-09/dar/index.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2009-2010* (2010). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/Budget/09-10/dar/index.htm> (viewed at 27 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *Defence Annual Report 2010-11* (2011). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/10-11/dar/index.htm> (viewed 27 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *Defence Personnel Environment Scan 2025* (2006). At http://www.defence.gov.au/dpe/dpe_site/publications/DPES2025/index.htm (viewed 19 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *Defending Australia in the Asia Pacific Century: Force 2030*, Defence White Paper 2009 (2009). At http://www.defence.gov.au/whitepaper/docs/defence_white_paper_2009.pdf (viewed 22 May 2012).

Department of Defence, *Pathway to Change: Evolving Defence Culture* (2012). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/culturereviews/index.htm> (viewed 31 May 2012).

Department of Defence, *People in Defence: Generating the Capability for the Future Force* (2009). At http://www.defence.gov.au/dpe/dpe_site/about_dpe/vision_mission.htm (viewed 26 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *Portfolio Budget Statements 2011-12*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/11-12/pbs/index.htm> (viewed 25 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *Portfolio Budget Statements 2012-13*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/budget/12-13/pbs/index.htm> (viewed 17 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *The Review of Employment Pathways for APS Women in the Department of Defence* (2011). At www.defence.gov.au/culturereviews/docs/epapsw/index.htm (viewed 17 June 2012).

Department of Defence, *The Strategic Reform Program 2009 – Delivering Force 2030* (2009). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/SRP/> (viewed 14 June 2012).

Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, *Industry Employment Projections 2012 Report* (2012). At <http://www.deewr.gov.au/imip/default.aspx?LMIP/Publications/IndustryEmploymentProjections> (viewed 26 June 2012).

Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, *2011 Australian Jobs* (2011). At <http://www.deewr.gov.au/Employment/Pages/default.aspx> (viewed 26 June 2012).

De Vries J, Webb C and Eveline J, 'Mentoring for gender equality and organisational change' (2006) 28(6) *Employee Relations* 572.

- Diversity Council Australia, *Get Flexible! Mainstreaming Flexible Work in Australian Business* (2012). At <http://www.dca.org.au/News/News/Get-flexible-or-get-real%3A-It%E2%80%99s-time-to-make-flexible-working-a-legitimate-career-choice/245> (viewed 28 June 2012).
- Dolan K, 'Are all women state legislators alike?' in Thomas S & Wilcox C (eds), *Women and Elective Office: Past, Present, and Future* (2nd ed, 1998).
- Doll Y, 'US Army Women General Officers and their Strategies for Ascension' (2007) 7(3) *International Journal of Business Strategy*. At http://usacac.army.mil/cac2/cgsc/repository/dcl_DOLLArticle.pdf (viewed 14 January 2012).
- Drew E and Murtagh E M, 'Work/life balance: senior management champions or laggards' (2005) 20(4) *Women in Employment Review* 262.
- Dunt D, *Review of Mental Health Care in the ADF and Transition through Discharge* (2009). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/health/DMH/Review.htm> (viewed 25 June 2012).
- Employment of Women in the Armed Forces Steering Group, *Women in the Armed Forces* (2002). At http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/A9925990-82C2-420F-AB04-7003768CEC02/0/womenaf_fullreport.pdf (viewed 21 June 2012).
- Estrada A and Berggren A, 'Sexual Harassment and its Impact for Women Officers and Cadets in the Swedish Armed Forces' (2009) 21(2) *Military Psychology* 162.
- Evertson A and Nesbitt A, *The Glass Ceiling Effect and its Impact on Mid-Level Female Officer Career Progression in the United States Marine Corps and Air Force*, Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey California, March 2004. At www.dtic.mil/dacowits/research/glassceiling.pdf (viewed 28 January 2012).
- Febbraro A, *Women, leadership and gender Integration in the Canadian combat arms: A qualitative study*, Technical Report, DRDC Toronto TR 2003-170 (2003). At <http://pubs.drdc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc31/p521088.pdf> (viewed 25 June 2011).
- Fowler T K, Bunting J, Nardotti M J Jr., Carpenter A M and Ripley J W, *Final Report of the Panel to Review Sexual Misconduct Allegations at the United States Air Force Academy* (2003). At www.defense.gov/news/Sep2003/d20030922usafareport.pdf (viewed 3 July 2011).
- Gibson S, 'Perceptions of US Military Leadership: Are All Leaders Created Equally?' (2005) 24(2) *Equal Opportunities International* 1.
- Goldman Sach JB Were, *Australia's Hidden Resources: The Economic Case for Increasing Female Participation* (2009).
- Hawke A and Smith R, *Australian Defence Force Posture Review*, Department of Defence (2011). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/oscdf/adf-posture-review/docs/final/default.htm> (viewed 26 June 2012).
- Headlam-Wells J, Gosland J and Craig J, "'There's magic in the web": e-mentoring for women's career development' (2005) 10(67) *Career Development International* 444.
- Hendricks C and Hutton L, *Defence Reform and Gender, Gender and Security Reform Toolkit* (2008). At <http://www.osce.org/odhr/30669> (viewed 5 June 2012).
- Hewlett S A, Peraino K, Sherbin L and Sumberg K, *The Sponsor Effect: Breaking Through the Last Glass Ceiling*, Harvard Business Review Research Report (2011).
- Hodson S E, McFarlane A C, Van Hooff M and Davies C, *Mental Health in the Australian Defence Force – 2010 ADF Mental Health Prevalence and Wellbeing Study: Executive Report* Department of Defence (2011).
- Hollywood D M, 'Creating a True Army of One: Four Proposals to Combat Sexual Harassment in Today's Army' (2007) 30 *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender* 151.
- Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, *Pregnant and Productive, Report of the National Pregnancy and Work Inquiry* (1999).

Hoglin P, 'Why Ab Initio?' (2011) 8(2) *Australian Army Journal* 157.

Inspector General Australian Defence Force, *Review of the Management of Incidents and Complaints in Defence including Civil and Military Jurisdiction* (2011).

Jans N and Schmidtchen D, *The Real C-Cubed: Culture, Careers and Climate and How They Affect Capability* (2002).

Jansen E and WO=MEN WG 1325 Dutch Gender Platform, *UNSCR 1325 In-country monitoring report – The Netherlands*, Global Network of Women Peace-builders (October 2010). At <http://www.wo-men.nl/cms/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/UNSCR-1325-monitoring-report-The-Netherlands-20101.pdf> (viewed 25 June 2012).

Johnson W B and Anderson G R, 'Formal Mentoring in the US Military- Research Evidence, Lingering Questions and Recommendations' (2010) 63(2) *Naval War College Review* 330. At <http://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/1d75c515-7093-4bc3-92fa-7284b7198bb4/Formal-Mentoring-in-the-U-S--Military--Research-Ev> (viewed 26 June 2012).

Joy L, Carter N, Wagner H and Narayanan S, *The Bottom Line: Corporate Performance and Women's Representation on Boards* (2007). At <http://www.catalyst.org/publication/200/the-bottom-line-corporate-performance-and-womens-representation-on-boards> (viewed 26 June 2012).

Kelley M J M, *Gender Differences and Leadership* (1997). At www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/awc/97-104.pdf (viewed 25 June 2012).

Kropf M B, 'Flexibility initiatives: current approaches and effective strategies' (1999) 14(5) *Women in Management Review* 177.

Krulak C, 'The Strategic Corporal: Leadership in the Three Block War' (1999) *Marines Magazine*. At <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA399413> (viewed 9 July 2012).

Lievore D, *Non-reporting and Hidden Recording of Sexual Assault: An International Literature Review*, Commonwealth Office of the Status of Women (2003). At www.aic.gov.au/documents/D/4/6/%7BD4631AC0-2DDC-4729-AD3C-8A69DF33BA65%7D2003-06-review.pdf (viewed 13 June 2012).

Mattis M C, 'Advancing women in business organizations: Key leadership roles and behaviors of senior leaders and managers' (2001) 20(4) *Journal of Management Development* 371.

McDonald P, Flood M and the Australian Human Rights Commission, *Encourage, Support, Act: Bystander Approaches to Sexual Harassment in the Workplace*, Australian Human Rights Commission (2012).

McKinsey & Company, *Women Matter 2012: Making the Breakthrough* (2012). At http://www.mckinsey.com/client_service/organization/latest_thinking/women_matter (viewed 26 June 2012).

McLoughlin C, *Women's Participation in the Navy*, Report of the Participation of Women in New Generation Navy Review (2009).

Meijer M and De Vries R, *Sexual Harassment in Netherlands Naval Operations*, NATO (undated). At <http://ftp.rta.nato.int/public//PubFullText/RTO/MP/RTO-MP-HFM-158//MP-HFM-158-29.doc> (viewed 6 June 2011).

Military Leadership Diversity Commission, *From Representation to Inclusion: Diversity Leadership for the 21st Century Military: Final Report* (2011).

Moelker R and Bosch J, *Hidden Women: Women in the Netherlands Armed Forces*, Publications of the Faculty of Military Science, No. 2008/01, Netherlands Defence Academy (2008) At <http://hbo-kennisbank.uvt.nl/cgi/nda/show.cgi?fid=1721> (viewed 15 July 2011).

Morgan M J, 'Women in a Man's World: Gender Differences in Leadership at the Military Academy' (2004) 34(12) *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 2482.

Mulhall E, 'Women Warriors: Supporting She 'Who Has Borne the Battle', Issue Report October 2009, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America (2009). At http://media.iava.org/IAVA_WomensReport_2009.pdf (viewed 15 January 2012).

National Equal Opportunities Network, *National Conversation About Work – New Zealand Army*. At http://live.isitesoftware.co.nz/neon/documents/Final_NZ_Army.pdf (viewed 4 August 2011).

New Zealand Defence Force, *Annual Report* (2011). At www.nzdf.mil.nz/downloads/pdf/public-docs/2011/nzdf-annual-report-2011.pdf (viewed 22 March 2012).

Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, *Evaluation of Sexual Assault, Reprisal & Related Leadership Challenges At the United States Air Force Academy*, Report No. IPO2004C003 (2004). At www.defense.gov/news/Dec2004/d20041207igsummary.pdf (viewed 16 June 2011).

Orme, C W *Beyond Compliance: Professionalism, Trust and Capability in the Australian Profession of Arms*. At <http://www.defence.gov.au/culturereviews/docs/personalconductpersonnel/index.htm> (viewed 9 July 2012).

OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, *Handbook on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Armed Personnel* (2008). At www.osce.org/odihr/31393 (viewed 21 January 2012).

Productivity Commission, *Paid Parental Leave: Support for Parents with Newborn Children*, Report No 47 (2009).

Quadara A, 'Responding to young people disclosing sexual assault: A resource for schools', *ACSSA Wrap*, No 6 (2008). At www.aifs.gov.au/acssa/pubs/wrap/acssa_wrap6.pdf (viewed 13 June 2012).

Quinn K, *Group Dynamics: An Organisational Framework for Understanding Mixed Gender Interaction and Sexual Harassment in the Military* (1992).

Rau T J, Merrill L L, McWhorter S K, Stander V A, Thomsen C J, Dyslin C W, Rabenhorst M M and Milner J S, 'Evaluation of A Sexual Assault Education/Prevention Program for Male US Navy Personnel' (2010) 175(6) *Military Medicine* 429.

Recardo R J, 'Overcoming resistance to change' (1995) 14(2) *National Productivity Review* 5.

Ridgeway R and Correll S, 'Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations' (2004) 18(4) *Gender & Society* 510.

Rimalt N, 'Women in the Sphere of Masculinity: The Double-Edged Sword of Women's Integration in the Military' (2007) 14 *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy* 1097.

Rumble G, McKean M and Pearce D, *Report of the Review of Allegations of Sexual and Other Abuse in Defence – Facing the problems of the past*, DLA Piper (2011). At <http://www.defence.gov.au/culturereviews/docs/DLAPiper/> (viewed 24 July 2012).

Rzechowka M, 'Gender Integration and Modern Military Forces: A Comparative Analysis' (2010) 13(2) *The Canadian Army Journal* 71. At www.army.forces.gc.ca/caj/documents/vol_13/iss_2/CAJ_vol13.2_10_e.pdf (viewed 26 June 2011).

Schipani C A, Dworkin T M, Kwolek-Folland A and Maurer V G, 'Pathways for women to obtain positions of organizational leadership: the significance of mentoring and networking' (2009) 16 *Duke Journal of Gender Law and Policy* 89.

Schjolset A, *NATO and the Women: Exploring the Gender Gap in the Armed Forces*, Peace Research Institute Oslo (2010). At www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Publication/?oid=192310 (viewed 19 November 2011).

Schmid M, 'Comment: Combating a Different Enemy – Proposals to Change the Culture of Sexual Assault in the Military' (2010) 55 *Villanova Law Review* 475.

Scoppio G, 'Diversity Best Practices in Military Organizations in Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States' (2009) 9(3) *Canadian Military Journal* 17.

- Scott K A, *Universal or Gender-specific? Exploring Military Leadership from a Subordinate Perspective*, Technical Report, DRDC Toronto TR 2003-121, October 2003. At <http://pubs.drdc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc57/p521079.pdf> (viewed 6 June 2011).
- Sheehan M, 'The changing character of war' in Baylis J, Smith S and Owens P (eds), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations* (2007) 213.
- Studlar D and McAllister I, 'Does a critical mass exist? A comparative analysis of women's legislative representation since 1950' (2002) 41 *European Journal of Political Research* 233.
- Summers A, 'Women's business in men's business: women's health in military service in Australia' (1999) 1 *ADF Health* 9.
- Tharenou P, 'Does mentor support increase women's career advancement more than men's? The differential effects of career and psychosocial support' (2005) 30(1) *Australian Journal of Management* 77.
- Thom V, Acting Commonwealth and Defence Force Ombudsman, *Australian Defence Force: Management of Complaints about Unacceptable Behaviour*, Report No 4 (2007).
- Thomas K and Bell S, 'Competing for the Best and Brightest: Recruitment and Retention in the Australian Defence Force' (2007) 3(1) *Security Challenges* 97.
- UK Ministry of Defence, *Equality and Diversity Annual Report 2008-2009*. At <http://mod.uk/DefenceInternet/Templates/InformationProfile.aspx?NRMODE=Published&NRNODEGUID=%7B1992AB7E-5091-48A2-878D-4FAD5E5FC4E0%7D&NRORIGINALURL=%2FDefenceInternet%2FAboutDefence%2FCorporatePublications%2FPersonnelPublications%2FEqualityandDiversity%2FDiversityInformation%2FEqualityDiversityScheme.htm&NRCACHEHINT=Guest> (viewed 24 June 2011).
- USA Department of Defense, *Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military, Fiscal Year 2010* (2011). At <http://www.sapr.mil/index.php/annual-reports/> (viewed 9 July 2012).
- USA Department of Defense, *Report of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services* (2009). At www.quantico.usmc.mil/download.aspx?Path=../Uploads/Files/SAPR_DTFSAMS_Report_Dec_09.pdf (viewed 21 June 2011).
- USA Department of Defense, *Report to Congress on the Review of Laws, Policies and Regulations Restricting the Service of Female Members in the U.S. Armed Forces* (2012). At www.defense.gov/news/WISR_Report_to_Congress.pdf (viewed 18 May 2012).
- USA Department of Veterans Affairs, Women Veterans Task Force, *2012 Report: Strategies for Serving our Women Veterans*, Draft for Public Comment (2012). At http://www.va.gov/opa/Publications/Draft_2012_Women-Veterans_StrategicPlan.pdf (viewed 17 May 2012).
- Van den Heuvel E and Meijer M, *Gender Force in the Netherlands Armed Forces*, NATO (undated). At <http://ftp.rta.nato.int/public//PubFullText/RTO/MP/RTO-MP-HFM-158//MP-HFM-158-02.doc> (viewed 16 July 2011).
- Wadia-Fascetti S and Leventman P G, 'E-mentoring: A longitudinal approach to mentoring relationships for women pursuing technical careers' (2000) *Journal of Engineering Education* 295.
- Watkins L and Bourg M C, 'The Effects of Gender on Cadet Selection for Leadership Positions at the United States Military Academy' (1997) 15 *Minerva: Quarterly Report* 63.
- Watts M J, 'On the Conceptualisation and Measurement of Horizontal and Vertical Occupational Gender Segregation' (2005) 21(5) *European Sociological Review* 481.
- Winslow D, 'Rites of Passage and Group Bonding in the Canadian Airborne' (1999) 25(3) *Armed Forces & Society* 429.
- Wittenberg-Cox A, *How Women Mean Business* (2010).
- Woods K, 'Has ADF Leadership Changed over the Last 20 Years and Can We Make it Better?' (2012) 187 *Australian Defence Force Journal* 48.

- Further Information

Australian Human Rights Commission

Level 3, 175 Pitt Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

GPO Box 5218
SYDNEY NSW 2001
Telephone: (02) 9284 9600

Complaints Infoline: 1300 656 419
General enquiries and publications: 1300 369 711
TTY: 1800 620 241
Fax: (02) 9284 9611
Website: www.humanrights.gov.au

For detailed and up to date information about the Australian Human Rights Commission visit our website at: www.humanrights.gov.au

To order more publications from the Australian Human Rights Commission download a Publication Order Form at: www.humanrights.gov.au/about/publications/index.html or call: (02) 9284 9600 fax: (02) 9284 9611 or e-mail: publications@humanrights.gov.au

