

Vol. 3, No. 4

# Women in Forestry

Nov. - Dec. 1981



CONTENTS

The Editor's Quagmire.....1  
Women Speaking Out.....3  
Follow Up to the Workshop for Professional Women.....13  
Reactions From a Network Member.....15  
Revisions to Forester Registers.....16  
Data on Women and Men in the Forest Service.....18  
A Conference on Women in Natural Resources.....19  
Questions From Readers.....20  
Bits 'N Pieces.....20  
The Best of Both Sexes.....21  
Membership/Subscription.....31

THE EDITOR'S QUAGMIRE

The other day I received a short note from a network member telling me rather bluntly to "get my . . . act together" and do a better job of processing checks, handling subscriptions, etc. Frankly, this got me steamed! So, pardon me while I step up on my soapbox and lecture a few minutes on the process of publishing a newsletter.

Back in the old days when the network was young and still part of the Forest Service (it was issued under the guise of the Federal Women's Program), we had some 30-odd members. Newsletter duties such as xeroxing, mailing, writing articles, and sending out job information were divided among several women, all of whom were geographically separated, some by hundreds of miles. After two or three newsletters were issued this way, we consolidated our efforts under one umbrella (mine - I volunteered) and made the newsletter a self-supporting operation via subscriptions; it was the only way at the time to continue our communication efforts and yet be free of Forest Service censorship. Since that time, the network has quadrupled in membership, and the newsletters have become much larger which means, naturally, more work.

Just to give you some idea of what's involved in putting out a single issue of the newsletter, I have to:

- Post new members on the mailing list
- Change addresses of people who've moved
- Keep track of who re-subscribed and who didn't
- Send out one and sometimes two renewal notices
- Deposit, withdraw, or refund newsletter money (and pay income tax on our account)
- Process government and university purchase orders
- Answer correspondence from network members and from people interested in joining the network
- Assemble newsletter contents from various sources
- Type or re-type several newsletter pages
- Make a cover sheet and table of contents
- Take the newsletter to the printer and pick it up when its done
- Buy envelopes and stamps, both of which require special trips
- Label, stamp, stuff, and seal over 100 envelopes, making sure that the right notices, correspondence, etc., go with the right envelopes
- Deliver the envelopes to the Post Office

All of this, and more, requires a L-A-R-G-E block of time. Competing for those hours are a full-time job and an unfinished Ph. D. thesis plus the usual home duties and other responsibilities. Because time is a precious commodity, I usually try to set aside one or two long weekends to do most everything: chunk out the newsletter, do the bookwork, answer correspondence, and so forth. It's the most efficient way for me right now. So, if your checks are returned to you late, your letters answered several weeks after you've written them, etc., that's why.

Now, I'm bound to make some mistakes in all of this. (Keeping track of well over 100 subscribers isn't easy.) When I do, let me know. Constructive criticism is important and welcome. But, I do mind gripes from people who don't



actively participate in the network and yet expect a polished performance and timely service. Don't gripe -- volunteer your thoughts and services in the interests of a better product! There's bound to be room for improvement. If anybody has suggestions resulting in streamlined operations, let me know. I also send out separate job-information mailings which take a lot of time. How could this service be improved?

Guess I've said my piece. Now, I'll step down from my soapbox and humbly thank all those people who've so diligently supplied the network with information and who've taken the time to write notes or letters offering their ideas and suggestions, expressing their appreciation and interest, or simply saying, "hello". Thank you. You've been great!

LINDA R. DONOGHUE

---

---

The following pages contain some responses to Juanita Larson's letters printed in the last newsletter. As Juanita so aptly states, "Women are speaking out and they will continue to do so regardless of their station in life. These are exciting times."

And, following those letters is the latest word from Region 6 on the "Follow Up to the Workshop for Professional Women in Natural Resources". I think you'll find it worth reading.

WOMEN SPEAKING OUT

April 25, 1981

Dear Juanita,

I am Cindy Hester, Procurement Clerk, GS/3, Estacada Ranger District, Mt. Hood National Forest. I have been with the Forest Service only a little over 1½ years, but I think I have a pretty good feel for the problems of the clerical employee.

Last week I went to a meeting of the Federal Women's Program in our Supervisor's Office. I was encouraged to find interest and sympathy from other (non-clerical) representatives for the inequalities a person in our ranks encounters. However, I was discouraged to hear what spokespersons for the group had to say about the problems. In a nutshell they said, "It's a societal problem, let's talk about how we can move women out of traditional roles, at least; and at best, let's talk about how we can get professional women behind Ranger's desks!" Perhaps the FWP should think about a new name. They seemed annoyed with questions concerning dead-ended clerical positions. Aren't we still the majority of the women that work for the Forest Service? --Societal problem, too big to sink our teeth in, so let's ignore it and blaze a path that too many women, even in the 80's, are not ready for or just plain don't want!

I am young, 26 years old, and I was married for 7 years. I have just recently divorced and I have a young daughter, 3½ years old. I know I have to work, like many other women today. I didn't work while I was married so I lost valuable time in the job market. But, I'm here now. And being one of many that enjoys, and is fulfilled by, clerical work, I am ready to explore and work towards making ours a better lot.

I know many are convinced that the work we do is valuable and important, and I think they would agree we are often underpaid and overworked. I also think they would agree that there should be room for advancement for employees that are dependable, bright, and perform their duties as expected. So, at least down here on the ranch, we have support. I, for one, want to find out what I can do to bring the "equal worth" issue to the attention of whomever can effect the changes. It is indeed an equal employment issue. Women hold clerical positions and clerical positions are historically under-rated and under-paid.

You know what I am saying. I'm no militant. I am proud of what I do. I do not want to climb telephone poles or fall trees, but I do want to support my family. I know that with some work and some brain-power we can make our work synonymous with living and surviving in today's economy.

If you have any guidance or advice for one who is ready to start banging her head against the wall, please send it my way. I applaud you and appreciate you for planting the seed.

Sincerely,

*Cynthia L. Hester*

CYNTHIA L. HESTER  
P.O. Box 907  
Estacada, OR 97023  
630-7358

P.S. I should have explained - our DBMA shared your letters with us. I was impressed and inspired. Being a little green at speaking out - I thought you would be a good sounding board for me. I really am interested in directing my feelings to the right places and I want, most of all, to make sure I'm presenting the case in the right light. Any advice would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks!  
*C. Hester*

April 9, 1981

Juanita Larson  
P.O. Box 285  
Prospect, Oregon 97536

Dear Juanita,

First of all I want to appologize for not writing sooner to lend my moral support to you. You are doing what most of us have talked about or wished we had the stamina and nerve to do for a long long time.

I hope you have heard from a large number of us because I'm sure most of us agree whole-heartedly with you and what you are doing.

I was interested in one part of Mr. Opsal's letter where he says that "some DBMA positions should be GS-9's but aren't "because, when audited, they were found to not be performing the full range of duties or the District Ranger would not delegate the authorities and responsibilities of a GS-9". He also says "there are differences in complexities from District to District and a range of grades is appropriate."

Isn't it strange that they don't use that same rational for the other Staff positions!! We are all on that same District where the size and complexities are supposed to be the big factor, yet for the DBMA position they evidently aren't complex enough while for the other Staff members that criteria doesn't amount to a hill of beans. I say, either the complexities are there or they aren't and we should all be graded accordingly.

Each time a TMA, FMO, etc., position is filled we certainly don't have to determine whether it will be filled with someone who will perform at a GS-9, 10, 11, 12, or what. It is understood the position is a GS-11 and that is how it is filled. I've never known one of the other staff positions to be filled and the incumbent then have to prove he could perform at the GS-11 level before it was "given" to him. That, as you probably know, happens all the time in clerical positions, from DBMA's to file clerks.

As far as the "new study" is concerned, I think it is designed to fail. In order to perform the cost analysis and studies required by the job, those people are going to have to have an education in economics and cost analysis. I doubt that the incumbents on the two test Districts have that. Also, how is their effectiveness going to be evaluated. What do the evaluators have to measure by? As you mentioned, studies have gone on for 2 or more decades and

the classifiers still aren't willing to get rid of their prejudices about BMA's and classify us and pay us like other staff positions.

I've talked with two other BMA's on our Forest and know they are in agreement with your efforts. One said her Ranger was also going to write to you. As we are between Rangers right now, I don't have that support, but I do know the other staff members and a good share of the other employees feel there is a gross injustice in the system as it is now.

On this District I take my turn along with the other staff members at being "Acting District Ranger" in his absence. Pretty big responsibility for a GS-303-8 huh? My past Ranger felt I was capable of handling the job.

I know you must sometimes feel very lonely out there but perhaps this letter will let you know I appreciate your efforts on behalf of all of us very much.

Thanks and good luck !

Sincerely,

*Noanie Graham*

Noanie Graham  
Administrative Technician  
Umpqua National Forest  
Cottage Grove Ranger District

1760 Equal Employment Opportunity

April 24, 1981

Letter of Resignation

Forest Supervisor, Rogue River National Forest

This is a letter of resignation from my position as an Equal Employment Opportunity Counselor for the Rogue River National Forest.

I wish to resign from the position effective as of the above date.

My decision has not been an easy one to make.


When I first became a Counselor (12-05-78), I really believed in what the position seemed to represent.

In the past few months I have become disillusioned with the EEO process and no longer believe in it.

As you know, I am currently in the position of Supervisory Financial Assistant (GS-8) on the Applegate Ranger District. Recently there have been actions taken against this type of position by the Regional Personnel Office. These actions have given the women incumbents on the Rogue River N.F. a feeling of being discriminated against.

When I attended the EEO Counselors session in Portland on 2/24-26/81, I discussed this issue with Bill Green of the Regional Office. I was told then that there had already been discrimination complaints filed by incumbents of similar positions on other Forests (DBMA's), and that the whole "DBMA Plight" was too "sticky" for anyone to want to become involved; therefore, the complaints keep getting put at the bottom of the "stack".

If this is the way the system is "set up" to operate, then I no longer wish to be a part of it, nor would I ever encourage anyone else to use this system.



LOIS A. COURTNEY  
Supvry Fnancl Asst.

cc: Regional Forester  
Merlin Mc Daniels RRNF  
Juanita Larson Prospect R.D. ✓

Blue River Ranger District  
Blue River, OR 97413  
February 13, 1981

Ms. Juanita Larson  
P.O. Box 285  
Prospect, OR 97536

Dear Juanita,

I read your letters with great interest and commend you for them!  
I am so glad to see someone else joining in the "fight".

I filed an appeal with OPM (then CSC) on July 18, 1978 requesting my position be classified as a GS-341-9. My appeal was accepted, and on Nov. 21, 1978 I was notified that it had been classified as GS-301-9. The R.O. challenged the grade and it was sent to Washington. The W.O. had maintained that there would be no BMAs over GS-7. After all the appeals that have been made, I guess W.O. finally decided it would have to raise that to GS-8. I am sure in my own mind that W.O. told the Commission that it would settle for the 8. On February 6, 1979 the Forest was notified of that decision and I was promoted to that grade retroactively to Nov. 15, 1978. I am enclosing copies of some of the correspondence for your information.

Incidentally, I didn't receive any help from the Willamette S.O. When asked for information by CSC they did a Position Evaluation Summary in August 1978. It stated in part "Overall, the bulk of the technical work is GS-5, although there are significant elements evaluated at GS-4 and other work which at times is GS-6. The final grade for the position should be GS-7, based on the significant supervisory duties and responsibilities. In practice, most of the lower graded work is carried out by direct or indirect subordinates. The technical work actually performed by the employee is normally borderline GS-5 and GS-6, but supervisory duties are clearly paramount." (Dealing with PAMARS is GS-4 work?)

My Ranger says the position should be GS-11 the same as other staff.

You will undoubtedly be hearing from the BMA at Detroit. She has filed a class action sex discrimination appeal and is requesting a GS-11.

Keep up the good work. Let me know if I can be of any help.

Sincerely,



Helen E. Youngdahl

(home address: 55560 McKenzie River Dr., Blue River, OR 97413. Phone 822-3284)

April 14, 1981

9

Mrs. Juanita Larson  
P. O. Box 285  
Prospect, OR 97536

Dear Juanita:

I have been reading your letters to Mr. Bates and Mr. Opsal. I do not know how they got to the National Park Service but I am sure glad they did. I agree with what you are doing "100%". You are correct in that "most clerical positions in the Federal Service are held by women". I will say that management is starting to see that some women are capable of holding positions such as personnel officers and in some instances superintendent's of National Monuments. Big Deal! The National Monument does not have that many people to supervise so I guess a woman can handle it if we try real hard.

It is great for me as an individual person to move around "BUT" you certainly do not get any encouragement from your supervisor. If you are a woman, the comment is "Oh come on you don't want to move", but if you are a man the comment is "I hate to lose you but the only way to get ahead is to move around and you do have a family to support so good luck". It does get a little disheartening after awhile.

When you are a woman who is the only one working (and there are a lot of us), it seems to me they should give you even more encouragement. Of course maybe we should be home attending clubs like most women do that have working husbands. Wouldn't that be nice! I was brought up with the understanding that the man was suppose to make the living and the woman was to stay home and keep house. Some of us are unfortunately not financially able to do that.

I have known you for six years and I thought you must be at least a GS-11. I know there must have been many people that you have trained and orientated into the Forest Service including many supervisor's. You are right in that, they should get out of the city and come out to see what keeps their jobs going. Also, if it wasn't for the clerical help there would be very little paper work accomplished and isn't that what makes the government run?

As far as the education rule goes, I am afraid that if I had waited to get a degree in something, I would have starved to death. I find that COMMON SENSE and some intelligence can get you just as far as anything. There are quite a few highly intelligent people that have no common sense whatsoever.

I am an EEO Counselor for four parks and when Mr. Opsal suggests you see one if you feel you have been discriminated against, I believe he missed the mark by about a mile. It is not an EEO problem, it is a GREAT BIG GRIEVANCE that your personnel office should certainly look into.

Hang in there Juanita, we are all behind you and know that you are a "Mrs." and not a "Ms." even if Mr. Opsal doesn't!



Dora Brewer  
Crater Lake National Park  
"Just a Clerk"



Newport, WA 99156  
April 27, 1981

Dear Juanita:

Your letters were of particular interest to me as they reflect my own views.

I started with the Kaniksu National Forest on the Newport Ranger District in 1957. We were in R-1 until July 1974. We were put under the administration of the Colville National Forest July 1, 1973 when the Kaniksu, Coeur d'Alene & St. Joe National Forests were reorganized into the Panhandle N.F. I never thought I would feel that I had been had by the Forest Service but I do now. BMA's to the Colville A.O. are in the servant class who don't mingle with the aristocrats. I had always been on a Forest where we were treated with respect by everyone and could feel free to talk with the Forest Supervisor if necessary.

I had a few words with our A.O. about my classification after my Position Description had been in S.O. Personnel for over a year with no action. He was scandalized that a mere woman and a BMA at that would talk to him in that tone. He did however get off his dime and start something going so I finally got a GS-8 on 1/11/81. This is the first and only 8 BMA on the Colville Forest. The excuse on this Forest is the grade level we supervise. We sure as heck can't supervise any higher grades as long as they keep the clerical staff as low as they do.

I don't feel that anyone on a Ranger District should be classed as a Clerk-Typist. To me a Clerk-Typist is someone who sits in a typing pool and has no other responsibility. There is no one on a District that falls within this class.

I never had to fight for a promotion before. I asked that my promotion be made retroactive at least 6 months but was told it wasn't possible to do this. The classifier in the Colville S.O. had put my P.D. on her lowest priority because she said it wouldn't change my classification anyhow. We had a due date of 11/5/79 to have all P.D.'s in the 300 series rewritten and turned in to the S.O. for classification. They left here 10/31/79 and she finally set up an appointment FOR a desk audit on 6/10/80 but cancelled out and nothing more was done about it until I started rattling cages. I had just let it go because we had received two memo's signed by the A.O. that there would be no GS-8's on the Colville. It seemed the decision had been made without further investigation as to the duties and responsibilities of each BMA. I started with the A.O. and he couldn't believe that a lowly BMA would speak to him like I did. The Ranger requested a desk audit on 10/9/80 but was told they couldn't make that date. 11/4/80 was then set for the audit but was postponed again until 11/12/80. It then took until 1/11/81 before my promotion became effective. I am eligible for retirement in May and they were just waiting for me to retire so they wouldn't have to do anything. It has started the other BMA's on the Forest to take a second look at their classification. Then

when they did the desk audit they used most of the info they had compiled in a desk audit to upgrade a GS-5 BMA to a GS-6. She is in an upward mobility position and it took 2 years and a desk audit to get from a 5 to a 6.

I asked the A.O. where the Personnel Officer got some of her information on me because she only talked to me about 1/2 hour. I was told she had talked to a lot of other people. I told him no one knew how I worked, they just knew the end results. He said I should be delegating and not doing some of these tasks. How much more can you delegate than to have a GS-3 and an older American enrollee compiling information that secured the end results.

After we received the attached memo I feel like they are watching everything I do so they can say "Aha I Gotcha" you are not working as an 8.

I had to fight like a Tiger to get the Resource Clerk upgraded to a GS-5.. I worked for over 2 years to get our receptionist-purchasing clerk upgraded to a GS-4. It took a year from the time she was desk audited before her promotion finally came through on 4/5/81.

Maybe I'm too close to Region 1. Their BMA's are called Admin. Techs. and when they were upgraded to GS-8's, several years ago, they didn't have a desk audit and all the delay we are subjected to here.

We were told by our Personnel Officer that they don't use the Position Description anyhow, the evaluation criteria is the deciding factor. What the heck is the use of having the P.D. if they are going to put whatever they feel like in the evaluation criteria.

We are all supposed to practice EEO and Nondiscrimination but discrimination is alive and well in the Forest Service; at least on the Colville National Forest.

Why are clerical positions always desk audited when positions traditionally filled by men are not? To me the word PROFESSIONAL doesn't just mean a college degree.

In my 23 years on this District I have seen several technicians who were more professional and dedicated than most people who call themselves professionals.

There is much more to being a professional and working with dedication and loyalty than can be read from a book.

We have one fellow here who really fights Business Management. QUOTE: "I have never taken orders from a woman and I'm not about to start now." He seems to think he is immune to following policy and procedure that is set and has to be lived by.

I'm real sorry to have taken so long to get back to you. I started this February 18 and never seemed to get finished. I get so darned cranked up when I even think about the situation. If they paid us our worth to the organization we would make as much as a GS-12.

This bit about retreaded housewives - who else would have the intestinal fortitude to work like we do and take on as much responsibility with as little gratitude shown for

our efforts. We may be retreads but we have put in a lot of dedicated years learning all the time. Over 20 years of experience should count for something unless the Forest Service doesn't have much faith in their teaching techniques. May 30 is the date set for my retirement. I hope to get to Oregon sometime this year and with good luck I'll get to Prospect so we can talk in person.

HANG IN THERE AND KEEP FIGHTING.

*Margaret Richards*

MARGARET RICHARDS

Box 682

Newport, WA 99256



Reply to: 1700 Civil Rights

Date: December 9, 1981

Subject: Follow Up to the Workshop for Professional Women  
in Natural Resources: A Year Later

To: Forest Supervisors, Directors

As many of you no doubt remember, a little over a year ago the Region sponsored a workshop for Professional Women in Natural Resources. Following the conference, a report was written and recommendations made by the participants. I responded to the recommendations thorough 1700 letter dated May 12, and asked Forest Supervisors to respond to me as as the implementation of the direction contained in that letter.

Every Forest Supervisor responded and is implementing or plans to implement all of the direction contained in my letter of May 12. A few have even gone further such as establishing sponsor systems, appointing a support group for women, sponsoring career information workshops, etc. The action items assigned to my staff have also been accomplished. Two Regional manual supplements will be issued shortly; one on the placement of two-career Forest Service couples and one on maternity leave. A question and answer leaflet on maternity leave is in the final steps of development. The action item dealing with mentorship has also been accomplished. Forest Supervisors and I discussed mentoring women and minorities at the July Forest Supervisors/Directors meeting.

As all of you know, it is the bottom line results--increases in the number of women in significant positions--that count. I am happy to report that indeed, during the past year, the Region made significant progress in the employment and advancement of women as reflected in the following statistics:

	<u>9/80</u>	<u>9/81</u>
Percentage of professional positions occupied by women:	9.5	11.2
Percentage of R-6 work force which is female:	28.5	30.2
Percentage of Admin/Tech positions occupied by women:	22.4	24.2
Women in TMA positions:	0	3
Women in GS-13 positions:	1	4
Percentage of women in Class I Overhead Fire teams:	16.0	22.0



In addition, prior to this year, only two women were ever selected for the "Intensive Semester" training. This year, four were nominated and three were selected.

The FY '82-86 Regional Affirmative Action Plan also contains action which will facilitate the employment and advancement of women (and minorities).

I am pleased with the progress this Region accomplished this past year-- made possible by the emphasis you and many of your employees placed on the direction contained in my letter of May 12. Yet, we must admit that there is still much left to do. I am looking forward to the time when women will occupy top management positions in the Region. We, as the management team of this Region, must consciously move the organization in that direction. The selection of a woman for a line job may feel a bit uncomfortable and be viewed as taking a risk, but I view it as taking the action necessary for us to achieve progress.

We have made much progress in just one year. I know I can count on you to continue to move towards placing women (and minorities) in every type of job in the Region so that we can truly have a "work force reflective of our Nation's diversity" (CS Reform Act-1978).

  
R.E. WORTHINGTON  
Regional Forester

cc: RF DRF's  
WO-CR  
PNW  
Participants  
Forest FWPMs  
District Rangers

INFORMATION ON REVISIONS TO FORESTER REGISTERS

The following information is the most current available on the Federal Forester (460) registers:

The Portland Area Office of the Office of Personnel Management informs us of the following changes as they relate to the GS-460-5 & 7, Forester register and the Mid (GS-460-9/12) and Senior (GS-460-13 above) registers.

At the present time three regions of the Office of Personnel Management recruit, examine, and maintain registers for Forester at the 5 & 7 level. Their central office maintains the registers for Mid Level (9-12) and Senior Level (13 and above).

Under the system they are currently planning to implement, the Portland Area Office will be the sole office with nation-wide responsibility for recruiting and examining for Forester at the GS-5 and GS-7 level. Mid Level, GS-9-12 and higher, will be handled by each regional office of the Office of Personnel Management, i.e., Seattle, Denver, etc.

The Portland Area Office is hopeful they will be able to implement the new procedures some time during the second quarter or the beginning of the third quarter.

In implementing the new procedures applicants will be required to complete a computerized application similar to the physical science and engineering application. In addition they will also, on a one time basis, submit a Standard Form 171 along with the computerized one. This is being done to assist the examiner to answer questions on qualifications and ratings.

After the applications are received (computerized ones) they are run through a computer with an optical scanner to gather pertinent data for determining qualifications and ratings.

Qualification and rating will be determined by the computer for each person applying. Computerized applications will also provide four specialty areas from which applicants must state their preference for employment. The specialty areas are: general forestry, timber, fire, and recreation.

Applicants will receive a Notice of Rating for each specialty area. Scores will be determined by applicants' achievement in undergraduate and graduate level education, their overall grade point average in all areas of study, and grade point average in major areas of study (Forestry), plus work experience.

The Office of Personnel Management Computer Center in Macon, Georgia, will be the office performing the rating of applicants. They will send out a Notice of Rating to each applicant in approximately 6 weeks after they apply. Applicants who qualify will be placed on a roster of eligibles in Portland, Oregon and will be eligible for appointment up to 12 months. All applicants will be removed from the roster after 12 months unless notification is received by the Office of Personnel Management from the applicant requesting extension of eligibility. Applicants who seek employment will be required to list in priority order a preferred geographic area by state.

There are four specialty areas listed on the computerized application (listed above). Agencies when ordering from the Office of Personnel Management registers, may request certification of those applicants who only wish consideration for one specialty area, i.e., timber only. Agencies will receive only those individual names who have requested consideration for the specialty identified on the order.

Job Information Centers nation-wide will be providing information and have applications for the public when the announcement is open.

At the present time the Office of Personnel Management is maintaining a register of 6000 eligibles with approximately 54 eligibles claiming veterans preference. Of these 27 are competitive due to having scores above 99. If an eligible has a score of less than 99, they most likely will not be certifiable for a long period of time as the present system operates.

Information from Andrew Cainion, Region 6 Regional Recruitment Officer:

♂ MALE (all)  
 A ♀ ANGLO FEMALE  
 M ♀ MINORITY FEMALE

COMPARISONS OF MALES/FEMALES IN SPECIFIC SERIES [F.Y. 1980]

IN THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

	FORESTERS 460			FOR. TECHS. 462			W. BIOLOGISTS 486			ENGINEERS 810			ENGR. TECHS. 802			LANDS. ARCHS. 807			SOIL SCIENTISTS 470			RANGE CONS. 454		
	♂	A ♀	M ♀	♂	A ♀	M ♀	♂	A ♀	M ♀	♂	A ♀	M ♀	♂	A ♀	M ♀	♂	A ♀	M ♀	♂	A ♀	M ♀	♂	A ♀	M ♀
REGION 1	604	33	0	876	56	2	37	6	0	171	9	0	361	36	3	13	4	0	22	2	0	38	5	1
REGION 5	816	42 <sup>1/</sup>		1991	173		58	18		241	22		58	33		51	6		41	5		32	9	
REGION 6	992	78	2	1702	213	24	44	17	1	284	8	2	713	86	8	33	6	1	41	6	0	68	43	2
REGION 10	145	6	0	33	4	0	18	4	0	57	3	0	43	1	2	13	3	0	20	2	0	—	0	—

PERCENTAGES

	♂	♀ <sup>2/</sup>	♂	♀	♂	♀	♂	♀	♂	♀	♂	♀	♂	♀	♂	♀
REGION 1	95	5	93	7	84	16	95	5	89	11	69	31	91	9	84	16
REGION 5	95	5	91	9	69	31	91	9	43	57	88	12	88	12	72	28
REGION 6	92	8	86	14	59	41	96	4	87	13	79	21	85	15	34	66
REGION 10	96	4	88	12	78	22	95	5	93	7	77	23	90	10	—	—

<sup>1/</sup> No separation between anglo and minority females is available for Region 5

<sup>2/</sup> Both anglo and minority females are combined into one category

According to Susan Odell, the only significant information not shown in the chart above is that in most of the series women are found in a higher percent of WAE tours than men. For example, in Region 5, 90 percent of women foresters are WAE while only 30 percent of the men foresters are WAE. 100 percent of women engineers are WAE vs. 4 percent for the men.



WOMEN IN NATURAL RESOURCES:  
AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

A Conference To Be Held On The University Of Idaho  
Campus On March 8th and 9th, 1982  
Moscow, Idaho

The College of Forestry, Wildlife, and Range Sciences at the University of Idaho in cooperation with the Agency for International Development (USAID) and Women in Development (WID) is sponsoring a 2-day conference for professionals and others interested in international work in the natural resource fields.

The focus of the conference will be on the role of women and their professional contributions to development projects, usually in less developed countries. There will also be sessions on specific development projects, on how one finds and funds foreign work, and how one prepares to contribute to a technical team abroad.

In addition to conference proceedings, a directory of professional women in natural resources will be published and a network established.

There will be a \$5.00 conference fee charged. Participants are expected from all over the United States.

For more information contact Dixie Ehrenreich, Ph.D., Laboratory of Anthropology, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, 83843, (208) 885-6754.

IF YOU'RE INTERESTED IN BEING INCLUDED IN THE DIRECTORY, LET DR. EHRENREICH KNOW!

QUESTIONS FROM READERS

The following questions are from a woman with undergraduate training (a B.S. degree) in biology and plant pathology who would like to get back into forestry work -- specifically silviculture and forest entomology. She thinks graduate work in forestry might be a logical first step, but she's not sure. She asks:

1. Should she pursue a Master's degree or a second Bachelor's degree in forestry?
2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of pursuing an M.S. degree? A second B.S. degree?
3. What is the most expedient choice if she seeks future employment with the U.S. Forest Service? With private industry?

Send your ideas, thoughts, and suggestions to Linda Donoghue, 15787 Whittemore, East Lansing, Michigan 48823.

Another woman writes, "I'm planning on organizing a 'Women in Natural Resources' group on campus. Do you know of any others that are active or have any suggestions that might be helpful?"

If you have information that might prove helpful, send your correspondence to the address above.

BITS 'N PIECES

TARGET, a network of women in various natural resource professions, will offer a seminar by Carol Apruzzese, a Forest Service genetecist, on the Forest Service genetics program. The seminar will be held Jan. 12 (Tuesday) 1982, 6:30 PM at 226 13th Ave. E., Apt. C, Seattle, WA. For further information about TARGET and its programs, contact Claudia Ross in Seattle (322-0908), Janet Mitsuyasu in Enumclaw (825-2412), or Christine Arredondo in North Bend (888-0084).

Barbara Leuelling (a soil scientist and Federal Women's Program Manager on the Isabella Ranger District, Superior National Forest, Region 9) wants to cultivate and initiate an informal network of women soil scientists. If you happen to be one or know of women in these positions, drop Barb a note. Her address is: Isabella Ranger District, Star Rt 1, Box 207, Isabella, Minnesota 55607.

## THE BEST OF BOTH SEXES

by Alice G. Sargent

To produce more effective managers, men and women need to develop behaviors traditionally assigned to the opposite sex. The concepts of "male" and "female" are certainly real enough, and their effects are felt on all levels of the business world. However, managers and their organizations could benefit from a blend of the two.

Managers have tended to value coolness, competitive power, charisma, toughness, resilience, external rather than intrinsic rewards, and logical problem-solving rather than an integrated approach relying on wants and needs as much as ideas.

To categorize these qualities as "male" is probably less accurate than to say organizational norms are synonymous with male norms.

Indeed, our cultural norms seem to be divided into organization (male) norms and family (female) norms. Men have been taught to value task-oriented achieving and have been socialized to fill the needs of the organization. Women have been taught to be expressive, oriented toward the development of others as an extension of themselves and have been socialized to fill the needs of their families.

Yet, the concept of the manager as a rational and analytical problem-solver with predominantly "organization man" characteristics is shifting toward a managerial style that encompasses human relations skills in addition to problem-solving. Increasingly, organizations train for and reward both vicarious and direct achievement styles of leadership, and both instrumental and expressive behaviors. The effective manager is seen as someone with both leadership skills and supporting and helping behaviors.

Some evidence of changing managerial styles can be found in performance appraisal forms. For example, one major corporation includes several social skills

among ten factors in evaluating managers. These are: (1) communicating expectations and standards; confronting problem situations and issues, (2) being open, honest, and fair with people, and developing trust regardless of racial, sexual, or cultural factors, (3) developing skills in group and individual effectiveness--being a good coach and mentor; recognizing and molding skills of others, and (4) communicating well at all levels of the organization.

Developmental training efforts in this corporation and others include increasing managers' abilities to express feelings and teaching helping skills, such as attending behavior, active listening, paraphrasing, reflecting feelings, and influencing. Also, some participants in management training seminars have reported they attended to learn how to be more sensitive and to show their feelings more.

Furthermore, radical shifts in the composition of the workforce to include women in management have raised one more challenge to norms and values. If women managers are not simply to be forced into male management styles, the entire organizational styles, the organizational culture needs to be studied. Also, women bring to the marketplace values, attitudes, and behavior that run counter to the mainstream. Therefore, the significant questions for corporations are: Can female characteristics and behaviors become part of managerial style without jettisoning the best of male traits? And, can new attitudes toward the place of work in one's life, the role of intimacy, and a wider spectrum of attitudes toward time and success be included in organizational values?

Changing values for managerial style are coalescing with the new composition of the workforce to create dual pressures for shifting mores. This could develop androgynous managers--people who have learned and value both "masculine" and "feminine" behaviors, fatherly styles and maternal behaviors, competition and cooperation. The concept of androgynous managers may enhance the ways we see managers, conduct training programs, and evaluate performance.

This androgyny is an archetype that represents the coming together of, for want of better terms, maleness and femaleness. The androgynous manager is both dominant and yielding, combining independence with playfulness and nurture. An androgynous manager is well-developed in both the right brain (creative skills, such as intuition, interrelationships, fantasy, and imagination) and the left brain (intellectual skills, such as linear, abstract, logical, and deductive thinking).

More and more, management is viewed as accomplishing tasks through building a set of relationships between boss and manager, manager and subordinates, and manager and peers. For example, managers spend between 50 and 90 percent of their time in interpersonal communication. Of that time, ten percent is spent communicating with bosses, 40 percent with subordinates, and 50 percent laterally throughout the organization. This kind of communication requires interpersonal skills and concern for relationships.

As a result of this emphasis, affiliation may become more important. Motivational psychologist David McClelland has noted that achievement was the motive of the '60's and power the major motive of the '70's, but the third interpersonal motive, affiliation, has yet to have its day in organizations.

Also, R. E. Boyatzis developed a two-factor motivation theory of affiliative assurance and affiliative interest. Managers with high affiliative assurance are concerned basically with the security and strength of their close relationships. Anxious about rejection, they tend to be jealous and possessive about subordinates and superiors and probably engage in sibling rivalry with peers. This form of motivation interferes with the work of managers, because it interferes with their perspective in making decisions about the quality of time spent with other workers.

The human relations components of managers' jobs require that they develop the potential of subordinates, give direct, sometimes critical, feedback about their work, build an effective work team, and help new employees join that team.

Yet, the manager with high affiliation assurance needs may not be comfortable in giving negative feedback, may not be able to place goals in perspective when interpersonal issues are present, may not model a collaborative style in the face of competition, and may not be able to help subordinates change their behavior if they do not want to.

In contrast, the manager with high affiliative interest--a good concern for relationships as well as for tasks--could generate a climate of openness and compassion, and could communicate directly and openly with his or her boss without being overly concerned about approval and reassurance. Importantly, security with an authority figure generates more problems for most than does seeking reassurance from peers or subordinates.

If affiliation becomes a more valued part of the manager's style, "feminine" behaviors, such as being able to express feelings, show vulnerability, and ask for support, may become more valued in the marketplace. It would then be as relevant for men to increase their interpersonal competencies in affiliation and intimacy as for women to become more assertive and more effective in dealing with the realities of power.

In many ways, it is as if women and men grew up in two different cultures in which both sexes developed and were rewarded for different skills, attitudes, and behaviors. For a healthy androgyny, both sexes need to temper their managerial styles with those of their counterparts. Women now need to develop behaviors that will enable them to be autonomous, powerful, and forthright as well as supportive; men need to learn to be more aware of their feelings instead of suppressing or avoiding them, to make greater emotional contact, to be more overtly dependent, and to build effective support systems.

The benefits of androgyny thus become clear. Women would benefit from the analytical skills and healthy assertiveness of males. And men could improve their

managerial abilities by developing more effective intuition, improved ability to express emotion, and more effective support systems. Men could learn to decrease exhibitionism and jockeying for power with each other. Women could learn to share their competence with other women. If both sexes would participate in compensatory education programs designed to develop their human and managerial capacities more fully, we could have managers with a high concern for task and relationships and who, incidentally, would be androgynous.

Androgynous behavior impacts a range of managerial functions: giving performance appraisals, encouraging team effectiveness, assisting in the career development of other employees, developing a variety of decision-making styles, dealing with conflict, the capacity to generate a positive climate in the organization, and responses to new ideas and to stresses.

In their quest to be taken seriously, many professional women go through a stage of becoming like the archetypical man before allowing themselves the tenderness and playfulness they abandoned. Women are often awkward as they search for role models, and they try to become like their male colleagues or mentors. They may try to take charge or express anger as some charismatic guru does, only to feel even more inept because they violate their own integrity.

In The Managerial Women, M. Henning and A. Jardim note that the successful woman of 35 frequently tries to recapture her feminine side. As the pool of assertive women increases and the initial awkwardness of the new behavior is overcome, more women move to the next stage--being assertive without being oppressive or non-caring.

If, as MS concludes (January 1977), it is possible to have "love after liberation," it may be all right to be both assertive and compassionate. Because women have for so long derived their style from the hostess role, it is almost a joy to see the disjointedness of the recent participant in assertiveness training.

Women have learned to be excessively pleasant, to smooth over conflict, to be preoccupied with bringing people together (often at the expense of substance), to be overly concerned with getting the job done, to smile too much, to allow themselves to be interrupted, to let their voices trail off when making an important point, to laugh at the end of an important sentence, and to require more expertise from themselves than a man would before venturing an opinion. In short, women have learned passivity, self-denigration, and vicarious satisfaction.

Because of socialization and continuing reinforcement, women are prone to abandon a position of strength in order to be charming and conciliatory. Rather than being concerned about whether they are being ignored or affirmed, women need to make their points and have their messages received openly. Also, they need to claim ownership for jobs well-done, to acknowledge errors in judgment, and to deal with instances where sexual attraction biased their responses to others.

Similarly, men tend to be awkward as they become aware of the need for more collaborative, less competitive behavior, and to commit themselves to greater openness rather than coolness. Men benefit when they are made aware that they are operating more out of need for power and control than a need to get the job done. On the basis that one should be rational, men typically act to the exclusion of needs for approval, closeness, and spontaneity, even to the extent of not recognizing the emotional content of a message or its relevance to a situation.

Newer management styles tend to emphasize more collaboration and less competition, or at least different decision-making styles for different situations. Contingency decision making and situational leadership styles are becoming more widespread so that benevolent autocratic styles tend to be used in fire-fighting, and more consultative styles used for planning. Participatory styles are not yet in widespread use.

A paramount issue for women is the exercise of power and the acceptance of any



conflict that results. Many women avoid confrontation and competition in policy-making and goal setting, even to the point of not seeing issues in terms of power struggles and even though power dynamics are rampant and frequently useful components in every organization. They may even spend their time in noninfluential roles in an organization rather than seeing the system's real governance and decision-making process as the issue.

Many women tend to be reluctant to take charge, even when appropriate, and to overuse the collaborative approach when it is inappropriate. As women become more comfortable leading, they undoubtedly will be able to make judgments based on a correct reading of a situation. But women managers now tend to be trained by subordinates rather than singled out by top leaders and brought along. They are not seen to have, nor do they have, as much access to information as male managers do.

Women managers also tend to give away their power. Women are much more familiar with seeking help from others than with being self-reliant. In one power-simulation game, which begins with the handing out of four pages of directions, it is not uncommon for a woman participant to glance at the directions, set them down, turn to the person next to her, and ask, "What do they say?" Similarly, women have been socialized to make do with what they have rather than to hustle for themselves, and they fail to demand adequate resources for their programs or training for themselves and their subordinates.

In contrast, men have been taught to overemphasize power--and are rewarded for doing so. Many men say they naturally slip into one-up/one-down interactions, even when unnecessary, and that they distance themselves in many of their relationships, business and social. Men frequently use jokes and stories to regain control or enhance a point. Few women use this approach, even when it might be helpful; they tend to speak from a base of expertise or to talk more personally. In order to be andro-

gynous, and less isolated and lonely, men need to experience situations that trigger the power responses and then allow and force themselves to feel the discomfort of being less in control.

Another facet of the male manager style is the lack of reflection or matching behavior. This is no surprise since organizations tend not to reward this behavior among managers. Typically, male managers learn from concrete experimentation and direct experience (doing), somewhat less from abstract (feeling) conceptualization (thinking), and least of all from reflective observation (watching).

Research on the impact of group composition on interaction patterns demonstrates that men and women have indeed learned different sets of behavior. Competition, aggression, violence, victimization, joking, identity questions, and fear of self-disclosure have been shown to predominate in all-male groups. For example, about one-third of the statements made in all-male groups tend to be addressed to the group as a whole, thus avoiding intimacy. Men also report that they do not usually get their intimacy needs met by men. All-female groups tend to stress themes of affiliation, family, conflicts about competition and leadership, and information about various relationships.

Women tend to deny the presence of power issues in a group. They want, instead, to feel part of a team where all are equal, whether this accords with reality or not.

In mixed groups, men tend to be more tense, serious, and self-conscious. They speak less of aggression and engage less in practical joking. Both sexes refer to the self and talk about feelings more, but women generally speak less than men by a significant amount; men get two-thirds of the air time. Sexual tensions are present in mixed groups, and people tend to express values and concerns about being attracted to the opposite sex.

Other research has demonstrated that a man in a female-dominated group is likely to be a central figure and to be deferred to and respected. On the other hand, a woman in a male-dominated group probably will be isolated and treated as trivial or as a mascot. Women express themselves more fully in a team situation if several women are part of the team. A woman alone on a team is less likely to make a full contribution because she tends to be invisible, isolated, and unsupported. This suggests the benefits of placing several rather than one woman on teams, even if other teams have no women members at all.

The language of transactional analysis provides a useful communications model. TA views each person as a parent (critical and nurturing), an adult (problem-solving, rational thinker), and a child (free, natural, adaptive, rebellious, manipulative, creative).

If adult-adult or man-woman and woman-woman communications is the goal in most work interactions, then the following behaviors should be eliminated:

1. Men using women managers as mothers--telling them personal information but not treating them as real colleagues with whom they also solve problems and perform tasks. (Mother-boy pattern.)
2. Women managers not sharing their competence with each other but behaving instead in negative girl-girl or mother-girl patterns.
3. Men and women managers using sex to play out power and control issues, as in father-girl and mother-boy patterns.
4. Male managers being angry at women employees but protecting them. (Father-girl pattern.)
5. In emotional situations, the male manager deferring to the female manager if pain is expressed (woman manager comforts tearful woman secretary while the male manager steps aside). (Mother-boy pattern.)
6. Woman manager deferring to male manager on policy-making. (Father-girl pattern.)

The androgynous manager combines the adult problem-solving mode with the nurturance of the parent and the spontaneity, creativity, and playfulness of the child. The androgynous manager acting as adult is able to love, assert, express anger and fear, be caring, and solve problems.

To be more androgynous, women need to expand their repertoire of behavior for dealing with power and conflict. Men need to increase their capability for self-disclosure and for the spontaneous expressing of feelings. Our daily lives do not offer much support for seeing men and women through the transition to androgynous behavior in male-female relationships. Therefore, we all need to build better support systems to help deal with anxieties, to encourage risk taking, to help renew our energy and determination, and to encourage us to increase our opportunities for behavior that is free of sex-role stereotyping. These issues need to be talked about and explored in every aspect of organizational and family life.

We are building toward dramatically new patterns of interaction between men and men, between women and women, and between men and women. It is critical that both sexes have opportunities to develop androgynous behavior, free of sex-role constraints, if they are to work effectively within the new workforce and with human relations styles of management.