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(ABSTRACT)

This study assessed the participation of six contributors to the career histories of fourteen women managers in five federal organizations. Briefly, the contributors included: (1) the processes of gaining managerial skills and abilities through informal and formal learning activities; (2) the demonstration of management skills through job responsibilities that were imposed upon or selected by the individual and which were observed by individuals as potential for positions of greater power and influence; (3) the attainment of positions of power and influence; (4) the development of sensitivity to organizational cultural phenomena; (5) the management of personnel decisions affecting career
advancement; and (6) the development of integrity of values and behaviors over time and through experiences.

The study showed how these women managers moved upward in organizations through a limited extent through participation in training and development programs and, to a greater degree, by understanding and adapting to various organizational structural phenomena.

Through qualitative methodologies of interviews, document analysis, and participant observation, data were collected, analyzed, and written in the form of case histories. A model summarizing the six constructs contributing to career histories was developed.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction to the Research Problem

An ethnographic study of a week-long training program for women managers in a particular federal government agency raised some questions regarding the uses of training and development in careers (Rusaw, Note 1). The federal agency sponsoring the program had terminated this highly-successful and popular program abruptly. In providing reasons for this, upper management maintained that since over 40 women had completed the program, the women could now advance in their careers. No follow-up programs were planned, no support systems instituted, and no reviews of current personnel practices for recruiting, selecting, and promoting women discussed. Without support from upper management, it seemed that training objectives to enable women's career advancement would not be met. It also was problematic that the women would use the training to move ahead in their careers. That some women had advanced into higher-level management positions suggested that there were successful blends of training, personal characteristics and abilities, and agency support. But what were they? And what combinations did not work? To find out more, further research was conducted.
organizational problem. Using a single training program to solve a problem in equal employment opportunity without concurrent changes in personnel policies produces skilled individuals without guarantee of mobility. If, after training, the women remained in dead-ended jobs, if they remained unpromoted, or if their supervisors continued to believe that women should not be managers in a particular technical field, training would fail. It would be a rootless structure, out of phase with existing assumptions about women in management that underscored practices.

**Background**

To begin answering the questions raised, a review of relevant literature was conducted. This review was based upon three variables that affected women managers' careers in the case example: organization development, management development, and women's career development. As guides for obtaining information about the phenomena observed, the variables were phrased in the form of three questions: (a) What organizational phenomena influence women's careers in management? (b) What particular needs and conflicts do women managers have with regard to their careers? and (c) What are important contributors to women's orientation to management careers?

The literature review revealed ten variables that affected women managers' career mobility in a number of
organizational settings. Briefly, the variables included: (a) **lack of opportunity structures in organizations.** Women were often trapped in low-ceiling, low-status, low-power jobs. The structure of such jobs provided either little motivation to advance or opportunities to gain additional responsibilities. (b) **blockage because of "power elites".** The "power elites" created norms that influenced how people in the organization were selected, promoted, and trained for jobs. (c) **avoidance of risk taking.** Women managers preferred not to take on controversial issues or to try novel approaches to work problems, for instance. (d) **low degrees of career satisfaction and commitment.** Women managers expressed career frustration that often resulted in short organizational tenures. (e) **low expectations for success.** Women who felt trapped in their careers experienced few rewards. Moreover, they expected to fail and, in many cases, said that male managers had encouraged them to do so. (f) **discriminatory personnel practices.** In spite of affirmative action and equal employment opportunity laws, women managers were not considered for jobs or assignments on a par with other qualified candidates. (g) **low degrees of self-confidence and poor group effectiveness skills.** Dissatisfaction with jobs, repeated failures, and few means for developing supportive systems affected actual
job performance. (h) attributional bias. The ascription of poor group performance to the gender of the leader is an example of attributional bias. (i) conflicting messages in personal and professional socialization processes. Women managers confronted a paradox: on the one hand, they were expected to perform tasks flawlessly. On the other, doing so threatened alienation from male peers. and (j) lack of supervisory support for career development in government. Supervisors restricted or denied training attendance, for instance, in particular federal government agencies.

**Statement of the Problem**

The ten variables created a picture of difficult situations that work against women managers' career advancement. In relation to the questions raised by the ethnographic study earlier, the issue of training and development in providing women tools for surmounting the difficulties seemed formidable. To accomplish career growth, training and development, it appeared, needed ties to other contributors to change within an organizational structure.

The issue of training and development in relation to organization change was taken up by both Nadler (1970) and Knowles (1978). Nadler conceptualized training and development as a means to enhance present or future job
performance. Improved performance, Nadler believed, would promote more effective work environments and would ultimately produce positive changes in the ways organizations functioned.

Knowles however, contended that training and development alone cannot be expected to change collective organizational behavior. His belief is based on three premises: (a) the skills acquired in the classroom do not always match conditions faced in the office; hence, transfer of skills applications is impeded. (b) the numbers of individuals trained to accomplish desired organizational changes is often quite insufficient or ill-supported; and (c) practices that contradicted purported organizational values often fail to reinforce training, even when such skills are based on what the organization wishes to promote. Knowles added, however, that when training and development is used in conjunction with a diagnosis of organization conditions contributing to perceptions of problems, it can affect organization change.

If one accepts Knowles' argument that training as part of an organization intervention process, the effectiveness of training and development rests on the strength of other systems working towards change. In the case referenced at the beginning of the chapter, the
particular kinds of systems in which the training program operated were unknown. Further, a review of the literature did not illumine the role of training and development in women managers' careers in federal government agencies. To find out the kinds of relationships training and development had to the careers of women managers in particular organizations, the present study was undertaken. It advanced the question for study, "What has been the role of training and development in the career histories of federal women managers in selected federal organizations?"

Significance of the Study

This present study undertook a description of the contributors to career mobility in response to the question, "What has been the role of training and development in the career histories of federal women managers?"

The study was important because it showed the patterns of formal and informal learning processes in skill acquisition and the demonstration of abilities to attaining positions of power and influence and becoming a credible leader.

Foremost in this was the discovery of six components comprising the career advancement process. This discovery
was described in a model showing the linkages of learning to mobility.

The connections of learning activities to career promotions revealed descriptions of deeply-held assumptions regarding women managers, training, and mobility in particular organizational environments. A major assumption, for instance, was that "hands-on," demonstrated performance was a hallmark of a "professional." Such performance often resulted from years of experience in a technical function of an organization. Formal learning to acquire competencies to perform in a technical specialty, by contrast, were less valued. Further, credentialed women managers without a technical background were not as esteemed as those managers who "had come up through the ranks."

The values conveyed by assumptions, such as in the above example, often underscored personnel management decisions. For instance, in selecting managers for promotion, some organizations placed a great deal of weight on experience versus training or abilities to manage functions other than a technical specialty.

The study also described the processes by which respondents learned rules and roles as managers. Cues from male-dominant power structures, from politically-appointed managers, and from various external interest
groups, for instance, played critical parts in the women's social learning process.

In sum, the study identified the systems, both formal and unarticulated, which influenced career learning and advancement. The study contains implications for further research as well as suggests models which human resource development professionals might use in regard to the findings.

Definitions

Several terms are central to understanding concepts contained in the study:

1. **Training and Development**: formal and informal programs or learning experiences that occur within a workplace setting and which are purposefully used by individuals to enhance job-related performance.

   Using Nadler's definitions, training is "...those activities designed to improve performance on the job the employee is presently doing or is being hired to do...[development] is...those HRD activities which are designed to improve the overall competence of the employee in a specified direction and beyond the job now held. (Nadler, 1970, 40-41)

2. **HRD (Human Resource Development)**: includes services, programs, and activities which utilized adult learning concepts and processes in order to improve job
knowledge, skills and abilities, facilitate socialization to role requirements within organization contexts, and promote meeting organization mission objectives.

Human Resource Development, as defined by Knowles, encompasses training and development and also includes concepts and theories for developing dynamic human subsystems in organizations. (Knowles, 1978, 128-129.)

3. **Learning**: a change of behavior resulting from a change process based upon perceptions of a need, problem, crisis, possibility, or puzzle.

4. **Learning activities**: individual learning responses to situations which are non-random and which are undertaken to obtain relief or for enhancement.

5. **Competence acquisition**: the gaining of knowledge, skills, and abilities through an informal or a formal learning medium.

6. **Informal learning activities**: learning activities which may occur in or outside the workplace in unstructured settings. They are guided by the individual and possibly others, whom the individual selects. Kinds of informal learning activities include use of: (a) observations, (b) interviews, (c) work assignments, (d) networks of individuals who share information on a topic or issue, (e) professional society activities, and (f) resource persons.
7. **Formal learning activities**: structured learning segments in which learning processes and outcomes are facilitated primarily by an individual or individuals having some knowledge of what is being learned. Some examples include: (a) agency training programs, (b) Office of Personnel Management training programs, (c) external training, or programs developed by a vendor or college or university with or without a contract with a government agency, and (d) institution-based, such as long-term residential training programs conducted by an institute of higher learning through contract with government agencies for senior-level managers.

8. **Responsibility demonstration opportunities**: skills, abilities, and knowledge that are gained as a result of formal and informal learning activities and which are exhibited through self-initiated accrued responsibilities and imposed accrued responsibilities.

9. **Self-initiated accrued responsibilities**: job responsibilities that result from individual planning, development, and execution and result in career advancement.

10. **Imposed accrued responsibilities**: job responsibilities that are given or thrust upon an individual and to which an individual must respond. Imposed accrual responsibilities, added to an individual's
responsibilities contained in a position description, represent opportunities for career learning.

11. **Referral opportunities**: opportunities for taking on new positions, often at a higher grade level, based on recommendations of external observers. Referrals are made on the basis of demonstrated competencies or of the potential for competence development.

12. **Visibility**: the acquisition of power and influence in an organization.

13. **Credibility**: being perceived by others competent at tasks and having values consistent with actions.

14. **Careers**: continuous employment in a single, definable occupational field or in a closely-related field and extending from five to over 15 years in length.

15. **Jobs**: non-continuous employment, not lasting more than three to five years, in one or more occupational fields.

16. **Managers and Senior Executive Service (SES)**: individuals in federal government organizations who have primary administrative control of assigned programs. In this study, managers and SES members were accountable for program oversight, a portion of their duties may also have included supervising subordinate employees. They are distinguished from supervisors, whose duties are concerned
with evaluating employee performance in meeting technical requirements of assigned programs.

Managers, as defined by the Office of Personnel Management in the Federal Personnel Manual, Chapter 312, Subchapter 9, September 27, 1985, are incumbents who (1) direct the work of an organization, (2) are held accountable for the success of specific line or staff programs, (3) monitor the progress of an organization toward goals and (4) evaluate attainment of goals and re-direct strategies for reaching goals, as necessary.

Senior Executive Service members include government managers classified above GS-15 and below Executive Level III who are not Presidential appointees and Foreign Service Officers of equivalent rank (the former positions of GS-16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule, and Titles IV and V of the Executive Schedule) provided such managers supervise employees or are responsible for the success of programs.

Assumptions

Institutions of religion, education, culture, family, and business have certain values, beliefs, and expectations of human behavior. These are communicated verbally and non-verbally through many different channels. There are, moreover, definable gaps between the values,
beliefs, and expectations for behavior espoused and practiced.

Career development histories are unique to the individual and cannot be separated from the overall development of the human.

Training and development are parts of an organization's culture and transmit that culture's values to participants in programs and activities. Training and development are vehicles for the process of socializing individuals to an organization's system of beliefs and values.

Women managers, as employees, have encountered discriminatory policies and practices in organizational recruitment, selection, promotion, compensation, and training and development.

Delimitations

Women managers in the federal government were chosen for study for several reasons. Many studies conducted on career development of managers have concentrated on male manager development. Some studies, however, have compared or contrasted career development aspects with both male and female subjects. Few studies, however, have utilized female subjects exclusively, and none have examined the linkages between individual and organizational socialization over an entire career history span. The
dearth of studies presented an opportunity to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the particular aspects of women's career development.

The federal government was chosen rather than the private sector for three reasons. First, there was an appalling lack of career development research in the public sector. Few training and development organizations provided any career counseling or guidance before managers enrolled in programs or courses. Secondly, most of the studies of management career development were carried out in private sector settings. Public and private sector organizations share several common features, but differences do exist. For instance, some federal organizations have a unique mission to regulate a certain type of business. Managers in that public organization normally have specialty backgrounds, such that some occupational series in are "agency unique;" they are not found in any other organization. Studying career development in the federal sector represented a new territory for research. Thirdly, the public sector was selected because it was more familiar to the researcher, who has over 10 years' experience training managers and executives in several federal government organizations.
Limitations

From the data collected and analyzed, six central concepts emerged that contributed both to learning and to career advancement in organizations. These concepts were linked together to form a model of how women managers used training and development in career development. The concepts in the model may generalize to other populations of managers in hierarchical organizations. It may not be applicable to managers in organizations having other structural arrangements, such as matrix.

Moreover, the model may not be generalizable to some managers who have had traditional career histories, similar to those identified in Miller (1986). An example of a traditional career history, as Miller described it, might include a white male who enters a professional career directly from a college or university, is identified as having potential for management early in his career, is provided a specific "track" of formal training and informal learning experiences, has an assigned mentor, and receives several promotions by a particular career advancement schedule. A traditional career history contrasts with histories of other managers which Miller also depicts. A minority male or a white male or female who are highly-educated, but who have not attained positions of power in their organizations, for instance,
had difficulty in being recognized or in being promoted. These non-traditional career histories are similar to those found among the women managers in the present study.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Relevant Literature

Introduction

The primary variables of the research question include women managers, career development, and training and development within the federal government. To develop a theoretical framework for understanding the scope of these variables, a review of relevant research was undertaken. The variables were framed in three questions, which were used as guides for the literature review:

1. What organizational phenomena influence women's careers in management?
2. What particular needs and conflicts do women managers have regarding their careers?
3. What are important contributors to women's orientation to management careers?

"Organizational phenomena" in question one refers to both hierarchical structural arrangements within organizations as well as to structures within corporate cultures. The latter includes what Deetz and Kersten refer to as deep and surface structures (Deetz and Kersten, 1983, pp. 157-58). Surface structures, which include personnel policies and training and development programs, are standard ways of accomplishing goals and
objectives, intentions, and assumed knowledge of how one "gets by" in an organization. Deep structures are taken-for-granted assumptions on which surface structures rest. The phenomena included in the literature review were hierarchical structures in relation to women's career development in organizations per se and particular policies related to women managers in the federal government.

"Needs and conflicts," question two, included those which pertained to women in the performance of their roles as managers.

"Contributors to orientation to management careers" in the third question includes organizational socialization processes and factors contributing to the development of beliefs, attitudes, and values about women working.

The following sections discuss literature studies with regard to the three questions.

**Organizational Phenomena**

Personnel and training policies are linking mechanisms between formal structures on organizational charts and informal processes and systems. Policies affecting women in management reflect both the position requirements as well as how women managers interpret their roles vis-a-vis formal structures. Literature reviews
revealed much concerning roles women fill as well as interpretations of the meanings of their roles. The meanings are contingent on particular organizations in which the women are employed.

**Historical Background: Women's Career Development**

Women's career development is a recent occurrence. Only within the last quarter century has the topic been the subject of research (Gutek and Larwood, 1987). In the past, few women pursued organizational careers. If women did work outside the home, it was usually to supplement a spouse's or a family member's income. "Climbing the corporate ladder" was not a choice women usually made.

For their part, organizations did not hire many women for leadership positions. Many hired women for entry-level and clerical jobs, believing women would neither stay long nor want to move upward. Hence, organizations offered few incentives as well as few rewards for women's upward mobility.

As surface structures reflecting taken-for-granted assumptions within organizations (Deetz and Kersten, 1983), policies run the risk of becoming fixed and out of phase with new conditions. Policies and interpretations of them in practice have not changed in response to contemporary demographics of working women. For instance, the Department of Labor reports that 62% of the growth in
employment between 1975 and 1984 were women, many of whom were moving into such non-traditional work areas as management, law, engineering, and social work, and who had several children for whom to care at home (Department of Labor Facts on Working Women, 1985). Many of the women worked of necessity, but a significant number also worked for self-fulfillment and professional growth (Brown, 1981).

Examples and Effects of Restricted Personnel Policies and Practices

Organizations typically reward men for displaying behaviors assumed to be characteristic of effective leaders. Women displaying identical behaviors are ignored, rebuked, discouraged. Wiley and Eskilson (1982) surveyed 95 managers in a banking organization and found that influential males were perceived as significantly more powerful, higher in corporate positions, and warmer than identically-described females. Moreover, in Rice et al's (1984) study of male and female squad leaders at West Point, male and female leaders were described equally successful on leadership process and outcome, but female leaders received lower group satisfaction scores. Similarly, female managers in Powell et al's (1977) study were described differently than those of low-performing
groups even though the behavioral styles of both women leaders were identical.

Biased information in personnel policies and practices become norms for lowering women's expectations for success, levels of achievement, and hopes for promotions. Garland and Price (1977) concluded that information about women's success or failure as leaders was insufficient in overcoming extant attitudes about women in general. Terborg (1977), citing cumulative discrimination in a comprehensive review of studies of women in management, remarked that women were rated less desirable for management positions, were extended fewer job offers, and received lower salaries than were men who performed the same work. Krauss (1977, pp. 1703-1706), in a similar review of gender roles studies, concludes that women come to expect appropriateness of lower pay, menial work, and eschewing leadership roles.

Several research studies have described specific effects of discriminate policies and practices on work motivations of women in management:

1. Reduced opportunities for demonstrating abilities in novel or complex situations (Kanter, 1977);
2. Contributed to social isolation (V. Schein, 1975; Bayes and Newton, 1978; Buono and Kamm, 1973;
Bartol, 1975; Deux, 1978; Ezell and Odewahn, 1982; Hennig and Jardim, 1977; and Smith, 1975);

3. **Created a sense of powerlessness** (Bayes and Newton, 1978; Berlew and Hall, 1976; Buono and Kamm, 1973; Chausmir and Parker, 1984; Dye and Strickland, 1982; Ezell et al, 1982; Fitzgerald and Crites, 1980; Morrison et al, 1986; and Kanter, 1977);

4. **Reduced group/task influence** (Roussell, 1974; Bartol, 1975; Deux, 1978; Powell and Butterfield, 1984; Sims, 1975; Wolman and Frank, 1975; and Yerby, 1975);


6. **Lowered expectations for success** (Berlew and Hall, 1976; Chausmir and Parker, 1984; Garland and Price, 1977; Kanter, 1977; Krauss, 1974; Morrison et al, 1984; Petty and Miles, 1976; Powell and Butterfield, 1980; Rice et al, 1984; Rosen and Jerdee, 1974; Smith, 1975; and Wiley and Eskilson, 1982).

In brief, organizations have perpetuated outmoded and erroneous assumptions about women's leadership motivations and abilities. Reified as norms, the assumptions have continued to prevent hiring and promoting women into management.
If personnel policies and practices derive meanings in given organizational contexts, what are descriptions of contexts in which federal policies and practices for career mobility are contained?

Statistical Employment Data

The federal government is complex, diverse, and kaleidoscopic. Employing over three million people in 443 white-collar and 476 blue-collar jobs, the federal government continues to expand operations nationwide and worldwide. Both permanent and temporary, and with divergent missions, structures, and sizes, government organizations include administrations, departments, authorities, boards, commissions, committees, conferences, corporations, councils, foundations, institutions, offices, services, systems, and tribunals. The previous Presidential administration had sought to reduce both the size and the regulatory complexity of the federal government; but, ironically, the size of the workforce as well as the numbers of structures have increased. Between 1983 and 1985, for instance, ten new agencies were added, but only three were terminated (Office of Personnel Management, 1985, p. 190).

In several ways, trends for women managers are similar to those of women managers in the private sector. Both the numbers of women employed and the pay rates for
them have increased. Women's participation in white-collar jobs, which comprise managerial positions, increased from 46.2% to 47.4% in 1985, and average salaries for the same period rose 9.7% for women. Federal women, like women in non-government organizations, continue to cluster in clerical positions; and, even when they are employed in professions, the women experience salary lags compared to men. Women hold 85.61% of all clerical jobs, but men have two-thirds of all professional positions. Only 33% of all managers in government are women, and their average salaries are $23,427, compared to $36,214 for men in that category (Office of Personnel Management, 1985, pp. 8-11).

The statistical data indicate that women in government are lower-graded, lower-paying jobs than are men. Because of this, it takes women a longer time to enter management and to reach the top. Dye and Strickland (1982) found that 58.8% of women managers in the federal government began their careers as secretaries—a finding similar to that of Ezell and Odewahn (1980) and to Lynn and Vaden (1979).

Women who are corporately upward bound, having entered government at lower level positions, have usually been offered catch up vehicles. Affirmative action and equal employment opportunity plans, which each federal
agency must submit for approval to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, as well as separate upward mobility policies written for each agency, are examples. DiPrete and Soule (1986), in a study of the effects of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action plans on the upward mobility of women in positions GS-7 and below in one federal agency, reported a "reasonably high level" of movement upward between 1971 and 1978. The authors, however, cautioned that upward mobility in an agency is contingent upon organizational and political interests; the latter, they assert, continue to oppose upward mobility policies, holding that personnel policies should be merit-based.

The "organizational and political interests" to which DiPrete and Soule allude, not only play a part in hindering career mobility, but they also contribute to frustrations and conflicts which women managers in government experience in performing their roles. These are discussed in depth below.

Organizational phenomena influencing women's career development in the federal government are similar to those in the private sector. Agency selection, hiring, and promotion practices have continued to bring women in at low-status, low-paying, jobs and have failed to move women into managerial positions as quickly as they have for men.
Upward mobility policies have assisted some women, but the policies' potential for affecting larger groups of women has been thwarted by countervailing powers in the organizations. One would expect similar lowered expectations for career mobility and achievements, as described earlier for non-government women managers. The peculiarities of phenomena in government and the specific effects on career histories were assessed in this proposed study.

Needs and Conflicts of Women Managers

Organizational Expectation Conflicts

Organizational expectations for how women should behave are contradictory and confusing. On the one hand, organizations define proper behavior of women managers according to Western cultural norms: "passive, intuitive, emotional, and dependent (White et al, 1981, pp. 547-569)." On the other hand, organizations reward women who exhibit opposite behaviors, which are characteristic of men, and denounce feminine-ideal behaviors. In a study of male and female bank executives, for example, subjects in conflict with subordinates were rated as more or less promotable in their organizations. Women executives displaying emotional behavior were seen as less promotable, although raters said they expected women to behave that way. Women showing calm reactions, however,
were rated equally promotable with men (Mai-Dalton et al., 1979, pp. 221-226). Other research studies have described similar outcomes (Rice et al., 1984; Wiley and Eskilson, 1982; Trempe et al., 1985; Powell and Butterfield, 1980; and Garland and Price, 1977).

Although adopting characteristic male behaviors may bring favorable ratings from superiors, it also alienates women from male managers, peers, and subordinates (Wolman and Frank, 1975). In response, male managers often react hostilely. Smith (1975, pp. 58-61) found women contended with men who "waited for the slip," who watched for signs of failure and even encouraged its occurrence. Smith concluded the women surveyed had to perform outstandingly and to be credible, but doing so threatened men and reduced believability.

Trying to meet conflicting expectations sets women up for failure (Riger and Galligan, 1980, pp. 902-910). Women who do balance conflicting roles follow a narrowly-prescribed band of behaviors: (a) taking risks, but being consistently outstanding; (b) being tough, but not "macho;" (c) being ambitious, but not expecting equal treatment; and (d) taking responsibility while also taking the advice of others (Morrison et al., 1987, p. 57). "Successful" women, by these descriptions, structurally re-define their roles to break from both male and female
stereotypical behaviors (Gordon and Hall, 1974, pp. 241-243).

Under conflicting role expectations, women managers often show patterns of defensive behaviors in groups: use of authoritarian power, close supervision, frequent criticism, and restricting subordinate growth. These behaviors often result in lowered morale and loss of group support and liking (Kanter, 1977, p. 201). Many women managers spin in a downward spiral of defeat: unrewarded for displaying characteristic "feminine" behaviors, to which they have been socialized, and chastised for being too masculine, many women managers destroy their chances for success with groups and individuals with whom they interact.

Conflicts and Needs Reported by Women Managers in Government

Perceptions of organizational environments, to a large extent, determine how one defines context. The definitions form the basis, in turn, for thought and behavior. Examining contextual perceptions of federal women managers provides a foundation for understanding conflicts and needs the women experience in their careers.

One study of women managers in a state government agency concluded that women managers have different perceptions about their role requirements than do men.
Specifically, the women were more career-goal oriented than were the men, but they were less oriented toward hierarchical norms of responsibility. Whereas men preferred making decisions unilaterally, women favored using public input in administrative decision making (Neuse, 1978). In another study, women managers in a public social service organization saw selection for top jobs open only to men. Women said they did not believe they would be selected for these highest-level jobs because they lacked the stability, creativity, and judgement they believed these jobs required; women also said they lacked "schooling" in organizational politics (Ezell and Odewahn, 1980).

Women in government organizations perceive certain political structures not only differently from men but also as barriers limiting career growth. Two studies of women managers in the federal government describe power coalitions as particularly restrictive. Lynn and Vaden's (1979, pp. 209-215) study of women Senior Executive Service members found that women had a strong need to have high impact and influence in administrative processes and outcomes. Although one might expect women to gain power as they gained more experience in understanding organization politics, in fact, the authors found the opposite; the more experience women had, the more they
expressed frustration with their lack of administrative power and responsibility. Moreover, in a study comparing interpersonal need orientation, leadership style, and perceptions of organizational structure among women in both business and the federal government, women in government expressed frustrations similar to those in the Lynn and Vaden study. In particular, the women expressed higher formalistic power and structured leadership styles than did the private sector women. The government managers also perceived their organizations as less collaborative, less coordinative, and more bureaucratic than the organizations of the business women (DiMarco and Whitsett, 1975).

Government Versus Non-Government Bureaucracies: Structural Differences?

Are government structures, seen as limiting growth, different in fact from those in the private sector? Morrison et al (1987), discussing their predictions of the improbability of women moving into the highest echelons of their businesses, note that breaking through this second barrier is more difficult than entering lower-level management positions. Both the women in this study and in the Lynn and Vaden (1977) study expressed similar inabilitys to move beyond a certain point in their hierarchies. The subjects in both studies were in
pyramid-shaped structures, but particular variables affecting the perceptions in such arrangements were not discussed. Madison (1980) suggests that structural arrangements influence potential power and influence depending upon: (a) the uncertainty of the environment; (b) the importance of the activity in relation to a larger system; and (c) the salience of an actor. The examination of these variables in the study shed some light on perceptions of structures as they affect career growth in public sector organizations. The respondent views can be used as a basis for comparative studies with private sector companies.

Needs for Training

A report prepared for a project for the Center for the American Woman and Politics (1980) examined needs of federal women in light of organizational structures, upward mobility, policies, and training. An important finding in relation to the latter was that training programs frequently did not attract as many women as they did men. One reason the women interviewed gave was that women are not given equal time to attend training, as are men. In addition, the women reported being denied opportunities to attend conferences, to participate in workshops, or to join professional organizations (pp. 88-91). This finding is nearly identical to that found in
the ethnographic evaluation of the women in management seminar referenced in Chapter 1 (Rusaw, Note 2). In the latter, respondents said that their supervisors frequently did not make training available to them, and, if they did participate, it was as a guest.

Summary

Perceptions contribute to the development of definitions of and reactions to conflict situations. Several research studies suggest women managers perceive organization power configurations as blocking career growth and impairing effectiveness. Moreover, conflicting messages about the role behaviors of women managers contribute to definitions of ineptitude—conceptions which women bear out in pernicious cycles of defeat in interpersonal relationships. Women who have broken through the downward spiral of defeat have re-defined their roles; neither behaving stereotypically feminine or masculine, but somewhere in a narrow band of acceptable behaviors to themselves and to those with whom they relate, women have succeeded.

Training and development, as a means of enabling role re-definition, can be used as an intervention in organizations to help women break the loops of recursive failure. The usefulness of training and development in this instance, particularly that in this study relating to
federal bureaucracies, depended to a great extent upon supportive management practices in light of organizational policies.

**Organization Socialization**

**Definition**

Organizational socialization may be defined as the process by which members learn social behaviors required to perform roles in organizations. Socialization processes are analogous to acculturation processes which specify boundaries of roles and prescribe permissible degrees of freedom. The socialization processes reflect deep structural assumptions within an organization's cultural context through manifestations at surface levels. As surface structures, personnel and training and development processes play vital parts in the socialization of organizational members.

Several studies were consulted for a description of organizational socialization (Feldman, 1976 and 1977; Louis, 1980; Miller and Wager, 1971; Schein, 1984; Sukel, 1983; Terborg et al, 1982; Van Maanan, 1976; and Wanous, 1976). The most comprehensive and definitive, however, was that in Van Maanen and Schein (1979, pp. 209-264). Their conceptualization, which is also found in part in other researchers, delineates four stages:
1. **Anticipatory.** This includes broad, societal perceptions of specific behavioral guidelines for a job and is characterized by high idealism and high expectation levels.

2. **Entry.** In this stage, high initial expectations give way to shock and disillusionment. The organization prescribes acceptable behaviors.

3. **Resolution.** The third year following entry, major conflicts are resolved and individuals integrate internal and external role requirements.

4. **Expansion.** Beginning with the fifth year of tenure on, individuals experience a need to achieve and to expand their role requirements. High levels of satisfaction are accompanied by mutual influence with other members.

**Six Dimensions of Organizational Socialization**

Van Maanen and Schein offer a comprehensive schema for identifying and describing organizational socialization processes. Briefly, they posit six dimensions of processes. These dimensions are summarized below. Following that, a tentative prediction of the kinds of responses government structures might be expected to produce is put forth. Lastly, variables from literature reviews of individual characteristics associated with women's career success is described.
Van Maanen and Schein classify organizational socialization processes on six continuua:

1. **Collective versus individual.** Individuals new to an organization facing similar boundary passage experience are socialized collectively. Individual socialization occurs singly and in isolation from other newcomers.

2. **Formal versus informal.** In formal socialization, newcomers are separated from other members and are given sets of learning experiences tailored explicitly for them. Informal learning processes, on the other hand, are based largely on trial and error.

3. **Sequential versus random.** Discrete and identifiable steps leading to a target role constitute sequential socialization. Random socialization, which includes most management training programs, occurs when the steps are unknown, ambiguous, and constantly changing.

4. **Fixed versus variable.** Fixed processes have definable timetables, but variable ones do not.

5. **Serial versus disjunctive.** Serial processes, which often use role models as guides, involve grooming less-experienced persons for particular positions. Disjunctive processes do not use such social learning models.
6. **Investiture versus divesture.** Investiture accepts the newcomer, builds upon qualities already present, and enhances self-image. Divestiture denies or strips away personal characteristics to build a different set of beliefs and values.

**Training and Development as Socialization Processes in Federal Government**

Based on the dimensions described, most management training for women could be classified as individual, informal, random, variable, disjunctive, and investiture. By these classifications, women managers would be expected to be role innovators: to re-define ends to which a role functions (Van Maanen and Schein, 1979, p. 229). In the present study, a great deal of self-responsibility was exhibited in the respondents' career history. Roles and responsibilities were re-defined and given greater latitude as women moved upwards in the organizations. In doing so, however, respondents described career blockages because of certain organizational practices. For instance, many women pointed out that their lack of technical qualifications prevented them from being considered for promotions even though women demonstrated competencies in managing several functions, including technical operations, in their organizations.
Van Maanen and Schein suggest several conditions which may mitigate socialization development processes; the processes and outcomes they describe are not formulae. Information carried into a new organization, for instance, affects how, or if at all, socialization will work. Moreover, individual temperaments and characteristics, including a willingness to accept norms that may or may not be similar to one's own, also produce variations in socialization results.

**Variables in Women Manager's Socialization Processes**

The present study did not explore the variables from earlier socialization processes and personal traits which literature suggests are associated with successful career development in women managers. These variables may be taken up in future studies. For instance, motivation variables which were observed in Chapters IV and V of the study, were inferred as contributors to certain respondents' desire to move out of dead end jobs.

Future studies of these contributors might consider the following from relevant literature studies:

1. Successful women managers were often first born or only children. They did not have older brothers (Brown, 1981, p. 66 and Hall, 1975, p. 486).

2. The women came from lower and middle classes and had fathers in management and mothers working in non-
traditional jobs during the child's early life (Brown, 1981, pp. 66-67.) In addition, the women had a close identification with their fathers (Brown, 1981, pp. 66-67) and with his level of education and aspirations (Berlin, 1976, pp. 99-104). Parents of the women were not overprotective (Krieger, 1972, pp. 414-432).

3. The women experienced a high need for achievement in school (Fitzgerald and Crites, 1980, pp. 44-62; Astin and Myint, 1971, pp. 369-393; and Harlan and Weiss, 1982, pp. 59-100). Frequently, they attended women's colleges or schools which stressed high achievement (Tidball, 1980).

4. The women delayed marriage, and when they did marry, chose supportive husbands. They also chose not to have any children or only a few (Brown, 1981, p. 66; Harlan and Weiss, 1982, p. 62; Mulvey, 1963, pp. 309-386; and Osipow, 1975, pp. 270-271).

5. The women were able to play multiple roles without experiencing debilitating stress or conflict (Nieva and Gutek, 1981, p. 158; Hall, 1972, p. 486; Myahira, 1975, p. 370; and Valdez and Gutek, 1987, pp. 157-169).
Several key observations were made in regard to the literature reviewed:

1. What organizational phenomena influence women's careers in management?

Women have not been in positions of power and influence in organizations historically. Personnel policies and practices have failed to account for increasing numbers of women who are working outside the home today, many because they seek stimulation and challenge in leadership roles. In attaining such positions, however, women often find themselves in double binds: on the one hand, characteristic "feminine" ways of coping with conflict are not rewarded. Using tactics of male managers, on the other hand, is threatening. Women often find that contradictory messages create frustration; over time, they have the effect of isolating the women socially, inducing a belief of powerlessness and ineffectiveness, lessening upward, downward, and lateral influence, making risk taking unattractive options, and lowering expectations for achievement.

Women in both public and private sector organizations continue to enter as secretaries and stay at low-status, low-paying jobs for long time periods. Moving out or up has been facilitated in recent years by affirmative action
and equal employment opportunities. But the mobility depends, to a great extent, upon support from nodes of power within organizational structures.

2. What particular needs and conflicts do women managers have regarding their careers?

Organizations' conflicting expectations for appropriate role behaviors of women managers creates a cycle of failure: lowered expectations for success and feelings of powerlessness spawn hostile and sometimes destructive behaviors in interrelationships with peers, subordinates, and with male managers. Pressures from outside the workplace, such as from home and family, frequently find little relief. Unable to delegate these added responsibilities, women experience acute role stress and role conflict which impairs personal and professional effectiveness.

Women who do overcome barriers within the workplace may find that climbing upward in a pyramid becomes more difficult and frustrating the closer one approaches the top. Power blocs at the uppermost reaches present redoubled efforts aimed at keeping women from executive positions.

3. What are important contributors to women's orientation to management careers?
Organizations convey expectations for role behaviors through a number of processes, such as personnel policies, training and development programs, and mentorships. Such processes occur both formally and informally and are aimed at structuring a framework from which an individual defines mission, job content, and role. Processes may be plotted along six different dimensions. Although they strive to create a particular lens, socialization processes are by no means standardized for each individual. Variables from previous socialization processes and individual characteristics, for instance, produce differences in adaptation of desired traits and outlooks. For women managers, some key variables include birth order, socio-economic class of family, need for achievement, timing of marriage, and numbers of children borne.

The literature review pointed up the need for research into organizational phenomena, such as policies, practices, and power structures, in the shaping of individual learning processes in specific workplace settings. The study of training and development in career advancement histories showed actual perceptions of the structures with their linkages to unstated assumptions deep within a particular organization culture. Training and development as vehicles for conveying how these
structures have been accepted and how individuals have, through choices and strategies, molded them to fit needs as they have perceived them.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter describes methods in answering the research question, "What has been the role of training and development in the career histories of women federal managers?"

Research Design

In answering the question for research, it was desired to know how training and development had been used throughout career histories. Because case study design provides depth of information, it was chosen as a strategy.

The units of analysis in this design were actual training and development events, and the purpose of the analysis was to describe their use in career development. Career development, as used here, referred to the use of skills in obtaining promotions, levels of greater responsibilities in assignments, and jobs having greater scopes of influence within organizations.

Because the literature review suggested that there were no extant theories regarding how women in the federal government had used training and development to advance their careers, building theoretical concepts was a primary aim of the study. To develop "grounded theory" in the
study, procedures for data collection and analysis in Glaser and Strauss (1967) were followed. Through these procedures, a model of career development was produced from the discovery of six variables and their relationships.

**Selection of Organizations and Cases**

As a first step in executing the case study design, organizations of varying sizes, missions, and numbers of women employed as managers was sought. The literature review suggested that organizational structure, and more specifically, the types of jobs women managers held within the structures, affected mobility. Kanter (1977), for instance, maintained that structure influenced the scope of responsibilities women managers have; managers with broad scopes of responsibilities have different career histories than do managers with narrower scopes, for instance. In addition, Kanter reported that large organizations having few women as managers limit opportunities for career advancement.

On these criteria, six federal agencies were chosen from descriptions contained in *The United States Government Manual* (1987-1988). Briefly, the agencies included (a) one large organization with a social mission and which employed a large number of women as managers; (b) two other large organizations, one with a military
mission and another with a technical/regulatory mission both employing few women managers; (c) a small to medium-sized agency with a social mission employing a large number of women as managers; (d) a small organization having a technical/scientific mission and employing few women managers; and (e) a small, non-cabinet-level agency employing a fairly high number of women as managers.

Letters to heads of the six organizations were sent describing the research and requesting permission to interview women managers nominated by agency personnel representatives. Five organizations responded favorably through one written response and four telephone calls from agency personnel representatives.

After permission was obtained for conducting research, respondent selection procedures were carried out. These included obtaining names of nominees from agency representatives, listing potential nominees from professional acquaintance, and obtaining referrals from nominees and acquaintances. Obtaining names from a variety of sources reduced potential selection bias.

After permission was obtained for conducting research in the five organizations, agency personnel representatives were called. Meetings were arranged in the agencies, and the representatives provided lists of
between 10 and 20 nominees who were of varied grades, position titles, and years of experience as managers.

Names of five individuals known through professional experiences were added to the agency representatives' lists. The individuals were in agencies selected and where permission had been granted to conduct interviews.

The first cases selected were from nominees in agencies of different sizes and missions. They were also selected from the lists of nominees and those of professional acquaintance. The nominees' names were placed on a four-cell grid segmented by large versus small agencies and technical versus social mission. Every second name in each cell was chosen to be interviewed first.

Interview Schedule

Since the researcher was interested in the histories of contributors to the overall advancement of women in organizations, a chronological pattern of responses was desired. A pattern for deriving this information was designed after the socialization stages described in Van Maanen and Schein (1979). Their research appeared to provide a comprehensive description of the growth of careers by stages: anticipatory, entry, moving upward in functional arrangements, and achieving an inclusionary position of power and influence among peers. A draft
The interview schedule was developed based on these socialization stages as well as on the ten variables affecting women managers' career advancement identified from the literature review (See Appendix A).

After the draft interview schedule was written, comments and insights were sought from individuals believed to have sufficient knowledge and experience federal government personnel management and training practices. Individuals providing comments included (a) a career female personnel director, (b) a career male personnel director, (c) a politically-appointed female deputy assistant secretary of human resources, (d) a male training director, (e) a female director of equal employment opportunity, and (f) three women managers of varying grade levels in three different federal organizations. After telephoning the individuals and obtaining statements of assistance in the research, meetings of approximately one hour were held with each person. The information and the rationale which the reviewers provided were considered and incorporated into a revised draft of the questionnaire. This questionnaire appears in Appendix B.
Data Collection and Analysis:

First Iteration

The four potential respondents were telephoned, the purposes of the research explained, and the procedures for selecting the individual outlined. Permission to interview the nominees for one to two hours in their offices or off-site, such as at a restaurant, was also asked. The nominees were provided copies of the guarantee of confidentiality and anonymity of responses, which were approved by Virginia Polytechnic Institute (Appendix B). Moreover, the nominees were asked have interviews tape recorded; copies of the transcriptions would be given to them for verification and review of accuracy of fact.

All four nominees agreed to be interviewed. Interviews of one to two hours were held during lunchtime at restaurants near the respondents' offices.

After each interview, marginal notes containing questions for further inquiry and assorted insights were made on the transcribed copies. Responses to questions were compared for each respondent. This was done by copying the interviews, cutting out responses, pasting responses on 5 x 8" note cards, and sorting cards into piles. The marginal notes pointed out similarities and differences in each response category data and were the
basis for formulating preliminary data codes. These codes appear in Appendix C.

After four interviews, some preliminary observations were made:

1. **Entry.** Individuals entered at lower grade levels directly from college in jobs which were not similar to their college major; they left these jobs a short time after entry. It was also noted that some respondents had had some career experience before entry while others had not. The observation that there were two routes into government jobs, directly from college and from another career suggested that the differences in pre-government experiences might influence patterns of development after entry.

2. **Promotion practices.** Individuals were in career ladder positions to GS-12, and they were promoted fairly quickly up to that point. This happened four to six years after entry. Blockage or plateauing occurred between GS-12 and GM-13, indicating slow movement into management positions.

3. **Training.** Individuals took very little training either before becoming managers or afterwards. Most of what they learned about their jobs was at their own initiative, such as volunteering for task forces or gaining leadership experience through service in
professional societies. Informal learning, it was observed, seemed to play a more direct role in both the acquisition of job skills and in career advancement.

4. **Supportive individuals.** Each respondent described supportive individuals, some of whom were first- or second-level supervisors. Some supportive individuals provided coaching, opportunities for participation in agencywide task forces, leads on jobs with promotion opportunities, and techniques for understanding and dealing with the personnel system of job grading, promotions, and selection.

5. **Career advancement issues.** Individuals noted issues in advancement related to personnel promotion issues. They also described expectations of male managers for role behavior.

6. **Strategies for dealing with advancement issues.** Each respondent emphasized the importance of working hard, demonstrating competence in a variety of ways to individuals in powerful organization positions, and achieving recognition as ways of meeting role expectations. Moreover, in dealing with personnel promotion practices, individuals used negotiation techniques or filed complaints. Filing complaints often brought resolution, but, in one case, the respondent said that it damaged her reputation.
Data Collection and Analysis:  

Second Iteration

Preliminary data analysis revealed some consistent patterns: (a) Slow mobility occurred after reaching a particular grade level (b) Formal learning activities were few throughout the career histories. (c) Informal learning, the most common type of activity, had many forms. (d) Supportive individuals played important roles in respondents' learning job skills, role requirements, and ways to deal with organizational politics. (e) Building a favorable reputation through being seen as a competent person was important in all the cases.

The patterns suggested questions for further inquiry. For instance, to what extent did they appear in other career histories? What were relationships between the patterns and to the entire process of developing careers? In addition, because the preceding data analysis indicated some respondents had careers before entry, prior experiences and education might have contributed to their having different career patterns than those without. Moreover, the striking contrast in the amount of formal and informal learning apparent in the histories left a void; what particular conditions might have contributed to the prevalence of informal learning?
To find out, additional interviews were conducted. From the names on the agency-provided lists and professional acquaintance, potential nominees were selected. Further, to identify potential nominees who had had previous careers and also those who had taken much training, agency representatives were called upon and requested to differentiate potential respondents on those two variables. In addition, names of professional acquaintances who met the conditions were added to the list.

To incorporate the two variables in selecting interviewees, an eight-cell grid was prepared. Names of potential interviewees were entered in the appropriate cells and every second name picked. This produced eight additional names.

In addition, information obtained from the first four interviews required some revision of the interview schedule. Therefore, questions relating to prior career experiences and to amount of training taken were added. A copy of the revised interview schedule appears in Appendix C.

Procedures used as before for obtaining individual permission to interview, protecting information, and for data verification were followed. All eight individuals agreed to interview. Two of the potential interviewees,
however, were not technically classified as "managers" under Office of Personnel regulations. Therefore, they were not interviewed. Two additional names were chosen from the list and individuals consented to be interviewed.

Interviews were conducted from one to two hours in each respondent's office. Copies of the protection of anonymity of responses as well as transcriptions of the interviews were provided respondents.

Content analysis using the initial data codes was accomplished. Categories of data were placed on 5 x 8" note cards and sorted into piles. As additional data were collected and analyzed, however, it became apparent that the data categories were changing. The specific changes in the categories are described in detail in Chapter IV. In brief, the revised categories were: (a) competence acquisition, which was later sub-divided into (b) informal learning activities and (c) formal learning activities; (d) organization cultural sensitivity; (e) referral opportunities; (f) self-initiated accrued responsibilities; (g) imposed accrued responsibilities; (h) advancement issues; (i) visibility; and (j) credibility.

To accurately describe the categories, the data codes were revised as well. A revised code list appears in Appendix E.
The processes of content analysis, coding, and pile sorting produced a great amount of data and became time consuming. After the eighth interview, a computer software program, Ethnograph, was used to conduct data collection and analysis more efficiently. Ethnograph is a set of interactive, menu-driven computer programs designed to assist qualitative researchers in mechanical aspects of data analysis. Following directions of the software program, notes from respondent interviews were re-formatted and lines numbered. On the printout, wide right margins permitted previously-developed codes to be applied to specific segments in context. Codes and nested codes were entered by lines of text for individual respondents. Data were then sorted by codes and retrieved for further analysis. Copies of the Ethnograph files appear in Appendix F.

As data were analyzed in each category, data sheets for each respondent were prepared. This permitted both a logical and a chronological understanding of events. It also permitted the observation of patterns of the occurrences of career phenomena. The data sheets were often the basis memo writing as well as for figures summarizing the patterns of recurring relationships among observed career phenomena. The memos provided an understanding based on the gestalt of the category and an
idea of how the category was related to other categories and to theoretical constructs from adult learning and management and organizational behavior. Specific memos are referenced in the discussion of particular findings in Chapter IV.

A table of respondents organized by prior and non-prior career histories was prepared as a point of reference in the data analysis and collection. The table initially had two major divisions. However, as individuals were interviewed, it was discovered that the divisions each had sub-divisions. In the prior career division, for instance, respondents had had both lengthy as well as shorter professional careers. This table is summarized below:

1. **Prior career history** (6 cases)
   a. long-term career (4 cases)
   b. short-term career (2 cases)

2. **Non-prior career history** (8 cases)
   a. short-term jobs (2 cases)
   b. no prior jobs (6 cases)

As data were collected and analyzed in these categories, moreover, it was observed that three respondents had entered federal government before passage of Civil Rights legislation in 1964. The three respondents had entered directly from college and had not
had prior jobs. On the finding of DiPrete and Soule (1986) that equal employment regulations influenced career mobility in federal government, these cases were analyzed separately from cases whose respondents had entered after 1964.

After data from the twelfth case history had been collected and analyzed, it appeared that the categories and the relationships between them had stabilized. To test this observation, two additional interviews were conducted. One nominee was selected on the basis of being in a small, social mission agency with large numbers of women managers. The respondent also had had a professional career prior to government and had taken a great deal of formal management training. The other nominee was selected as one of the few Senior Executive Service members from a large organization of a technical mission. Unlike the other nominee, she had had no career before government and had taken only a few training programs after becoming a manager.

After interviews with the two respondents were conducted, data analysis revealed that the categories did not change a great deal in meaning or in relationship with each other. It was therefore concluded that the categories had saturated. No additional interviews were conducted.
Data Collection and Analysis:

Third Iteration

After fourteen interviews had been conducted, data collection and analysis revealed that patterns identified from the first four interviews were found in subsequent case histories. Slow mobility, for instance, was observed in later interviews among respondents who were in dead-ended jobs, who had confronted issues in being selected or promoted into jobs, or who had lacked technical qualifications for top-level positions. Informal learning overshadowed formal; training, except in the area of special management training, had limited career impact. Thirdly, supportive individuals played a number of key parts in the career advancement process, such as mentor, referral agent, and counselor. Lastly, reputation-building was related both to the demonstration of competencies acquired and to attaining positions of power or influence in organizations.

Data categories and their relationships from fourteen career histories were observed across cases. It was desired, however, to understand how the data relationships observed from all the cases applied within particular histories. Understanding how data relationships had manifested themselves in unique career sequences, it was reasoned, would provide depth to the cross-case
observations. With this in mind, five issues were formulated for further research. They were formed into questions, as follows:

In respect to a particular group of women managers employed in five different government agencies:

(1) In what ways have training and development prior to entering management careers participated in advancing the careers of certain women managers?

(2) How have learning opportunities from special training and development programs been utilized in the development of the careers of certain women managers?

(3) How have selected women managers applied informal learning in their career histories?

(4) How have selected women managers employed learning strategies in reducing barriers to their career development?

(5) How have various kinds of supportive people participated in developing careers of particular women managers?

In order to understand varieties of applications of formal and informal learning, strategies for managing difficult issues, and use of supportive individuals in particular career histories, cases showing contrasting patterns were selected for in-depth analysis. Thus, respondents who had used a great deal of formal learning
versus those who had used none were chosen; individuals who had had several issues with which to contend were paired with those who encountered none; cases in which supportive people were plentiful versus those careers had few supports were selected.

Specific criteria for selecting respondents from the fourteen cases included: (a) respondents who had taken generic versus agency-designed training; (b) role-modeled learning versus self-initiated learning projects which had contributed to organizational socialization; (c) promotions which were based on "referrals" versus those that had involved difficult issues; and (d) respondents who had described supportive roles played by key people in the organization versus respondents whose careers did not exhibit a great deal of support from such individuals.

In addition, cases were chosen on the basis of prior versus non-prior career education and experience. It was assumed that respondents having prior career histories would have different "meaning schemes" (Mezirow, 1985) than for interpreting and responding to career events than would respondents not having the experiences.

Five cases that appeared to best meet the criteria were selected from the fourteen cases. Figure 1 summarizes the ranked amount of relative importance of the criteria in relation to the respondents' case histories.
## Criteria for Selecting Focused Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Training
   - a. Generic
     * 1 1 2 2 2
   - b. Specialized
     * 1 3 3 3 1

2. Informal Learning
   - a. Role-Modeled
     * 3 2 3 1 3
   - b. Self-Initiated
     * 1 3 2 3 1

3. Promotions
   - a. Referrals
     * 2 1 2 1 3
   - b. Hard Issues
     * 1 3 3 3 2

4. Individual Supports
   - a. Several
     * 3 2 3 1 3
   - b. Few
     * 1 3 2 3 1

5. Numbers of Women
   - a. Many
     * 3 3 2 1 1
   - b. Few
     * 1 2 1 3 3

6. Prior Histories
   - a. Prior Career
     * A-1  A-2
   - b. No Prior
     * B-3  B-3  B-3

**Legend:**

- 1 = Low
- 2 = Moderate
- 3 = High
- A-1 = Long Term
- A-2 = Short Term
- B-1 = No Job
- B-2 = No Job
- B-3 = No Job (Pre-Civil Rights)

**Summary of Criteria for Selecting Focused Interviews**

*FIGURE 1*
To collect the information, a structured questionnaire for each respondent was written. Questions pertaining to each of the research issues and in regard to particular career events were formulated. Copies of questionnaires appear in Appendix E.

Individual respondents were telephoned, the purposes of the focused research explained, and permission was sought for a second interview. All five respondents consented to the focused interview.

The interviews, from two to three hours each, took place in the respondents' offices. They were tape recorded and verbatim transcriptions provided for respondent review and verification.

The transcriptions were the basis for content analysis and data coding. Data were placed on 5 x 8" note cards and sorted into piles based on research issue. Summaries of issues for each case were written, subsequently, as well as a comprehensive summary of issues for the five cases. A copy of the summary of the research issues appears in Appendix P.

Summary

The simultaneous processes of data collection and analysis as described were undertaken throughout fourteen case histories. They were also used to obtain in-depth information through focused interviews of five of the
fourteen respondents. From the procedures described, a pattern of relationships between skill getting and career advancement in a particular type of organization emerged. This pattern was a precursor to a model that portrayed how individuals used training and development for career mobility. This genesis will be discussed following the summary of the pattern of relationships, which the researcher named, the "credibility connection:"

After entry, respondents said they had to "work hard" to "prove themselves." "Working hard" meant such things as working long hours, over-preparing for work assignments, being able to respond with detailed information during meetings in which technical information was discussed, and using various group process techniques to facilitate interpersonal communications between male and female employees as a team.

Respondents gained recognition from their superiors and, in some cases, higher-level managers within their organizations. The respondents noted that establishing a reputation for thoroughness, attention to detail, and "going the second mile" was critical to being regarded as competent and esteemed.

Some respondents complemented the "hard work" on the job with self-initiated learning activities. These included formal training in particular specialty and
management development programs or involvement in professional society activities. Learning informally off the job provided some respondents with leadership skills they could not obtain in the regular course of their job responsibilities. The activities, as well as developmental assignments and task forces within the organization, were instrumental in enabling respondents to obtain both qualifying experiences for promotions as well as obtain "connections" to individuals of power or influence in the organization.

Respondents continued "working hard" as they moved to positions of higher visibility. Attaining visibility, however, appeared to increase tension for them, and issues of security and belongingness appeared noticeably in the descriptions of late-career events. Damage to "credibility," an integration of actions with espoused beliefs, could be irreparable at that level, respondents maintained, by a single mistake.

"Credibility," as respondents described it, took a very long time to build. Yet, its cultivation over the course of a career could be used as leverage in gaining acceptance. One respondent, who had been a tenured professor before entering government, addressed this when she noted that she did not have to "prove" her capability to the male managers in her organization; her credibility
based on expertise developed outside and inside the agency was sufficient.

**Description and Use of the Model:**

**Contributions to the Career Advancement of Federal Women Managers**

The model appearing on Figure 2 on the following page was produced as a means of describing the observed linkages between categories of data that had appeared to stabilize after the twelfth case history. The model evolved from the bottom up through successive rounds of data collection and analysis. In general, the first link in the evolutionary chain was the collecting, coding, and sorting of information into a particular category. Definitions based on characteristics of data in each category were then established. Thirdly, based on category properties contained in the definitions, relationships between categories were observed and recorded. The arrangements proceeded from a level of abstraction which ranged from observation to inference. Thus, the topmost category, "credibility" is an extremely abstract category based upon the observations of kinds of formal and informal learning activities taken at various stages of career histories. Specific events in the evolution are discussed with reference to the development of each category in Chapter IV.
CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE CAREER ADVANCEMENT OF FEDERAL WOMEN MANAGERS

FIGURE 2
The model on the preceding page can also be used as a reference for locating information discussed in Chapter IV as well as for showing the relationships of a particular category to another. As a guide, the model contains a system of numbers and letters for each category. Numbers in parentheses refer one of the six major categories. As noted, the categories in the model are numbered according to level of abstractness: "competence acquisition" precedes "responsibility demonstration opportunities," for instance. Under each major category are sub-categories, which are referenced by number and letter (for instance, 1-a.) Lastly, sub-sets of sub-categories are described by decimal numbers (1-a.1.) If sub-sets are described further, the decimal numbers are followed by letter (1-a.1-a). In the latter instance, "mentor" is a type of "resource person." "Resource person," in turn, is a sub-set of "informal learning activity," which is a sub-category of "competence acquisition."
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

This chapter presents findings from analysis of data in answering the research question, "How has training and development been used in the career histories of women managers in selected federal organizations?"

In discussing findings, the chapter describes specific data analysis procedures used for development of each category of data and poses summary conclusions based on the data analysis. The data categories are presented with respect to the model, Figure 2, which was described in Chapter Three. The purpose of the model is to organize the findings with respect to the relationships among the categories of events and experiences.

The model contains six major topics, which are discussed by number (major category), by letter (subcategory), and by decimal number (sub-set of sub-category.) The topics are:

1. competence acquisition (1)
   a. informal learning activities (1-a)
   b. formal learning activities (1-b)
2. responsibility development opportunities (2)
b. self-initiated accrued responsibilities (2-b)
c. referral opportunities (2-c)

3. visibility (3)
4. organizational culture sensitivity (4)
5. advancement issues (5)
6. credibility (6)

In this chapter, the categories are discussed in depth. The discussion includes a definition of the category, a discussion of how it was formulated, and some illustrative examples. The examples are referenced by numbers in parentheses, which are line numbers of the ethnograph interviews in Appendix F. Following discussion of the six major categories is a summary of observations. Particular analytic techniques used for each of the six major categories, summary findings, and relationships of the categories to each other are discussed in the following sections. As discussion ensues, the model may be used as a guide to understanding relationships.

**Competence Acquisition (1)**

In analyzing learning activity data, it was clear that a key outcome of learning was the acquisition of skills, knowledge, and abilities. This outcome was labeled competence acquisition. Learning took place through two major kinds of activities: informal (1-a) and
formal (1-b). Informal learning activities were learning activities which may occur in or outside the workplace in settings that are not structured for organized learning processes. Formal learning activities were defined as organized learning segments in which learning processes and outcomes are facilitated primarily by an individual or individuals having some knowledge of what is being learned.

Information in the transcribed interviews coded "competence acquisition" was coded either "informal" or "formal learning" activity. The data were coded in context and were placed on 5 x 8" note cards. After they had been sorted into piles labeled "informal" or "formal," particular kinds of learning activities for each sub-category were identified and labeled.

**Informal Learning (1-a)**

After data for "informal learning activities" been sorted into piles, it was observed that there were eight distinct types: (a) resource persons (1-a.1), which included: (1) mentors (1-a.1-a), (2) role models (1-a.1-b), (3) technical experts (1-a.1-c), (4) support personnel (1-a.1-d), (5) family and friends (1-a.1-e), and (6) protectors and allies (1-a.1-f), (b) work assignments (1-a.2), (c) professional societies (1-a.3), (d) networks
(1-a.4), (e) developmental assignments (1-a.5), (f) task forces (1-a.6), (g) observations (1-a.7), and (h) interviews (1-a.8).

Resource persons (1-a.1) was the largest sub-category of informal learning activities and was subdivided into six types of individuals. The six kinds of resource persons were identified by definitions which respondents provided in their accounts. The resource persons included:

MENTORS (1-a.1) AND ROLE MODELS (1-a.1-b)

The two sub-sets, mentors and role models, had similar patterns of relationships. That is, both mentors and role models provided information, keys to acceptable organization behavior, and opportunities to develop respondent careers. For those reasons, they were combined.

Mentors included individuals who provided insights into cultural or political structures in enabling the individual to learn roles and responsibilities. Moreover, mentors provided instruction or coaching in specific situations to individuals. Mentors who were also supervisors provided assignments with professional growth opportunities and furnished support of individuals in obtaining promotions or positions of greater influence in organizations.
Role models were similar to mentors in their providing information to respondents, but they differed in that respondents adopted the role models' points of view, mannerisms, styles of leadership, and values.

As data were being analyzed, it was notable that mentors' and role models' insights penetrated layers of unstated assumptions in organization environments. One mentor, for instance, could be called a cultural polyglot, translating communications codes of several different organizational societies: males and females in certain ethnic religious and occupational groups. The respondent, Ms. Henry, used the insights in several interpersonal situations with males in particular (second interview, 632-716). Ms. Benet also described a situation in which her mentor gave her insights into how male managers in the organization resolved conflicts (second interview, 323-339). Ms. Garret, in addition, pointed out how a role model had given her information on how diverse public interest group norms are integrated into organizational objectives (first interview, 166-180). In brief, mentors and role models appeared to be the most articulate means by which respondents understood cultural and political structures and their intricate linkages. The explication of this knowledge, in large part from interactions with
resource persons, was recorded in the category, organization cultural sensitivity.

To understand more fully the characteristics of mentors and role models, a summary from respondent descriptions was made. Briefly, mentors and role models exhibited the following:

1. were in a position of power (Ms. Benet, first interview, 40-42; Ms. Pierce, second interview, 349-350; Ms. Henry, first interview, 208-219);

2. were highly educated (Ms. Benet, second interview, 216-223; Ms. Lindstrom, 142-147; Ms. Thompson, 43-75);

3. had developmental experiences outside their organizations which exposed them to varieties of people (Ms. Benet, second interview, 224-244);

4. were sensitive to individual needs (Ms. Henry, first interview, 217-227);

5. knew "government games" (Ms. Murphy, 138-142);

6. were "fast trackers" who often did things ex-officially (Ms. Benet, second interview, 42-49; Ms. Rogers, 93-107);

7. surrounded themselves with competent staff members (Ms. Benet, first interview, 39-49);

8. treated everyone on their staff fairly (Ms. 
Henry, first interview, 217-227; Ms. Pierce, second interview, 480-484);

9. encouraged innovation (Ms. Benet, first interview, 215-220; Ms. Henry, second interview, 70-75); and

10. were humorous; could handle pressure well (Ms. Benet, second interview, 166-76).

The prominence of mentors and role models in learning was noted and their contributions to learning principles hypothesized. Appendix H describes in depth the use of mentors and role models in early stages of respondent careers and three hypothetical ways in which the contributions assisted in respondent learning processes.

TECHNICAL EXPERTS (1-a.1-c)

Technical experts were individuals who provided specialized knowledge which respondents used for particular purposes. When respondents needed in-depth information about a particular topic outside their fields of interest or expertise, they called upon technical experts for help. A typical example occurred in Ms. Pierce's case, where Ms. Pierce asked an equipment specialist to get parts information for a report to Ms. Pierce's supervisor (second interview, 7-35). In this instance, Ms. Pierce's supervisor realized that she was
able to perform project management responsibilities without having "hands-on" experience:

...it was the job of the equipment specialist to come back to you with that technical information. When he [the supervisor] told me he had changed his mind about [my professional qualifications as a manager,] he says, 'I can see in this type of job you don't need that kind of hands-on experience. That's why you've been successful, because you knew you could get that information from the equipment specialist.' (second interview, 174-209)

Technical experts also assisted in developing projects with respondents. Two examples are Dr. Delaney's use of an internal consultant in answering questions for a reorganization project (137-144) and Ms. Lindstrom's use of an external consultant and the agency training director to help with implementing a productivity improvement project in a regional office (177-187).

A third use of technical experts occurred in abrupt changes of leadership. Ms. Garret, for instance, relied upon the long-term programmatic knowledge of seasoned careerists when Ms. Garret became acting director of a nationwide program. Ms. Garret remarked that using staff expertise provided both continuity and stability in carrying out program objectives (first interview, 78-96).
The observation of the use of staff expertise in vacant supervisory situations is discussed more fully in a memo which appears in Appendix I.

SUPPORT PERSONNEL (1-a.1-d)

A third type of resource persons were secretaries, clerks, and an assortment of individuals in administrative or helper roles. Secretaries, clerks, and others in administrative support roles have played various roles in helping women move forward. Ms. Henry, for instance, used the secretary of a military commander in resolving a promotion issue. Ms. Henry realized that the secretary, who had been in her job for over 20 years, had a great deal of influence and respect in the organization. Because the commander would defer to her in resolving the issue, Ms. Henry knew that cultivating the secretary's support was strategically important (second interview, 362-381). In another instance, when Ms. Henry registered for a conference in which she was the only female presenter, the registration clerk saw to it that Ms. Henry received a place on the agenda (first interview, 294-304).

Support people were often gatekeepers to accessing important information. Ms. Pierce gave an example of this when she related that peer male managers frequently excluded reports and other documents which Ms. Pierce needed to keep up with events in her organization. The
secretaries of the males, however, gave Ms. Pierce copies of what their supervisors received because "they wanted me to succeed," Ms. Pierce said (first interview, 147-161.

Although support personnel were observed to provide important information to the respondents and to allow them to gain access to important individuals, they differed from the roles played by mentors and role models. The latter usually had relationships with respondents that were long-term and based on trust. Mentors and role models were able to tailor learning to individual needs, strengths, and weaknesses. The case description of Dr. Overby in Ms. Garret's history (first interview, 154-180) is illustrative. Dr. Overby, in this passage, gave Ms. Garret an assignment to a particular task force involving experts from the specialty area; this was in order that Ms. Garret, who did not have a strong background in research, would understand how research was developed and applied to a specific program.

FAMILY AND FRIENDS (1-a.1-e)

Friends and family members included individuals having a relationship characterized by depth and intensity gained over time. Respondents noted that they relied upon family members for both encouragement and for making important career decisions. Ms. Henry, for instance, said that she decided to finish the difficult, long-term
training program in which she had been enrolled because of the confidence that her sister and many friends expressed (first interview, 272-278). Ms. Ferris discussed with her husband the possibility of moving into a position in which she would be in a supervisory relationship to former peers. On his advice, she made the decision to take the job (189-208). Lastly, Ms. Pierce called on her husband to provide explanation of technical terms and concepts and for encouragement in learning rudiments of her new job (second interview, 7-13).

PROTECTORS AND ALLIES (I-a.1-f)

Protectors and allies were individuals who spoke on behalf of the respondent or who interceded for the individual who faced a difficult situation with another party. Protectors and allies sometimes also acted in roles of referral agents, pointing individuals to opportunities for career growth. Thirdly, they provided resources to respondents in the form of material or resource commitments.

Protectors and allies were another source of informal learning; but only two respondents used them in their career histories.

Ms. Benet, who used them more extensively than did Ms. Pierce, defined protectors and allies as people who can "back you up, who can say, 'This is how it really
happened" (first interview, 190-194). Protectors and allies in Ms. Benet's history provided referrals or havens of escape. "If you get into trouble," one of them remarked, "let me know and I'll find a place for you" (first interview, 209-211).

Ms. Pierce used two allies: (a) to gain leverage in obtaining funds for resources in establishing a new program (second interview, 439-486); and (b) to allow her to attend executive training when training money for such programs was reduced substantially (second interview, 452-462). As in Ms. Benet's career, allies in Ms. Pierce's accounts spoke on behalf of the respondent. In two instances, it was through commendations for performance awards (second interview, 519-520), and, in another, sanctioning her promotion to male peers (second interview, 278-279).

Both respondents took active roles in cultivating support of protectors and allies through developing long-term, informal relationships in external and internal associations. Ms. Benet did so through her experiences over time with Congressional staff members and industry groups (first interview, 177-199); Ms. Pierce, through professional societies (second interview, 287-300) followed by a supervisor-employee relationship (second interview, 267-275).
Nurturing relationships with protectors and allies was important to both respondents, who were in male-dominated organizations that placed value on demonstration of technical competence. Ms. Benet remarked:

If you fail, you're so obvious. If you don't have some allies in the agency, you just wouldn't survive. And I think that's one thing I've been able to do. Every two or three months, I really take stock. I go down the list...of the 20 senior managers here and say, 'Where do I stand with each one of these people?' (second interview, 157-169)

Chart 3 on the following three pages summarizes the contributions of resource persons to the informal learning process. The following is a description of the contributions illustrated in the chart.

Respondents learned through different persons many skills associated with acquiring job knowledge, locating individuals having information bearing upon completing a task, and improving job performance.

Specific job skills, such as learning how to analyze problem situations, how to locate job mobility information, understanding complex forces in organization dynamics, and technical tasks were taught mainly by persons having high levels of expertise. Mentors having specialty areas of knowledge and sometimes individuals in
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Skill Learning (SK)</td>
<td>SKA</td>
<td>SKA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Analytic (SKA)</td>
<td>SKA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mobility (SKM)</td>
<td>SKM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Org Dev (SKOD)</td>
<td>SKOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Technical (SKT)</td>
<td>SKT</td>
<td>SKT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Contacts Information (CI)</td>
<td>CIH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Hill (CIH)</td>
<td>CIH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Internal (CIN)</td>
<td>CIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. External (CIX)</td>
<td>CIX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### CONTRIBUTIONS OF RESOURCE PERSONS TO INFORMAL LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMAL LEARNING INSTANCE</th>
<th>MENTOR (1-a.1-b)</th>
<th>ROLE MODEL (1-a.1-b)</th>
<th>TECHNICAL EXPERT (1-a.1-c)</th>
<th>SUPPORT PERSON (1-a.1-d)</th>
<th>FRIENDS/FAMILY (1-a.1-e)</th>
<th>PROTECTORS/ALLIES (1-a.1-f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Assignments (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Per/Prof Growth (AP)</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Research (AR)</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Challenge (AC)</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support Tactics (ST)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Learn Job Respon (STJ)</td>
<td>STJ</td>
<td>STJ</td>
<td>STJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Personal Intervention (STJ)</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td></td>
<td>STP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Counsel (STC)</td>
<td>STC</td>
<td></td>
<td>STC</td>
<td>STC</td>
<td>STC</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CONTRIBUTIONS OF RESOURCE PERSONS TO INFORMAL LEARNING
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMAL LEARNING INSTANCE</th>
<th>MENTOR (1-a.1-b)</th>
<th>ROLE MODEL (1-a.1-c)</th>
<th>TECHNICAL EXPERT (1-a.1-c)</th>
<th>SUPPORT PERSON (1-a.1-d)</th>
<th>FAMILY/FRIENDS (1-a.1-e)</th>
<th>PROTECTORS/ALLIES (1-a.1-f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Program Management (PM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Handling Conflict (PMC)</td>
<td>PMC</td>
<td>PMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Nationwide (PMN)</td>
<td>PMN</td>
<td>PMN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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subordinate, administrative roles provided skill information as well.

Throughout the case histories, respondents came in contact with individuals having important roles in the business of the organizations. Understanding the roles individuals and the organizations played was facilitated largely through persons in mentor roles. In one case, however, a subordinate of an influential person inside the organization provided a respondent with an understanding of the roles played by organizational players.

Supervisors who were also mentors or role models gave respondents opportunities to apply job skills in novel contexts. These assignments enabled respondents to experience feelings of personal growth and challenge. Occasionally, respondents learned how to apply certain skills from non-supervisory persons. A technical expert in organization development, for instance, and an administrative clerk who suggested ways for presenting a program research report were important in implementing projects respondents initiated.

In managing job responsibilities, respondents frequently relied upon mentors, role models, and technical experts, such as subordinate staff, for support. When respondents ran into difficulty with peer managers, for instance, they looked to role models or allies and
protectors. In a particular instance, a secretary of a military officer interceded for the respondent in having a complaint resolved. Respondents also sought out advice or counsel from mentors, technical experts, support persons, and from families and friends.

If respondents encountered conflict in managing program responsibilities, they learned particular resolution techniques from mentors or role models. Moreover, to preclude potentially disruptive conflict situations with a variety of special interest groups involved in a nationwide program, respondents emulated skills of experienced role models. An analysis of the characteristics of the resource persons, although not within the scope of this study, might be fruitful for further research.

Work assignments (1-a.2)

A second type of informal learning came from work assignments. In analyzing data which had been coded work assignments, it became clear that this category had to be defined precisely. Work assignments per se were a chief means for learning job skills, roles, and interrelationships, but assignments were often accompanied by several other formal and informal learning activities, making analysis difficult. To provide clarity, work assignments were defined to include knowledge, skills,
abilities, and insights respondents picked up from tasks accomplished. The category also included applications of skills from formal and informal learning activities because novel contexts presented further opportunities to adapt previous learning.

The category was defined to examine skills, not responsibilities accrued. Skills were defined as steps or a series of steps taken to accomplish objectives or to perform tasks. Responsibilities, on the other hand, included skills development, but their primary distinction was the relationship to performance of roles in a particular position in an organization. Skills were seen as the "learning how to do" rather than the accumulation of responsibilities.

Many respondents took jobs in the federal government for which they had little or no prior education, training, or experience. Skills had to be acquired on the job. Examples are the knowledge of equal employment opportunity regulations (Ms. Henry, first interview, 142-157; and Ms. Harris, 61-69); investigative and regulatory process abilities (Ms. Harris, 35-42; and Ms. Ferris, 49-64); personnel recruitment techniques (Ms. Logan, 74-81); staff relationships management (Ms. Ferris, 209-246); negotiation skills (Ms. Chisholm, second interview, 167-227 and Ms. Henry, first interview, 103-108); and
interpersonal skills (Ms. Lindstrom, 76-92; Ms. Rogers, 73-79; Ms. Ferris, 253-260; and Ms. Thompson, 39-54).

Respondents acquired additional job skills by applying skills from past experience or training to new contexts. In this fashion, earlier socialization processes prepared respondents to meet the challenges of new job demands. For instance, Ms. Chisholm applied survival skills from experiences as a black and as a female to encounters with male political figures in her organization (second interview, second interview, 351-442). Ms. Garret, in addition, practiced providing confrontation and feedback skills with Dr. Overby based on her former job before government, which was in crisis intervention (second interview, 196-255).

Work assignments also enabled respondents to learn how to solve difficult interpersonal situations. For example, Ms. Murphy dealt with a difficult male subordinate by developing an understanding that his behavior would eventually "self-destruct." (194-209) Ms. Lindstrom (76-92), Ms. Thompson (39-54), Ms. Garret (second interview, 196-255 and 256-304), and Ms. Rogers (63-90) developed interpersonal relationship skills with staff in order to resolve perceived crises that could potentially disrupt efficient staff operations.
Respondents also developed skills to implement innovative or improved approaches to program management. Ms. Henry, for instance, came up with several novel ideas for developing recreational programs to suit a variety of user needs (second interview, 84-144). Ms. Benet learned how to set up a program area in which she lacked technical expertise (second interview, 224-229). Dr. Jones recognized possibilities for improving program information coordination, and, based on her insights, established a policy network (17-29).

Respondents also developed awareness of socialization rules and processes within their organizations. Ms. Benet (second interview, 324-335; first interview 60-63; 82-91; and 286-291), Ms. Logan (134-164), Ms. Ferris (273-287; and 301-306), Ms. Pierce (second interview, 301-309; 582-624; and 649-660), and Dr. Jones (93-99) perceived that male peers did not respond to them as professionals. Each respondent took steps to gain peer recognition. Ms. Benet developed a role as information coordinator and translator (first interview, 82-91); Ms. Logan (50-72) and Ms. Pierce (second interview, 582-624) redoubled work efforts in order to demonstrate competence; and Ms. Ferris (276-287) and Dr. Jones (146-158) used assertiveness skills; and Ms. Henry developed negotiation strategies (first interview, 103-118).
Lastly, work assignments provided insights for solving problems. Work assignments were one way by which individuals defined situations and located information in solving problems or in dealing with difficult situations. They provided a reference base for meeting new or unexpected demands of the job, such as reorganizations, (Ms. Rogers, 73-79), being an acting director (Ms. Lindstrom, 226-245 and Ms. Benet, first interview, 236-253), dealing with union officials (Ms. Pierce, second interview, 784-741), providing feedback to one's superiors (Ms. Garret, second interview, 196-243), and so forth.

**Professional societies** (1-a.3)

A third vehicle for informal learning was professional societies. Professional societies offered a variety of opportunities for career advancement. Foremost was the providing of information about career management: how to fill out an SF-171 qualifications statement so that selecting officials would respond favorably (Ms. Henry, first interview, 129-141), how women managers could acquire skills to cross-train for management positions (Ms. Pierce, first interview, 115-133), how to locate job opening information (Ms. Henry, second interview, 463-500), and so forth.

As forums for information exchange, moreover, professional societies introduced respondents to
individuals who could become mentors, role models, and other resource persons. Professional societies thus offered a pool of talent for future reference and support (Ms. Henry, first interview, 122-124; 142-148; 157-163; and Ms. Pierce, second interview, 322-347).

Professional societies also provided laboratories for developing management skills. Ms. Henry, (first interview, 122-124; Ms. Pierce, first interview, 115-133; and second interview, 287-300). Ms. Logan (107-116) and Ms. Benet (first interview, 39-63) were elected to leadership positions in professional societies, and each one learned how to manage a full range of programmatic functions and roles in such positions.

Networks (1-a.4)

Similar to professional societies, networks were ad hoc associations of individuals who exchanged information on a variety of topics. Networks, however, were more informal in structure than professional societies, and included individuals who met based on a shared interest. For Dr. Jones, the interest was improved policy coordination, and actors from a variety of government agencies, positions, and functions participated (17-29). For Ms. Benet (first interview, 151-160), Ms. Harris (204-222), and Ms. Thompson (133-138), the networks of contacts provided useful information on career issues.
Developmental assignments (1-a.5)

In several instances, developmental assignments were parts of formal training programs. They permitted participant-respondents to apply skills, such as in Ms. Lindstrom's case in productivity improvement, to a particular situation (161-174). Moreover, they enabled respondents to gain hands-on experience in managing an entire organization, as with Ms. Lindstrom (162-174) and Ms. Pierce (first interview, 259-266). Lastly, they permitted respondents to understand the "big picture" interrelationships between their agencies' functions, missions, and the Congress, such as for Ms. Benet (second interview, 279-297), Ms. Logan (33-51), and Ms. Garret (first interview, 44-52).

Task forces (1-a.6)

Task forces of organization members having particular skill levels and interests in a particular problem were also means by which respondents learned informally about particular roles and responsibilities. Task forces were assembled based on an agencywide, top-priority need or problem, typically. Respondents selected for task force participation were nominated on the basis of their expertise, such as EEO in Ms. Harris' case (33-60) and organization and communications skills in Ms. Thompson's history (94-98 and 37-54). Participation enabled the
respondents to reinforce and to expand their skills. Moreover, it gave them entree to working with high-level managers and for cultivating referral opportunities.

Dr. Delaney volunteered for three task forces that had convened to reorganize various agency departments. Dr. Delaney used task force participation as a means to develop her skills in organization development (159-165). Examples of skills which she acquired included an understanding of socio-technical systems, staffing and budgeting, decision making, and facilitating organization transition issues.

Observations (1-a.7) and interviews (1-a.8)

For the purposes of describing how respondents learned various management skills, observations and interviews were combined. In both categories, respondents picked up subtle cues about how managers communicated with peers, staff, and superiors as well as with external agency clients.

Ms. Garret and Ms. Benet, in particular, worked closely with individuals in role model positions and were able to absorb many of the models' ways of managing by using observation. Ms. Garret, for instance, described a "shadowing process" by which she learned to adapt Dr. Schmidt's participative management style (second interview, 14-30). Ms. Benet, moreover, pointed out that
she observed "sound management practices" from an "incredible young man in a powerful position." (first interview, 39-49). She noted, in particular, how he interacted with Congressional staff. "He was especially skilled at bringing people around to his views," she commented (second interview, 15-23).

Ms. Thompson and Dr. Delaney noted that their participation in agencywide task forces allowed them to watch high-level managers make decisions. They analyzed which actions seemed effective and which ones did not seem to work so well. Both developed their observations into cases for study. Ms. Thompson used the cases later, when she took a long-term program in executive skills (109-112). Dr. Delaney integrated her cases with a variety of courses she took from vendors in organization skills concepts (145-178).

In one case, observations were used in conjunction with formal learning. Ms. Harris had completed a five-week apprentice program and had been paired with a more experienced analyst after the conclusion of the program (13-17).

In another case history, interviews were used exclusively as an avenue of informal learning. Ms. Logan used the technique in order to find out what skills a sample of managers said they needed to do their jobs and
how they used the skills for career advancement (33-45). Through interviews, Ms. Logan learned that developing effective relationships with Congressional staff was important to managers. She decided to undertake an assignment to Capitol Hill to acquire the competencies and to cultivate informal relationships with key committee staff members.

Summary.

Chart 4 on the following pages summarizes the contributions of job-related activities to informal learning processes. From it, it may be seen that informal learning was a major component of learning on the job. Work assignments, in particular, were fertile areas for learning task skills and techniques. Such on-the-job learning was vital to women who had no previous management education, training, or related job experiences. Respondents having requisite skills before taking the jobs were able to transfer skills from previous professional or cultural socialization processes. Work assignments were particularly useful in enabling respondents to learn how to deal with difficult interpersonal relationships, developing innovative approaches to program management, and gaining a sensitivity to socialization rules and processes in their organizations. Lastly, work assignments provided skills for "learning how to learn:"
CONTRIBUTIONS OF ACTIVITIES TO INFORMAL LEARNING PROCESSES

(1-A.2) WORK ASSIGNMENTS:
1. Agency Stance
2. Staff Management
3. Regulations Knowledge
4. Organization Linkage
5. Creativity
6. Confrontation
7. Interpersonal Communications
8. Applications of Prior Socialization
9. Problem Solving
10. Job Rudiments
11. Program Director Skills

(1-a.3) PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY:
1. Leadership Competencies
2. Presentation Skills
3. Program Management
4. Mobility Information
5. Contacts

Summary of Contributions of Activities to Informal Learning Process (1 of 3)
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(1-a.4) NETWORK:
1. Career Issues
2. Professional Information Exchange
3. Contacts

(1-a.5) DEVELOPMENTAL ASSIGNMENTS:
1. How "Hill" Works
2. Agency Interpretation of Regulations
3. Productivity Improvements
4. Organizational Linkages

(1-a.6) TASK FORCES:
1. Reorganization/Organization Development Skill
2. Program Management: Issues Resolution Skills
3. Contacts

Summary of Contributions of Activities to Informal Learning Process (2 of 3)
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CONTRIBUTIONS OF ACTIVITIES TO INFORMAL LEARNING PROCESS
(Continued)

(1-a.7) OBSERVATIONS AND (1-A.8) INTERVIEWS:

1. Case Studies of "Good Managers"
2. Mobility in Organization
3. Male Culture Cues
4. Reinforce Formal Learning

Summary of Contributions of Activities to Informal Learning Process (3 of 3)

FIGURE 4
in providing a framework for defining problems, developing solutions, trying different approaches to resolution, and finding ways to obtain constructive feedback. Professional societies and networks were vehicles for sharing information about a variety of career advancement topics, coordinating policy development, developing management skills, and meeting other professionals inside and outside one's immediate office.

Developmental assignments and task forces, moreover, were instrumental in enabling respondents to apply skills they had learned in formal learning programs. They also granted respondents opportunities to understand the gestalt of interrelationships among functions. In the process of participation, in addition, respondents got to know top-level decisionmakers. This was important because it enabled them to observe, first hand, how the managers operated. A secondary benefit was the visibility and promotion potential that participation afforded.

**Formal Learning (1-b)**

Data were analyzed to assess the degree to which respondents had engaged in formal learning in their management careers in government. In analyzing the types of formal learning utilized, four sub-categories appeared from the data: agency, Office of Personnel Management (OPM), external agency, and institution-based. Agency,
OPM, and external were further divided into long-term or short-term.

The sub-categories were defined as follows:

**Agency, long-term** (1-b.1) refers to training developed by a government agency, exclusive of OPM, which includes one or more learning programs one week or longer and which may or may not be supplemented by a project or special assignment.

**Agency, short-term** (1-b.2) are those programs of less than one week in length.

**Office of Personnel Management, long-term** (1-b.3) are programs more than one week in length and which are geared towards developing specific skills. Examples are: The Federal Executive Institute (FEI) (1-b.3-a) for senior-level managers; The Senior Executive Service Candidate Program (SESCP) (1-b.3-b), a two-year program designed to equip highly-qualified senior managers (GM-15) for entry into executive management positions; and Executive Seminar Centers (ESC) (1-b.3-c), which are two-to-three week programs concerning a variety of current topics and skills training for managers GM-13 to 15.

**Office of Personnel Management, short-term** (1-b.4) are for managers GM-15 and above. They are programs less than one week long which foster an awareness of broad issues, interrelationships among government structures,
awareness of government/non-government management trends, and management skills.

External training (1-b.5) includes both skills training and topics awareness. It may be provided by a professional society, vendor or a college or university without a contract with the federal government.

Institution-based training (1-b.6) refers to long-term, residential programs conducted by an institute of higher learning through contract with government agencies.

To assess the relationships between careers and formal training, Chart 5 was prepared. This chart, which appears in two parts on the following pages, depicts the use of formal learning by prior versus non-prior career managers. Part A presents formal learning of respondents who had careers before entering government, while part B presents that of respondents who entered government without established professional careers.

From a preliminary data analysis of all fourteen case histories, it was inferred that respondents having professional careers before government used formal training differently from those who did not have such experience.

Prior careers

Of the cases analyzed, six had had prior career experience before coming into government and eight did
### PRIOR CAREER ENTRANTS TYPE FORMAL TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>AGENCY LONG (1-b.1)</th>
<th>AGENCY SHORT (1-b.2)</th>
<th>OPM LONG (1-b.3)</th>
<th>OPM SHORT (1-b.4)</th>
<th>EXTERNAL BASED (1-b.5)</th>
<th>INSTITUTION BASED (1-b.6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Dr Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Dr Delaney</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Executive Seminar</td>
<td>1. OECD Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. FEI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Medium Tenure Admin-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>istrators:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Ms Garret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ms Chisholm</td>
<td>Process Consulting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>AGENCY LONG (1-b.1)</th>
<th>AGENCY SHORT (1-b.2)</th>
<th>OPM LONG (1-b.3)</th>
<th>OPM SHORT (1-b.4)</th>
<th>EXTERNAL BASED (1-b.5)</th>
<th>INSTITUTION BASED (1-b.6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Short to Moderate Tenure Attorneys:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Ms Lindstrom</td>
<td>1. Process Consulting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ms Murphy</td>
<td>Women in Management</td>
<td>FEI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 3 2 5 0 2 2
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## NON-PRIOR CAREER ENTRANTS TYPE FORMAL TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>AGENCY LONG (1-b.1)</th>
<th>AGENCY SHORT (1-b.2)</th>
<th>OPM LONG (1-b.3)</th>
<th>OPM SHORT (1-b.4)</th>
<th>EXTERNAL BASED (1-b.5)</th>
<th>INSTITUTION BASED (1-b.6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. College Without Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 2 Wk Mgt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mgt Development (3).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Non-Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Pre-Civil Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Military Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Fix 16mm Projectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assertiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Exec Sem Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Women in Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Human Resource Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Harvard Sr Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SF171 Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Classification Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>AGENCY LONG (1-b.1)</th>
<th>AGENCY SHORT (1-b.2)</th>
<th>OPM LONG (1-b.3)</th>
<th>OPM SHORT (1-b.4)</th>
<th>EXTERNAL BASED (1-b.5)</th>
<th>INSTITUTION BASED (1-b.6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. College, Some Jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Non-Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Management Cadre Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Executive Development Seminar (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SESCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Zero Based Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SF171 Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Pre-Civil Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 8 2 4 0 12 1
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not. In reviewing cases of prior-career respondents, it was discovered that, within the category as a whole, training and development patterns varied by length of prior career. The two respondents who had been tenured professors before entering government, for instance, took several formal training programs in early stages of careers and participated in task forces (Dr. Delaney, 145-148) or networks (Dr. Jones, 17-21) to gain additional management skills, improve organization functioning, or to develop internal and external information coordinating mechanisms. Of the other four respondents having professional careers, tenures were shorter, fewer formal training programs were taken, and mentors and role models were used. Two of the four took long-term training involving implementation projects (Ms. Lindstrom, 153-160 and Ms. Chisholm, first interview, 50-89). A third respondent took a long-term OPM course in addition to an institution-based one (Ms. Murphy, 148-153; 171-175).

**Non-prior careers**

Among the respondents without professional careers before entering government, several patterns of use of training and development were observed. Of eight respondents in the category, four had entered directly from college or university without prior job experiences (Ms. Henry, first interview, 3-16; Ms. Rogers, 3-13; Ms.
Thompson, 3-17; and Ms. Ferris, 3-15). Three of the six entered as administrative support personnel, but within six months to a year, moved into professional occupations (Ms. Thompson, 3-14; Ms. Rogers, 3-13; and Ms. Logan, 3-31). Of the respondents entering from college without work experience, three were hired before passage of Civil Rights legislation (Ms. Henry, first interview, 3-16; Ms. Thompson, 3-14; and Ms. Harris, 3-34). A brief discussion of the within-group patterns of development follows.

Of the three administrative entrants, formal training use was limited. Ms. Thompson took an agency-developed, short-term course in assertiveness skills (126-132) and a long-term, university-based training program in management—both late in her career. She noted that longer training only reinforced skills she had picked up earlier on the job (109-125). The assertiveness course, however, was useful only in helping her establish an internal network of women managers (133-138). Similarly, Ms. Rogers took a two-week executive development program through OPM late in their career, but found the content "irrelevant" to her needs (183-193). Ms. Logan took no formal management training, but a few specialty classes through a local college (117-128).
It was observed that, although respondents in this category took little formal learning, informal learning accounted for most of their development. Respondents chose several informal learning activities for primary, on-the-job training and for career advancement. Ms. Thompson (73-85) and Ms. Logan (50-72) used a task force and a developmental assignment, respectively, in order to move from the journeyman level to professional positions in management. Both, in addition to Ms. Rogers (173-181), utilized referral opportunities extensively to find job leads.

Among the non-administrative, post-college entrants, similar usage patterns were noted. Two of the five respondents in the category took jobs unrelated to their college majors (Ms. Pierce, first interview, 3-24; and Ms. Henry, first interview, 3-27); and one of the two, who had prior job experience, had relevant experience (Ms. Pierce, first interview, 3-24). Both jobs were dead-ended. Finding mobility difficult, both respondents took graduate degrees in management before becoming managers (Ms. Pierce, first interview, 108-114; and Ms. Henry, first interview, 81-91). Additionally, they participated in leadership roles and took courses from professional societies (Ms. Pierce, first interview, 115-133; and Ms. Henry, first interview, 122-141). Moreover, they took
agency-long term training and one took several long-term training programs through OPM (Ms. Pierce, first interview, 182-187 and 254-258; Ms. Henry, first interview, 259-263; 164-172 and second interview, 209-225).

The remaining three respondents in the non-administrative entrant category took entry-level professional jobs in fields closely related to their college majors (Ms. Benet, first interview, 3-29; Ms. Ferris, 3-15; and Ms. Harris, 3-12), and one of the respondents had job-related experience (Ms. Benet, first interview, 3-29). Of the three, only one had formal management training; Ms. Benet completed the SESCP and a two-week, institution-based program (first interview, 255-278).

The respondents had mixed views of the utility of training, however. Ms. Benet took training late in her career and found it only "somewhat good" (first interview, 266-269). She found the fellowship program as well as learning directly from mentors and role models more beneficial in both learning her job and in advancement (first interview, 279-296). Another respondent, Ms. Ferris, described the limited array of internal training programs as "abysmal" (54-64). She took several specialty courses at her own expense through a vendor and a
professional society and supplemented formal learning with a role model (122-130). Thirdly, Ms. Harris, who took no training at all either before or after becoming a manager, believed classes were not useful to her career advancement (197-203). It was noted that Ms. Harris, like the three administrative entrants described earlier, was promoted following participation in an agencywide task force, use of referral opportunities, and self-initiated accrued responsibilities.

Ms. Harris, along with Ms. Thompson and Ms. Henry, entered government before Civil Rights legislation. All three entered limited-potential jobs, and all used informal learning extensively to surmount them. Only Ms. Henry, however, used formal learning to any appreciable extent; this was, however, one means by which she "got her ticket punched" for management (second interview, 242-271).

**Summary: formal learning**

The majority of respondents utilized informal learning to a greater extent in their careers over training. The observation of uses of formal development pointed up a strong reliance upon resource persons, in particular, as learning agents. The variables, however, were the existence of a prior career, length of
professional career before government, and whether one's job had mobility potential.

Mentors, role models, task forces, and developmental assignments were especially helpful in both learning the job and in career advancement. It was observed that the greater the use of mentors and role models, the less likely it was that the respondents would engage in formal learning. For a fuller description of this phenomena, a memo appears in Appendix G.

Among the respondents who took training, the two former professors took a total of nine courses, or sixty-four percent of all training in the group. Most training was done through long-term programs conducted by the Office of Personnel Management. The least training was taken by the two former school administrators.

The largest number of training programs was taken by one respondent in the pre-Civil Rights category. Ms. Henry's training and development, in this instance, accounted for nearly one-third of all non-prior career entrants. Moreover, she, along with Ms. Pierce, were in dead-end positions. These two respondents alone took approximately sixty percent of all training in the non-prior career category.

The respondents in this category took external training, and most courses were in specialty or technical
programs. Three respondents took graduate degrees, while one took a course in general management principles. The second most popular type of training taken by respondents in this category was agency-long. The latter accounted for approximately thirty percent of all training taken.

Respondent reactions to the utility of training varied. Among respondents in dead-end jobs, it was a means for advancement, along with a number of informal learning activities. Respondents with prior jobs or careers found it useful in relation to meeting people or exchanging ideas. Respondents who learned team building or organization development skills often applied the skills directly to situations in their environments. Respondents whose agencies did not place a high value on credentials often remarked that training was not as useful as it could have been. This was especially so for respondents who had taken management training late in their careers and who had learned concepts discussed in classes from on-the-job experience.

Some tentative observations made on the basis of the analysis are summarized here:

Of those who found training useful were those who tended to: (a) be in dead-end jobs; (b) have taken non-specialty or management courses early in their careers; (c) have used training co-incidentally with various forms
of informal learning; (d) were able to practice skills in applicable job situations; and (e) have fairly lengthy, pre-government careers.

Of those who did not use training a great deal in their careers, they tended to (a) rely on mentors or role models as early sources of career information; (b) utilize referral opportunities a great deal throughout their careers; (c) participate in agencywide task forces or external development assignments early in their careers; (d) have entered government with a bachelor’s degree only directly from college and have been in limited-potential jobs, particularly administrative support positions; and (e) said that job experience was more valued as a credential in their work environments.

**Responsibility Demonstration Opportunities** (2)

Responsibility demonstration opportunities, as a category, was defined as the gaining of skills to perform tasks of jobs. Responsibilities were defined operationally as sets of tasks or related functions of a job. This definition was based on several observations of how jobs are created. On the one hand, job responsibilities may be defined in position descriptions. Other responsibilities, however, are unwritten or evolutionary. Over a period of time, such responsibilities may accrue as to change the kind of job
performed. Miner and Estler (1985) describe this phenomenon as "responsibility accrual." In this study, "responsibility accruals" were observed to be of two types: imposed accrued responsibilities (2-a), and self-initiated accrued responsibilities (2-b).

**Imposed Accrued Responsibilities (2-a)**

Imposed accrued responsibilities were defined as conditions that made demands upon extant skills, abilities, or knowledge. The conditions forced respondents to apply competencies to immediate situations or to acquire additional skills through informal or formal means. Examples of demands included reorganizations, resource cuts, and the sudden or unexpected vacancy of one's superior and the subsequent elevation to an "acting" supervisory status.

**Data analysis procedures**

Information was classified by key words, phrases, or concepts and placed on 5 x 8" data cards. Data sheets for each respondent were prepared listing respondent name, career phases in which the imposed accrued responsibility occurred, a summary phrase of the event, the respondent response and observed outcomes.

The data sheets revealed six kinds of imposed responsibilities: (a) reorganizations (2-a.1), (b) resource cuts (2-a.2), (c) supervisory vacancy (2-a.3),...
(c) new work assignments (2-a.4), (which were sub-divided into start-up programs (2-a.4.-a) and office takeovers (2-a.4-b), (d) dead-end jobs (2-a.5), and (e) collateral duties (2-a.6).

Two instances of career plateauing were also observed from the data (Ms. Rogers, 139-155 and Ms. Logan, 84-90). It was not clear whether these were, by definition, examples of imposed responsibilities. The instances both related to women's lacking technical or line experience in being considered for selection or promotion. Because they related to personnel management issues, they were classified in the category, advancement issues. Jobs which had a limited structure and which prevented the women from advancing, on the other hand, were categorized, dead-end jobs.

A discussion of findings of the sub-category, "imposed accrued responsibilities," follows.

Reorganizations (2-a.1)

In the case histories, there were four instances of reorganizations. In each, respondents confronted job changes. In two instances, a downgrade resulted (Ms. Chisholm, first interview, 207-220; and Ms. Thompson, 166-169); in two others, respondents were referred to jobs in which they were promoted (Ms. Harris, 102-134; and Ms. Rogers, 63-68). In the two upgrade situations,
respondents used a superior and a mentor, respectively, as referral agents. In the downgrade instances, however, respondents used past work assignments and initiated projects to demonstrate competence to their new supervisors. The supervisors, convinced of the respondents' abilities, had the grades restored.

Resource cuts (2-a.2)

The two instances of resource cuts in the cases, like reorganizations, triggered a reliance upon staff for getting work accomplished (Ms. Lindstrom, 217-224; and Ms. Garret, first interview, 78-107). As with reorganizations, the development of interpersonal communications skills was manifest. Yet, in addition to the coordinating of information with staff, respondents encouraged staff motivation.

Supervisory vacancies (2-a.3)

In addition to the organizational structural changes, changes in supervisory positions also produced development of new skills and abilities. In instances of unexpected or long-term vacancies, respondents used either staff expertise or elements from the situation at hand to establish innovative and collaborative management strategies. For instance, Ms. Lindstrom described an arrangement whereby the acting manager position was shared among a peer branch chief, the respondent's immediate
supervisor, and Ms. Lindstrom (Ms. Lindstrom, 226-245). This arrangement provided Ms. Lindstrom with an idea of how the program was managed from her supervisor's point of view. This exposed her to political forces of which she had been unaware previously. The use of participative management observed among respondents who were thrust into acting roles is discussed in greater depth and additional research is called for in a memo which appears in Appendix I.

New work assignments (2-a.4)

In respondent histories, new work assignments involved intra-agency job transfers at the requests of top-level managers. Two types appeared prominent in the case histories: programs which respondents were asked to begin and programs which respondents were asked to take over.

START-UP PROGRAMS (2-a.4-a)

Ms. Benet described an instance in her career history in which a political appointee gave her an assignment to set up a program with industry officials in economic analysis. She noted:

The program was difficult to put together. I didn't have an engineering or a physicist's background. So I hired some great, young, excellent staff. This program was a major event in my career. A major
improvement in product came about and its results can
be seen today in the industry. (first interview,
221-230)

A similar situation occurred in Ms. Thompson's
career. An administrative officer with whom she had
worked transferred to a large agency that administered a
variety of social programs. He asked Ms. Thompson to join
his staff and to head an agency-wide program in planning,
programming, and budgeting. The program was a turning
point in her career as well. It introduced her to high-
level people in the organization and opportunities for
working directly with senior officials and the agency
head. Such exposure gave her a broad understanding of the
interrelationships between agency functions, opportunities
to observe what particular managers did that was effective
in making decisions, and provided opportunities for her to
practice behaviors she had observed to be effective on her
job (Ms. Thompson, 73-85).

Dr. Delaney's assignment to begin a program in
managing change likewise led her to develop new skills and
interests. She remarked that it gave an opportunity to
move out of a specialty area and to see, from a cross-
agency perspective, how dynamics of managing complex
change were coordinated (Dr. Delaney, 22-40).
OFFICE TAKEOVERS (2-a.4-b)

In one instance in the cases, a respondent was asked to take over a program which had been experiencing staffing and programmatic problems. Ms. Murphy described the office as one in which the male predecessor had taken no action to resolve difficult situations in the office. When Ms. Murphy came in, she contended with a variety of competitive people. One obstructive male, she noted, "got his kicks out of making life miserable for me." She remarked that she dealt with the situation in the following manner:

Dealing with difficult people is simply part of life. People will play games. The key is to figure out why they are doing obstructive things. I realize there's a lot of jealousy with competitive situations, but this person will eventually self-destruct. He's plain dirty. Some battles aren't worth fighting. (324-329)

Dead-end jobs (2-b.5).

In the case histories, it was observed that some respondents found themselves in jobs with limited mobility potential. These jobs, which were labeled, "dead end jobs," had prescribed levels of responsibilities that limited career advancement. Because the limitations were regarded as conditions with which respondents contended,
they were defined in the category of imposed accrued responsibilities.

In confronting the reality of limited advancement potential in jobs, individuals can take one or more options. These might range from mere resignation to an intense searching for ways to leave. In the case histories, two respondents found themselves in dead-end jobs, and both took similar courses of action to deal with them.

Ms. Henry and Ms. Pierce said that their jobs terminated at the journeyman level, GS-9 to GS-12. To move into a management position from there, both would have to acquire the necessary skills at their own initiative. To do this, both respondents took several kinds of formal training courses in addition to graduate degrees in management. Also, both engaged in many informal learning activities, such as serving in leadership roles in professional societies and using resource persons. In addition, both took the extra duties as assigned and developed them into promotion opportunities.

**Collateral duties (2-a.6)**

Ms. Henry's collateral duties as equal employment opportunity advisor was used as a basis for further training in pertinent regulations and in ex-officio
speaking engagements (Ms. Henry, first interview, 19-27). Ms. Pierce used an assignment to assist her supervisor with the budget and to display her skills in zero-based budgeting. This resulted, ultimately, in her securing a staff position in the office of her second-level supervisor (Ms. Pierce, first interview, 175-207).

**Summary**

Reorganizations, downgrades, and resource cuts catapulted respondents into developing responsibilities as transition managers. In periods of organization change, the respondents developed an understanding in a different dimension the political forces shaping formal and informal relationships. Adapting to the changes required developing a sensitivity to the implications of the decisions on resource levels. Further, it necessitated the development of managing interpersonal relationships with peers, staff, and superiors in a different key. At the forefront were coordination skills, motivational techniques, and collaborative strategies.

The women with limited career mobility exhibited a great deal of self-responsibility in changing careers. Each used several routes to mobility, including formal and informal learning activities.

The women were dissimilar to those whom Kanter (1977) described in *Men and Women of the Corporation*. Kanter
observed that women in low-ceiling, low-ladder jobs were characterized by low commitment, low involvement, and withdrawal from responsibility. One wonders what factors might have produced differences in the two women in the government organizations? It is possible that conditions other than structural ones, as Kanter asserts, produced the variations. A discussion of the topic of motivation in dead-end jobs is contained a memo in Appendix J.

Leader behavior in an "acting" position also created some further interest. It was noted that respondents who were thrust into acting leader roles typically relied upon staff to fulfill responsibilities. The respondents exhibited numerous group process techniques to stimulate involvement, such as attending to intergroup communications issues, recognizing and utilizing staff expertise in decisions, verbalizing concern for output, and so forth. Appendix I depicts leader behavior in temporary positions to a greater depth.

**Self-initiated accrued responsibilities (2-b)**

Self-initiated accrued responsibilities were responsibilities added through individual planning, designing, and carrying out. Distinct from conditions which called for the generation of new responsibilities from demands of a changed work environment, self-initiated accrued responsibilities resulted from seeing
possibilities for work improvement, for understanding more of a phenomena, or for enhancing reputation, for instance.

As respondents became skill-proficient, particularly in responsibilities of altered job conditions or in responsibilities which they initiated, they were seen by individuals of power or influence as having advancement potential. These individuals often referred the respondents to positions of greater power or influence in an organization.

Data analysis procedures

In analyzing data coded informal learning, it was discovered that respondents used skills to structure their own job responsibilities. In these instances, respondents defined jobs, sought out challenges, began projects, or pursued new interests. In analyzing this phenomenon, a description of Tough's (1979) learning projects was consulted. The observations of workplace phenomena appeared to fit Tough's descriptions of learning episodes, but they went beyond them. Rather than mere temporary or short-term episodes, the phenomena became integral parts of respondents' jobs. The additions were seen to change the jobs and to promote respondents' professional growth.

To obtain further insights, Miner and Estler's (1985) article, "Accrual Mobility," was examined. The article was of help in that it described various individual and
organizational contributors to the acquisition of job responsibilities. The authors noted, but did not name, two types of accrued responsibilities. In this study, the responsibilities were labeled imposed and self-initiated accrued responsibilities. Data cards were sorted into two piles at first, then re-analyzed and re-categorized on the basis of sub-divisions within each respective category.

The sub-divisions were posted to a chart and displayed against type of learning activity underlying them. At the intersections of sub-divisions and learning activity type were contained names of respondents who had utilized the learning in structuring the responsibilities. Chart 6, which illustrates the use of competence acquisition in self-initiated accrued responsibilities, appears on the following pages.

With respect to the self-initiated accrued responsibilities data category four strategies were identified: (a) becoming an expert (2-b.1), (b) gaining reliability (2-b.2), (c) becoming a resource (2-b.3), and (d) getting one's ticket punched (2-b.4).

**Becoming an expert (2-b.1)**

Throughout the cases, it was noted that women placed a great value upon acquiring a reputation for being a competent, hard-working individual. In many instances, the drive was to become an expert: an individual who was
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recognized for competence both within and outside the organization. Gaining a reputation for competence underscored many of the self-initiated responsibilities in the careers.

Ms. Henry, for example, expanded her responsibilities as an equal employment opportunity officer by giving speeches, undertaking formal classes at her own expense, and by participating in professional society activities on the topic (first interview, 154-163). Ms. Ferris, moreover, dissatisfied with the internal training her agency provided, initiated many programs and activities to make training for her sub-organization useful to particular needs (122-130). Ms. Thompson, in addition, became recognized for her abilities to manage complex organizations through her skills in planning, programming, and budgeting (165-172). Ms. Harris, who saw a need to improve investigative skills in her field in her agency, undertook a project of assimilating all pertinent regulations (35-42). Ms. Rogers, by acquiring a "service attitude" in helping managers fill personnel vacancies efficiently, became known for her own effectiveness (38-50).

**Gaining reliability (2-b.2)**

By performing their additional responsibilities well, respondents also, in some instances, were called upon to
rectify difficult situations; they were regarded by observers as individuals who could be counted upon to improve operational functioning. Such capabilities were seen to make the respondents more influential or visible in their organizations. In many cases, the demonstrations of reliability led to opportunities to be promoted. In relation to this study, opportunity events were classified under the category, "visibility," while the responsibilities that individuals accrued in relation to the events were labeled, "gaining reliability."

Ways in which they demonstrated reliability were (a) becoming an information coordinator and spokesperson to external interest groups (Ms. Benet, first interview, 82-91 and Dr. Jones 17-29); (b) becoming a group process facilitator in resolving intergroup conflicts or hostilities (Ms. Thompson, 39-54 and Ms. Lindstrom, 76-92); and (c) becoming an intervenor for staff on concerns with the superior (Ms. Garret, first interview, 189-225 and second interview, 196-245 and 256-305).

Becoming a resource (2-b.3)

Respondents frequently used their expertise, such as in Ms. Harris' case, to become resources to staff and to other individuals in their organizations (43-48). One of the ways in which respondents showed this was by establishing networks. Ms. Harris (204-222) and Ms.
Thompson (133-138), for instance, started up networks of other women in their organizations to discuss career issues. Additionally, respondents became tutors, such as Ms. Harris (44-48) and Ms. Henry (first interview, 157-163 and second interview, 612-623), in equal employment opportunity policies and practices.

**Getting one's ticket punched (2-b.4)**

As some respondents realized they could not get promoted in their particular jobs, they initiated activities that they believed would enhance their mobility. Ms. Henry and Ms. Pierce, for example, took a variety of training and education and professional society activities to move into professional and managerial positions. Both, for instance, enrolled in graduate programs in management, in long-term agency programs, and in courses sponsored by professional societies. In addition, both were elected to leadership positions in their professional societies (Ms. Henry, first interview, 259-263; 122-124; 208-212; 337-346; and 87-91. second interview, 209-226; 259-265; 314-329; and 533-605. Ms. Pierce, first interview, 20-30; 100-114; 115-133; 175-181; 182-187; 254-259; and 530-140). Ms. Logan volunteered for a developmental assignment outside her organization on the belief that was how many top managers in her agency were promoted (51-73). Ticket punching
involved awareness, planning, researching, and goal setting.

**Relationship of formal and informal learning to self-initiated accrued responsibilities**

The relationship of formal and informal learning to self-initiated accrued responsibilities is summarized in Chart 7. This chart shows that becoming an expert was the dominant type of self-initiated accrued responsibility and was accomplished primarily through work assignments or through long-term training given by the Office of Personnel Management. Ticket punching was the next most prevalent form, and it occurred most often through professional societies, agency-provided training, and external developmental assignments.

The sub-category, becoming an expert, played a central role in enabling respondents to develop job responsibilities on their own. Having expertise is one prerequisite for being a resource as well as a reliable person. Expertise in this context, however, is more than the development of particular skills; in the case histories, it included an attitude of service to others and goals of improving the overall functioning of the respondents' organizations. Becoming an expert is a sub-category that gives meaning to other sub-categories as well as derives special characterization from them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE LEARNING ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TICKET PUNCH</th>
<th>BECOMING EXPERT</th>
<th>BECOMING RESOURCE</th>
<th>GAINING RELIABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Resource Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Mentor</td>
<td>BH</td>
<td>BH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Protector/Ally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Role Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Tech Expert</td>
<td>MD, KP, BL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Support Person</td>
<td>BH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HH, MB, AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Observation</td>
<td>MD, AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interview</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Task Force</td>
<td>MD, HH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Work Assignment</td>
<td>MD, HH, TM, MB BL, AT, JR</td>
<td>AT, BL, SG, MB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Professional Societies BH, KP, ML BH, KP</td>
<td>BH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Developmental Assignments ML, KP KP, BL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE LEARNING ACTIVITY</td>
<td>TICKET PUNCH</td>
<td>BECOMING EXPERT</td>
<td>BECOMING RESOURCE</td>
<td>GAINING RELIABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Agency-long</td>
<td>BH, KP</td>
<td>BH, KP, MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Agency-short</td>
<td>BH, KP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Long</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>KP, MD, AMJ</td>
<td>MB, TM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Short</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMJ, AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Vendor</td>
<td></td>
<td>MD, KF, ML</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. University</td>
<td>BH, KP</td>
<td>AMJ, AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Professional Society</td>
<td>BH, KP</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. MB Margie Bennet
2. RC Ramona Chisholm
3. MD Dr. Mary Frances Delaney
4. KF Kim Foley
5. SG Sharon Garret
6. HH Hilda Harris
7. BH Barbary Henry
8. AMJ Dr. Anne Marie Jones
9. BL Betty Lindstrom
10. ML Meghan Logan
11. TM Tara Murphy
12. KP Katherine Pierce
13. JR Jane Rogers
14. AT Alice Thompson
Motivations for taking on additional responsibilities can be inferred from the cases, such as the desire to improve situations, seeing possibilities for enlarging the boundaries of a job, curiosity and desire to find out more about a phenomenon, and even the more personal goal, perhaps, to escape role entrapment. Whether the accruals were part of an overall plan for mobility or whether they were undertaken for other reasons, nonetheless, in many instances, they resulted in additional opportunities for advancement.

In undertaking the responsibilities, respondents used both formal and informal learning activities. The most fertile area for learning was through work assignments. Learning from the responsibilities at hand was most useful in gaining expertise, becoming a resource to others, developing roles as facilitators of change, and gaining skills useful in being promoted.

Formal learning enhanced learning from assignments, particularly if it was used to augment expertise or to get one's ticket punched. By itself, however, training had little impact on the kinds of responsibilities respondents initiated.

**Referral Opportunities** (2-c)

As respondents demonstrated competencies in job environments, certain individuals provided information
about job openings or helped respondents secure jobs that had greater responsibility scopes and influence. The opportunities given respondents in this manner were defined as "referral opportunities," and individuals who made the referrals were called, "referral agents." Chart 8 on the following page shows six ways in which respondents received referral opportunities: (a) start-up projects; (b) take-over projects; (c) openings in one's own organization; (d) openings in other agencies; (e) staff promotions based on perceived competence; and (f) details. Referral agents, in addition, included superiors, supervisors, clients, and co-workers in the study.

Data analysis procedures

In analyzing data coded self-initiated accrued responsibilities and imposed accrued responsibilities, it was noted that respondents expressed a desire to gain recognition for their achievements. The recognition was more than a form of reward for performance, however. Recognition implied the bestowal of status. In making the connection between competence demonstration and recognition, individuals often outside the respondent's immediate chain of command referred respondents to either high-level individuals or to positions. Opportunities for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Activity:</th>
<th>Instance:</th>
<th>Type Agent:</th>
<th>Type Visibility:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start-up Programs</td>
<td>Ms. Benet, 1: 101-113;</td>
<td>Political Supervisor</td>
<td>Internal Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Thompson, 65-72</td>
<td>Non-Political Supervisor</td>
<td>Internal Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take-over Programs</td>
<td>Ms. Murphy, 183-193</td>
<td>Political Supervisor</td>
<td>Internal Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openings in Own Organization</td>
<td>Ms. Ferris, 65-75</td>
<td>Non-Political Supervisor</td>
<td>Internal Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openings in Other Organizations</td>
<td>Ms. Murphy, 64-69, and 82-94</td>
<td>Client</td>
<td>Internal Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Henry, 2: 964-967</td>
<td>Coworker</td>
<td>Internal Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Rogers, 108-116</td>
<td>Non-Political Supervisor</td>
<td>Internal Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Harris, 111-134</td>
<td>Political Supervisor</td>
<td>Internal Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Promotions</td>
<td>Dr. Jones, 34-40</td>
<td>Political Supervisor</td>
<td>Internal Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Lindstrom 47-61</td>
<td>Non-Political Supervisor</td>
<td>Internal Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Logan, 95-106</td>
<td>Non-Political Supervisor</td>
<td>Internal Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Ms. Murphy, 43-49</td>
<td>Non-Political Supervisor</td>
<td>Internal Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Chisholm, 1: 182-196</td>
<td>Non-Political Supervisor</td>
<td>Internal Role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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advancement, all made on the basis of competence, were labeled, referral opportunities.

Key words and phrases in contexts related to referral opportunities were coded and placed on 5 x 8" note cards. Cards were sorted into a pile for analysis. Data were then transferred to a summary chart, which showed the relationship of the referral opportunities to imposed accrual responsibilities, self-initiated accrued responsibilities, competence acquisition, and visibility categories.

In the following sections, the six types of referral opportunities from Chart 8 are discussed by type of referral agent.

Referral agent: superior (2-c.1)

Some referrals were made by superiors not in the respondents' immediate chain of command. One example is a high-level female manager who saw to it that Ms. Chisholm was placed on agency-level task forces (first interview, 191-196); a mentor who gave Ms. Rogers information about a vacant branch chief position (108-116); and a mentor who was an SES member who gave Ms. Logan information about a staff position in his office (95-97). In some instances, the referral agents were superiors who were familiar with respondents' past performance or reputation. This was especially true in the cases of Ms. Harris (102-120) and
Ms. Rogers (111-116), who were referred to jobs with promotions in other agencies by individuals who had heard of their competencies in equal employment opportunity and in personnel administration, respectively.

Working with top managers as a result of referral opportunities gave respondents chances to witness processes by which decisions affecting large numbers of human, financial, and material resources were made. Ms. Thompson, in particular, described the observations from working with such officials on a detail as ingredients for case studies in decisionmaking (44-102). Ms. Garret, additionally, related how working with all political appointees taught her how her agency's program goals and strategies were forged to meet a multiplicity of interest needs (first interview, 44-61; 154-180 and second interview, 144-163).

Referral agent: supervisors (2-c.2)

Supervisory personnel, particularly political appointees, were also instrumental in providing career mobility opportunities. In general, these consisted of requests to start new programs, as in Ms. Benet's (first interview, 101-112) and Ms. Murphy's cases (183-193), or to hire respondents on staff, such as in Ms. Rogers' (175-181), Ms. Benet's (first interview, 108-114), and Dr. Jones' (34-40) cases. Assignments to begin new programs
or to take over programs which had not been performing adequately were also made on the basis of a supervisor's observation of past performance or upon potential.

The assignments carried with them tension as well as risk for the respondents. This meant setting up new procedures and policies with little guidance from past history or the desensitizing of employees to ineffective past practices. In Ms. Benet's case history, setting up of two new programs was accomplished through reliance upon the resources that newly-hired staff had (first interview, 111-116). Ms. Murphy's taking over the contract administration section of her organization involved a combination of negotiation skills and tact (183-193).

The status of the supervisory referral agent was important in reducing risks of start-up or takeover programs. One way of reducing risk was the attribution of status associated with higher authority. An example Ms. Ms. Benet's job reporting directly to the Assistant Secretary gave her "special status in the group." (first interview, 101-105). And in another, similar appointment, setting up a program at the request of the Assistant Secretary enhanced her reputation for competence among peer managers (first interview, 111-118).

Having freedom to implement a particular program gave respondents opportunities to gain visibility. For Ms.
Garret (first interview, 34-42), Ms. Harris (115-134), Ms. Chisholm (first interview, 45-54), and Dr. Jones (34-40), working closely with political figures gave them a great deal of freedom in carrying out their responsibilities; but along with the freedom was the responsibility of being a spokeswoman for a particular stance. In some instances, such as in Ms. Garret's case, there were no conflicts because values were similar (first interview, 44-61). In Ms. Chisholm's case, however, conflicts of values inhibited influence (first interview, 80-103; 119-169; 171-180 and second interview, 264-317).

Working with political appointees gave respondents influence in making policies for their agencies. Working with busy, non-career managers who lacked specialty acumen, Ms. Rogers developed merit pay for the large organization in which she worked (175-183). Ms. Henry provided counsel in equal employment opportunity affairs to an Assistant Secretary of one of the branches of the Armed Forces (second interview, 1111-1122).

Referral agent: coworker (2-c.3)

Coworkers or friends provided information and recommendations for jobs. A friend who coordinated training told Ms. Ferris of an opening in her department (65-75), for example. In some cases, coworker referrals resulted from individual initiative. Two examples of
individual effort were Ms. Lindstrom's (76-92) and Ms. Thompson's (39-54) use of interpersonal communications skills to reduce conflict among staff. After resolving communications issues in their respective work groups, in these two instances, the two respondents gained the respect of co-workers. Their initiatives, in turn, were observed by their supervisors. Subsequently, as promotion opportunities occurred, the two respondents were personally selected for the positions. In a similar fashion, Dr. Jones' establishment of a policy coordination network, moreover, opened the way to her director's recognition of the achievement and her subsequent assignment to his staff (17-29).

Referral agent: clients (2-c.4)

In the study, clients of respondents also served as referral agents. Two clients, for instance, of Ms. Murphy recommended her for supervisory positions in their organizations (43-49; 64-69; and 82-94).

Importance of referral opportunities

Referral opportunities provided through four types of agents were vital links between the demonstration of competence and the assumption of positions with more power and latitude for influence. Referrals were often made on observation of particular performances or upon perceived
competence through hearing of a respondent's reputation in a particular specialty.

The mere recognition of competence, however, did not appear to be the sole basis upon which referrals were made. Referrals also involved the imputation of trust through demonstration of mutual respect. In one case history, only one referral was made. In Ms. Pierce's accounts, having requisite management skills through credentials and through leadership experiences in professional societies did not necessarily allow her to move upward. She pointed out that managers in her organization were not "comfortable" with her style and, in many ways, discredited her accomplishments (second interview, 198-123). It was by responding to a budget problem her supervisor was having and by demonstrating to her second level supervisor that she could be relied upon in a crisis that she was given an advancement opportunity. By way of note in Ms. Pierce's case, Ms. Pierce was able to secure financial and staff resources for her program by having established first a relationship of mutual trust based on past experiences through a professional society with the unit commander (second interview, 329-387 and 389-436).

Referrals resulting from relationships built on trust, whether with superiors outside the respondent's
immediate organization, with co-workers and friends, or with a first-level supervisor, carried an implicit risk. Opportunities for advancement provided through the referrals might not work out; risks were especially high that involved new programs or for ones already in trouble. Referral agents placed their own, as well as the respondents' reputations on the line, so to speak, in such circumstances. Yet, on the basis of past performance or upon the voucher of another observer, the chances were assessed. The knowledge of the risks, moreover, may have been impetuses for using whatever resources available to see that the commitment would be honored. Motivation for learning, in this case, was optimal.

Visibility (3)

Advancement that came as a result of referral opportunities, imposed accrued responsibilities, and self-initiated responsibilities were ways in which respondents obtained visibility. Visibility included attainment of positions of power or influence inside the organization or in communities associated with the organization. Visibility also resulted from having acquired prominence in job-related activities in professional societies. In addition, visibility also came about by attribution, through role association with prominent persons either within or outside an organization.
Data Analysis Procedures

Observation of the data in the three opportunity-responsibility categories revealed descriptions of how respondents obtained visibility. From analysis of the three categories, Chart 9 was prepared to show specific relationships. To do this, data cards were re-analyzed and coded "VIS" where examples of visibility were observed. Data cards were re-labeled, "VIS/REF-OPP," "VIS/SELF-ACC," and "VIS/IMP-ACC," and sorted into three piles. Piles were separately analyzed and routes to visibility identified. Routes were then placed on the chart. Modifications were made based upon logic of the semantic relationships contained in the coded data samples (See Chart 9).

Visibility, as a category, was subdivided into internal and external as data were being analyzed and posted to the chart. In like manner, each sub-category was split into actors and roles, depending upon whether the respondent acquired visibility through attachment to a high-level person or to a position having power and influence.

A summary of the categories and sub-categories of visibility are: (a) internal (3-a), including (b) roles (3-a.1) and (c) actors (3-a.2); and (d) external (3-b), divided into (e) roles (3-b.1) and (f) actors (3-b.2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE DEMONSTRATED OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>INTERNAL VISIBILITY ROLES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL VISIBILITY ROLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTORS</td>
<td>ACTORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Referral Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Introduction to Key People</td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Forces</td>
<td>Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Information: High Level</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td>Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Recommended for Senior Level</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions</td>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Imposed Accrued Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Big Picture of Organization</td>
<td>Becoming Acting</td>
<td>Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Force</td>
<td>Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Sharpened Expertise</td>
<td>Task Force</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start Up Project</td>
<td>Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office Takeover</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Director</td>
<td>Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-Initiated Accrued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Recognition as Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Task Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Societies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recognition as Expert</td>
<td>Inside</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Outside the Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Establishing Confidante</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF CONTRIBUTORS TO VISIBILITY

FIGURE 9
From observing descriptions of how individuals had attained visible positions, it was postulated that the category, visibility, was an a connecting mechanism between the three demonstration opportunity categories (referral opportunities, self-initiated accrued responsibilities and imposed accrued responsibilities), and credibility. The hypothesis was that respondents obtained visibility (defined as the acquisition of power and influence) through competence demonstration routes. Obtaining visibility, in turn, was also one way of attaining follower respect.

**Internal Visibility: Roles (3-a.1)**

Obtaining visibility through internal routes was the most commonly selected method, and respondents obtained this more through roles than through actors.

There were seven ways by which respondents obtained influence internally by roles: (a) working on high-level task forces and developmental assignments, (b) having valuable expertise, (c) doing start-up projects, (d) taking over offices, (e) gaining recognition for expertise outside one's immediate organization, and (f) becoming an "acting" director.
High-level task forces and developmental assignments (3-a.1-a)

Working on a difficult or complex assignment, problem, or set of problems involving a lengthy commitment of human and financial resources was instrumental in demonstrating potential for upper-level management. As a result of such task forces, Ms. Harris (94-100) and Ms. Thompson (65-72 and 86-91) were able to overcome the entrapment of specialist positions by managing an array of responsibilities independently. Moreover, in conjunction with two agency long-term training programs, Ms. Lindstrom (161-174 and 253-272) and Ms. Pierce (first interview, 259-266) took developmental assignments that allowed them to manage, temporarily, entire regional offices.

Valuable expertise (3-a.1-b)

Respondents who had become experts in their own technical or professional fields were relied upon for their contributions to solving problems by higher-level officials. Ms. Pierce, for example, had developed an expertise in zero-based budgeting and was invited to use the knowledge at her second-level supervisor's office (first interview, 182-251).

Having expertise sometimes led to being selected for positions of status. This was evident in programs which top managers had asked respondents to initiate or to take
over. Because of the similarity of the patterns of attaining internal visibility, they are described together below.

**Start-up projects (3-a.1-c) and take-over projects (3-a.1-d)**

Top-level agency managers asked respondents to begin new programs or to take over programs having difficulty. Ms. Benet described two instances in which she was asked by an Assistant Secretary to initiate programs (first interview, 106-113). Ms. Murphy, an attorney, was asked by another Assistant Secretary, to replace a manager having several long-term operational problems (197-207).

**Gaining recognition for expertise outside organization (3-a.1-e)**

Two respondents obtained status as experts in their organizations for having developed reputations as scholars. Ms. Henry, for instance, wrote a research paper on agency procurement practices to complete a training program requirement and subsequently presented it at a professional society conference and published in a scholarly journal (first interview, 311-313). Moreover, Dr. Delaney noted that she sustained a status of peer esteem through having developed a reputation as a scholar prior to entering government (197-207).
Becoming an "acting" director (3-a.1-f)

Respondents who filled positions of directors temporarily, while permanent personnel were being selected for the positions, assumed the status of the role. Ms. Garret (first interview, 78-107), Ms. Lindstrom (226-245), Ms. Benet (first interview, 242-253), Ms. Rogers (63-71 and 206-272), and Ms. Murphy (101-120) all obtained visibility vested in the position of "acting" director.

It was observed that individuals who assumed acting positions displayed varieties of participative management techniques with staff. A comparison of the instances and implications for future research is contained in a memo, which appears in Appendix I.

Promotions in other agencies (3-a.1-g)

Changes in agency resource levels or career plateaus were impetuses for movement out of the agencies many times. When Ms. Harris' organization imposed a personnel actions "freeze," Ms. Harris' job was abolished (137-150).

Through a referral opportunity, she obtained a position in another organization as a special assistant to an Assistant Secretary. Similarly, Ms. Rogers, unable to be promoted because of lack of technical experience in her organization, took a promotion in another organization where the expertise was not required (63-71 and 151-160).
Internal Visibility: Actors (3-a.2)

In some instances, respondents obtained influential status through their associations with individuals of power. Ms. Benet's career history shows several examples of this. An early mentor was a "an incredible young man in a powerful office. He was a brilliant analyst...He was so smart, everyone relied on him," she remarked (first interview, 42-45).

Ms. Benet also had two role models: a young female who was an Assistant Secretary and the female head of the agency, who exerted strong pressure to enroll more women in the Senior Executive Service Candidate Program (first interview, 119-150 and 161-176).

Ms. Benet also relied on the assistance of powerful and influential peers and Congressional staff in defending her positions. "Protectors and allies" in her organization were those who "took the hits," she said, for her (first interview, 195-199). Liaison staff from the Hill backed her up (second interview, 24-42).

Ms. Benet (first interview, 166-176); Dr. Jones (34-41); and Ms. Lindstrom (48-50) assumed influence through their roles as advisors to their supervisors, who were top-level agency managers. Their influence was not, however, as much through the role they played per se, but rather through the development of a relationship of trust.
built on competence. Ms. Benet, for instance, explained that she was able to gain support of other managers for a new program through deferring to her manager:

I put together the job, hired staff, and figured out what I had to do to get the job done. People knew I had access to him and had his confidence. (first interview, 223-230)

Dr. Jones and Ms. Lindstrom had been commended for their outstanding performances before being selected for the roles as advisors to their respective directors. Dr. Jones noted that she often represented the agency director and provided insight in policy decisions for outside organizations (30-40). In addition, Ms. Lindstrom pointed out that by demonstrating outstanding accomplishments over a two year period, her division director showed confidence in her and promoted her to a GM-14 (50-54).

External Visibility: Roles (3-b.1)

Performing in various roles outside their organizations also provided paths to visibility for some respondents. This was particularly so for those who had experienced career plateauing or dead-ended jobs. Ms. Henry (first interview, 122-124; Ms. Pierce (second interview, 281-300); and Ms. Logan (108-116), for instance, were elected presidents and held numerous offices in their professional societies in order to gain
management experience. Ms. Logan's developmental assignment to Capitol Hill (51-73), in addition, and Ms. Benet's Congressional Fellowship program (first interview, 279-296) gave each respondent an opportunity to influence decisions regarding their respective agencies.

External Visibility: Actors (3-b.2)

Relationships to actors in networks or professional societies also led to external visibility. Ms. Pierce, for instance, developed informal relationships through professional society activities with three high-ranking military officers who later commanded units in Ms. Pierce's organization (second interview, 329-347 and 349-436). Dr. Jones (17-29) and Ms. Ferris (105-112) established networks with professional individuals outside their respective organizations and, through sharing information, developed creative ideas for more effective internal program management. Lastly, Ms. Benet cultivated the support of Congressional staff members as allies in her career (second interview, 24-42; Ms. Chisholm, moreover, included a member of a Senator's staff in her network of knowledgeable persons (second interview, 580-585).
Relationships of Imposed Accrued Responsibilities and Self-Initiated Responsibilities to Visibility

Referral opportunities, imposed accrued responsibilities, and self-initiated accrued responsibilities paved the way for obtaining influence and power within and outside respondents' organizations. To assess the relationship of imposed accrued responsibilities to competence acquisition, self-initiated accrued responsibilities, referral opportunities, and visibility, a series of line charts were prepared. These appear on the following page, collectively grouped as Chart 6. The patterns observed from these graphs are referenced in the discussion below.

Referral opportunities

Referral opportunities introduced respondents to individuals in the organizations who had power or access to power. Power was held in expertise the key players had, in their positions, and in their relationships with other powerful individuals both within and outside the organization. In addition, the individuals making the referrals gave individuals information about high-level openings either in the respondents' agencies or other ones. Such persons also gave respondents recommendations based on observed competencies for senior-level positions.
Imposed accrued responsibilities

Being thrust into a vacant supervisory position opened new perspectives on how organizations were managed. This condition frequently occurred a resource cut or reorganization. Performing the functions of an "acting" supervisor, moreover, allowed sharpening of expertise and promoted expanded applications of skills in a broader range of responsibilities. This was especially notable as a result of task forces, start-up projects, or office takeovers. The "acting" director status, also, allowed respondents to utilize participative management skills.

Self-initiated accrued responsibilities

As individuals worked in a particular environment, they became recognized as a competent, potential manager. This recognition followed many responsibilities which the respondents initiated. The initiatives enabled respondents to be regarded as an internal expert. If the respondents interacted with groups doing business with their organizations or through professional societies, they developed a reputation for a particular expertise from individuals outside their immediate organizations. These outside observers were often instrumental in referring respondents to positions of greater responsibility in organizations other than the respondent's own.
The responsibilities which individuals initiated, moreover, opened doors to establishing confidante relationships with prominent individuals in the immediate organization.

**Organization Cultural Sensitivity (4)**

In collecting and analyzing data, it was apparent that respondents who had advanced in their organizational responsibilities had also developed a sensitivity to the particular environment. As they learned job skills and developed responsibilities, they also learned environmental cues which prescribed certain behavioral responses. This sensitivity was called organization cultural sensitivity.

Organization cultural sensitivity is part of the category of informal learning activities because of the mode in which this sensitivity is acquired. It was made a separate category of analysis, however, on the premise that without attaining sensitivity, personal influence necessary for advancement is thwarted. A proficient individual may become visible by becoming chief of an organization controlling important financial or material resources allocations. Without an understanding of the interests of divergent political and social groups both inside and outside the agency, however, personal power in influencing decisions affecting a program is limited.
Organization cultural sensitivity included cognizance of interests and positions of political groups or individuals, an awareness of expectations of dominant power structures within the organization, particularly peer male managers, and a knowledge of how and when to apply skills to particular situations. A memo referencing the phenomena is found in Appendix K.

Data Analysis Procedures

As data coded informal learning activities were being analyzed, it was noteworthy that learning cues from the social and political environment frequently coincided with various learning activities. That is, as respondents were learning skills in managing programs, they were also being made aware of what skills would be rewarded and which would not. Rewards were based on organization norms which subtly guided how the respondents selected management skills and behaviors.

The phenomena was further defined by reference to Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) article, "Toward a Theory of Organization Socialization." The authors point out that a process of "learning the ropes" informally occurs through a

... relatively quick, self-guided, trial-and-error process to a far more elaborate one requiring a lengthy preparation period of education and training
followed by an equally drawn-out period of official apprenticeship...Socialization entails the learning of a cultural perspective that can be brought to bear on both commonplace and unusual matters going on in the workplace. To come to know an organizational situation and act within it implies that a person has developed some commonsensical beliefs, principles, and understandings, or, in shorthand notation, a perspective for interpreting one's experiences in a given sphere of the work world. (p. 212)

The relationship of the category, organization cultural sensitivity, was difficult to fix in relation to overall career development. As Van Maanen and Schein have suggested above, enculturation occurs across an entire career history. In relation to the data analyzed, however, having a refined sensitivity to cultural cues was seen as necessary to advancement. It was observed that being technically competent was not the only criteria on which respondents moved upward. Moreover, having a position which was responsible for managing important agency resources was also insufficient. Without knowing and adapting to cultural cues, acceptance and advancement were limited.
A Case in Point

In the data analyzed, a sequence of related events clearly demonstrated the relationship between knowing the culture, being competent, and advancing. Ms. Pierce had entered government from college and had taken a number of management and technical training programs, including an internship, before she became a manager. In spite of her technical knowledge, however, she did not find acceptance as a professional among the male peers. To Ms. Pierce, "professional" meant the gaining of credentials through education and training and the ability to locate information that was outside one's own area of expertise. When Ms. Pierce realized that males belittled her competence, she resorted to being even more "professional": doing extra research for reports, turning reports in on time, doing homework so that she would be prepared to discuss technical issues at meetings, and so forth. By educating herself as completely as possible, she felt she would be accepted on a par with other managers in her organization. Ironically, the more she turned out, the more distant she became (second interview, 482-616).

A breakthrough came, however, when she realized that her idea of "professional" was at odds with the concept that the male managers held. When Ms. Pierce understood
the cues and was able to adjust her behavior (such as
doing only what the situation norms required), she was
able to convince her supervisor that she was, by the male
cultural definition, a "professional":

I'd knock myself out and do a lot more than is
expected of me. For example, I'd always taken
deadlines to be life or death...When they say
something is due on such and such a day, a lot of my
male counterparts would do a sloppy job and hand
something in; but I would take it as though I'm not
going to get an extension...This caused me some
problems then, because I'd meet the deadlines on
time, and the others wouldn't. They'd say, 'She's
just trying to show us up...' Even now, that's one of
the things I've had to learn politically: 'Don't take
some of these deadlines too seriously, because you
may come up with an answer that maybe your boss
doesn't want you to come up with. (second interview,
582-624)

Ms. Pierce pointed out that after her supervisor
recognized the changes in her responses to work
assignments, he correspondingly changed his reactions to
her. "It wasn't too long after that," she stated, "that
I got my next promotion (second interview, 276-275)."
Differentiation of Contributors to Organization Cultural Sensitivity

An analysis of environmental forces that provided cues by which the women in the present study interpreted their workplace revealed four major sub-categories: (a) male cultural cues (4-a), (b) political culture cues (4-b), (c) external entities cues (4-c), and (d) personnel management decisions cues (4-d).

The perceptions of personnel management decisions and the particular responses the women took vis-a-vis the perceptions was made a separate category of analysis, however. It was hypothesized that cultural assumptions regarding women managers' career advancement could be traced in various kinds of personnel management decisions. However, decisions adversely affecting women managers' mobility were more often described in the respondents' accounts of advancement issues. Moreover, because the scope of the study did not allow ascertaining the embeddedness of cultural assumptions in personnel management decisions, the sub-category, (4-d), was pulled out and made a distinct analytical category. The sub-category was made into the major data category, "advancement issues."
Male-Cultural Cues (4-a)

In organizations having large numbers of males, norms for management behavior are established by particular individuals in positions of power or influence. Inability to know or to negotiate the norms with the dominant power groups can be ruinous. Women respondents alluded to this throughout the cases. The phenomenon, however, is not exclusively encountered by women; not knowing where the tripwires are organizationally can detonate advancement of both women and men. This was related as an anecdote by Ms. Benet:

We have one new white male in this organization who I think has ruined his career here. He appears to be hanging on. There appeared to be a crisis over the summer which he seems to have gotten over; now, he's hanging on. (second interview, 490-515)

Inferences for how women respondents identified acceptable behavior were made on the basis of four common conditions the respondents described: (a) pressures to succeed, (b) having technical competence, (c) solving conflicts, and (d) assignments.

Pressures to succeed (4-a.1)

Perhaps the most important source for learning male culture cues was the pressure respondents said they felt to succeed. In the instance of Ms. Pierce above, Ms.
Pierce felt that acceptance in the male-dominant culture was contingent upon competence. The more she felt she could demonstrate competence, the more she reasoned she should be accepted. This phenomena also appeared in Ms. Rogers' description of the training program in which she took part with over 60 men:

I was able to hold my own with what I knew; nobody could quarrel with the fact that I was not a dummy. (128-138)

Ms. Benet pointed out that in her agency, if a woman manager makes a mistake, the consequences can be "fatal:"

In this agency, everything is so visible that even a small mistake, if you are in a highly visible job, will just finish you off. (second interview, 332-335)

Technical credentials (4-a.2)

In the male dominant-agencies, particular kinds of technical jobs or professions were prevalent or esteemed. Some examples included a particular specialty of engineering or law. These occupations had few women in them, but, in most personnel promotion decisions, having competence in technical areas weighed heavily. The respondents pointed out that not having technical credentials such as these deterred their career advancement in many ways. To gain recognition as "professionals" in these agencies was difficult because of
the difference in values placed upon technical qualifications versus other professional occupations. To achieve recognition in these agencies, respondents described developing a reputation for competence as essential. Ms. Thompson summarized this when she remarked that "Women must demonstrate competence in each new situation and must work hard to gain access to key individuals in organizations" (182-187).

The determination to achieve and to maintain reputation in their organizations contributed to the pressures to succeed. Ms. Rogers stated that she was "driven enough and attentive enough to details that I was able to teach myself what I needed to know" (38-41). Moreover, she said,

I also had the attitude that, 'I have a job to do. It's important to be responsive. I have a service attitude and was able to survive. I had a management orientation. I wanted to be supportive of positions people wanted me to do. That was my key to advancement. (44-49)

In the analysis of the cases, there appeared to be a conflict between the cultivation of a reputation for being effective, having a technical background, and being accepted. In reference to Ms. Pierce's case above, respondents could perform specialty roles superbly, but
fail to be recognized. Even women who had technical credentials, as Ms. Benet observed, went "down just as fast as women without" (second interview, 294-297). Dr. Jones added that she experienced slow mobility in her agency in spite of having credentials that were superior to many males' (160-174). Hence, it appeared that women were caught in a classic double-bind: heaping up reputations for effectiveness was thought to be a path to acceptance, but superior qualifications, even when they are in a technical area, do not necessarily lead to recognition.

Ms. Pierce offered a clue in her observation that women who had "come up through the ranks," such as secretaries, were promoted faster. Such women, she remarked, were seen to have "earned their way" in the organization. And because they could identify with males who had intimate, first-hand knowledge of many technical operations, they were more easily accepted:

Women are at a disadvantage when it comes to the comfort factor with men," she stated, "because I've seen that men have accepted women into management that were 'one of the boys:' the wisecracking, the joking, the going out for beers after work and everything that they indulged in prior to their
promotions. Then they got their promotions. (second interview, 98-147)

Resolving conflicts (4-a.3).

Another set of cues about the expectations for women managers' roles and behaviors can be inferred from descriptions respondents offered for solving conflicts in their organizations. Ms. Benet remarked that conflicts are often characterized by "latent, surface, aggressive conversations" which culminate in what she calls, "hardball politics:"

I think hardball politics is when you go after the individual. The primary objective is to undermine the individual...[If you are attacked,] you go back after them, and you get them, and you make sure they know you've got them, however you can do that. (second interview, 300-310)

Respondents often reported being involved in conflicts with the male managers in meetings. Quite often, if an issue were raised, respondents would not be recognized by the discussion leader. Ms. Pierce, for example, said that if she wanted to speak up about an issue, she was met with "funny looks, like, 'What do you really know?'" (second interview, 42-50) Dr. Jones, at a meeting with corporate directors of private industry
groups, noted that the leader ignored her raised hand and looked over her, waiting for men to respond (146-158).

In cases of conflict with male peers, the respondents did not report they used counteraggressive tactics. Ms. Jones (143-144 and 151-158) and Ms. Ferris (276-286) used assertiveness skills in expressing their views. Ms. Chisholm described a "taking it in the audience" attitude with which she mentally detached herself (second interview, 529-534), as did Ms. Benet (second interview, 422-452), from the conflict. In another situation, Ms. Benet (first interview, 82-91), as well as Ms. Logan (52-72), used the conflicts as a basis for displaying coordinative skills. By filling what they perceived to be a gap in information coordination with external entities in the situations cited, Ms. Benet and Ms. Logan sought to gain respect. Additionally, Ms. Benet cultivated support of what she called allies and protectors to intercede in conflicts for her:

I don't think there's any point, as a woman, you can win. Maybe that's why I don't get into the vindictiveness...I think that all it does is further undercut you. (second interview, 400-404)

Assignments (4-a.4)

Several respondents pointed out that assignments from male supervisors have been restrictive. Ms. Murphy, for
instance, said that she had been hired to resolve employee grievances in a particular agency, but, in three years, did only one:

My boss felt women shouldn't do cases involving enforcement. Women, [he felt], shouldn't deal with mean people. (26-33)

At the other extreme from overprotecting women employees, Ms. Pierce noted several "sink or swim" assignments which she felt were calculated to make her fail. One example was her supervisor's sending her to a major conference to discuss technical aspects of a new inventory parts system. Ms. Pierce noted that she was given only a week to prepare for a presentation on the system—one with which she was unfamiliar, at that. She found out, a day before the presentation, that the military officer in charge of her organization would be attending. With a great deal of research and polishing her presentation, Ms. Pierce was successful, however (first interview, 308-349).

Ms. Henry suggested that male managers seek to control assignments given to women to lessen competition:

One thing is that men, I believe, like to manage, and many of them don't like to be specialists themselves. But they need specialists to shore them up, so they reward women or anybody who wants to be a specialist
or who doesn't know any better. They think they become part of the family, with females as specialists, on budget, whatever...But they don't seem...to have any of those folks become managers because, ultimately, they would be competing. (second interview, 514-529)

Political Cultural Cues (4-b)

In several of the case histories, respondents reported learning how to work with politically-appointed individuals. The politically-appointed individuals were often the heads, or at least high-ranking senior officials, of the agencies. The political appointees are placed in power, often by the consent of Congress, for a limited period of time. The typical tenure is 18 months.

Respondent actions to expectations of political appointees varied. Ms. Benet, who had worked with several in her agency over a period of 20 years, had found working for them beneficial. For the most part, they provided her advancement opportunities which she believed could not have been made had she worked with a lower-level career manager:

If you are working with political people, you have a better advantage than if you work with bureaucrats, because, many times, political people know they have a short tenure and are looking for people who are
smart and who can pick up programs and move with them. They're not as threatened; they know they'll be short-tenured. They already have their positions. They won't be there two years later. (second interview, 88-99)

Dr. Delaney, however, found that political appointees expect career managers to carry out agendas, even if it meant overlooking different external interest perspectives. She described an instance in which, as a manager for programs for women's interests, she sought to involve all interests in a particular decision. When she did not weight the views of a particular group favored by her politically-appointed supervisor, her supervisor removed her to a "non-assignment: a program that had "no funding and was of minor political importance" (52-85).

Dr. Delaney confided that experiences, as well as similar ones she had observed in other career manager's histories, had been a factor in her decision not to seek a Senior Executive Service position in the agency. She said that SES members have been transferred at the whim of political appointees and have also been used as "buffers" (173-195).

Ms. Chisholm pointed to two conditions which belittled her career experiences. One was a ceremonial role which she learned to play in spite of her own set of
values. In one instance, Ms. Chisholm was appointed to a Presidential council that recognized individual student contributions in education. The agency had nominated Ms. Chisholm on the basis of her credentials as an educator. Ms. Chisholm, however, did not participate in the selection process, but rather "passed out pencils and plaques." In another situation, involving use of program money for a political speech that involved "spouse attendance, catered luncheons, and shopping trips," Ms. Chisholm expressed anger (first interview, 130-151). She added:

Money for careerists to provide technical assistance in their programs was cut. (first interview, 138-146)

The second condition involved a political appointee's failure to acknowledge her contributions to important briefing papers. The appointee had assumed that his staff assistant had written the papers, since Ms. Chisholm's name did not appear on them. When he found out that Ms. Chisholm was the author, he was surprised. Ms. Chisholm remarked that she felt she had been "prostituted" (second interview, 264-317). Thereafter, she made duplicate copies of the briefings that were to be made before Congress and affixed her name to each of them. This would minimize the chances that, even if the aid would erase Ms.
Chisholm's name, Ms. Chisholm would receive proper credit (second interview, 306-317).

Ms. Garret pointed to a situation in which a political appointee had failed to understand the role which career managers played in program review and had criticized the managers for ruining "the relationship between the parents and the [state agency] (second interview, 256-305).

External Entity Cues (4-c)

In addition to learning to work with political appointees, several of the respondents learned that managing their function involved working with divergent public interest groups as well as with Congress. Learning the variegated interests and accommodating sometimes conflicting aims into a national program was part of the socialization process of women in the federal government.

Of the respondents, Ms. Benet has had the most long-standing relationships with the Congress. Learning how to deal with Congress members came early in her career. A key set of skills, she pointed out, was learning who the Congress member's staff were and what their interests in a particular piece of legislation were. It was the staff, she noted, that were central in upholding an agency stance (second interview, 45-49).
Ms. Garret, similarly, noted that developing an informal relationship with staff members enhanced Congressional acceptance of agency legislative proposals (first interview, 34-42).

Ms. Benet (second interview, 24-42) and Ms. Ferris (105-112) described the importance of negotiation and interpersonal communications skills in addressing concerns of public and industry officials in relation to their programs. Understanding how to integrate the different views came about, in Ms. Garret's case, through the tutelage of an experienced manager who had been both a careerist and a consultant to the organization (first interview, 109-116).

Relationship of Organization Cultural Sensitivity to Mobility: Some Possible Explanations

The pressures to perform outstandingly and the tensions of being visible in male-dominant cultures have been well-documented in literature of women's careers. Kanter (1977), Morrison et al (1987), Powell et al (1980), and Gutek and Larwood (1987) have discussed the topics in depth. The findings from this study appear to confirm observations that women experience difficulty in being recognized as professional individuals.

The behavior in conflict situations, which several authors have characterized as avoidance of risk taking
(Hennig and Jardim, 1977), may, in another light, be regarded as adaptive. Kanter (1977) suggests the avoidance of risk stems from lack of positional bargaining power. Another possible explanation, however, may be that the adaptation was not as much on a structural basis, as Kanter suggests, but rather on an historical one. Many women in rather high-level positions had not experienced or had been able to identify with "coming up through the ranks." Males may have believed that because women in their culture had not experienced direct and intimate contact with technical problems, they could discount arguments or even ignore the women in discussions. Finding themselves ignored, women may have realized that using tactics of the males in resolving disputes did not enhance their positions; hence, they may have jettisoned that as an option.

From respondent descriptions, assignments may be regarded as mechanisms which male managers used to exclude women from advancement. Respondents suggested a number of possible explanations, such as men fearing competition, not recognizing women as professionals, or from personal beliefs about the suitability of work women should do.

Political culture also influenced the women's career development. Although the tenures of political appointees were short, they provided program direction for the
majority of agency managers and employees. Learning what the appointees' goals and objectives were and strategies that the appointees forged to implement the programs was vital to managing. The brevity of the tenures, on the one hand, provided discretionary opportunities for career managers to develop implementation tactics. On the other side, however, they created expectations that careerists would uphold a certain posture vis-a-vis public interest groups. Tension resulted at the interface of public and politically-appointed goals, and left the career managers to deal with it. If the career manager's own values coincided with those of the politically-appointed leader, there was little dissention. But, as in the instances of Ms. Chisholm, Dr. Delaney, and Ms. Garret, disagreement produced a greater tension in carrying out an agenda.

"Learning the ropes" inside the agency, for several respondents, was in part contingent upon learning the varied interests of groups of external organizational stakeholder. As their agencies sought to be responsive to the Congress and to accommodating groups having interests in various pieces of agency legislation, interpersonal skills and networking came to the fore and blended into the creation of a particular artistry respondents referred to as an "agency stance" (Ms. Garret, first interview, 114-153). How the respondents forged this was through
carefully cultivating informal and long-term relationships with people most likely to influence processes and outcomes.

Advancement Issues (5)

From a review of management and organization behavior literature, it was assumed that there were definable gaps between personnel management policies and practices. To examine and describe the manifestation of the disparities in the career histories of the respondents, the respondents were asked to relate issues in their career advancement. They were also asked to describe actions or responses they took in face of the issues. The responses were recorded as learning strategies based on the problem-centered definition of adult learning in this study. The ways in which respondents characterized and dealt with the issues indicated possible contributions of a particular organization culture to career advancement.

Personnel management policies and practices were distinguished from organization cultural sensitivity on the assumption that personnel decisions were direct links to advancement. Through decisions made about selection, promotion, and training, additional inferences about the particular organization culture could be made. Moreover, respondent perspectives on the advancement issues were seen as both reactions to specific institutional values as
well as, in more general terms, human reactions to restraints.

Data Analysis Procedures

A pile sort of 5 x 8" data cards was completed to reveal categories of issues. This produced three sub-categories: (a) selection (5-a), (b) promotions (5-b), and (c) training (5-c).

Data sheets were then prepared by category for each respondent. The sheets included respondent name, antecedent event, description of issue, respondent action(s), outcomes of action, and respondent insights about the issue.

Data were posted to a composite chart and respondent actions categorized. Actions as learning responses were paired with type of issue and a summary of the issue recorded in the cell. A vertical reading of the issues provided a summary of the responses per category, while a horizontal one showed the numbers and varieties of learning responses to the particular issue. A final version, Chart 10, appears on the next page. Chart 10 summarizes the issues discussed below.

Selection (5-a)

Personnel management issues constituted the largest number of the instances. Of that, selection issues appeared most often. In three cases, less-qualified males
### TYPE ISSUES: LEARNING RESPONSE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filed Complaint</th>
<th>Left Situation</th>
<th>Perservered</th>
<th>Took Tng On</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Selection (5-a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Less Qualified Male Selected</td>
<td>1. Ms Harris 152-191</td>
<td>2. Dr Delaney 86-103</td>
<td>3. Ms Thompson 140-165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promotion (5-b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Lacked Technical Qual</td>
<td>Ms Pierce 1: 210-220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Difficult Going From GS-12 to GM-13</td>
<td>Ms Rogers 139-155</td>
<td>Ms Logan 85-99</td>
<td>Ms Pierce 1: 108-114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Training (5-c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Not Allowed to Complete Program Requirements</td>
<td>Ms Pierce 1: 33-55</td>
<td>Ms Chisholm 1: 95-103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Disqualified Not Allowed to Attend</td>
<td>1. Ms Murphy 160-170</td>
<td>Ms Henry 1: 81-91</td>
<td>Dr Jones 100-113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Few Programs</td>
<td>Ms Ferris 122-130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ADVANCEMENT ISSUES.**
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were selected over females for jobs. In one case, a respondent had been denied a supervisory position because the personnel manager did not feel it appropriate for her, as a recreation management specialist, to inspect men's locker rooms (Ms. Henry, first interview, 99-102).

In all instances, the respondents filed complaints to personnel representatives, but had varying resolutions. Ms. Pierce queried the personnel panel which had selected two males for two different jobs. The panel spokesperson admitted that Ms. Pierce "gave better answers" than did the males, but the men got the jobs, nonetheless, because "You know the way things are" (first interview, 267-298). When Ms. Thompson's supervisor attempted to replace her with a less-experienced male from outside government, Ms. Thompson filed a complaint. She subsequently took a job in another office, however, before it was settled (140-155). Dr. Delaney, on the other hand, obtained the job after complaining to personnel that her supervisor said he "hadn't thought of selecting a woman" for the position (81-103). The resolution to Ms. Harris' complaint that three less-qualified males in succession had filled the director's vacant position produced lingering problems for her. Although the complaint was resolved in her favor, she noted that her "reputation for competence was severely questioned" (189-195).
Promotion (5-b)

Related to selection, promotion issues were also prominent in the case histories. The issues all pointed to an inability to be promoted into mid-level management positions, GM-13 to 15. The respondents cited lack of technical experience and special opportunities to expand responsibilities beyond those of specialists as reasons.

"Technical experience seems to be the one criterion for getting any place in this organization," said Ms. Benet (second interview, 204-207).

Ms. Rogers added that, "If you're not technical, you're second class" (149-152).

"Women who lack technical experience with equipment," Ms. Pierce remarked, "make male managers look bad" (first interview, 88-94).

Ms. Henry, in addition, observed that "Men have steered women into specialty roles from which it is hard to escape" (first interview, 238-242 and second interview, 475-481).

Dr. Jones offered a clue that valuation of demonstrated technical competence might emanate from cultural norms established by top managers. "Top-level management doesn't look at training, but rather experience," she noted (176-178).
Training (5-c)

Attending training, in fact, came up as an important issue in the career histories. Ms. Chisholm remarked, People in the old boy network get to do the 'goody-good' things, like going to conferences. It's almost like you have to stand in line or wait for attrition (second interview, 56-69).

Ms. Murphy related that her supervisor removed her name from nominees for training (160-170), and Ms. Pierce said that her supervisor refused to allow her to attend training required by the internship program in which she was enrolled (first interview, 33-49).

Personnel officials restricted attendance, as well. Dr. Jones pointed out that her application for an executive development program was denied because the reviewer said Dr. Jones "wouldn't get anything out of it" (134-136). Further, the reviewers in Dr. Jones' agency said that nominees below the Senior Executive Service were ineligible to attend a particular program; Dr. Jones later found that not only was she eligible to attend as a GM-15, but that a male was selected to attend the program (100-105).

Several women said they took training at their own expense and, in some instances, on their own leave time. Ms. Henry (first interview, 81-91) and Ms. Pierce (first
interview, 108-114) enrolled in graduate programs in management using their own funds because they felt it was an effective way to establish qualifications for advancement. Both also paid for a variety of agency-sponsored long-and short-term programs and courses through professional societies after they realized that training was a key to mobility. Another respondent, Ms. Ferris, said she paid for as many programs in human resource development from a vendor as possible to do her job effectively. Internal training programs, because of agency budget cuts, were extremely limited, she noted (122-130).

Observations: Organization Values in Advancement Issues

Developing managers in organizations includes more than sponsoring training and development programs; selection and promotion policies and practices are intricately connected to the overall process of growing managers. Organizational values underlying personnel selection, promotion, and training processes, to a large extent, influence the kinds of managers produced and advanced.

From respondent accounts, management selection, promotion, and development in their organizations has been framed around technical competence as an ideal. Many federal organizations have unique missions that require
managing particular sets of technical operations. Understanding the mission as well as operations is important, especially at the levels closest to employees.

Organizations value technical expertise, however, to the point of excluding consideration of other skills, abilities, or ways of managing. That other ways can be used effectively, such as Ms. Pierce's using parts specialists to provide certain information to meet a particular task requirement, is overlooked. Moreover, alternative techniques or skills of managing are viewed as inferior: as "second-class."

An erroneous corollary, that those having other than a technical operational background in management are likewise "second-class," may be a distortion. An indication of this appears in Dr. Delaney's comment that a woman was not even considered for a particular program opening. Failure to consider skills other than technical, but which are important in managing operations, was alluded to in several accounts of slowness in or failure to move from one management level.

The shortsightedness appeared to manifest itself in practices of selection for training programs as well. Assumptions in statements that women would not understand or find useful certain executive leadership programs or that workload issues were more immediately important than
attending training refuse to consider development of skills other than particular technical ones.

Respondents' agencies also seemed to have a view that training was less preferable than experience. On this basis, formal learning was not strongly encouraged. Credentials gained through professional training or graduate education were not as important as hands-on experience in defining a professional.

In dealing with perceptions about formal learning and with specific actions limiting career growth and advancement, respondents exhibited a range of responses. Overwhelmingly, in instances in which less-qualified males were selected for management positions, respondents filed complaints. In non-selection for training programs, formal complaints were filed with personnel officials, likewise. Realization of career stagnation, however, was met with reactions such as taking whatever is offered and hoping for the best (Ms. Logan, 85-94); frustration, ("I just kept bumping my head up against a wall;" Ms. Rogers, 147-152), and abandonment ("I'll go somewhere else." Ms. Benet, second interview, 379-380).

The responses reveal also an underlying degree of self-assertiveness in the face of risk. Filing a personnel complaint often resulted in an informal resolution before formal action against respondent
supervisors was taken. In Ms. Harris' case, however, the
complaint was resolved formally in her favor; but the risk
of complaining had detrimental consequences. It is ironic
that protection for recrimination, provided in personnel
management regulations, is not applied to individuals
filing complaints.

Lack of Professional Recognition

In analyzing the relationships between the
categories, organization cultural sensitivities,
visibility, and credibility, there emerged a suggestion
that lack of professional recognition stood in the way of
being seen as a credible leader. The elements in this
suggestion appear on the accompanying Chart 11. This
chart shows that lack of recognition as a professional is
a linking mechanism between social learning processes,
attaining positions of power and influence in
organizations, and advancement issues.

The striving to attain distinction as a competent
professional in the eyes of peers, non-political, and
politically-appointed superiors appeared prominent
throughout respondent career histories. From accounts,
however, there appeared to be three obstacles in this
striving: (a) a pressure to avoid mistakes; (b)
assignments of non-politically-appointed supervisors; and
(c) controlling tactics of politically-appointed
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superiors. These were identified from data analysis of data coded "organization cultural sensitivity," "visibility," and "advancement issues." Categories and sub-categories related to each of the three concepts were collected and plotted on a chart. Linkages in the form of antecedents and outcomes were identified from the accounts and through logical inferences based on the accounts.

Briefly, pressure to avoid mistakes was described by respondents in highly-visible positions. Usually, these women were a numerical minority of line managers in large, multiple-layer, functionally-complex bureaucracies. Some respondents alluded to pressure that came from "sink or swim" assignments or from being caught in the middle of "hardball politics." Single mistakes, no matter how minor, could potentially undo them, they pointed out. Tactics respondents used to manage this pressure were chiefly a drive to excel, pouring out extra effort and overdoing assignments, and surrounding themselves with people who voluntarily "took the hits." The latter, referred to as "protectors and allies," could include Congressional staff members.

The assignments of non-politically-appointed managers were not only geared to exacting near perfect managerial performance, but they were also seen as appropriate for females. Assignments in the latter category were based on
what male managers believed female subordinates "ought" or "ought not" do. This had the effect of keeping women in specialist roles and belittling their lack of direct, "hands-on" technical experience credentials. Women who remained in specialist roles were unable to get the technical experience required for managing a broad range of complex organizational functions of a higher-level position. Women lacking, or perceived to lack, this type of credential, in turn, were often not selected for or promoted into jobs requiring technical mastery and wide-ranging interfunctional responsibilities. This non-selection sometimes resulted in the women's filing formal complaints to personnel. At other times, the women simply persevered until they could find other positions, usually in other organizations.

A third obstacle in achieving professional recognition was political appointees' use of several types of management control. The control tactics included budgetary control over organization programs, such as spending funds for social functions while at the same time limiting funds for career managers to use in carrying out program oversight, and controlling assignments. Examples respondents mentioned were carrying out a ceremonial role, being used as "buffers" for unpopular political agendas,
and being given "non-assignments" of low-budget and low-status as punishment for disagreement.

Recognition as a professional is related to attaining credibility. If credibility is defined as an integration or consistency of personal and professional values and actions over time, then lack of recognition as a professional plays an important role in relationship to how much credibility is perceived. Women, for instance, may strive to enhance credibility through developing excellent reputations for competence, may seek esteem from external public liaison actors and politically-appointed superiors; but, ironically, the lack of perception of them as professionals can limit the amount of confidence others place in them.

Recognition as a professional, for the most part, emanated from perceptions of others. Credentials and competencies that the women managers strove for appeared to be of limited help in promoting perceptions of them as professionals.

Credibility (6)

A sixth component of contributions of training and development to the career histories of women managers in federal government was credibility. Credibility was defined as the congruence of personal beliefs and values with actions in an organizational setting. A description
of how this hypothesis evolved is contained in a memo in Appendix L.

Data Analysis Procedures

From respondent interviews that pertained to the definition of credibility, data were coded by key words or phrases in context, placed on 5 x 8" note cards, and sorted into piles. Data were then analyzed using content analysis techniques.

Data analysis of the category of "credibility" was difficult for several reasons. First, there were few examples in the fourteen case histories in which respondents specifically described "credibility." In these comparatively few instances, however, respondents indicated that attaining "credibility" was crucial to their career development. Moreover, coding the content was difficult because "credibility" was an extremely abstract concept. It involved not only skills, demonstration to others, and a sensitivity to organization phenomena; it also relied upon the perceptions of other individuals. Thirdly, because the category was abstract, it was difficult to infer its occurrence in cases in which respondents had not described or labeled "credibility." "Credibility," as such, was not referenced as a specific example. That is, by doing "x," the respondent demonstrated credibility. Rather, credibility seemed to
be a much more abstract category, defined more broadly by waves of experiences over a long period of time. The concept of "credibility" appeared to be evolutionary, and like organizational cultural sensitivity, organic.

Description of Credibility

The most detailed description of credibility is contained in Ms. Henry's account. The instances are stated in toto and inferences drawn from them.

[in reference to Dr. Solomon:] He would say, 'This is how you would approach that.' [in reference to male managers in the organization.] 'Your personality is warmer if you don't go for the jugular...instantly. That isn't the way to play. It's like chess. You make a move, and then your opponent does. You build credibility the whole time. But if you always are out to change the world, you cannot do it by 3:00 p.m. It's an evolving process.' (second interview, 703-716).

In this anecdote from Dr. Solomon, Ms. Henry implies that credibility is relational, based on perceptions of cultural cues. It is based on calculated assessments of risks.

In another anecdote, Ms. Henry describes a female psychologist who had knowledge, competence, and visibility, but who lacked credibility:
Here's an example of somebody who was a very smart woman, but who didn't have the benefit of a [Dr. Solomon.] This woman wore diamonds a lot: diamond earrings, diamond rings, and all that. She was a psychologist and really hadn't thought, I'm sure, about how she looked. She also had an elaborate hairdo and she had wonderful materials to present. But in a way, by her appearance, she detracted from [the impact of her presentation.]...This woman would say, 'Now I wear diamonds and I like to wear them. If you don't like it, you can lump it.' That isn't the point. The point is, how do you come across? (second interview, 799-824)

In this instance, Ms. Henry indicates that credibility involves a sensitivity to others' feelings and involves a willingness to adjust behaviors to meet their expectations. It is knit by an assessment of others' needs and a periodic self-inventory or mirroring.

In a later portion of her interview, Ms. Henry defines credibility as

... perhaps two kinds of things. One is how others perceive you. do you seem to others to be correct? Able? Certain? Informed? And that's only the perception. How others view you. Maybe you're a phoney. So there's another kind of credibility,
which is bona fide credibility, which is what you truly do know. And that's the difference between somebody that can wing it and skate through. And unless they come off as somebody who knows more or zeroes in on them. Those are the key concepts of credibility.

Sometimes, that person may not be perceived to have credibility—may know it all—but somehow, not be able to articulate it, or doesn't look the part. Somehow, there's something wrong. There are two ways of looking at credibility. Women have to do both. They have to know, they have to have done it all... they have to know everything about everything. And then, they have to be not too overcome when they're challenged... (second interview, 1142-1169)

By Ms. Henry's definition, credibility seems to be a fundamental integrity of values and actions. It appears to be those values which are core or central to the "nature" of a particular human being: those which are fairly resistant to change over time. They are those which are revealed to others, oftentimes without the awareness in social situations on the part of the sender. Merely "covering up" by outward mannerisms will inevitably give the "phoney" away. Women's credibility or integrity is under constant scrutiny. To prepare for this, women
need to have a broad sense of experience and knowledge and to desensitize feelings of being overwhelmed by the pressure.

A second respondent, Ms. Benet, gave some further insights into "credibility" in her case history. In the first instance, she describes "credibility" from her own career experiences:

A lot of people I met when I worked with him [her supervisor and mentor] are people I still work with. There's a long continuity. People who have known me for years and I've established my own credibility. Having those introductions is very important, and the earlier, the better. (second interview, 35-42)

She seems to point out that credibility is established over time and through a continuing relationship. It is a kind of trust which is implicitly conveyed through interactive relationships.

Ms. Benet also gave an example of a young male colleague, new to the organizations, who had not learned the tripwires within the organizational setting. He made some near-fatal mistakes early:

We have one new white male in this organization who I think his career is ruined here. He appears to be hanging on...I think his credibility has been so diminished by that. You wonder really what use he is
to the agency. Maybe, over time, he will rebuild.
(second interview, 490-499)

According to Ms. Benet's observation of "credibility" in the young man's career, credibility implies a value of worthiness. Those who lose credibility run the risk of losing their self-esteem. This worth is tied to the values which an organization has of the individual. One slip, and the damages take a long time to recover.

Implications of Credibility

Credibility, as a category, had only a comparatively few illustrative pieces of data for analysis. On the whole, however, it seems an integral part of the processes by which respondents have used formal and informal learning in their careers. Without the sensitivity and the integrity of credibility, respondents may lose out on a lifetime of resource investments. Further, advancement within the organization may be limited. One may have competence and even attain positions of power and influence in an organization. One could be respected by many individuals and provide resources to others. But without being perceived as having credibility or integrity, advancement to highest organizational levels may be extremely difficult.

Chart 11 posited relationships to credibility by three concepts: (a) organization cultural sensitivity; (b)
visibility; and (c) advancement issues. The figure suggested that failure to be recognized as a professional was a pivot in linking the three concepts to credibility. Data coded "credibility," moreover, provided what may be interpreted as another indication of this connection. In particular, Ms. Henry describes a kind of devaluation she has observed:

Women generally undervalue, and this is what causes us to get lower salaries. And, in a way, we're perpetuating it by overproducing. It might be pumping up our credibility all the time. We're now getting men to be used to the fact that we should be better performers. And that's not fair, either. But we're contributing to it ourselves. But I don't know if we can stop doing it. So I'll just say that underlying all this is the undervaluing of women by men and women. (second interview, 1192-1206)

Devaluation implies a perception of loss of value, or of discrediting. In relation to human resources development, a program that would incorporate both sensitization of perceptions as well as identification of structures that reinforce devaluation (such as practices that retain women in specialist positions) may be considered. An outline of such a program appears in Appendix M.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study answered the question for research, "What have been the roles of training and development in the career histories of women managers in selected federal organizations?"

Summary

Purpose

The study was undertaken to examine the linkages of training and development, as surface structures, to unarticulated beliefs, values, and assumptions about career development in organization environments. It was also produced to analyze the roles of training and development as catalysts of change in individual organizational careers.

Background

On Knowles' (1970) research, it was surmised that training apart from an overall organizational intervention program was insufficient in enabling federal women managers to advance in their careers. The organizational systems in federal government in which training and development, as sub-systems, operated, however, was not known. The "organizational systems" referred to personnel policies, regulations, and procedures as well as management practices that governed selection, promotion, and training of women
managers in the federal government. To understand the systems and their linkages to training and development from the viewpoint of women managers, the present study was initiated.

As a first step, a review of literature pertaining to women managers' organizational careers was undertaken. The review centered about organizational phenomena influencing women's careers, particular needs and conflicts of women managers, and contributors to women's career orientation. The literature review revealed ten variables: (a) lack of opportunity structures, (b) blockage because of "power elites, (c) avoidance of risk taking, (d) low degrees of career satisfaction and commitment, (e) low expectations for success, (f) discriminatory personnel practices, (g) low degrees of self-confidence and poor group effectiveness skills, (h) attributional bias, (i) conflicting messages in personal and professional socialization processes, and (j) lack of supervisory support for career development in government organizations.

Research Methodology

The literature review suggested that not a great deal was known about how women in particular federal organizations had used training and development in their careers. To develop a data base from which inferences could
be drawn in order to answer the research question, a case study methodology was undertaken.

The literature review suggested that varieties of organizational structures and sizes influenced career history patterns of women managers. On this basis, federal organizations that varied by size, mission, and numbers of women employed were identified. Following that, heads of six organizations were contacted by letter to obtain permission to conduct research. Through representatives of the agency heads, permission was obtained in five of the six organizations. Each agency was provided written guarantees of confidentiality of information and anonymity of responses.

Meetings to further explain the proposed research to agency representatives and to solicit names of individuals to be interviewed were held. Following the meetings, each representative nominated from between 10 and 20 individuals of different grades, position titles, and years of experience in the federal government for interview. In addition, five individuals known through professional experiences and who were in organizations which had granted permission to conduct research were added to the agency-representative lists. The nominees' and the professional acquaintances' names were placed together on a four-cell grid of large versus small and few versus many numbers of
women managers in agencies. Each second name in the cells were selected for interview.

To derive information about career histories, a structured interview was developed. Questions were based upon contributors identified from the literature review and were sequenced according to the socialization stages described by Van Maanen and Schein (1979). The questionnaire was reviewed by several male and female career and non-career federal government human resources managers before it was revised and administered.

Four interviews of one to two hours were held in respondents' offices or at restaurants near their work. Each interview was tape recorded and copies given to respondents for subsequent verification and correction of factual information. Transcribed interview data were marked with preliminary category codes, which were based upon interview question. The coded information was placed on 5 x 8" note cards and hand-sorted into piles by category.

Preliminary data analysis revealed that formal learning activities were sparse in comparison with the various kinds of informal learning activities. Informal learning through several types of supportive individuals appeared paramount, in fact. These two findings, however, were not too surprising. What was more intriguing, however, were the possibilities for varied career paths suggested by the
finding that some women had had lengthy professional careers before entering federal government. Moreover, building a reputation for competence appeared to be an important goal for both informal and formal learning. Analysis of the four cases did not yield possible explanations for this. To explore the questions relating to the role of competence, informal learning, and pre-entry careers on mobility in federal organizations, additional case study data were gathered.

To solicit additional information, the questionnaire was revised. Moreover, an eight-cell grid was prepared to account for pre-entry careers and for individuals who had taken a great deal of training after entry. The agency representatives were contacted to provide names of individuals who matched the information requested. Names, along with professional acquaintances, were placed in the cells and each second one was drawn. Ten individuals were telephoned; of these, two nominees were excluded because they were not classified as "managers" under federal regulations.

Interviews of two hours were conducted outside the respondents' offices. Interviews were tape recorded and transcribed copies provided respondents for verification and correction of factual information. Transcriptions, moreover, were coded by interview question category and data
placed on 5 x 8" note cards. The cards were sorted into piles and further analyzed. From the piles, data sheets, memos, and preliminary charts showing tentative relationships between data categories were prepared. After the eighth interview, when hand sorting became tedious and time-consuming, a computer software program, Ethnograph, was used to conduct data collection and analysis more efficiently.

After the twelfth case study, data categories and relationships between them appeared to stabilize. The analysis revealed six major contributors to career histories: (a) competence acquisition, which was a means of gaining job skills and abilities both through training and through informal learning processes; (b) responsibility demonstration opportunities, which were ways in which respondents used job skills and abilities to gain additional position responsibilities and to be referred to positions of greater power or influence in their organizations; (c) organization cultural sensitivity, in which respondents learned the implicit and explicit cultural rules of the organization; (d) visibility, which referred to the processes of obtaining power and influence in the organization; (e) advancement issues, which included learning practices in hiring, promoting, and training women managers that were at variance with affirmative action
policies and regulations; and (f) credibility, which was defined as a perception of one's integration of personal and professional beliefs and actions.

To ascertain that data categories had saturated, two additional case studies were conducted. Because the new data did not appreciably change the meaning of the categories nor their relationships, it was concluded that no additional data collection and analysis were required.

Data categories and their relationships from fourteen case studies were across cases. It was desired, however, to understand the relationships within certain histories. Selecting cases in which the relationships appeared to be particularly exemplified would, it was reasoned, provide an in-depth understanding of individual perspectives.

Five issues for further research were identified: (a) ways that training and development had participated in advancing certain career histories; (b) how specialized management training and development programs had been used in particular histories; (c) how selected women had applied informal learning opportunities; (d) how some women had used learning strategies to reduce barriers to their career advancement; and (e) how various kinds of supportive individuals had participated in developing certain respondents' careers.
Five individuals whose careers seemed to depict the issues clearly were selected for in-depth interviews. A questionnaire based on each individual case history was developed and administered. Interviews of two to three hours were held either in the respondents' offices or off-site at lunchtime. Content analysis using data coded by questionnaire category was conducted. Data were collected and analyzed using the Ethnograph software package.

Results

Competence acquisition referred to the getting of skills, abilities, and knowledge for performing job-related duties. Demonstrating competencies not only in a particular function but also in interpersonal work-related situations was quite important to respondents, moreover. Reputation building was a key objective for obtaining mobility. Respondents who developed expertise in a specialty were regarded as resources and were often referred to positions of power and influence in organizations.

In enabling respondents to develop competencies and to be referred to higher-level positions, mentors and role models were key resources. Learning informally through mentors and role models was enhanced if they were supervisors, and first supervisors, especially. Some ways in which the mentors and role models participated in the learning were: (a) introducing respondents to prominent
officials within and outside the agency and teaching the respondents interpersonal skills in communicating with the officials; (b) teaching respondents ways of integrating divergent political interests in formulating goals to serve nationwide program objectives; (c) serving as interpretive filters of organization social, political, economic, and cultural phenomenon; and (d) providing challenges and opportunities in learning new assignments.

Although not all respondents used them, protectors and allies also played important parts in informal learning processes. They provided referrals or havens of escape, provided leverage or support in defending respondent positions, and sanctioned respondent promotions and performance awards in the context of peer male managers.

In addition, support personnel, such as secretaries, administrative personnel, and training officers were often gatekeepers in providing access to important opportunities, individuals, or events. Support personnel encouraged participation in developmental opportunities as well as provided advice.

Similarly, respondents relied upon family and friends for counsel, encouragement, and sustainability in times of crisis or momentous decisions.

Besides resource persons, work assignments were prime sources of gaining competence informally. Respondents used
work assignments not only to learn new job skills but also as bases for applying skills learned from prior career contexts, from education, or training. Examples of skills learned from work assignments included how to manage people in difficult interpersonal situations, how to implement new program initiatives creatively and efficiently; how to define socialization rules and processes; and how to locate sources of information for solving work-related problems.

Professional societies and networks were also used in career development as sources of career information, means for introducing respondents to potential resource persons, and as laboratories for developing and testing leadership and information sharing skills.

Developmental assignments and task forces outside and inside the organization enabled respondents to gain new skills, such as productivity improvement or organization development, to develop new interests, and to expand a list of professional contacts. They were also instrumental in enabling respondents to understand "big picture" configurations of organization structures. Moreover, they enabled respondents to gain experience in managing an entire range of organizational responsibilities.

Interviews and observations were occasionally used as informal learning vehicles. By watching what managers did that was effective, respondents fashioned cases of "good
management" for study. Interviews, moreover, enabled respondents to gain insight into how top managers moved ahead in particular agencies.

Informal learning, in brief, played a critical part in learning organization socialization processes as well as job skills and responsibilities. Socialization, it appeared, appeared to be carried out more through informal than formal learning mechanisms. The present study illumined the unstated assumption about particular organizations' reliance upon informal learning activities as social learning vehicles.

It was observed that the amount of training taken after entry into government varied with length of prior career history; respondents who took a great deal of training tended to have extensive prior experience in a particular career.

Respondents who found training useful tended to: (a) have taken non-specialty or management training early in their careers; (b) be in jobs with limited mobility potential; (c) use a mix of training and informal development; (d) had opportunities to apply skills from formal learning programs immediately in developmental assignments or special projects; (e) and have established professional careers before entry.
Respondents who did not find training particularly useful in their careers tended to: (a) rely on mentors or role models extensively throughout career histories; (b) use referral opportunities to gain visibility; (c) participate in task forces or external developmental assignments early in their careers; (d) have entered in limited potential jobs, particularly in administrative support areas; and (e) state that job experience was more valued than training in their organizations.

Reorganizations, downgrades, and resource cuts were central forces that often propelled respondents toward learning new responsibilities. For instance, during times of organization change, respondents often took on responsibilities of transition managers; learning about the political forces shaping the dynamics of the change processes going on, respondents also employed strategies for enabling peers and subordinates to manage changes. Use of motivational strategies, creative job structuring, and interpersonal resource skills became prominent. Ironically, changes in organization structure also provided opportunities to demonstrate exemplary performance in managing tasks and relationships. The demonstrations, observed by superiors, often turned into referrals to positions of promotions or, in the case of downgraded positions, to grade restoration.
In a similar vein, collateral duties and jobs of limited mobility opportunity appeared to provide impetuses for developing additional skills and responsibilities. This often resulted in taking training, joining professional societies, and obtaining leadership positions in professional societies to acquire credentials for career advancement.

Respondents extended their job responsibilities by developing roles as "experts" in a particular skill area. Examples included establishing a policy coordination network between government agencies, developing expertise in planning, programming, and budgeting, becoming a change agent in an organizational transition, and providing quality customer service in personnel management.

In order for respondents to establish a reputation within an organization, however, more than technical expertise demonstration was sought. Respondents also strove to be regarded for reliability, or being able to be counted on to solve a difficult problem, or being a resource to others.

Some respondents, additionally, displayed self-responsibility in developing plans for managing their career development. Respondents who "got their tickets punched" became aware of what skills and abilities were
needed to move ahead in their organizations and developed action plans for attaining them.

Several individuals provided information on job openings and exerted support for respondents being promoted into higher-level positions in organizations. The opportunities came from supervisors, political appointees, co-workers and friends, and clients.

Opportunities as a result of referrals often increased respondent peer status through expanding respondent influence. The opportunities also enabled respondents, in many situations, to impact agencywide policy.

Referrals were often based on observed skills competencies in a present or in a past performance situation. Referrals were made on the basis of mutual trust and assumption of risks, particularly when the opportunities were in starting new programs or in taking over less-effective ones.

Organization cultural sensitivity is a learning process that appeared to be continuous throughout career histories. It manifested itself when respondents became aware of practices not consistent with policies and also aware of practices joined together in a larger sub-structure of organizational behavior. Three contributors to the process of learning organization culture appeared from male cultural cues, political culture cues, and external entity cues.
Adapting to the dominant culture of male managers involved dealing with pressures to succeed, or to perform outstandingly, achieving a reputation for competence in a organizations having strong technical missions, resolving conflicts that men often managed through use of "hardball politics," and coping with assignments that tended to restrict mobility.

Political appointees as managers, in some instances, provided favorable opportunities for career growth. In other instances, however, political figures inhibited it through giving "non-assignments" as consequences for respondent disagreements, using respondents as "buffers" for a particular agenda, and discrediting contributions of career managers.

Respondents learned the informal ways in which their organizations did business with Congress and various public interest groups. In learning an "agency's stance," respondents acquired skills in interpersonal relationship building, negotiation, and program objective setting.

Organization cultural sensitivity involved three elements: (a) an understanding of interests in and outside the organization; (b) an awareness of dominant power structures, and (c) an intuitive grasp of how and when to apply knowledge to a particular situation.
As women moved upward in organizations, they obtained power and influence most often through positions. Visibility included acquisition of power and influence both internally and externally and through both roles and colleagues.

Respondents who gained internal role visibility were often promoted on the basis of observed competence into positions in which they managed important financial, human, or material resources. In addition, respondents were able to gain influence by associating with individuals who were powerful within the organization. Examples were one's supervisor, Congressional liaison staff, and peer managers who functioned as protectors and allies.

Occasionally, respondents acquired influence through roles they performed in professional societies or networks. This was especially notable in those individuals who had experienced limited mobility. Through these roles, respondents not only acquired leadership competencies and experiences, but they also became acquainted with individuals who played influential roles in the respondents subsequent career mobility.

Moreover, respondents developed informal relationships with powerful individuals outside the organizations. The external actors were individuals such as Congressional staff or high-ranking military people respondents met through
professional society activities. The external actors were used as protectors and allies as well as for developing important ideas.

There were five major routes to gaining visibility:
(a) Serving on a high-level task force or developmental assignment provided respondents an understanding of how their organizations operated internally and with various external interest groups. It also introduced them to key decision makers. (b) Becoming an expert in a specialty area, such as planning, programming, and budgeting enabled respondents to develop a reference base for being referred to greater levels of responsibility. (c) Obtaining sponsorship of high-level officials in initiating programs of national importance or in taking over ineffective programs permitted building up of trust among high-level officials. (d) Becoming scholars recognized inside and outside the agency fostered reputations for competence and provided additional avenues for reward. and (e) Becoming an "acting" director transferred the attributes of the status of positional power to the respondents.

As respondents advanced in their careers, three types of issues emerged that affected mobility: selection, promotion, and training.

Selection issues, particularly involving less-qualified male managers, were most commonly voiced. Respondents dealt
with the issues by filing complaints with personnel offices. This response, however, had varying effects upon the outcomes. In some instances, respondents were offered the positions before the complaint was resolved, in others, the resolution came about through a personnel officer's intervention with the particular manager, and, in one, the respondent's complaint was resolved in her favor, but damage to her reputation was costly.

Promotion issues centered about women who, lacking technical experience, were unable to be promoted into management. It was noted that women were retained in specialty skill areas for long periods of time, moreover. Respondents remarked that having technical experience was a criterion for mobility in their agencies.

Respondents noted that training opportunities were not afforded them for a number of reasons. Organizations selected "old boys" to attend courses rather than opening up slots to other qualified employees. Personnel officers did not admit women to courses on the premises that the women would not be interested in the topics discussed or lacked qualifications to attend. Additionally, agency training programs were limited because funds were cut severely.

It was observed that the three major categories, organization cultural sensitivity, visibility, and advancement issues were linked by a central concept, lack of
professional recognition of the women. Three specific kinds of contributors pointed to this concept: a pressure women described to avoid mistakes; assignments of non-politically-appointed supervisors; and controlling tactics of politically-appointed superiors.

It was also observed that the concept of lack of professional recognition also was connected to credibility. Credibility was defined as the integration or consistency of personal and professional values over time. Credibility was derived from perceptions. Hence, if a woman was perceived to not be a professional, such a perception inhibited the attribution of trust. Credibility was more than the development of reputation for competence, reliability, or even respect and it was more than obtaining influence or power. It was a relational concept that was based on perception of cultural cues and assessment of risks in certain situations. It involved sensitivity to others' feelings and a willingness to accommodate views of the others in interpersonal relationships. It was nurtured and cultivated through periodic self-assessment.

It was noted that the observed lack of professional recognition of women as managers was related to the observed phenomenon of personal devaluation.

In summary, the study described the overall process of development of careers in the fourteen cases analyzed. A
model depicting the relationships was put forth. It is summarized below:

Respondents acquired competencies through informal or formal learning activities. To be used for job learning and for career advancement, the competencies were demonstrated through self-initiated accrued responsibilities and imposed accrued responsibilities.

Often, in the process of competence demonstrations, respondents would be observed by individuals having degrees of power and influence in or outside the organization. These individuals would refer respondents to positions offering opportunities of greater responsibility and influence in organizations.

Throughout their careers, respondents encountered advancement issues. Understanding assumptions underlying the issues allowed respondents to gain sensitivity to organization politics and skills for managing the issues.

Obtaining skills, demonstrating expertise, and, over time, developing a reputation for being a competent, reliable, and respected person, however, did not necessarily lead to advancement. Respondents obtained visibility by cultivating relationships with senior officials based on mutual trust and acceptance of risks. Actions conveyed not only trustworthiness, but also a sensitivity and a flexibility in adapting to interpersonal relationships with
a variety of people. Over a career history, respondents built up credibility.

Conclusions

Formal learning, in relation to gaining job skills to perform roles, had limited impact. Respondents maintained it was both irrelevant to their particular needs, was untimely (in the sense that skills and abilities had often been gained informally through career experiences by the time training occurred), and was sparse. Too few classes on needed topics were offered because of agency resource cuts. Much training took place at the individual's initiative and expense.

By contrast, informal learning was paramount both in career learning and in advancement. Two chief vehicles were use of resource persons (particularly mentors and role models) and work assignments.

In analyzing possible explanations for the preponderance of informal learning activities, several theories from adult learning and organizational behavior can be brought to bear. One possible explanation is that mentors and role models knew particular organizations well. This is especially important in the early stages of one's career, as Hall and Takami (1977) point out. Having mentors orient newcomers reduces tension of learning many new pieces of information at once and provides a roadmap for future
navigation (Feldman, 1976). Having familiarity with conditions that existed, or which could exist, improved the likelihood that skills would be applied correctly (Watson, 1961). Also, because mentors and role models could describe unarticulated assumptions of particular organization cultures, they could be regarded as accurate and reliable sources for applied learning.

Mentors and role models also knew the individuals well and tailored experiences to particular needs. Learning which recognizes the needs and interests of the learner and which involves the learner in the process of learning is effective (Houle, 1972).

In addition, mentors and role models emphasized specific results to be achieved and provided support in achieving them. Learning which specifies clear and attainable objectives, which provides specific feedback in meeting objectives, and which provides a realistic simulation of the exact environment in which concepts and techniques are to be applied facilitates transfer of knowledge (Bandura, 1969).

Work assignments also offered fertile ground for learning. Lindeman (1926) maintained that as adults mature, experiences are inherent resources for learning. Knowles (1970) adds that experiences provide a base for new learning. Experience gained from work assignments,
moreover, were most apparent in assignments involving risk or uncertainty. Starting new projects, taking over less-effective functions, and managing reorganizations called forth strategies that had to be developed quickly, accurately, and, where subordinate staff was involved, tactfully.

Environmental instability seemed to engender creative ways to manage difficult assignments. Yet, the lack of order was not of such severity that it hindered skills development. Conditions from unstable environments suggest some mitigation of potential debilitation. These include (a) establishment of a supportive or mentoring relationship with a superior before changes began; (b) extraction and nurture from the mentor or role model a style or set of management principles which were compatible with respondents' own values; (c) lack of severe interpersonal conflict among subordinate staff before structural changes were made (in fact, a congenial, collegial relationship was suggested); and (d) bestowal of status from a superior. This appeared to provide legitimacy to both role and power. The mitigating conditions in permitting the applications of skills and the development of creativity appeared to include the use of formal power (Filley and Grimes, 1967) and socialized power (Powell et al, 1984).
The demonstration of competencies under adversity or from opportunities developed through self-initiative led to advancement. The movement was conditional, however, upon the interaction with a referral agent. Without the referral, mobility on the basis of competence demonstration alone did not occur.

The moving of a respondent from organizational peripheries to positions of power in the interior of Schein's (1979) conic career model is analogous to the progress of attaining centrality in Smith and Grenier's (1982) conception of organizational power. The present study, however, suggests that attaining visibility results not merely from a sequence of ever more responsible career moves, as Schein's cone suggests, nor of individual effort and achievement by themselves, as Smith and Grenier depict. The study does suggest that power and influence evolves non-linearly, contingent upon human referrals.

The model of the six contributors to career development suggests also that the mere gaining of competence and power do not alone guarantee that a leader has credibility. Knowing how to do a particular task or perform a particular function well and being recognized for one's expertise stop short of enabling a leader to be trusted. Unless individuals develop a sensitivity to subtle cues from an organization's dominant social and political culture and
skills for managing outcroppings of cultural assumptions embedded in personnel management decisions, credibility does not evolve.

Awareness of culture appeared to result from interactions with mentors and role models. Cultural awareness building was based on observations of how experienced managers learned "government games" (as one respondent termed them) as well as explicit teachings of how dominant culture members carried on business. Respondents learned to interact with the dominants by learning from the mentors and role models such things as how conflicts were resolved and how male managers view women managers in interpersonal situations. Using the teachings, respondents were able to bridge cultural gaps and foster development of credibility among peers.

The processes of social learning were continuous throughout a career. Early establishment of bases of support from protectors and allies was important. The support paid off in later career stages where, it was observed, mistakes carried more serious consequences. Mistakes early in one's career, even if near fatal (as in the anecdote of a young male related by one respondent) need not bring permanent damage. Mistakes made later in careers, however, have different effects. They are like car crashes on freeways: chain reactions can tie up traffic for hours.
Surviving the games and the crashes required skills that were developed over a lifetime through the sustained intervention of different support individuals, through periods of self-assessment, and through desire for improvement.

The ability to survive and to thrive, with respect to credibility development, appears to be related to self-efficacy. If individuals do not have feelings of positive self-worth, it is unlikely that they would have inner motivation to undertake risky projects, use several formal and informal learning strategies for moving out of dead-end jobs, and assert rights in contending with personnel management decisions. If this is true, the presence of self-efficacy would allow setting ever higher goals (Wood and Bandura, 1989). The achievement of advancement goals, in turn, might have created an expectancy of future success and the establishment of even more self-confidence. Building a strong belief in one's own abilities as well as establishing nodes of power and support appeared to absorb shocks that could affect credibility.

**Recommendations for Management Development**

The findings from this study can be applied to a comprehensive federal management training curriculum. The recommended applications include planning as well as pre-entry, entry, and expansion phases of management. The basis
for the recommendations is the observation from the study that the vitality of training rests upon the alignment of organizational selection, promotion, and rewards systems. The recommendations discussed below, moreover, are made on the assumption that managers have not had established careers before entering federal government.

Planning

Before initiating management training, an analysis of a particular organizational learning climate should be undertaken. The analysis can be accomplished through a structured survey and observation of key work units and their managers. The result of the analysis should be a description of how freely the organization encourages risk taking and developing, rewarding, and implementing creative ideas. Moreover, the analysis should indicate the degree of consistency between the agency's policies and practices for selecting, promoting, and training women, minorities, individuals in non-technical jobs, and employees in jobs with limited mobility potential. In addition, the analysis should also include a profile of the agency's attitude toward formal and informal learning, particularly learning outside the organization. Lastly, the analysis should spotlight linkages between organizational structures. Gaps that indicate restrictive practices should be noted for possible areas of change.
The planning should also include statements from top managers indicating strong support for training and development as individual and organization change strategies. Responsibilities for carrying out the policies should be stated in management performance appraisal agreements.

**Pre-Management Phase**

After analyzing an organization's learning climate and recommending changes in particular organizational structures, human resource development professionals can design a training and development program. The study indicated that a great deal of learning about management took place prior to entering management. To encourage individuals who would like to become managers to acquire the skills, the organization should provide numerous formal and informal learning experiences. The aim of such development is the acquisition of "big picture" relationships, the cultivation of skills for self-assessment and management, and the exposure to management officials outside work units. This aim can be accomplished through agencywide task forces, inter-agency developmental assignments, and through training in management skills, such as team leadership, problem solving, and program management.
Early Management

Training and development for individuals after entry into management should aim at developing an organizational, rather than parochial, view of work management. This can be accomplished informally through brown bag lunches, cross-organizational task forces, and agency-purchased memberships in professional societies. Formal learning can include skills in building networks, interpersonal relationships, conflict resolution, and developing support for ideas. In support of training, training in adult learning concepts followed by clinics in informal learning processes should be provided to individuals who wish to develop mentoring skills.

Expansion Phases

Formal and informal learning for mid-career managers should concentrate upon developing individual and organizational productivity. This is possible after having had earlier experiences as managers that provided an understanding of how technology, employees, and political interests contribute to the mission and functions of the organization as a whole. Informal learning experiences should build upon these experiences as well as complement training in organizational productivity. Training programs should provide skills in organizational diagnosis and intervention, building work climates that foster innovative
thinking and participation in problem solving, group process
skills, and organizational communications techniques.

The study sketched, through descriptions of mentors and
role models, characteristics of supportive individuals.
Because these individuals apparently had long-term training
outside their organizations which enabled them to understand
complex intra-organizational management relationships and to
communicate these to their employees, a recurrent model of
management development should be considered.

The goal of management training and development, based
upon findings from the present study, is to enable
individuals to acquire competencies for self-initiative,
skills for job responsibility development and career
advancement, and tools for organizational climate
management.

Areas for Future Research

The study raised some questions for areas of further
research. One of these was the hypothesized relationship
between self-efficacy, use of training, and career
advancement. A future study of the characteristic in women
who remained in dead-ended jobs versus those who left them
might shed additional light on the role of self-efficacy to
achievement and career development.

Another area for future study is the observation that
mentors and role models have values which are at variance
with dominant political sub-structures in hierarchies. A future study might examine the ways in which the organizational relationships have evolved and the operant values which the resource persons use with the proteges and with the dominant configurations of power.

Why respondents relied on the resource persons over formal learning processes might be explored further through an analysis of cultural assumptions within a particular organizational climate. Such a study might analyze determinants of a particular culture that affected organization members' use of formal and informal learning. Because the study indicated that the role of the supervisor is critical in establishing a learning climate, such a study might began at this level.

Developing sensitivity to unstated organizational assumptions played a key role in respondents' learning how to deal with issues in advancement. It was speculated that developing this sensitivity occurred continuously over a career. An in-depth study of the identification of and negotiations with organizational norms in varying power configurations in career histories could be undertaken. Case histories in such a study might be used to answer the question, "What competing paradigms of women manager development operate in organizational strata that affect learning 'the system'?"
Lastly, the concept of credibility in career development as defined in the study, may be more comprehensively studied in future studies. Of particular interest are ways in which managers gained or lost credibility, as perceived by others in their organizations. Moreover, a related area of interest is the contribution of organizational norms to individual credibility development. What are some perceived conflicts managers experience between organization values and their own? How do they perceive these conflicts affecting their credibility?

Generalizability of the Model

It is hoped that the model depicting six contributors of career advancement will describe similar organizational socialization processes of other populations of managers. To assess the generalizability of the model, a study using research methodology similar to that in the present study may be undertaken among a group of male federal government managers. Following that, a survey research design may be considered for both male and female managers in private sector organizations, such as manufacturing, retail, trades, and high technology. In describing the career development histories of male and female managers in organizations, it is surmised that the model can be used to delineate non-traditional career paths of individuals.
In conclusion, the present study has broken ground for future studies by assessing the use of training and development in relation to organizational careers of a selected group of federal government managers.
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Appendix A: Draft Interview Schedule

1. Tell me about what you do on your job?

2. How did you get into government?

3. Tell me about your first job in government? (Repeat for jobs subsequent to this)
   a. What was it?
   b. What kind of prior training or education had you had?
   c. What were some of the challenges you had?
   d. What were some obstacles? How did you meet them?
   e. What kinds of training did you take at this time? Why?
   f. What were some special opportunities for learning on the job that you had? How were these made available to you? What did you do with the opportunities? How did they contribute to your career development?
   g. Who were individuals who helped you in your career? Please describe them. What were some examples of ways in which they helped you?
   h. What opportunities did you have for promotion? What was your next job?
i. After you were promoted, what kinds of training and development did you take? Why?

j. What changes in your professional relationships did you notice since the training you took?

k. What were some learning opportunities outside your job you used to enhance your career? Please give examples of how these opportunities helped you.

Sample Profile of Interviewees

1. GM-13 - 3 interviewees who had participated in special programs for women managers.
   a. individuals participated in special program, such as OPM's Executive Leadership Program (for GS-9 to 12's).
   b. promoted into management following program participation.
      1. had been in government several years as professional, technical, or administrative specialist.
      2. had demonstrated initiative, creativity, and excellent interpersonal skills, but had few opportunities to develop them.
c. program helped promote visibility and provide opportunities for further developing skills; fostered network contacts within and outside agency.

d. after program, initiated several developmental assignments and task force projects.

e. pursued additional training and education opportunities within agency, government, and at college or university.

f. had variety of "mentors" inside and outside organization who supported their development before, during, and after program.

2. GM-13-4 interviewees who had not participated in special programs for women.

a. two, who came into government at high level in scientific, legal, or technical occupation; had graduate degree directly related to job.

1. active professional network.

2. has been in agency entire career.

3. predictable promotions; may have been "tokens" promoted because of sex.

4. training taken for professional development, not necessarily for career growth.
5. deal with power coalitions by virtue of professional position, although sensitive to feminist issues.

b. two, who are in professional, administrative, or technical positions.

1. promotions competitive; have been position several years.

2. various strategies used in coping with power coalitions:
   a. demonstrated competence and initiative, initially, but lack of recognition and support cooled enthusiasm.
   b. experience frustration; various coping methods used.

3. training seen as competitive; only some people take it, such as the "favored"; training regarded as means for getting ahead.

4. developmental assignments or special projects few.

5. supports small; may be peers or professional organization outside job; generally feeling isolated and focused inward.
3. Mid-Level, highly experienced managers (GM-14-15) - four interviews conducted.
   a. entered government at lower level (GS-5) from college; went into careers not directly related to their majors (i.e., secretarial work, EEO, or personnel) usually because that was the only way for them to get in.
   b. promotions up to GS-11 and 12 came rapidly (within 4 years), but usually after career fields had changed (i.e., secretarial jobs of short-term duration and used as stepping stones); promotions fairly predictable.
   c. promotions beyond GS-12 came as a result of special assignment(s) and resulted in unique opportunities to demonstrate capabilities to high-level people inside and outside agency; established "reputation" for competence.
   d. dealings with power structures (usually male-dominated superiors) one of major obstacles.
   e. family relationships not to severe source of conflict: two of women single and one had two children under age 5.
   f. strategies for coping with power structures:  
      1. working hard (long hours, not complaining, not being outspoken "feminist").
2. demonstrating competence.

3. arranging for special details; brokering for advancement opportunities (short-term assignments to another agency, a regional office, or "to the Hill").

g. initiated informal learning projects or activities.

1. support groups: in agencies, met to discuss career histories and ways of getting ahead among themselves.

2. informal network of professional women in agency but also in other agencies employing women in same professional jobs.

3. active roles in professional societies of both male and female members.

4. initiated individual case studies of what "good managers" are.

h. career advancement supported by high-level people; composite picture:

1. usually male, SES, and in agencies or organizations outside "parent" one.

2. usually second-level supervisor or peer; thoroughly know women managers; met on special detail,
3. in special executive training and development programs.
4. willingness to informally teach what they'd learned to both men and women on staffs.
5. long-term relationship; may be personal
6. not regarded as "mentors" but as "friends"
7. provided information on completing application forms and location of developmental assignments.
8. warm, confident, not threatened by competence or by women, secure.
9. promoted actively high-level visibility of women through special projects, such as organization-wide task forces.
10. were objects of study and emulation.

i. role of formal training
1. not much prior to management jobs.
2. much training taken was skill orientated, for instance, computer literacy and budgeting.
3. not much training since becoming manager regarding development.
4. training not very useful
   a. credentials don't matter
   b. experience more important
c. participated in university management training program full time for one year where case study approach to learning used, but already learned effective management techniques through observing managers at work.

j. self-initiated learning useful
1. case studies: observation
2. developmental assignments
3. learning networks, inside and outside organization.

k. careers plateaued at mid-point; see little likelihood of advancing into SES.
Appendix B: Revised Interview Schedule

1. I would like to find out various ways in which you used training and development in your career in government.

2. I want to begin by understanding how you entered government. Did you have a professional career before government?
   a. If so...
      1. What was it?
      2. What training and education had you had for this career?
      3. Did you have any special opportunities for developing your career into a government career? If so, what were they? How were they made available to you? How did you use them?
      4. How did you get into government?
      5. What was your first job?
   b. If not...
      1. What were you doing just before entering government?
2. Were you a college or university student? If so, what was your major? Did you have career goals at this time? If so, what were they?

3. If not, what kind of job did you take in government?

4. What were some reasons for getting into government?

3. Thank you. Looking back at that job for a minute, were there clearly-stated opportunities for you to advance?

   a. If so...
      1. What were they?
      2. How were they made available to you?
      3. What did you do with these opportunities?

   b. If not...
      1. Did you develop opportunities on your own to advance?
      2. If so, what were they?
      3. How did you come up with these?
      4. How did you utilize them?

4. What were some issues which you confronted in advancing in this job?
a. How did you deal with them?

b. Were there any people at this time who were of help to you in managing these issues? If so, who were they? Please describe them. In what ways did they help you?

5. Did you experience any particularly difficult situations related to your career advancement at this time?

   a. What were they?

   b. How did you react to them?

   c. Did you consult with any resource for help? If so, who or what was it? Describe how they helped you. Did you find this help useful? How?

6. Thank you very much. I would like to talk about learning opportunities you had on that job. What skills and abilities, in particular, do you feel enabled you to become a more effective, more mature manager?

   a. What were some skills and abilities you picked up while working on that job?

      1. How did you acquire them?

      2. Were there individuals whom you feel were particularly helpful in enabling you to
learn these skills? If so, who were they? In what ways did they help you learn?

3. How did you use these skills on the job?

b. In this job, were you given any training and development to help you learn your job? If so,

1. What was it?
2. Did you find it useful or relevant? If so, how?
3. How were you made aware of opportunities to take training?

c. Did you take any special training and development on the job at this time? If so, ...

1. What was it?
2. Did you find the training and development program(s) useful or relevant? If so, how did you apply what you'd learned?
3. How were you made aware of the opportunities for these special programs?

d. Did you take any classes outside your normal duty hours that were related to your job? If so, ...

1. What were they?
2. Where did you take them?
3. Why did you enroll?
4. Were the skills and abilities useful to your job? In what ways?

5. Were the classes useful to your career advancement? How?

7. Good. I want to talk now about career moves you made at this time. "Moves" can be, for instance, from one job to another in the same agency or different one, in the same job field or to a different field, or promotions.

   What was your next job after this one?
   a. Was it the same type of work?
   b. If not, what was it?
   c. Was it in the same organization?
   d. If not, where did you go?
   e. What were some reasons for taking this job?
   f. How were you made aware of the job opportunity?
   g. Was it a promotion? If so, was it a career ladder promotion?
   h. How did your responsibilities change with the move?

(NOTE: Repeat questions 3 through 5 up to current position)

8. I appreciate your sharing your career history with me. There's just one more thing I'd like to ask you. As we've
reflected back on your jobs, I'm wondering what advice you'd give to women aspiring to move upward into management?

9. Thank you for this information. I appreciate your generosity of time and for the wealth of information you've shared.
### Appendix C: Initial Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) prior government</td>
<td>PRE.GOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a) college major</td>
<td>PRE.GOV.COLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-b) job experience</td>
<td>PRE.GOV.JOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-c) career</td>
<td>PRE.GOV.CAREER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-a) internships</td>
<td>ENT.INTERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-b) fellowships</td>
<td>ENT.FELLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-c) temporary appointment</td>
<td>ENT.TEMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-d) apprenticeship</td>
<td>ENT.APPRENTICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) initial training and development</td>
<td>INIT.TRNG.DEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-a) on-the-job</td>
<td>INIT.TRNG.DEV.OJT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-b) non-specialty training</td>
<td>INIT.TRNG.DEV.NON.SPEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-c) task force</td>
<td>INIT.TRNG.DEV.TASK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-d) developmental assignment</td>
<td>INIT.TRNG.DEV.ASSIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) formal learning</td>
<td>FORMAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4-a) non-agency specific</td>
<td>FORMAL.NON.AGENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4-b) agency-specific</td>
<td>FORMAL.AGENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4-c) generic</td>
<td>FORMAL.GENERIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(4-d) special management training
FORMAL.SPECIAL

(4-e) university
FORMAL.UNIV.

(5) informal learning
INFORMAL

(5-a) reading
INFORMAL.READ

(5-b) network
INFORMAL.NET

(5-c) task force
INFORMAL.TASK

(5-d) developmental assignment
INFORMAL.DEV.ASSIGN

(5-e) work assignment
INFORMAL.WORK

(6) non-goal learning
NON.GOAL

(6-a) observation
NON.GOAL.OBS

(6-b) role model
NON.GOAL.ROLE

(6-c) case study
NON.GOAL.CASE

(6-d) big picture
NON.GOAL.BIG.PICT

(6-e) group skills
NON.GOAL.GROUP

(6-f) social learning
NON.GOAL.SOC.LEARN

(6-g) professional society
NON-GOAL.PRO.SOC.

(6-h) job challenges
NON-GOAL.CHALLENGE

(6-i) task force
NON-GOAL.TASK

(7) mobility issues
MOB.ISS
(7-a) personnel management decisions
MOB.ISS.PERSONNEL

(7-b) discrimination
MOB.ISS.DISC

(7-c) gain acceptance
MOB.ISS.ACCEPT

(7-d) power structure
MOB.ISS.POWER

(7-d.1) political
appointee
MOB.ISS.POL

(7-d.2) male
MOB.ISS.MALE

(7-e) tokenism
MOB.ISS.TOKEN

(7-f) difficult people
MOB.ISS.DIFF

(7-g) dead-end job
MOB.ISS.DEAD.END

(7-h) limited resources
MOB.ISS.RESOURCE

(7-i) downgrade
MOB.ISS.DOWNGRADE

(7-j) demanding job
MOB.ISS.DEMAND

(7-k) bureaucracy
MOB.ISS.BUREAUCRACY

(8) supportive people
SUPP.

(8-a) co-workers
SUPP.COWORK

(8-b) supervisor: political
appointee
SUPP.SUP.POL

(8-c) friends
SUPP.FRIEND

(8-c.1) male
SUPP.FRIEND.MALE

(8-c.2) female
SUPP.FRIEND.FEMALE

(8-d) supervisor: non-political
SUPP.SUP.NON.POL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-e</td>
<td>internal consultant</td>
<td>SUPP.CONSULT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-f</td>
<td>retired female</td>
<td>SUPP.RET.FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-g</td>
<td>secretary</td>
<td>SUPP.SEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-h</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>SUPP.FAMILY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-i</td>
<td>protector</td>
<td>SUPP.PROT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-j</td>
<td>mentor</td>
<td>SUPP.MENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-k</td>
<td>training officer</td>
<td>SUPP.TRNG.OFF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D

**List of Codes Used in Data Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Classification/Data Category:</th>
<th>Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) competence acquisition</td>
<td>COMP.AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a) informal learning activities</td>
<td>INF.LEARN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.1) resource person</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.RES.PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.1-a) mentor</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.RES.PER.MENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.1-b) role model</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.RES.PER.ROLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.1-c) technical expert</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.RES.PER.TECH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.1-d) support personnel</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.RES.PER.SUPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.1-e) family/friends</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.RES.PER.FAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.1-f) protector/ally</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.RES.PER.PROT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.2) work assignments</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.3) professional society</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.PRO.SOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.4) network</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.NET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.5) developmental assignment</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.DEV.ASSIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.6) task force</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.TASK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.7) observations</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.OBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-a.8) interviews</td>
<td>INF.LEARN.INT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-b) formal learning</td>
<td>TRNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-b.1) agency-provided, long term</td>
<td>TRNG.AGENCY.LONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-b.2) agency-provided, short term</td>
<td>TRNG.AGENCY.SHORT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1-b.3) OPM: long term
TRNG.OPM.LONG

(1-b.3-a) Federal Executive Institute
TRNG.OPM.LONG.FEI

(1-b.3-b) Senior Executive Service Candidate Program
TRNG.OPM.LONG.SESCP

(1-b.3-c) Executive Seminar Centers
TRNG.OPM.LONG.EXC

(1-b.4) OPM: short term
TRNG.OPM.SHORT

(1-b.5) external
TRNG.EXT

(1-b.6) institution based
TRNG.INST

(2) responsibility
demonstration opportunity
RES.DEMO.OPP

(2-a) imposed accrual responsibilities
IMP.ACC

(2-a.1) reorganizations
IMP.ACC.REORG

(2-a.1-a) downgrade
IMP.ACC.REORG.DOWN

(2-a.1-b) grade restoration
IMP.ACC.REORG.UPGRADE

(2-a.2) resource cuts
IMP.ACC.RES.CUT

(2-a.3) vacant supervisory position
IMP.ACC.VACANT

(2-a.4) new work assignment
IMP.ACC.WORK

(2-a.4-a) start up program
IMP.ACC.START

(2-a.4-b) take over program
IMP.ACC.TAKEOVER

(2-a.5) dead end job
IMP.ACC.DEAD.END

(2-a.6) collateral duties
IMP.ACC.COLL

(2-b) self-initiated accrual responsibilities
IMP.SELF

(2-b.1) becoming expert
IMP.SELF.EXPERT
(2-b.2) gaining reliability
(2-b.3) becoming a resource
(2-b.4) punching one's ticket
(2-c) referral opportunities
(2-c.1) superior
(2-c.2) supervisor
(2-c.3) coworker
(2-c.4) other
(3) visibility
(3-a) internal
(3-a.1) role
(3-a.1-a) task forces and developmental assignments
(3-a.1-b) valuable expertise
(3-a.1-c) doing start up programs
(3-a.1-d) taking over offices
(3-a.1-e) gaining outside recognition
(3-a.1-f) becoming an acting director
(3-a.1-g) promotions in other agencies
(3-a.2) actor
(3-b) external
(3-b.1) role
(3-b.2) actor
(4) organization cultural sensitivity

(4-a) male-dominant

(4-a.1) pressures to succeed

(4-a.2) technical credentials

(4-a.3) resolving conflicts

(4-a.4) assignments

(4-b) political appointee

(4-c) external entity

(5) advancement issues

(5-a) selection

(5-b) promotion

(5-c) training

(6) credibility
Appendix E:
Respondent Questions for In-Depth Interviews

Second Interview:
Sharon Garret

1. You mentioned learning to articulate the "agency stance." How did you develop this?

2. Susan helped you "learn the ropes." Can you provide some examples of how she did this?

3. How did you develop your own style of management?

4. You mentioned three ways that you used to manage changes. Where did you acquire these skills?

5. In relation to the transition into the acting position, did you feel like you used the expertise of the career managers to help? How so?

6. In relation to Dr. Overby, you used a certain skill to provide feedback on his style. Did you have similar experiences in this setting?
7. Dealing with political figures and male figures is something that has come up in many interviews. Some people have said that there are separate systems—a separate set of rules for women and for men. Women have found their transitions into that system difficult. Have you experienced that?

Second Interview:

Barbara Henry

1. You said that women were not hired into professional foreign service jobs when you started your career.

   a. How did you react to that?
   b. Had you had similar experiences in the past?
   c. How did you respond to them?

2. Your supervisors in Korea and Panama seemed to provide support in helping you try out new ideas and programs.

   a. Could you describe these supervisors? For instance, were they males? Did they discuss some strategies for your development?
b. What are some examples of new ideas or programs that you started?

c. What supports were you given, such as resources?

d. How did you develop support for implementing new ideas or programs?

e. In Korea, how did you learn about the announcer job? Had you previous experience or training?

3. On page three, you say that you realized training was a key factor in moving ahead.

a. How did you come to this realization?

b. Did you have a specific career goal in mind at this time? If so, how did you develop it?

c. Did you have any people who supported your decision at this time? If so, who were they? What kind of support did they provide?

4. I am interested in your descriptions of not being selected for a particular task or job because you were not
male. (For instance, you reference an example on page 3, paragraph 3.) Had you had other experiences in your career that were similar? If so, what were they?

a. How did you react to them?

b. What skills do you feel were helpful in enabling you to deal with not being selected?

5. On page 7, you talked about women not having line or specialized experience finding promotions difficult.

a. Can you provide some examples?

b. Have you observed men reacting to women who do not have the specialized experience? If so, what are the reactions?

c. Have you noticed women's responses to not having specialized experiences? If so, what are some examples?

6. On page 8, you mentioned being the only female presenter in the symposium.
a. What were some of the ways the main presenters reacted to your presentation?

b. What were examples of your responses?

7. On page 9, you noted that the "climate" was not good where you worked.

   a. Could you provide some examples of the type of climate in which you worked?

   b. What was your relationship like with:

      1. your supervisor?

      2. your coworkers?

   c. Were there other women in your shop?

8. On page 9, you decided to make two choices in regard to your career: changing career fields and going for a doctorate degree.

   a. What were some of the factors you considered (i.e: pros and cons in making your choice?)
b. Did you receive encouragement from or support for making the changes?

1. If so, from whom?

2. What were some ways in which you received help?

9. On page 9, you referred to "credibility" as being important to a woman's career development.

a. Can you define and give examples of "credibility?"

b. What are some ways women can gain "credibility?"

c. How do you feel "credibility" helps women develop their careers?

Second Interview:

Margie Benet

1. Jack taught you how to analyze various situations. Were there others who taught you analytical or problem solving skills on the job?
2. Jack also taught you how to deal with the Hill.

   a. What was involved in that?

   b. Did you gain additional skills in that after working with Jack? Please give examples.

3. In dealing with older, more highly technical males, what were some examples of ways that you, as a young female, had to "constantly prove" your competence?

4. You mentioned that you gained additional "credibility" with the men by forming associations with powerful men and women in your organization. You also provided examples of how these associations helped you.

   a. How did you learn to form these associations?

   b. Were there earlier instances in your career that enabled you to learn how to make contacts and to enlist their support?

5. You mentioned two terms that captivated me: "mentor" and "protector."
a. Could you give me an example of each?

b. How are they the same?

c. How are they different?

6. How did you develop a supportive relationship with these people?

7. What kinds of people were the supporters? You called them "knee-jerk liberals."

8. You mentioned that you cultivated their support on a day-to-day basis. Can you give examples of this?

9. You also mentioned that women not having a technical background had a difficult time being accepted in a male-dominant power structure. You discussed the tactic of "hardball politics," which I was fascinated by. Would you give an illustration of that?

10. What are some ways that you have found effective in dealing with damage to "credibility?"
11. You indicated that "hardball politics" is like a win/lose situation in the sense that it involves vindictiveness. What were some examples of how that manifested itself earlier in your career?

12. You mentioned that it was difficult for you to receive feedback from your peer managers. Have the people you've been associated with, such as the mentors and protectors, given you feedback? How?

**Second Interview:**

**Katherine Pierce**

1. On page 3, you described male managers who did not accept female managers who lacked a technical area of expertise. What were some of their reactions to you, as one such woman?

2. How did you respond to the male managers reacting to you in that fashion?

3. Did you develop any specific techniques for gaining acceptance with these people? What were they?
4. What were the criteria for gaining acceptance? For instance, was it having technical competence? Was it being there with the answers?

5. You mentioned men having a "comfort factor" as a means of accepting other managers. Can you provide some examples of that?

6. On page 10, you mention a supervisor who had indicated a change in his attitude toward women managers. For example, he believed that women who didn't have technical expertise could be effective managers. Can you elaborate on this change of mind?

7. How did his reactions to you change after that?

8. On page 3, you said that training was an important way to get ahead, and you describe two routes that you took in getting additional education and experience in management. What contributed to this realization?

9. Were there people in professional organizations that supported your career development, who, for instance, told you of assignments or opportunities?
10. You described a particular person, a military officer whom you met through the professional society, who was especially helpful in providing support. What kind of person was he?

11. On page 9, you mentioned that when managers put you in the "sink or swim" situations, you often responded by "going overboard" in what you wanted to do. Could you provide some examples of that?

12. You mentioned that you were able to make adjustments in the ways in which you completed assignments, for instance, after you had come to an awareness that the males had spelled out to you how they expected the assignments to be done. Can you provide further examples of how you came to this awareness?

13. You mentioned a particular situation involving two male subordinates who had filed a grievance and you resolved the situation through the union official. Please elaborate on how you dealt with this situation.
Second Interview:
Ramona Chisholm

1. You discuss ways in which you provide encouragement and support to your subordinates in carrying out assignments.

   a. Could you provide further examples of this?

   b. Did you use that approach when you were a school administrator? Please provide examples.

2. On page 1, you talked about being in touch with "real world issues." How were you, as a young female administrator, able to develop support?

   a. Were you able to use persuasion in that?

   b. What were some examples?

   c. Did you have any formal training in this, such as in graduate school, before you came into government?

3. You describe a situation in relation to a particular political appointee as feeling "prostituted." What are some examples of this?
4. How did you learn to deal with "feeling prostituted"?

5. On page three, you mention feeling frustrated by your politically-appointed supervisor. Had you experienced similar situations in your career before this? If so, what are some examples?

6. On page 5, you mentioned that you had both career and non-career people in high positions that gave you a lot of support. Can you give some examples of the kinds of support you were given?

7. You described your experiences as "training grounds" for moving up to more responsibilities. Can you provide some examples of these kinds of experiences?

8. You stated that you do a lot of "self-analysis" in relation to developing and maintaining supportive relationships with other people. What are some examples of how you have used this technique?

9. What kinds of people have been supportive? How would you characterize them?
Ms. Alice Thompson

Entry
After graduating with a bachelor's degree in foreign languages in 1957, Ms. Thompson applied for a management intern program at a DOD field site. The program, which selected a small number of college graduates for entry level management training positions, was not open to women, however. Ms. Thompson found out that the only way she could get into government (not using her educational credentials) was to take a secretarial job. She thus began her career as a GS-5 in a Navy organization not far from her home.

Transition into a Professional Job
Frustrated with her secretarial job, Ms. Thompson made a transition via "Professional Qualifications Test," administered by Princeton for the National Security Agency in the Washington, D.C. area and worked as a foreign language cryptologist and analyst for three years. Then, she transferred to a small federal organization that administered educational grants and doing scientific reporting. Because the organization had established several programs to meet newly formulated national objectives, Ms. Thompson experienced heavy work loads. To meet demands of increased workload, Ms. Thompson noted she worked "very hard." She found that communications skills in getting the job done. She cited an example in her creation of a liaison role between her staff and a woman editor in another department. To get their work completed, the staff frequently interacted with the woman, whom Ms. Thompson described as "difficult." Friction between the woman and the reports specialists erupted and produced anger, bitterness, and ill
Thompson realized that resolving problems required communicating perceptions, verbalizing feelings, and learning problem resolution skills. Ms. Thompson helped both parties communicate more effectively. Two coworkers, a female economist and a male, observed Ms. Thompson's use of communications and other job-related skills and suggested she apply for higher graded jobs. They both encouraged her application and introduced her to key supervisors.

PPBS Experience

Ms. Thompson said she soon developed a reputation for hard work and as one who had potential for managing complex, agency wide activities and issues. Her supervisor became aware of her abilities and provided further opportunities for her development. Ms. Thompson's administrative officer, an "extremely competent, bright, self assured individual," Ms. Thompson recalled, later transferred to a large agency administering a variety of social programs. He asked Ms. Thompson to join his staff, which administered a large, new federal program. Ms. Thompson later moved upward in the agency by working on a Planning, Programming, and Budgeting system begun in that office. This new assignment was instrumental in introducing her to several high level people in the organization and an opportunity to work directly with agency senior officials and the organization head. Through them, Ms. Thompson noted she developed three competencies:

a. A broad based understanding the interrelationships between the agency mission and programs and the need to deal with outside constraints;

b. An understanding of what
particular managers did that was
effective in solving problems as
well as what not to do; and
c. Opportunities to practice
behaviors which she had observed
effective in her own job.

Formal Training
Ms. Thompson declared that she has
not found the usual formal training
as helpful as her observations of
effective managers at work. She had
taken a year long residential
program for senior managers at
Harvard University in the late
1970's. The program used the case
study method of instruction. Ms.
Thompson commented that she had an
excellent frame of reference from
her experiences working at the
agency head level. It provided
articulation and reinforcement of
this experience and broadened it.
Also, it gave her a better
appreciation of the political
climate of government and how to
reach goals in a hostile
environment.

Ms. Thompson had also taken a course
instructing managers in the
department in assertiveness
techniques. Ms. Thompson said it
was valuable, primarily as a means
of setting up an informal network of
women managers. In addition, it
reinforced effective practices and
promoted confidence, Ms. Thompson
maintained. Each month, the women
met for lunch and shared events in
their careers that helped them
become more mobile.

Career Blockages
When Ms. Thompson was a GM 14, a
senior official tried to replace her
with a young male from outside at
the GM 15 level. Ms. Thompson said
that the recruitee lacked knowledge
and experience to do the job she was
already doing. She filed a
complaint through her EEO office
over the matter. Before the case
was resolved, however, a female friend of Ms. Thompson asked her to transfer. This office carried out inspections and program audits. Ms. Thompson did transfer, but she disliked the "bureaucratic mindset and police like climate there."

At this time, her former office underwent a reorganization. A policy job opened up in the Assistant Secretary's office Ms. Thompson had left and she was requested to return. Ms. Thompson agreed and negotiated the resolution of the complaint along with a promotion to GM-15 in an agreement with management. Later, a major reduction in force hit high grade women hard. Ms. Thompson's position was reduced to a GM 14. She was able to have her GM 15 grade restored about 18 months later, however, when her job performance came to the attention of a new administrator. She had demonstrated her value to the success of his organization and he did not want to lose her to another lateral offer she had received.

Advice
Ms. Thompson maintained that there is a period of "breaking in" to a new job: a time for learning rules and expectations. Women in particular, Ms. Thompson noted, must demonstrate their worth in each new situation and must work hard to gain both recognition and access to key individuals in organizations.

Finally, she remarked, "Training and development and the acquiring of credentials didn't matter as much to me as experience combined with sensitivity and flexibility. In each new situation, women must first demonstrate their effectiveness before being accepted as managers. Competent people with interpersonal skills can make it no matter what the flavor of the times is."
Ms. Barbara Henry

Entry

After graduating from college with a bachelor's degree in foreign affairs in the early 1960's, Ms. Henry wanted to work at the State Department as a Foreign Service Officer. She was told, however, that women were not hired for those positions. She reasoned that she might have the opportunity of working in foreign affairs at the State Department, however, if she were to begin as a clerk typist in that organization. Hoping for this, Ms. Henry took a GS 4 clerk typist job.

Transition into Defense Agency

In a short time, Ms. Henry became frustrated with the clerical job. She discovered, however, that she could get foreign service experience by taking a job as a recreation management specialist GS 5 with a large military organization. She applied for and accepted such a job and went to an Asian country. There, Ms. Henry found that she had a fairly large degree of freedom to structure her job. The regulations there were not overly restrictive and she was given numerous opportunities to try out new ideas for initiating a variety of programs for military and civilian employees. She also volunteered to be a radio and television announcer for cultural activities.

Her supervisors recognized the novelty of the programs which she designed and asked her to stay a year beyond the year she had agreed to and accept a promotion to a GS 7. After deliberating their offer, Ms. Henry agreed to stay on. After that, Ms. Henry took a two year tour with the organization in another country. While there, she developed several kinds of recreational programs, led tours,
and traveled extensively in the area. She was promoted from a GS 7 to a GS 9. The organization assists the placement of returning civilian employees and offered her a GS-7 job with GS-9 in the same career field. Subsequently, when she asked Personnel to consider her for a professional job, however, the personnel office told her that women could not enter such jobs. "The Civil Rights Act of 1964 had been passed a short while earlier," Ms. Henry commented, "but government was slow to hire women into professional positions." The job was demanding. Ms. Henry put in long hours and frequently worked nights and on weekends to make sure the recreational programs she had developed operated efficiently. At the same time, and still wondering how she could get out of the limited career opportunities in recreation management, Ms. Henry realized that training was a key factor in moving ahead.

Move to Another Defense Organization: a Chance to Move Ahead A recreation management specialist job opened up in another military organization. Ms. Henry applied, was interviewed, and was selected. She took it to not only get her grade 9 back, but also to be able to work eight to five. This would also permit her to work on her Master's degree in business management and supervision: a program held at the on site educational center. Ms. Henry's supervisor's job, a GS-11, opened a few months later and she applied. Personnel initially refused to consider her application because she was not a male. Ms. Henry had, however, come out first in the competition among applicants. "You can't go in to inspect the
men's locker rooms at the athletic
center," the personnel director told
her.
Ms. Henry, who had inspected the
men's locker rooms prior to opening
the facilities each day in her
overseas jobs, brought the issue to
the installation commander,
who was a Colonel.
After he interviewed Ms Henry, he
called the Director of Personnel.
Ms. Henry was offered the job and
accepted it.
In later months, she asked the
Civilian Personnel officer for
information on being promoted beyond
the GS-11, the top of the line in
recreation management at the
installation level.
"They felt I was in a dead end job,"
she explained, but "I had to look
elsewhere for help."
She found it by joining a national,
nonprofit organization of male and
female federal employees. Among the
members were several high ranking
retired females. Two, who mechanics
of personnel staffing in order to
advance to higher graded positions.
The female retirees developed
workshops and provided individual
consultations particularly for other
women on such topics as completing
the SF-171, Qualifications
Statement, drafting an Individual
Development Plan to lead to career
enhancing job experiences,
negotiating training assignments
with one's supervisors, and learning
how to qualify for professional
positions through cross training and
job enlargement.
At the same time that Ms. Henry
became active in the organization,
the Commander asked her to head the
newly established Federal Women's
Program and to serve as an Equal
Employment Opportunity Counselor--
both as collateral duties. Ms.
Henry knew the volume of work would
be great, but she accepted the extra
duties as an avenue to move into
another Federal career field which
would have a higher grade.
"I was intrigued by the assignment," she explained. "I began doing a lot
of research on the subject of Equal Employment Opportunity. I also
began making speeches and explaining the regulations to people,
particularly those in recreation management jobs in the U.S and overseas.
I wanted to tell them how they could get out of dead end jobs."
In addition, on Saturdays and at her own expense, Ms. Henry took classes
on Federal Personnel Procedures. She also bought from the U.S. Government Printing Office a
complete set of Federal Personnel Manuals on classification and qualifications standards for federal jobs.
"These books were carefully guarded, by Civilian Personnel offices, she noted, "but I was determined that I would have all information on qualifications for jobs, such as management analyst. I wanted to know specific information I needed to meet so I could be considered eligible for jobs outside of recreation management. One job I found that would lead to the supergrades was management the same as in the Senior Executive Service (SES) today."
Supportive People
Not only gains in knowledge or qualifications for career advancement potential but also self awareness helped Ms. Henry at this point. The career kit explaining how to fill out an SF-171 for a job had been prepared by a female GM-13 retiree of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management.
"She was at the top of the grade structure then," Ms. Henry commented
regarding the woman. "She felt people ought to know specific job skills, knowledge, and abilities, how to acquire them, and how to describe them in job applications. It was a process of self discovery for me as I began to focus on a roadmap for reaching higher level jobs."

Ms. Henry added that the Commander had provided numerous opportunities for career and personal growth, such as supporting her participation in national conferences. The Commander created a climate which facilitated Barbara's feeling of work group cohesiveness and fairness. "He treated people fairly in spite of rank," Ms. Henry observed. "If I had an EEO case at the initial stage, he would open the door of discussion and say, 'If someone has a problem, tell me early and we can deal with it.' He would use the power of his office to resolve cases of employment discrimination. In a couple of hours, often. The morale of the organization improved. People could see results of an inquiry.

Additional Supports
Ms. Henry's EEO duties led her to a full time GS-12 job at another defense agency which provided logistical support to the military departments. She was promoted to a GM-13, but she found promotions beyond that point would be difficult. Few women, she noted, had been in line management jobs, hence, lacking specialized experience needed for higher graded jobs. She found help, however, in the training officer: an expert in relating experience and training to advancement. He noted the prevalence of white males in long term training programs which have a high value in
had applied for a six month program, but her limited experience in line operations did not qualify her for a slot in the training. The training officer, however, called on the organizational head, who endorsed Ms. Henry's participation as a substitute for another employee who could not attend due to a family emergency. Recognizing her potential, Ms. Henry's supervisor concurred with the endorsement, and two weeks later, Ms. Henry entered the program.

During the first three weeks of training, Ms. Henry had little difficulty understanding concepts discussed. Much of the early classwork related to foreign affairs and policy formulation. When the course of instruction shifted to military strategy, however, she became frustrated. After a month of the program, Ms. Henry felt she was lost and was ready to go home. Ms. Henry's sister and many friends encouraged her to continue. They pointed out that she had the drive as well as the ability to complete the course. The turning point came, Ms. Henry reflected, when her supervisor suggested that she select a research project acquired in the training program. He felt that Ms. Henry could address the topic as an expert, and thus, could fulfill a requirement for completing the program.

Ms. Henry did so well on the written report of the project that her supervisor asked her to present it orally at the forthcoming contracting practitioners' annual symposium. Ms. Henry agreed to do so; but, she explained, she had trouble getting on the roster of presenters all of whom in the past, had been men.
"I was the only female applicant," Ms. Henry commented. I think the reason for my being selected as a presenter was that the registration clerk for the symposium was a female who supported women's research efforts.

Ms. Henry's presentation was lauded. She won a $50 award and had her paper published by the professional contract management society. "This was a great breakthrough for me," she exclaimed. "I was seen as an author and as an expert whose work received public acclaim. It enhances credibility— an attribute very important the higher you go in management. You are regarded as someone who does more than the job."

Ms. Henry's realization of the importance of authorship created a dilemma, however, after she returned to her office. On one hand, she received an Outstanding Performance Award. But on the other, she sensed that coworkers saw the training as a "boondoggle," and they resented her attendance and subsequent success with her research paper. "The climate in which I worked wasn't good," Ms. Henry noted. Our office was transferred to another government agency. I realized I had outgrown my job and that it was time to move on to compete for jobs at higher levels of Federal service.

Career Expansion

Realizing the limitations of her job, Ms. Henry made two choices: (1) to change career fields in order to be promoted to a GS-14, and (2) to enter a doctoral program in public administration. These, she maintained, have given her additional "credibility" on the job and in holding offices in professional societies. Soon, Ms. Henry was promoted to a GM-15
position in another agency. She now, with others, writes policy on Federal Equal Employment and affirmative action for the entire agency.
Ms. Barbara Henry

1. You said that women were not hired into professional foreign service jobs when you started your career. How did you react to that? Well, it's a crime, since they let us take the foreign service exam and even go to the interview after we'd passed the exam, and then say that they didn't hire women; it was curious. A waste of money. And that they didn't intend to hire women; they shouldn't encourage them. They should let all schools foreign service know that women aren't capable of taking foreign affairs in college. It seems so ludicrous anyway. How I reacted was, I said, 'Fine. You don't hire here. I'll go somewhere else.' And the [military organization] hired me right away to go to [Asia.] So I went. And the people at the Department of State said, 'Why do you want to go to [Asia?] Why don't you stay here. We need you in the clerical work force.' I said, 'Why should I do that? I didn't want to go to college for four years to be a clerk typist.' That was their mentality.

2. Had you had similar experiences like that in the past? No. It was my first job. I was 21.

3. Your supervisors in [Asia] and [South America] seemed to provide you support in trying out new ideas and programs. Could you describe what these supervisors were like? Well, they were remarkable. They were very well-educated women who were over 40 years old and above who had come from the field of education or music. They were university professors. They, at that time in the federal government, did not have many professional jobs open to women. In the field where I entered in [Asia] was one of the fields
where they entered and they were permitted to work. Now, I think the quality of women that they have in the recreation services career field has gone down because many of the talented women have now been employed elsewhere in the federal government. So now it's the opportunity to be a recreator or a program analyst; and a program analyst goes up to a GM-115 and then the SES beyond that. It would be of no point of getting into the career field of recreation management where the top job would be GS-11 or 12, or 13, you see. So now the quality of people in that career field has decreased and I think it's because of nowhere to go.

I'd say that because these women were so unique. At the same time, they permitted people like me, who were 21, 22 years old, to experiment with programs and with no limitations. Also, the very fact that we were on the front lines of the [military,] there were fewer rules. There weren't as much bureaucracy as you would find in Washington, D.C. or a metropolitan area. In other words, the farther you are from a flagpole, the easier it is to conceive of an idea and to implement it.

I didn't realize it at the time that I was aware of the people with whom I worked. We worked closely, and in one particular job, I would think of an idea and it was my supervisory—my immediate supervisor who was a couple of years older than I was, would work out the details. But she couldn't consider the idea. Once I'd explained it all, she could understand it and methodically go through all the steps. But she couldn't pick up the steps intuitively. So I experienced that at the time.

There was another woman who was an
ENTJ, now that I look back on it. So there were two of us coming up with ideas. So the ideas became so much bigger and bigger and more marvelous to the point where my coworkers invited a circus to come to the front lines of the [military] division. And she went down and all-all of this is unheard of—I mean, you just don't do this. She went down, and we had a lot of orphanages over there, run by nuns. So we all worked with them in our spare time. She engaged the circus run by the [foreign nationals] to come up and they would provide their own transportation. She got the children from the orphanage and we got the soldiers, who paired off with each child. Then, we played games, and the dining hall people brought out the food, made special cakes. We ordered balloons for the clowns and that sort of thing. The military men, especially the commanders, were anxious for us to come up with ideas for programs. You see, the more unusual, the better. So this did a lot of good. WE became very famous quite early due to that, because the newspapers (especially the Stars and Stripes) picked us up—and also the radio stations and the television stations in [Asia] for the American forces. So we were rewarded for thinking big. This is not always what happens because of other jealousies or conflicts. In [Asia,] there are all kinds of limitations imposed. We didn't realize it at the time that other places in the government did not do that, quite frankly. This was our first job. What did we know? 4. That is fascinating. It was. But that is just one example. We had other fabulous things. The women—the older women who were in charge of the program in
[Asia-] were very highly regarded by the hierarchy in the military because they were professionals and their objective was to train us to think up creative ideas. And we were rewarded for it. They were rewarded, too.

5. so you were rewarded for coming up with "off-the-wall" ideas?
Right, and the soldiers loved everything. They were so very bored and some of them, sad. Morale was the bottom line in the whole thing. It was intangible, but critical to the success of the military. If you don't have soldiers who want to fight, you're not even effective. Our objective was to work constantly on the morale. Everybody understood that was the name of the game when they contributed. Quite frankly, if anyone had a problem, and we had a few people who had problems, they were shipped out, like within hours. They were shipped out to a metropolitan area, like [another Asian country] or [a particular state,] and so forth.

6. They couldn't handle that situation.
No. Anyway, it was fun, though. We could help them. In a way, it wasn't work. It was fun. Most people who I know went to [Asia] in those days were like that—the organizational climate, as they call it now, the culture of the place.

7. The isolation may have contributed to that.
Morale is better in a place where it's harder to live. The hardship is greater, the morale is higher because you have to work harder at it.

8. On page 2, you say that training was a factor in moving ahead. How did you come to this realization?
Well, two things happened. One was that I met a man in [Asia] who was a training officer in our
personnel organization. He told me that there was a course for supervisors called, "Management for Supervisors." He felt that it was a good course for me to go to. When I inquired into it, I was informed I couldn't go. It was a challenge; why couldn't I go?

9. Did he give you any reason?

No, he said I could go. But the person filling out the form said I couldn't go. So I said I would take annual leave for it. I would be willing to come and sit in the room and not be trained specifically at the end of it. That was the basis upon which eventually I went. Because I wasn't—my personnel record didn't even show—I was a supervisor, even though I supervised volunteers, I supervised duplicate bridge games, the organization of them, the communications—that at that time was not recognized as supervisory; now it is. They went very much by the letter of the law. So I wouldn't be eligible to go. That was my first government course. It was fabulous. I said, 'I've got to figure our how I could get training because it was motivational for me, because I could constantly be creative. It didn't get any sort of fuel. And I didn't also realize we didn't have a master's degree program through the education centers at DOD at the time. Now, we do. But at that time, the bachelors's was it. And I already had a bachelor's. So there was no other training available.

The other thing I learned was about goal setting—from an Army Colonel who had just graduated from the national War College. He said to me, 'What you should do is get yourself a plan of how you're going to take training for your whole life. And I thought about it for a long time—at least until I got back to the United States where I could
take training.
I took one other course, by the way, in [Asia.] It was, "How Do You Fix a 16 mm. Projector." The reason I took it was I couldn't check out a 16 mm. projector of the TV shop or audiovisual center unless I was licensed. To be licensed, I'd have to take the course, of course. So I took the course and I again took leave to do it. I went over to another city because the people giving the training wouldn't process the forms. So I did it anyway. I took it for two weeks, and I got my certification, so I could show a 16 mm. movie. However, behind my determination was that I knew I would take training. Now, the Colonel said...

10. How did you meet this Colonel? Well, we lived up in the country, in the front lines of the [Asian country.] Everybody knew everybody. We had three women and about 2000 men. This one said he wanted a special program and he did not have a recreation center where he was located (20 miles away.) So he came over and asked our Colonel if the three of us—the three recreation specialists—could design a particular program for some field events. He was going to have athletic events and all that sort of thing. He had hard about our field service. He wanted something like that, but not the same thing. So we designed something and that's how I met him. In the process, when we were introduced, he said, 'Why don't you consider your civilian training program like a 20-year plan?' And I said, 'Well, we don't have anything like that.' And he said, 'Well, we have in the military. Every three years, we go to school. And after we do that, we go to work assignments, and then we get promoted. We have to do all things
to punch our ticket.' And I said, 'Oh! I'll never forget that term, 'punching a ticket.' But I couldn't find any schools that people would go to and certainly not me as a woman. I knew that I also had my two problems—with my 16 mm. course and my supervisory course. I already knew I had a problem getting into any kind of training. I've always been fascinated by it ever since.

So when I got back to the United States, I went to school for a while. Then, I went down to [South America.] Also, they didn't have any training down there—at all, of any kind. Except, they had Spanish schools. So I signed up to go to Spanish school for two hours a day for every day for two years. I loved it. We had an assortment of teachers. They wouldn't stay too long. It was held in the education center. I thought somehow I needed to be working on the intellectual end of things as well as pump out all these kinds of programs.

11. So you found the device really useful?

As a lifetime plan. And now, it's developed for civilians into organized development plans even as part of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978. They've taken the military model, in a way, and made that into a civilian plan. But not many civilians buy that idea; they don't want to. a lot of people get promoted without them. I personally believe that you've got have an ongoing program system. I've spent a lot of my working hours developing that sort of thing and coaching women on how to do that. I think that's why my ambition is.

12. It was a roadmap for you to get out of this career field that you had been in.

My real goal was to get into the
Department of labor and be a GS-7, but I never did that. I went to South America and became a GS-9 and running a 16 mm. projector!

13. I'm interested in your description of not being selected for a particular job because you were not male. For instance, page three. Had you had any other kinds of experiences like that?

I had the job when I was in the [military organization] when I wanted the position vacated by my boss as a GS-11. I went to discuss this with the secretary of the Colonel, the Commanding Officer. I told her I didn't want to make a fuss, but that the Director of Personnel, another Colonel, told me I couldn't have the job because I was not a man. Therefore, if it's appropriate, I'd like to go in and state the case to the Colonel, the Commander, even though I realized I'm coming off, as it were, where I might be in bad with the Director of Personnel, who is already my boss. But I felt strongly about it—to go out of town, you might say. So I went in to see her.

14. Had you done this before? It never came up before. I'd always gotten promoted very fast. I had very fast promotions, so it never came up.

15. So it is something you did, more or less naturally?

I did it naturally because I felt it was unfair and I had heard or read about the gender discrimination being added to the Civil Rights Act. So I thought it must apply to them. I didn't know anything about any specifics. I sort of knew of it. I didn't have anything in my hand.

16. Did you have anyone coach you? No. I just went on my own, and asked for the secretary's help, recognizing that this woman was
enormously powerful, that she would
grease this.
If I had gone in alone, and said to
the Colonel, 'Hey! I think I'm not
getting a fair shake here!' he would
have been taken aback. She could
find out what the climate was and
whether it would be worth my going
in. I probably would have done
nothing. I wouldn't have filed a
complaint. I don't believe in it.
There's always another way.
17. You try to work things out?
Oh, yeah. Definitely. When I went
in to see him, it was with the idea
that if I could present myself in
the position that I could do the
job, he would probably give me the
job. So I prepared somewhat for
this interview—went in and said,
'This is why I believe I should have
the job.' Just like that.
18. Did you find it helpful that
the secretary greased the way for
you?
Oh, yeah. She helped me many, many
times in other things. But she
always helped me. I'm sure that she
also helped other people as well.
But she was a quiet person—very well
respected. And in an enormously
powerful position. She didn't get
paid for everything she did,
obviously, but secretaries don't.
But she was enormously powerful.
But she was also a longtime person.
He was the two to three year
employee and she was the person who
was the 20-year employee. He would
look to her for answers.
19. You talked about women not
having line or specialized
experience and finding promotions
difficult. Could you provide
examples of that?
Well, they do not have the line
experience as managers, but they do
have specialized experience, meaning
that, oftentimes, they may be a
budget analyst, but won't be in
charge of the budget shop. So they
are specialists. They might be an
audiovisual specialist, but they
won't be the person who has managed
the whole organization. Most of
the time, they do not have a line
job. In recreation management,
women ran it, and they were the
managers. There was nobody else in
it, except for a few men down at the
gymnasium. Most women nowadays,
if they find themselves up to GS-14
and 15, are budget specialists,
personnel specialists, logistics
specialists; but they've never had a
management job. They never
supervised; they've never had
control over the real estate, the
resources of the organization, the
annual budget, the pencils and the
pens, the typewriter repairs, light
bulbs—all that's management of
people. they haven't done that.
They know how to do their own
specialty; and the men have steered
women into that. The women have not
guessed how to get out of that.
So when it comes time for promotion
to the SES rating, for example, they
have not filled in all the blocks.
They haven't done their ticket
punching. that's why I contend that
if they start early, at GS-5, that
women and men—anybody—could take in
a combination of experiences, seek
them out—even if it's a detail
somewhere to be the manager of
something. They need to do that,
and, to take training programs to
augment that. They would take
programs in supervision. My problem
was when I was a recreation
specialist that, you don't need to
take courses in supervision because
you aren't a manager; you aren't a
supervisor. It was a big point made
to me early, and I'll never forget
it. You're limited because of the
nature of your job.
18. But you took a lot of action to
find another way.
Of course. My view is that just
because there are rules doesn't mean
that there aren't loopholes. There
may be some other way of doing it.
Maybe an exception. And my whole
training experience is one big
exception.
19. You mentioned here (you touched
on it briefly,) about men holding
women back. Could you elaborate on
this?
Umhmm. One thing is that men, I
believe, like to manage, and many of
them don't like to be specialists
themselves. But they need
specialists to shore them up, so
they reward women, or anybody who
wants to be a specialist or who
doesn't know any better. They think
they become part of the family, with
the females as specialists, on
budget-whatever-technicians. But
they don't seem-they don't want-it's
not in their interest to have any of
those folks become managers because,
ultimately, they would
be competing.
21. What do you suppose women can
do-or what tactics have you
observed-that would support this?
Well, to seek out short-term
assignments as managers, if they can
get them. Then, get an individual
development plan that will organize
the whole thing. In other words-a
roadmap. Like that Colonel said,
'Get a roadmap early.' If you get
this kind of assignment, that kind
of assignment, you can get this kind
of training, that kind of training.
And when you get to the end of 20
years, you've done it all and you've
punched the ticket.
Well, I would say to anybody, 'You
ought to have an individual
development plan—a written out
thing—if you need it.' That came in
under the Civil Service Reform Act
of 1978. If you are working your
whole life, you are struggling to work on the big things. You socialize—everything; the big picture. Specifically, if you do not have a supervisory job, you can get a chair of the EEO council, which is supervisory, part-time, ad-hoc kind.

You can get a detail to a job vacated by somebody—maybe even your own boss, even if you don't get selected for the position—as long as you've spent three to four months. It counts for something. It's an experience that you've had. It gives you a different look at things; and that makes you different. And what you should always try to seek out is a managerial job if you want to. But I also recognize that not everybody wants to be a manager; not everybody wants to be in the SES. I understand. Of those who desire to get ahead, tactics or strategies would be to get up a plan, and then how, within your organization, you can accomplish it. And then there's the outside route, which is what's wrong with being the president of the American Society for Public Administration? A chapter or section or something like that. Personnel. If you can do anything like that, you can augment your in-house, on-the-job experiences. And then, obviously, to take training.

This man told me, I asked him, 'What kind of training should I take?' He said, 'Well, first of all, never take a course unless it's labeled, 'management' or supervisory,' or 'executive.' One of those three words, or all three. If it doesn't have those, they don't count. So, to me, that means a technical course. Don't take that, because it's not going to lead you into management. It's the title of the
term. I asked. Therefore, my
training record shows all the
training courses I've taken show
management or supervision.
22. So you'd probably advise this
person...
There are two male figures who
taught me (1) to get an ID, and (2)
the other one is how to select
courses.
23. Do you think these experiences
are similar to those of other women?
Oh, yeah. My experiences are the
same as anybody else's experiences,
only I just figured out, 'Here's the
best route to moving forward.' And
most of the people I've worked with
have gotten promoted. And I'm
working with my third, fourth group
of people I'm mentoring. And
they're all making it big time.
Terrific!
It's not like the good old days,
though. So it's a different kind of
person. Excellent people.
24. Can you tell me a little more
about those mentors? I'm really
interested in them. You mentioned
them in these examples. What are
some characteristics?
Well, there was a psychiatrist I
knew socially, who taught me about
human behavior and how to read
people. He was extremely intuitive.
He knew all about me. He saw me as
a person who needed mentoring. In
turn, I was considerably younger. I
seemed to represent to him, youth.
I met him when I was in my 20's and
he was in his 40's. He had never
been married. He, in fact-
psychiatrists-have a hard time
adjusting, even though they're real
smart. But they don't know how
smart they are. They're so
sensitive. My particular
personality was ideal for an
extraverted person, and he was an
introvert. He was reflecting all
the time. I find it hard to
reflect. He probably was the person who taught me most about different personality styles and how to approach different personality styles and still be effective in getting my point across—even into what to wear; he was very into that very, very early.

I used to have a General Ryan suit. A General Ryan suit meant that...

22. Is that a power suit?

No, it's something like a Mrs. Ryan would wear. General Ryan could understand what Mrs. Ryan would wear, but he might be threatened by [Barbara Henry] in a power suit. When I was going to brief that man, I would wear a Mrs. Ryan suit. He could understand how he was supposed to behave because he could see his wife there and what she was telling him. And he, because he was Irish, (and this man, he had everyone in an ethnic background and what you could expect and everything,) ...He was fabulous!

He would say, 'You know what to expect because we went over that. This guy has this background. He probably went to this school.' I would know—I thought it's immensely successful—largely because my mentor, [Dr. Solomon,] was telling me what to expect. And we talked at least daily, and oftentimes, more than that. And he thought it was good, because he could progress in my case. 23. So he helped you develop important concepts in your development?

Yes. In fact, when I first started the Federal Women's Program, he was the greatest contributor to the concepts that I have been able to find successful. A lot of people come on too strong in the Federal Women's Program, and they annihilate all the men who might be willing to help—those with the power—who
have line or signature authority.
He would say, 'This is how you would
approach that.' And I'd go in after
the jugular if he didn't say it.
'Your personality is warmer; you
like to go for the jugular and get
your wish instantly,' he said.
'That isn't the way to play. It's
like chess. You make a move, and
then your opponent does. But it's
slower. You build your credibility
the whole time. But if you always
are out to change the world, you
cannot do it by 3 p.m. It's an
evolving process.'
Another thing he said was that, as
women are emerging, men are saying,
'Don't ever tell a woman.' 'What
they're saying is, 'What's in it for
them.' Where do I was a man fit in
their social phenomena as women?
He said, 'They're changing.
Therefore, they're not going to tell
you that that's what's troubling
them. What you must do
is constantly work toward
negotiating-mediation-but work
toward effective change with them,
as opposed to beating them to a
pulp.' He said, 'It won't be any
fun if women go off and take over.'
He said, 'What does that do? It
will destroy society. So what you
should do is try to work with the
male leadership to accommodate
whatever lead and guidance you will
need for the future.'
So I said, 'Of course. Well, that's
too much burden. Why should I do
that?' But I realized he's right.
Now, I've gone through the whole.
He was saying this, as gently as a
feather. I knew him from 1967 to
around 1976.
23. Sounds like he was a really big
contributor.
Oh, yes, he was, in my thinking.
And now, you might also say I had
hang-ups that, if he had not
remarked about, I might not have
been successful in having a relationship. So...

24. On page 8, you mentioned you were the only female presenter in the symposium. Were there ways that men reacted toward you because you were the only female presenter? Or did you notice anything different about the way they interacted with you?

Well, I think they acted the same way that they always act when a woman presents something. Not only on this occasion, but many, many times have I been the only female present.

25. How is that? I've been curious about that. Different women have said there is some kind of difference when you are the only female. Men react to them differently.

Well, yes, there are. As [Dr. Solomon] would say, 'They're struggling with their sexual fantasy, and they can't help it.' If you're up there talking about logistics, and they're thinking about something else,' he says, 'they can't help themselves, or whatever is the problem.' Many men would say, 'Oh! That's not me!'

They become defensive. He believes that's the case. He said the other thing is Mrs. Ryan; You must be conservative. You have to be so good that you're presenting your material that you have thought out so well that you've covered all the bases and that you can—it's that credibility issue. You become valued for what you have said. And some of the people in the room may never check into your net anyway. But the other people who are interested in learning something may.

Here's an example of somebody who was a very smart woman, but who didn't have a benefit of a [Dr.
Solomon.] This woman wore diamonds a lot—diamond earrings, diamond rings, and all that. She was a psychologist and really hadn't thought, I'm sure, about how she looked. She also had an elaborate hairdo and she had wonderful materials to present. But in a way, by her appearance, she detracted from...In a way, there's a school that says women deliberately do that, because of some inadequacies in themselves or seek to destroy themselves.

26. Or their credibility?
Yes, so consciously are they doing it. So subconsciously I think they do, too. This woman would say, 'Now I wear diamonds and I like to wear them. If you don't like it, you can lump it.' That isn't the point. The point is, how do you come across.

At the Pentagon, stage one, we had a big program. This woman and her husband, a psychiatrist, were presenting something about male-female relationships in the workplace. He was wearing his conservative uniform, being very dressed up in this—she was taller than he—anyway, wearing a black dress, which is very powerful. And those diamonds. And the Director for Civilian Personnel [for the installation] was sitting next to me and said, "Barbara, you've to tell this woman she's not wearing that jewelry. It's distracting. Now, that's an example of...if she had a Mrs. Ryan suit on, she wouldn't have had her diamonds on.

27. You mean, with flowers and very feminine?
No, no, not that much. A Mrs. Ryan suite would be much more understated, but it would be a little bit feminine; soft. She wouldn't present a big threat. So
that was his idea, not to have diamonds.
I would say in presenting the case of the [military installation] program, I wore a Mrs. Ryan suit and I had my slides presented. I gave my speech and they asked questions, and I got a prize.

28. And you weren't really a threat to them at all?
I don't think so. I hope not. I didn't intend to be. In fact, [at the military situation,] at an official situation, I don't use the word, ['this military installation.']. I would say, oftentimes, if it's a situation where I'm going to not be successful, I end up on the losing side, I'll wear white. I have a whole series of white clothes. Because, if you wear white, they're not going to pick up on somebody. You've got purity, the bride-too many things that men are not going to want to attack. But you wear your bright red suit and you get up there like gangbusters, they will attack you. So what you do is you cut all their offenses. So I have these white outfits! Another friend of mine says, 'I think I'll go off and get coffee. What are you going to wear? Is it white or not?'

29. On page 9, you noted that the climate in your organization you returned to after the symposium, was not good. Could you provide some examples of that?
Well, there were two things that had happened. I had been away for six months to go to this special school where all the military people went. That would be a ticket-punching course according to that Colonel I met in [Asia.] Then, I went as a result of that, as my research paper, and presented it at the procurement symposium. So that was two things, you might say, that
other people didn't get. It was hard for me—that six months' course. But they didn't know that. They viewed it as a boondoggle, or a vacation. It was one of the most difficult things I ever did.

30. Were your coworkers mostly male? There were two women, and the rest, men. And they were not awfully bright, I must say. Now, I don't think I'm Einstein, but I'm fairly bright. I would say they were underbright, and we were all the same grade. They saw my chances for promotion greater because I was in school. Also, of that group, maybe half the people were black. And they may have felt other things toward...There was something happening here. Whereas, before, when I went to the organization as a GS-11 and promoted to a 12...It was right after I was promoted to a GS-13 that I took off for six months. So they were stunned that I had to be a 133. Then, went off to school. Then, got a prize, then, they printed it in this journal. You see, this was a bit much. So they would say things like, 'Well, where are you going to work now that you've done all these things? Aren't you going to work and get promoted somewhere else?' So I would say they weren't friendly. But also, some of my strongest allies had already left that organization, and people I had been especially close to before had left. We had new bosses, and lots of things had happened. And also, I knew I wasn't going to stay there. And also, the organization was moving to another department; we were all going to have to go, and there was a great shuffling for jobs. There were other factors, too. There were other folks who were being transferred on top of us.
And everybody was wondering if they were going to get demoted. So it was more than me, the woman, going off to school and getting the bennies. It was that, plus other things that were happening.

31. You decided to make a couple of choices in regard to your career, such as changing career fields and going on for a doctorate degree. What were some of the factors you considered in that?

I got a master's in between there. I changed career fields largely because somebody called up and said there's a job open at the [military organization,] and why don't you apply for this job? And I said, 'I'm not qualified.' And the woman said, 'I'll show you my paperwork and how it's worded, because it's not a simple application. I'll show you how it's done in the [military.]' So I said, 'Fine.' So I filed it out, not fully realizing all the things I could possibly think of—described my experiences and training and all that. Designed to tie that to the job that I was to go and to qualify for.

32. Was this woman in personnel?

No, she was an associate in the recreation management career field. They were a sterling group of people that we had. That's the way a lot of women gate it out—as support on the job. She found the job, she went to get the vacancy announcement, got her own paperwork, did her own paperwork—really wonderful. And said, 'This is how you do this.' Of course, mine didn't look anything like hers because I didn't do all the things she did.

She had done many, many more things than I had done. So I put down everything I could think of, and I had it all documented. It was very
precise. She let me see what she had. Then, I typed up my version of it. Then, I let her look at it. She made a few suggestions, then, I finalized it and xeroxed it because I didn't trust the personnel office to xerox it properly. They might leave out a page or something. I said, 'What I'll do is get four kits,' because I figured that there would be four persons on the panel, max. And I'll take the original and handcarry it over and I'll get them to sign for it. I'd worked hard on this, you see. That's the way I operate. It was successful. Too many things can go wrong. First of all, they were astounded. They said, 'You didn't have to come in.' And I said, "Oh, well, I wanted to, because I wanted this job.' Then they received it and so forth. And I didn't hear from them for the longest time. Then after I got to the Department of Labor, I was hoping to get the job before I left at the DOD slot and our function was transferred to the Department of Labor. So I finally did get to Labor, except that wasn't the right job I thought I should have. I was over there altogether five weeks, during which time I went to the interview and I prepared for the interview. I prepared for the interview also in a way to consider all the aspects of the job, although I didn't know the interview questions. What I had written. I took a kit for a panel of persons in case there was a panel. It turned out there was a panel: three persons. So I had given them a kit of my 171 plus supporting documentation and so forth. I also recommend that people who are going to be interviewed to have colored-coded their things. Probably the best interview I ever
had was a woman whose suit had a maroon trim, and she had maroon folders to give to the panel; and she had a gold pen. The totality of it! Obviously, she cared enough to think of the whole thing before going in. It's an impression like that people will buy, as it were, in the interview process, assuming that all of you are highly-qualified and are going to be interviewed. What makes a difference is personal appearance and approach. You consider how you're coming across.

33. It was something you picked up from experience?

Well, I prepared for the interview in the fullest sense. And I asked for help from one person, a former boss whom I knew had worked with the ultimate selecting official. I said, 'I have applied for this job. I don't know how appropriate it is for you to vouch for me. But may I use you as a reference?' So I think the man let me use him not only as a reference, but he also spoke to the selecting official.

In addition to the interview process, there's also the phone call business that goes around. And supervisors, selecting officials, will say, 'Well, I've interviewed so and so. What do you really think and so besides what she's already declared?' And that's where it all hangs out. And in EEO complaints, nobody really knows what the gray area is. But it goes on, and it will probably continue to go on. And all you can do is the best you can so the votes will come up in your favor.

So anyway, I got the job. And they had to check it out with...And for one thing, one of the deciding factors in my favor was Spanish. Remember, I went to Spanish school in [South America?]! Well, one of the things was that made me
different from everybody else was
that I had this language capability
that nobody else had. Then, the
selecting official called me back
and said, 'How would you rate your
Spanish?' Obviously I realized he
was having to write up the
justification or something. So I
told him what I recommended.
The next level of the interview was
with a political. And I went up to
this place—a big ceremony—with the
Assistant Secretary of the [military
organization,] and got into the
interview. We lived in the same
neighborhood in Chevy Chase. He was
an attorney, and [Dr. Solomon] had
taught me how to relate to
attorneys, also. That was another
thin, because basically, I don't cut
it with
a shrink.
34. Was it difficult for you to do?
Yes, I found it difficult talking to
a shrink. But apparently, I did all
right. I got the job and I was
called in, and they said, 'Do you
want this job?' I said I could come
right now. I'm taking annual leave
and you can send me in for real.'
They said, 'WE just have to submit
the paperwork now.' And i didn't
trust them. I said, 'Well, I'd be
glad to come and type it up even,
and xerox it, package it, make sure
it gets in.'
35. Wow! On page 9, you refer to
credibility as being important to a
woman's career development. Can you
define, by examples, what you mean?
Credibility is perhaps two kinds of
things. One is how others perceive
you. Do you seem to others to be
And that's only the perception. How
others view you. Maybe you're a
phony. So there's another kind of
credibility, which is bona fide
credibility, which is what you truly
do know; and that's the difference
between somebody that can wing it
and skate through. And unless they
come off as somebody who knows more
or zeroes in on them. Those are two
key concepts of credibility.

Sometimes, that person may not be
perceived to have credibility—may
know it all—but somehow, not able to
articulate it, or, doesn't look the
part. Somehow, there's something
wrong. There are two ways of
looking at credibility. Women have
to do both. They have to know, they
have to have done it all—the slides;
they have to know everything about
everything. And then, they also
have to be not too overcome when
they're challenged. Really, if
you're challenged, you should be
prepared; if you're prepared, they
will never even challenge you,
because they don't want to challenge
a person who knows more than they
know.

The other thing is the profession.
I wouldn't go anywhere unless I had
props and all kinds of stuff because
that's part of the profession of
credibility, without which, as a
woman, you have real credibility.
You can't go in and win. you have
to have props.

36. Another thing that has come up
in the interviews is that women feel
they constantly have to prove their
competence. They have said they
were expected to be perfect
and could not possibly make
mistakes. Is this part of
credibility?

Women generally undervalue, and this
is what causes us to get lower
salaries. And, in a way, we're
perpetuating it by overproducing.
It might be pumping up our
credibility all the time. We're now
getting men to be used to the fact
that we should be better performers.
And that's not fair, either. But
we're contributing to it ourselves.
But I don't know if we can stop doing it. So I'll just say that underlying all this is the undervaluing of women by men and women. If you have a chance to go to a dentist, would you take a man or a woman? A woman might be more competent. Or, that a woman got through dental school at all—could even get in, and then got out, and now is practicing. Why wouldn't you want to go?

37. How can a woman gain this credibility?

It might be a matter of time. It's like black bus drivers. They have the same problem. The blacks became integrated in our society, and we said, white bus drivers. Now, we have black bus drivers with a lot of blacks. First we say, 'God, they'll wreck the bus!' because we undervalue them. Over time, for 20 or 30 years, that's not valid. They can drive just as good as a white person now.

Women drivers—you've heard that? If women are such bad drivers, why is it that their insurance rates are lower than men's? Because it's a myth. You undo the myth by time, and keep building upon it. Now, men don't laugh at women drivers. In fact, women drive the buses around town. We don't laugh. I mean, they're very good. You begin to see it. You experience it. The more our sex get into higher-graded jobs, the more we'll change the concept of undervaluing; I hope.

38. As you say, I can hear the standards will come down more to their realistic levels. I talked to a number of women who have been, what we call, the 'token' women in organizations. They have expressed a great deal of stress in their particular roles. Part of it has to do with the undervaluing of their expectations; and, because the
expectations seem to be undervalued, their performance tends to be below the standard. They undervalue themselves to the point that it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. The Post, just recently, ran an article about a woman who had adopted the male model of success. She was in the papers recently. She's got a sex discrimination case going on right now because men in the organization wouldn't promote her. The reason that she didn't have enough charm or didn't have enough of the social skills that they wanted to have in a woman, be it wife or mother—because they're confused, you see. She said, 'Well, you don't have those skills. Why should I have to have them?' In other words, there is a double standard. 'You want me to do the entertaining, why should I have to do it? Why don't you do it?' Her basis is that she's getting inequitable treatment. She looks—has a lot of male characteristics. The next shot was pictured on the front page of the Washington paper, which had her shown with the children. There are a lot of messages going on here. I don't know over time what is going to happen. I think the bottom line is money—that a lot of younger people, men and women, are dependent on two incomes. We may outgrow a lot of our stereotypes. And as women become more confident, all the women in medical school, CPA school, and business school—all of this—the more of them—then our society will change. We're moving from tokenism to almost an invasion, which will change the norms and values. I hope so. Otherwise, I will have failed.
Ms. Betty Lindstrom

Entry

Ms. Lindstrom made several major
career changes before coming to the
federal government in 1979. After
taking a bachelor's degree in
chemistry and a master's degree in
medical genetics, Ms. Lindstrom
married and raised a family. She
participated in several civic,
political, and social activities,
such as serving on a governor-
appointed commission on the status
of women in her home state, becoming
active in the American Association
of University Women, and taking part
in the League of Women Voters. When
her youngest child started
kindergarten, Ms. Lindstrom took a
job at a state university in
administering an affirmative action
program. Her interest in the legal
aspects of the program led her to
attend law school evenings. After
she obtained a law degree in 1978,
she took a job as a legal advisor to
the president of a college. Eager
to broaden her legal experience, she
accepted a GS-11 staff attorney
position in a civil rights office of
a federal agency.

Policy Experiences

Ms. Lindstrom's first job involved
developing policy
and legal standards for
interpretation of statutes and
regulations as well as translating
Supreme Court decisions. Ms.
Lindstrom recalled an especially
important case involving collegiate
athletics. She utilized not only
her legal training but also her
experience in postsecondary
institutions on a department wide
task force to develop meaningful
standards for enforcement.

After Ms. Lindstrom was promoted to
a GS-13 in 1982, the director of her
office selected her to be his
attorney advisor. The director had
been impressed with the quality of
Ms. Lindstrom's casework as well as
with the strong endorsement from his
outgoing advisor, a female.
The outgoing advisor and Ms.
Lindstrom had worked closely on
several cases. And before she moved
up to the Assistant Secretary's
office, the advisor felt Ms.
Lindstrom could do well in the
vacant job.

Attorney Advisor and Cultivating
Support
Ms. Lindstrom's new position gave
her an overview of all the program
activities in the office,
including not only policy
development, but also litigation.
Ms. Lindstrom also took on the role
of sharing information with others
on the staff. She became recognized
for her reliability.
Ms. Lindstrom developed two
important relationships at this
time.
The first was with Marsha, a fellow
attorney. Marsha had been perceived
by other office workers as "tough,
remote, and having few friends."
Ms. Lindstrom, however, won Marsha's
respect by providing Marsha with
information helpful to several of
Marsha's cases.
"It was because she respected my
ability, Ms. Lindstrom remarked,
"that we broke down a barrier."
Eventually, Ms. Lindstrom and Marsha
developed a friendship.
"We had fun talking about legal
issues, and out of that interaction,
we developed mutual respect and
eventually, trust," Ms. Lindstrom
concluded.
Ms. Lindstrom also cultivated a
supportive relationship with Matt,
the office director who hired her as
his advisor. Ms. Lindstrom's
demonstrating outstanding
professional accomplishments over
time built up Matt's confidence in
her. Matt promoted Ms. Lindstrom
after she had been on his staff for
two years to a GM-14 and endorsed
her for her present position as a
GM-15 branch chief in policy
development.

Career Development
Since she moved into the policy
development position in 1984, Ms.
Lindstrom has had numerous training
and development experiences. After
being appointed as a supervisor, Ms.
Lindstrom took a series of training
classes in management within a six-
month interval. Ms. Lindstrom said
that she initially did not want to
attend such training, but that the
topics proved useful as she gained
supervisory experience.

"We filled out the Myers-Briggs
Personality Type Indicator, for
instance," she stated. "I was
skeptical at first, but I saw its
applied a great deal on the job. It
is important to understand that
people process information
differently. As a manager, you must
understand that just because you
process information in a certain
way, the other person's mind may not
do it in the same way.

"Training also included the
routine things," she went on, "like
filling out time and attendance
reports, what is the department's
affirmative action policy, what a
grievance is and how to deal with
one, and how budgets are formulated.
Also, it was nice to meet other
fairly new managers in other parts
of the department."

Ms. Lindstrom's present supervisor,
himself a graduate of the agency's
year-long, special development
program for mid-level managers,
couraged Ms. Lindstrom to apply
for the same training. The training
provided 15 selected managers GM-13
to 15 from throughout the agency
skills in process consultation,
project management, teambuilding, and interpersonal communications. During the year-long program, managers attended workshops every other month as well as two, week-long residential programs. The formal training was supplemented by the participants' serving as internal consultants to top agency officials on a special project. Ms. Lindstrom's project in the program coincided with a temporary assignment managing an entire program in one of the organization's regional offices. "The regional office was in dire trouble," she explained. "There were production and personnel problems. The previous director retired, and the deputy director, who took over, wasn't able to pull the staff of 90 people together. I stayed there six months. It was a laboratory for me."

Ms. Lindstrom decided to put into effect the module on productivity from the course. To assist her with managing the more complex tasks, Ms. Lindstrom called upon the external consultant who had developed the training module and who had an office not far from Ms. Lindstrom's regional office. Ms. Lindstrom also asked the agency headquarters training officer to conduct productivity improvement courses for the managers. Ms. Lindstrom commented that, unlike in her management job at headquarters, she did not have to obtain approval from several layers of upper management to make productivity improvement decisions. Moreover, she believed she could identify several key results from the productivity improvement and training programs in the regional office; at headquarters, where there is more coordinating between organizational structures results
would not be as apparent.
The regional director's job opened, but Ms. Lindstrom decided not to apply for it. Family and personal reasons, she maintained, precluded a move.

Coping With Job Limitations
Ms. Lindstrom said that she enjoys her current job, but she faces two difficult situations in it. "The biggest issue right now is limited resources," she remarked. The Civil Rights Restoration Act has increased our workload, but, at the same time, our office has not been able to fill behind vacancies." Ms. Lindstrom explained that she copes with the staffing shortages by providing encouragement to her staff.
"The group often goes 'the extra mile,'" she asserted. "They also have exhibited a group pride. But there is still only so much you can do."

Ms. Lindstrom also said that the office director's job has been vacant for a year and that she and a co-worker have had to rotate being acting supervisors while their boss filled in for the director. Ms. Lindstrom sees the occasion as an "impetus for developing a positive relationship between herself, her supervisor, and her co-branch chief."
"We are colleagues and bosses," she noted. "We've gotten closer and have seen each others' work in different ways."

She added that the situation has also provided her with a perspective on how a second-level supervisor sees day-to-day operations.

Striving For More Challenges
Ms. Lindstrom pointed out that, although her present job in policy is non-routine and challenging, she wants yet more challenge. She knows
She can do more than be a branch chief. She wants to move up.
She had one opportunity not too long ago when she applied for a regional director's job near her family's home city. Ms. Lindstrom admitted the responsibilities of the job would have been "a bit of a reach" for her. Ms. Lindstrom was not selected for the job, but she believes that merely putting her credentials before the assistant secretary for review was important. Through this review process, Ms. Lindstrom claims she was able to gain the assistant secretary's endorsement for the regional office training project assignment. "The application process itself puts you in your best light," Ms. Lindstrom confided; "you can be noticed by those above."

Advice To Women

Ms. Lindstrom stated that, to succeed, women managers must not be afraid to risk and to seek developmental opportunities. She noted that she, herself, had been reared in a family which had traditional expectations for her, including marriage and childbearing. "Women aren't gunners," she declared. "They aren't particularly motivated to climb. Until recently, many have been raised to marry successful men and to raise children. We satisfied the need to be successful simply by recognizing the need and gaining certain rights. Team membership was enough. This doesn't lead to anxiety, however, as it has with men. Men were raised with the expectation that they must achieve the top to be a success."
Dr. Anne Marie Jones

Entry
Dr. Jones had been a professor at a major university before entering government. She came to the agency on a one-year appointment and administered grants programs. After that year, Dr. Jones would return to her faculty post.

Soon after her arrival, Dr. Jones saw an important need associated with her programs. Several government agencies shared responsibilities for funding the grants, but the agencies frequently did not share their information with each other. Aware of many "larger possibilities for better communications," Dr. Jones developed a goal to improve information exchanges. To help, she called a person she knew in the White House and arranged for a meeting of key individuals in the funding process. Dr. Jones also realized that better communications would facilitate better policy for administering the grants; policy administration was of keen interest to her.

Dr. Jones soon realized that information coordination among many government entities could not be accomplished in six months. Moreover, officials in her own organization had noted the high quality of her work, and they asked her to stay on past a year. After carefully reviewing the needs and the challenges of the programs, Dr. Jones agreed to become a permanent staff member.

Training and Development
To acquaint newly-hired managers with the mission, programs and functions of Dr. Jones' agency, the organization conducts a week-long seminar. Dr. Jones said she found the seminar quite useful in understanding how the government, and the agency in particular,
operate. Most importantly, however, Dr. Jones said she developed a list of individuals she could call on for future reference. These people included speakers from the Congress, personnel from within the organization, and academicians. Dr. Jones also met the other women managers in the agency. Dr. Jones also attended regularly meetings of professional societies to keep current and to meet other scholars in her particular field. Dr. Jones has participated in several management training programs which the Office of Personnel Management sponsors. After becoming a manager, she took one of that organization's special, two-week programs. She found this helpful and enjoyed discussing current management topics with managers from throughout the federal government. She also attended the OPM's Federal Executive Institute. She noted that it was more useful than most of the other OPM one to two-week courses. "The FEI was useful mainly for what it taught me about interpersonal relationships," she remarked. Meeting other government managers, in particular, was valuable to her; but she found many of the discussions in the coursework were irrelevant and unstimulating. "It was a sign of the times," she remarked about the Federal Executive Institute. "It was a holdover from the 'touchy-feely' days of the 1970's. I don't need this; I think I am pretty much in touch with myself. Also, many of the people were in specialist roles," she noted. "They were there only to get their tickets punched. They weren't very active in the discussions at all. I did observe, however, women and younger men came there to learn and to contribute." Dr. Jones applied for the Harvard
Senior Executives Program, but she was turned down because she was a not a member of the senior Executive Service and ineligible by agency policy. Dr. Jones said that the personnel office administering the program told her that the program was open to only managers who were above GM-15. "But I found out that non-SES people could attend," Dr. Jones stated. "I could have gone, but a male was chosen instead." Dr. Jones applied for, and was accepted into, another special management training program. However, she experienced difficulties in it. Each year, she explained, fourteen or fifteen federal executives, as part of the Brookings Institute's fellowship program, met with chief executive officers of major corporations and discuss issues involved in managing large organizations. Visiting an average of five such corporations a week, the federal executives in Dr. Jones' fellowship program spent a week in several cities. When Dr. Jones applied, personnel told her that she was only a section head, not an agency director, and that she probably would find little useful information in the program. "I found their response interesting," she declared. "I had been turned down by them once before for the Harvard Senior Executives Program, but this time, I wasn't going to let them get off the hook. I presented a rebuttal of their decision. They let me go this time." Dr. Jones was the only female in the program; and that fact produced some frustrating experiences for her. "The Chief Executive Officers refused to acknowledge me," she
related. "I asked many questions during our discussions with them, but I couldn't get their attention. I would raise my hand and they would look right over me. I had to wave my arms for them to notice. The men saw me as an administrative secretary, not as a peer."

Obstacles
Dr. Jones said she feels she has had a more difficult time in her position than a man would have had. It took longer for her to advance to a senior level in spite of her superior qualifications than many men she knew, she stated. "When I came here, I was a fireball-full of ideas; in fact, she observed, "I haven't seen a program officer in my area come in with the kind of ideas I've had. But I've noticed that people-men in particular-with ideas but without training have advanced. Training hasn't helped advancement," she concluded; "top-level management doesn't look at training, but experience."

Advice and Prospects
Dr. Jones has observed a barrier to women managers' advancement as their refusal to gain experience outside their specialty area. "Women need to gain a great deal of diversified experience to succeed. It is necessary to see the bigger picture," she noted. Dr. Jones came to the agency with both ideas and with plans to make the ideas reality. She expressed satisfaction in having accomplished what she set out to do, but she regretted she had not had the achievements earlier in her professional experiences.
Ms. Hilda Harris

Entry

Following graduation from college in 1962 with a bachelor's degree in mathematics, Ms. Harris began working in a regional office of a large federal organization as a GS-5 hourly wage rate investigator. The position often involved investigating complaints from women, minorities, blue-collar, and wage-graded employees. Ms. Harris's training encompassed a five-week formal program as well as an apprenticeship. As she became more proficient, Ms. Harris was given more assignments.

In the days before Equal Employment Opportunity, Ms. Harris recalled, few people were attracted to this type of work. In checking out complaints between employers and employees, investigators frequently had to confront resistant, angry individuals; often, their work took them into inner cities where street violence was not uncommon. Ms. Harris maintained, moreover, that investigators before the Civil Rights legislation was passed in 1964 often took a casual, non-objective stance in relation to their work. Documentation of cases was not consistent.

Determined to establish a more objective basis for analyzing cases and to make her investigations less stressful, Ms. Harris first searched for a complete set of regulations. Unable to find one in her own organization, Ms. Harris found one in a nearby library and began an intensive study of them on her own. Additionally, she provided information about the regulations to her co-workers; she quickly became a resource both to her own office and to other offices in the region.

Nationwide Task Force and Aftermath

Appalled at the large number of
unresolved cases, President Johnson
in 1964 asked Ms. Harris's agency to
convene a 50-member task force to
work on ways to reduce the backlog.
Because of her reputation for
thoroughness, objectivity, and
problem-solving ability, Ms. Harris
was selected to come to the
Washington headquarters office to
participate.

After the months-long assignment
ended, Ms. Harris and her long-time
friend from the regional office,
Clay, decided to stay in Washington.
Within four years of working on the
newly-installed Equal
Employment Opportunity program in
the agency, Ms. Harris was promoted
from a GS-5 to a GS-12.

Puzzled about how to be promoted to
a GM-13, Ms. Harris asked Clay for
help. Clay gave her information
about how she could highlight her
competencies on the SF-171
qualifications form and could make
the eligible roster kept by the then
Civil Service Commission. A vacancy
for a GM-13 came up in Ms. Harris's
office, but because Ms. Harris's
boss did not know about Ms. Harris's
eligibility for the opening, did not
consider her. Ms. Harris explained
the process to him, and eventually
she was promoted.

Running the Program
After her promotion, Ms. Harris took
on a broad range of assignments.
The pace was brisk, as Ms. Harris
made frequent field office visits
and investigated complex EEO cases.
Often, she served on department-wide
task forces that examined largescale
discrimination cases.
"I worked hard, but developed a
reputation for my expertise," Ms.
Harris remarked. "In my office, I
ran the whole show. It gave me a big
perspective on my organization—the
types of cases it handled and who
some of the key players were."
Ms. Harris's reputation for competence paid off a few years after her promotion. During a departmental reorganization, Ms. Harris's job was slated for transfer to a regional office. Although she knew she would soon be out of a job, Ms. Harris decided to remain at headquarters.

At a Christmas party that year, Ms. Harris met a man who had worked with a Deputy Assistant Secretary and who had found out about Ms. Harris's dilemma. The man pointed out that a division director in the Deputy Assistant Secretary's office had openings and suggested Ms. Harris apply; he even arranged for her to meet the division director.

At first, Ms. Harris did not want to work for the division director. In fact, during her interview with him, Ms. Harris said that some employees on his staff were not highly motivated and that she would not enjoy working with them. Rather than dismiss Ms. Harris after the interview, however, the division director considered her remarks; a day later, he called her and invited her to be his special assistant in a job he created just for her.

In President Nixon's second term, Ms. Harris's agency imposed a freeze on all personnel actions: very few people were hired, promoted, and trained. Ms. Harris's boss' job, a GM-15, became vacant, but Ms. Harris knew the chances for her getting it were remote. Meanwhile, Ms. Harris heard about a vacancy in her field in a small federal agency that managed project grants. The position was a GM-14, but it had potential to a 15. Ms. Harris took the job.
Ms. Harris's new organization had a large number of scientific and technical employees, mostly male. Ms. Harris's job was to investigate EEO complaints, but, as events turned out, she had to file one herself. The staff of Ms. Harris's office included herself, a director, and a secretary. Not long after Ms. Harris's arrival, the director's position became vacant, and Ms. Harris applied. A man was selected instead, but after three years, he left. When the position opened after that, Ms. Harris again applied and again was turned down. The cycle repeated once more: a male was selected, stayed a short while, then left. For the third time, Ms. Harris applied for the job, and for the third time, she was not chosen. "This time," she declared, "I filed a complaint. Each time the director's slot was vacant, it was filled noncompetitively with an unqualified male personnelist or scientist." Ms. Harris's new boss, a male, found out that she had filed a complaint and trumped up information about her. Personnel's subsequent investigations of the case found the boss' charges untrue. As a resolution, Ms. Harris accepted back wages. But the reparations did not heal the damage to Ms. Harris's reputation, Ms. Harris confided. "My reputation for competence was severely questioned; it has taken much time to rebuild it, even though I was not at fault," she maintained. Training and Development Ms. Harris has not taken any formal management training, and she sees little need for earning a master's or a doctorate degree.
Gaining knowledge through direct experience has been most useful to her development. Ms. Harris has been pivotal in organizing a professional organization for women in scientific and professional organizations in the federal government. She established the organization after coming to her agency seven years ago. Through her continuing leadership, the organization holds monthly meetings, sponsors conferences on career development, and provides a forum for information sharing among participants. Membership, which includes women from several federal organization, is composed primarily of women at entry-level stages of their careers.

"In my experience," Ms. Harris commented in reference to women's careers, "women don't seem to want to advance. I have observed male scientists and engineers deciding to move up when opportunities present themselves or when budget cuts come. Women, on the other hand, stayed around. Women must want to get ahead and to accept assignments outside their areas to get qualifying experience."
Jane Rogers

Entry
Ms. Rogers entered the federal government as a GS-7 administrative assistant in a large federal organization. She passed the Federal Service Entrance Examination after having received a Bachelor of Arts in personnel administration. The position an administrative assistant, she remarked, "was an efficient way to get into government."
Ms. Rogers became bored quickly with the routine paperwork processing duties. Part of her duties, however, as the routing of vacancy announcements to office workers and typing of position descriptions for vacancies that occurred in her own office. Ms. Rogers quickly picked up how positions are classified and filled. She also learned what was needed to qualify for a job with promotion potential. When a vacancy for a personnel management specialist job came across her desk, she applied and eventually got it. She also established contacts with servicing personnel officers, which assisted her in changing jobs.

Transition into Personnel
After moving into personnel, Ms. Rogers received no training or guidance from her supervisor on how to do the job. She learned the rudiments by day-to-day experience. "I was driven enough and attentive enough to details," she explained, "that I was able to teach myself what I needed to know."
"I also had the attitude that, 'I have a job to do,'" she explained. "It's important to be responsive. I have a service attitude and was able to survive. I had a management orientation. I wanted to be supportive of positions people wanted me to do. That was my key to advancement."
Attention to detail and a service attitude, moreover, led to her supervisor's and her clients' recognition of her achievements. Ms. Rogers asked questions if she did not fully understand a situation. Seen as a person of competent technical ability and judgement, Ms. Rogers advanced to a GS-12.

Reorganization and Promotion into Management
Ms. Rogers's organization underwent a restructuring which resulted in an opening for a division chief. Ms. Rogers was detailed temporarily to this position, although it was two grade levels above hers. Ms. Rogers admitted she feared the move. She had never supervised before and had no prior training in management. Ms. Rogers said she dealt with this fear by taking the new responsibilities seriously. By this she meant making a point of developing effective interpersonal relationships with staff and sharing information. She had supervisors who failed to teach her what they knew. Even when she tried to get information from them, she said, they would not be around. Ms. Rogers was determined not to run her own shop that way. "I always made it a point to share information and to let everybody know as much as I did. I saw morale go up; people were really trying to do a great job," she stated.

Recognition from Outside and Advancement Opportunity
While working in personnel, Ms. Rogers had met a man who, she maintains, remains "a subtle influence in my life." Ms. Rogers had first heard of him in the organization as a "fast track guy who was promoted every year on his anniversary up to GM-15. Frank ran
things by the seat of his pants, and
he surrounded himself with competent
people. People trusted him," Ms.
Rogers remarked, "and he trusted
them in return. You worked harder
to make yourself worthy of his
trust."

After Frank transferred to another
agency, he became aware of a vacant
deputy branch chief position in
personnel. Although Frank had not
met Ms. Rogers previously, he knew
of her qualifications, called her,
and encouraged her to apply. Ms.
Rogers did apply and was selected
for the job.

Shortly after taking the new job,
Ms. Rogers attended a mandatory, tow-week management training
program.

Ms. Rogers found the training,
however, not as useful as she had
anticipated.

"I already knew most of the material
they covered," she explained, "and I
found the environment competitive."
Ms. Rogers was one of four women in
the group of sixty three managers
being trained. Because of their
small numbers, the women's
performance was quite visible.

Ms. Rogers felt an intense pressure
to excel under the circumstances.

"I was able to hold my own with what
I knew," she remarked. "Nobody
could quarrel with the fact that I
was not a dummy."

Climate Issues

Ms. Rogers maintained that she had
not experienced opposition to career
advancement in her field because the
jobs are predominately staffed by
women. She did describe conditions,
however, which have impeded progress
in her organization.

"I kept bumping my head up against
the wall trying to get promoted to a
GM-14, Ms. Rogers said. "The climate
at the top was if you aren't
technical, you're second class."
"I'd apply for jobs inside and outside the organization, but I didn't get anything."

Responsibility Broadening
Ms. Rogers eventually did move out of the organization and into a staff position with a smaller organization in the same agency. While she was there, she had a variety of new responsibilities, such as commenting on personnel policy, developing a staffing program, coordinating conferences, developing a performance appraisal system for the agency, and defending the agency's position in personnel issues. In addition, she developed contacts within the organization; they supported her performance of the new responsibilities and helped her believe that she "could do the role."

Frank referred Ms. Rogers to a GS-14 staff opening in the office of the Secretary. The position required someone who would coordinate merit pay for the whole department. Ms. Rogers applied for and was selected for the job.

After a few years, on the job, Ms. Rogers signed up for a week, Management Development Seminar, which was sponsored by the Office of Personnel Management. She came away, however, very upset. "I didn't learn anything from the course," she stated. "Everything was not relevant."

"I was frustrated when I returned to my office," she continued. "My boss and his boss knew it."

When the new Secretary came in, Ms. Rogers took a GM-14 job coordinating new personnel initiatives. "It was a grueling year," Ms. Rogers said. "After that, I took a non-supervisory staff job at the same grade level. This had many pros and cons, but it got me back into more mainstream personnel work. The new
The job was different from anything I had done to date. My supervisor was an SES Candidate, about to leave on a rotational assignment. I was temporarily promoted to run the division in her absence. While she was gone, a new director of personnel was appointed and which put me in a very visible position with her. I managed to do well, and when my supervisor took a new permanent assignment, I applied and was selected for the position to which I had previously been temporarily promoted. This time, it was permanent."
I. ENTRY

Ms. Pierce was just finishing a bachelor's degree in psychology and was eager to launch a new career. Ms. Pierce was a wife and mother, and she had also worked as a medical lab technician before returning to college. One day, at a college job fair during her senior year, she became aware of an intern program with a large military command. This two-year training program would lead to a permanent job in the organization and, Ms. Pierce thought, perhaps would lead to a career in management. At that time, there was an economic recession and few openings in Ms. Pierce's field. Hoping to develop a new career, Ms. Pierce applied for, and later accepted, the internship. She began working for the military command after graduation.

Ms. Pierce's formal training consisted of learning all aspects of parts inventory management. She also studied program management as a back-up field and which was allowed as part of the internship.

II. EARLY TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCES

An important feature of the internship was an individual Development Plan (IDP.) This plan, drawn up by mutual agreement between the intern and the program manager, included formal training courses and developmental assignments.

Ms. Pierce and the program manager agreed on the IDP, which was a required part of the internship. When Ms. Pierce was scheduled for her training, however, her supervisor refused to let her attend. He told her that other employees did not receive such training and, furthermore, workload would not permit her absence.

Ms. Pierce was furious. She called both her program office and wrote to
the Admiral in charge of the program
to complain. As a result of her
complaint, Ms. Pierce was allowed
to complete the training. At the
same time, however, she decided to
move into program management, which
was her alternate area of interest,
in another office.
In program management, Ms. Pierce
took another assignment. She
learned about day-to-day equipment
management and she enjoyed the
assignment. In fact, after she had
completed the internship, and upon
promotion to a GS-9, Ms. Pierce an-
ticipated a permanent assignment in
the office.
Ms. Pierce was selected for the
permanent job, but her personnel
office said she was not qualified to
fill it. In spite of Ms. Pierce's
pointing out her specialized experi-
ence in the internship, personnel
refused to consider the placement.
Ms. Pierce complained this time to
the Inspector General, and personnel
reconsidered its earlier decision.
III. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT: A SANDTRAP
Once she got into program
management, Ms. Pierce's battles did
not end, however.
Ms. Pierce related that the male
managers with whom she worked did
not want a female manager in their
unit because they believed women
lacked "hands-on" experience with
the equipment. Having such women in
their offices would make them "look
bad: that is, that hands-on
experience was not essential."
"Their attitude was 'We've got to
make sure she doesn't do her job
well,'" Ms. Pierce added.
Ms. Pierce had been promoted in a
year on the job from a GS-9 to a GS-
11, but she realized she was "going
to be sidelined" unless she took
action.
IV. ACTION PLANS
In her job, Ms. Pierce received
little training. She believed that training was important to getting ahead, however. Moreover, to get out of the rut, Ms. Pierce believed gaining experience at the next higher grade level was critical. To obtain both training and experience, Ms. Pierce took two steps: enrolling in a Master's of Public Administration program at a local university and participating in activities of a professional society.

Ms. Pierce became quite active in programs for women managers. In fact, she became president of a local chapter for women. Under her leadership, the organization held monthly luncheons, brought in high-level public-service speakers, and conducted an annual conference, which Ms. Pierce had televised. In addition, she was involved in a professional group, mostly male and military oriented, in which she eventually became president. She gained "a lot of exposure," which allowed her to gain experiences and skills in management. She now had demonstrable management skills, which she could not obtain through her job, for her SF-171.

Additionally, Ms. Pierce sought out people to support her career development. She had searched for a mentor and found a high-level male in her organization whom she thought would provide assistance. "But he was not helpful at all," Ms. Pierce lamented. "He just wasn't interested in me. He was not around for decisions when I needed him. He was very narrow in his outlook and he didn't understand my frustration."

Ms. Pierce pointed out that there were no high-ranking women managers to whom she could go for advice and information. Instead, Ms. Pierce found rapport with secretaries.
"Secretaries," Ms. Pierce maintained, "were mostly women and were in key informational spots. Frequently, male managers I worked with didn't give me vital documents to do my work, such as correspondence and procedures. The secretaries had access to these. They wanted me to succeed, and they passed the information on to me."

"The male managers," Ms. Pierce went on, "were technical people who didn't know how to develop others. They didn't know what you needed to do your job. They only did so if you came to them and said, 'I need this, this, and this.'"

"Initially," Ms. Pierce added, "they would say, 'You need this to do your job. If you have any questions, come see me.' But they didn't have the answers."

V. TRAINING PAYS OFF

Ms. Pierce stated that she took training as a GS-12 on her own initiative. She said courses in presentation skills and decision making were especially important in preparing her for her eventual management job. One two-hour course in zero-based budgeting, taken during one of her professional society workshops and at her own expense, was pivotal in securing an assignment with high visibility. Shortly after Ms. Pierce's taking the budgeting course, her supervisor called her into his office and said he was having trouble doing a particular budget. He asked for Ms. Pierce's help, and she knew exactly what to do. Using the zero-based budgeting concepts, she prepared a report for her supervisor's manager. After Ms. Pierce's second-level supervisor had reviewed Ms. Pierce's report, he replied to Ms. Pierce's boss. The second-level supervisor expressed delight with the report,
and he asked how Ms. Pierce knew so much about zero-based budgeting.

After Ms. Pierce had described her training, the second-level supervisor asked her to work on his staff with two GM-13's and a GM-14.

VI. SUPPORT AND A TEMPORARY PROMOTION

After this work assignment, Ms. Pierce received a temporary promotion to a GM-13. Ms. Pierce explained that going from GS-12 to a GM-13, which is the grade personnel often designates as a "manager," was difficult. As a GS-12, Ms. Pierce said that she would apply for a promotion, be highly rated, but would not be offered a job. "It was a real problem," she maintained. "I was very frustrated. I went to personnel and brought it to their attention. Word got out that I got my 13 only because I had complained to EEO."

Ms. Pierce was subsequently promoted to a permanent GM-13 and was permanently reassigned to the office. After the reassignment, Ms. Pierce realized some of her goals for gaining professional recognition in her organization. The GM-15 director, with whom Ms. Pierce worked, was, in Ms. Pierce's words, "an older man who went back to school and got his degree."

"He liked the fact that I brought problems as well as solutions to him. I remember him saying to me, "That's how a manager thinks."

Ms. Pierce described him as a "personable individual for whom I had a great deal of respect."

"He could be hardnosed too," Ms. Pierce added. I had to convince him of my recommendations, but he treated me fairly."

The director, impressed with Ms. Pierce's work, gave her extra assignments. One was planning
VII. SPECIAL TRAINING

After she became a GM-13, she applied and was accepted for a special management training program developed by her organization.

After completing a formal week of training in executive management, Ms. Pierce went on a six-week developmental assignment to a regional office of her organization. Ms. Pierce related that she filled the slot of a GM-15 and "ran the department of 375 people." During her assignment, she was considered for two jobs. But she got neither. "I called the panelists [who interviewed the applicants,]" she said. "They said they were impressed and that I gave better answers than did the male applicants. But they said I didn't get the job because 'You know the way things are.' Two old boys who worked there were selected," Ms. Pierce summed up.

VIII. MOVE TO PRESENT ORGANIZATION

Ms. Pierce believed her rejection for the two jobs did have some positive effects, however. Her portfolio, used in the selection process, was seen by many other managers who may have anticipated openings in their shops. Such observation, she noted, was helpful in her getting her present job.

Ms. Pierce, a supervisor who works with computers, found her current job three years ago. She continues to seek acceptance from her male colleagues; she does not, however, expect to be promoted in the organization. "They like what I'm doing here. My track record has been excellent, but there's no hope," she stated.

"I probably would have gotten help had I come across as 'Poor me; I need some help.' But I'm an
aggressive person. I don't need people to give me a push. If I see something that needs to be done and if they don't tell me how to do it, I'll find out how to do it on my own."

Ms. Pierce described several "sink or swim" situations into which managers have cast her. Many wanted to see her fail, she reiterated. But this tactic only "made me go overboard in what I wanted to do," she noted.

Ms. Pierce gave an example of her supervisor's sending her to a major conference to discuss technical aspects of a new inventory parts system. Ms. Pierce was unfamiliar with the new system, but the conference was only a week away. With not much time for planning, Ms. Pierce quickly assembled background information, studied the system as thoroughly as she could, and prepared her discussion. She went to the conference a day early: a wise decision, she later found out. The military officer from the headquarters command was to attend the presentation.

"He felt it was so important," Ms. Pierce declared. After I learned that he was to be present, I spent that night doing more preparation."

The morning of the presentation to the military officer, Ms. Pierce explained that she was only filling in. She then gave her presentation and hoped it would be successful. Two weeks later, Ms. Pierce's supervisor got a call from the officer. Ms. Pierce, he was told, "did a super job." Ms. Pierce's boss then told her that if he had known the officer would be attending, he would have given the presentation. Ms. Pierce, the boss said, should have called him the morning she was to have spoken.

Ms. Pierce noted that she observed
one of her male supervisor's attitudes toward her change, however. He confessed that she had broken through his prejudices about women managers; she had proven that women could do an effective job of weapons management in spite of her lack of experience in the technical operations of a military command.
Ms. Katherine Pierce

1. You mentioned that women lacking technical expertise had a difficult time being accepted by the male managers with whom you worked. How did you deal with this?

This was in radar systems, and my husband had been in radar and the Merchant Marine, so he was "my own expert." I would go home nights, and he would sit down with me and give me basics of this so that I understood the terminology and everything else. But for the most part, for the year and a half that I worked in that job, I knew how to learn what I had to know to be able to know if things were right or not. And if I didn't know, I knew where to go to get the answers. I'd either consult my husband or go to books or go to somebody that, if I asked the right questions, I'd get the right answers. In all my jobs, I had not been the technical expert when I got the job. But you also know where to get the answers. You're not going to know all the answers. And even now, in my present job, I am not a computer expert, and I don't pretend to be. Now, when these technical questions come up that involve a computer expert, I will remind them that it is not my area of specialty; however, I will consult my experts and get you the answers. And I know where to go for the information.

2. On page 3, you described male managers who did not accept female managers lacking a technical area of expertise. What were some of their reactions to you, as one such woman? Some of the reactions, for the most part, were, if you wanted to speak up at meetings, getting the floor— for one thing. Or, if I offered a suggestion, it was met with funny looks, like, "What do you really know?" But if a man had come
out with the same thing that I had said, the answer would be attributed to the male, and I was never given credit for knowing anything. And I could see that happening.

3. How did you respond to that when they did that to you?

It irritated me, but I never showed it—never showed it at all. And I would just continue in the discussions and all, even though I knew what I was saying was not being taken for what it was worth. But I knew a lot of things that were being said on the side, like, "She's only a woman; she doesn't know. She only got the job because she's a woman; don't look to her for the right answers."

4. But that didn't phase you. You kept on going.

Right. I knew these things were being said, and I had to work smarter in spite of it.

5. Did you develop any specific techniques for gaining acceptance with these people?

I tried to do a lot of homework. If I knew there were going to be a lot of meetings, what they were about. I tried to learn as much as possible about the subjects that were going to be discussed, so that I could bring something positive to the meeting and discuss things intelligently.

There were times when I was called into meetings without warning, and it took a long time to get acceptance; there were one or two occasions where I never did get acceptance, and I just,...I didn't know what to do.

6. What were the criteria for gaining acceptance? Was it technical competence? Being there with the answers?

It was a number of things—the comfort factor—is a big thing. And I learned that a long time ago.
7. What is that?
It's just like George Bush now.
Who's he selecting for his Cabinet?
He's selecting people with something
that's comfortable. The comfort
factor means they can feel very
comfortable with you. You've got
the same kinds of values and
objectives and all.
Now, women are at a disadvantage
when it comes to the comfort factor
with men, because I've seen that men
have accepted women into management
that were "one of the boys:" the
wisecracking, the joking, the going
out for beers after work and
everything that they indulged in
prior to their promotions. Then
they get their promotions; the men
felt very comfortable with them
because they figured, "Sue is one of
us, even though she's a female;
she's grateful for her job and all."
But the environment I was in the
other activity, there weren't that
many men or women that had all
their degrees—had all their
professional accreditations.
Consequently, if you were a woman
and an educated woman at that, you
were resented right from the start.
What I kept hearing repeatedly was,"If you were a secretary and came up
from the ranks, you were accepted."
But I got mine the easy way. That
was said to me quite a few times.
The "easy way" was by coming in
under a training or an intern
program. I went to college and got
that piece of paper; and you really
didn't have to work for it.
Whereas, if you came into government
as a GS-2 and worked your way up—
those women were perceived in a
different light. They earned their
way; we didn't. A few of us had
earned our professional accred-
itations.
8. And that would tie in with
knowing who we are, knowing our
business, and being accepted.
Right. That's what I mean by "feeling comfortable" with the women who were secretaries, with the women who had been clerks, and all, because they came from similar backgrounds. Those of us that came in... But the male college graduates, though, that came in as 5's, were accepted a little more easily. Now, there were some resentment there on the parts of some people, but not as much as the women who came in. 9. But the fact that you were a woman intensified their resentment. Right, because they felt you were taking the good jobs away from them. 10. On page 10, you mention a supervisor who had indicated a change in his attitude toward women managers. For example, he believed that women who didn't have technical expertise...
...or hands on experience. Well, one of the things he came to understand was that to be a good weapons program manager, you didn't necessarily have to work with the nuts and bolts and screws. If you had other qualifications, such as being able to manage your project, your budget, what was needed in making out (what we call) project development plans, making those out and all, and going to the equipment specialist if you had questions as to whether, for instance, they need 10 parts to be on board ship—but last year, they only needed five—What's the reason? Are there parts wearing out or what? And it was the job of the equipment specialist to come back to you with it was the job of the equipment specialist to come back to you with that technical information. When he told me he had changed his mind about this, he says, "I can see in this type of job you don't need
That's why you've been successful, because you knew that you could get that information from the equipment specialist." And even they didn't have to have that kind of experience. All they had to do was study the blueprints, drawings, and everything else; then, they would come back with it.

But he perceived that as a mark of competence. Right, but he found out, too, that to be a good program manager, you had to have very good communications skills—some of the others didn't. Writing and presentations skills—and that's what it came to.

And he perceived that in you? That was one of those competence areas?

Yes.

Because of that, his attitude changed. Right. He's the one that sent me up to that positioning conference with only a few days' notice. He didn't have anyone else to send, and I guess he figured sending Ms. Pierce is going to be better than sending nobody. And I really didn't want to go.

That was one of the questions I was going to ask. How did his reactions to you change after that? He started treating me a lot more professionally. Up until that point, he hadn't selected me; someone else had selected me. When he got our branch, I guess he felt he was stuck on two accounts. He was stuck with me because I was already there. Plus, I was a neighbor. There was a personal relationship there. But that didn't matter once we got into work because he wasn't going to do me any favors, and I wasn't looking for any, either. I was just trying to prove myself to him, because I knew what
his biases were. I knew that his
wife was sitting at home, and he
felt that was the place women
belonged. He didn't know quite how
to handle the relationship with me,
plus the fact that there were all
these men who were program managers
and I was the only female. I think
he was really confused about how he
should treat me and how he should
handle situations with men.
16. So you saw a different
treatment after that. Sounds like
after the conference, he would
treat you humanely; but yet, he also
would revert back to this other way
of treating you.
Yeah. It wasn't too long after that
I got my next promotion. He knew it
was going to happen, because he say,
"Hey! You belong in management! I
know it's just going to be a short
period of time." I could take things
and analyze things and see what had
to be done; and he recognized that.
17. Then he was willing to support
you.
Yeah. He was one of the few ones
that was willing to support me.
18. Hmmm. On page 3, you believe
training was an important way to get
ahead and you describe two routes
that you took in getting additional
education and experience in
management. What factors
contributed to this realization?
I realize that I had to get this
ability, and I had to prove I was
capable of "managing organizations."
So I figured that was one of the
ways to do it. That was one of the
things they kept preaching
at the FEW training conferences. If
you don't have the opportunity to
give presentations and get
visibility on the jobs, get involved
in the organizations; that's when
you'll have opportunities to in-
roduce speakers and everything.
That was one of the ways I did it.
For me, it was very successful, because most of the time, when they try to hold a person down, a woman or a minority person, they will not give them the opportunity for visibility in the way of special assignments that you know are going to give you a lot of visibility or giving briefings and presentations. The funny part of that was, I've always been very good at presentations, but I had very little opportunity to do that.

So this was a way you could do it. This was a way I could do it.

20. Were there people in those professional organizations who supported your career development—who, for instance, told you of assignments or opportunities? No. That was the funny part of it. A lot of people got a lot of respect for me by being president of these organizations and getting these key speakers in and all; but I never really did get the benefit of contacts.

Except that in one case, there was an Army Colonel. I was up for Woman of the Year Award there, and one of the women on his staff was on the panel to make this decision. He told me later, "I didn't do anything to influence her, but I want to tell you one thing. If they hadn't selected you to be the winner, I think I would have ordered them all back in there to take another look."

He said, "I've been aware of everything you've done and I don't see how they can hold you down." He was never in a position to offer me a job because he was in a different command. It was part of DLA where it was warehousing and all, and they had more wage-grade jobs.

The funny part is our Admiral here at [this organization.] I met
him...He was the Executive Officer at [XYC CMD] when I first went there. It was one activity I worked at. Then he went over to XTXT, which is on the same compound. And he was Admiral over there. So I had invited him to all these luncheons when I would have the Admirals from Washington come as guest speakers. It's been interesting, because since I've been down, he remembers me and remembers me well. And now, I go down to do my budget presentations, and people don't understand what I'm doing, and they're ready to cut my budget out. You know the kind of treatment I get from him? When I walk down there, he says, "Hey, Ms. Pierce. Come on, sit right beside me." He's very open with me. And he said to me repeatedly, "I've told them there aren't a lot of things that are being done right in the way our system is being designed and nobody's listening to me." He said to me, "Ms. Pierce, I have all the confidence in the world in you. If you tell me it's true, I know it's true. Now, let's go about doing what we can do to make a difference." Now, that isn't generally true in some of the things that follow on with some of my male supervisors here. But it's funny, because...now, he's only going to be here until next June. But he's remembered the connection, and he really...
The first year he was here, they told me that, when I accepted the job, that I'd have two assistants. After I got in the job, I found out there's no budget, and I'm only going to have one assistant. Well, thee's no way I'm going to do anything. So I got a budget together, and I went down to see him. And our comptroller wasn't going to let me have any money and wasn't going to let me hire a person
from clear across the country. So I sat down with this Admiral, gave him a presentation, and explained everything I was doing. That presentation was only supposed to be 30 minutes, but it lasted over an hour. After it was all over, he said to me, "Ms. Pierce, it was a tough subject, but you did a good job of explaining it to me." I said, "Fine, but there are two things that I need. I need a certain amount of money to operate on. I don't have a penny." I said, "Will you release those funds for me?" He said, "Yes." He said, "What's the second thing?" He said, "Boy, did I ask for it now!" I said, "I need to hire another person to get this work done, and you've given orders that we will not pay POV for coming across country. I'm interested in someone across the country." He says, "What do you know about this person?" And I told him the background. He said, "Do you think she'll be good?" I said, "Yes." He said, "Okay." So when I got back to my office, my boss said, "Are you going to write a memorandum for the record?" And I said, "You bet I am." I wrote all this down, and I sent it to Admiral Able. Lo and behold, it came back, the original, a week later, with his initials on it. He had, "Proceed" on it.

So I went to the comptroller and I said, "You know that I wanted to start to use this money." She wasn't going to release it. So I pulled out a copy of the original, and I said, "This tells me I can." She was just fit to be tied! She said, "When did this meeting occur?" I said, "Last week." She said, "Well, why didn't we know about it?" I said, "The Admiral told me he wanted a presentation and I said I didn't know anyone else was supposed
to be there." So, he supported me. And even in May, when I was supposed to go to Oak Ridge, we had seven other people from XYC CDD that were scheduled to go to those executive courses; they cut out the money for everybody else, but he said, "Let her go." And I only found out two days before I was going that they approved my plane tickets and I was the last person to go last year. Nobody else went.

21. What kind of person was he? He was having a lot of personal problems in XTXT; his mother-in-law was living with him and all; he was really a negative-type person. But he did an extremely good job of running the ships point of control center. And as I said, when I met him professionally, he was always polite. He came across as not looking down his nose at people, which I liked. When I came down here, (I guess he came on board a year after I got here) I met him in the hall one day, and I said, "Remember me?" And he said, "I sure do." And we were on a first name basis.

I would say that he...you have to prove your worth to him; but he's willing to give you the benefit of the doubt. And he gets things done; he's not afraid to make a decision.

22. He sounds like he's a friendly, open person.

Yes, but a lot of people don't view him that way. A lot of people don't feel as though they could talk to him. But I always felt as though I could. And I think it was because I had worked with him in a different capacity in this organization.

23. And you had developed another kind of relationship to do that.

Yeah, right. It's just like now. He says, "Hey, Ms. Pierce. You remember when we worked at SPCC and you know we worked at XTXT and you
"Yes, Admiral. I know how things work. That's why I would like to go this way." He's been very supportive.

Sounds like he...

Now, I've got another Admiral who just came down who was my former boss at XYYX, too. He...I had a good relationship with him right before I took this promotion. I only worked there for six months while he was CO there. Lo and behold, he has...he's my...There are several Admirals here; there are three altogether. He's the third in command, and I work right across from him. And I'm on a first name basis with him. When I was at xyyx and I was leaving, he gave me an award. He says, "Well, I know we haven't heard the last of you." And in between his coming here last June, I've seen him when he came over on business; that was on a first name basis. "Ms. Pierce, how are you? What's going on?"

Was he also impressed with your competence?

It was funny, because I took him as a guest to a FEW luncheon when I was up there. I was a past president, and they were honoring me and some others. And I sat at the table and he got me talking about myself. He said, "Tell me about your background." And I was telling him about working with the different programs. And I said to him, "But I wanted to talk to you, and all I'm doing is talking. I'd rather listen." He looked at me and said, "I'm impressed with you." And I looked at him and said, "Would you mind telling me why?" And he said, "You're very enthusiastic about your work, and I like that." And I thought, "That really made an impression on him. And he didn't forget that." And I had to go up
and make major presentations while he was CO up there. And he was pretty hard on people that make presentations; but he wasn't too hard on me. There were once or twice technical questions that came up, and I said, "I don't know the answer, but I'll get it for you."

And anybody else, he probably would have bawled out that you weren't prepared. But he says, "Fine." I said, "I'll get back to you in an hour on that." And I did. I heard later from people that you make a mistake pretending if you try to be something you're not. If you pretend you know all the answers, he'd rather you told him you didn't know something and you'd find out than if you'd find out than if you'd given him any kind of an answer that he'd find out later wasn't true. 25. Trying to wing it?

Yeah.

26. Now, I just have one more question. On page 9, you mentioned that when managers put you in the "sink or swim" situations, you often respond by "going overboard" in what you wanted to do. Could you give some examples of that? I'll knock myself out and do a lot more than is expected of me. For example, I always take deadlines to be life or death. Maybe that's part of my training in the medical profession. When they say something is due on such and such a day, a lot of my male counterparts would do a sloppy job and hand something in; but I would take it as though I'm not going to get an extension. Consequently, I'm going to have to knock myself out and get it done till then. This caused me some problems then, because I'd meet the deadlines on time, and the others wouldn't. They'd say, "She's just trying to show us up." They'd say, "Ms. Pierce
did this and she did a better job of it, and you've given me only a draft of this." So, in one way, it caused problems. Even now, that's one of the things I've had to learn politically: "Don't take some of these deadlines too seriously, because you may come up with an answer that maybe your boss doesn't want you to come up with. And if you've given him that answer when it was due, then it makes him look as though he's got to do something with it in the meantime. He may give the excuse, 'Well, she needs more time to get additional information.'"

27. So you have made an adjustment there.

Oh, yeah. One of the things I've found out is just what are they looking for. Do they really want you to honor that date? If they do, do they want something quick and dirty? Or do they want something in depth?

28. How did you come to this awareness?

Through experience. You know, they say that women are very detail oriented. We think we have to do the very best of everything. And research and research every nitty-gritty detail or a report isn't going to be perfect. I would really spend a lot of time (knock myself out) and my superior would say, "I don't like this;" or "You didn't have to do all this."

And I think, "Okay, they're telling me something. I think these details are important, but obviously they don't think they're important. Maybe I should have concentrated on something else, rather than searching out all this additional information."

29. So it was a process of feedback, in a sense.

Yeah. Now, I'm smarter, too.

Rather than second-guess them, I'll
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651 ask up front when I'm given

652 assignments, "How soon do you want

653 that?" And "Is that a drop-dead

654 date, or do you just want something

655 rough by then?" And, "Would you like

656 me to do this, this, or this?" So

657 that I don't go off in a corner

658 someplace and knock myself out, only

659 to find out they really didn't

660 want all this.

661 30. We were talking about, earlier

662 when you came into a position, when

663 you were selected over a couple of

664 males. You were describing a situ-

665 ation that was very tense with one

666 of the subordinates. I think you

667 had used a lot of team-building

668 strategies.

669 Yes, I did. And I also found out,

670 by way of the grapevine, (this was

671 several months after I'd gotten that

672 job) that two of the males that

673 wanted this promotion made the

674 statement that, "Well, she got the

675 job, but just wait. The very first

676 time she makes a mistake, she's

677 going to get it. We'll have a union

678 complaint in there, and we'll get

679 rid of her." And maybe it's a good

680 thing I didn't know it. But I

681 sensed it. I sensed I cannot make

682 one mistake here because, if I do,

683 it's going to be fatal.

684 31. What did you do about that?

685 One of the things I learned to do

686 very early (and you know, it's

687 funny, because I didn't realize that

688 people that work with me and for me

689 say this about me) was I really

690 learned regulations: what I could

691 and could not do as a supervisor. I

692 did that very early in the game

693 because we had a very strong union

694 up there. I thought, "If I don't go

695 according to regulations, I can be

696 caught in a union grievance." And I

697 was. But I knew regulations, too,

698 and I knew I was doing the right

699 thing. And I was caught in union

700 grievances twice. And both times, I
As I said, people who have worked with me have said, "Don't tackle with Ms. Pierce on anything like that, because she's well-versed in regulations and procedures; and she goes by the book."

32. Do you feel that may be a factor in why people-men in particular-haven't tripped you up?

I've gotten a reputation as being a fighter, and the fact that I can come up with a position that I've done my homework on and I know is the way something should be done. I think that's probably why some things have turned out the way they are, because I was told too, in this union grievance. The union steward even came up to me later (this first one that was brought by the one man) and he said to me (he treated me terribly all throughout the grievance. After it was all over, he said, "I'm glad you won."

And I said to him, "You are?" I said, "Your behavior during this six months didn't show that." I said, "You know you really treated me in a very unprofessional manner; as a matter of fact, it was very demeaning at times." And he says, "Well, that's the way we have to do things as a union steward." And I said, "No, it isn't." But I said, "Why are you glad I won?" He said, "Because he was wrong." I said, "But you wouldn't have told me that before when you were helping him."

But he said, "I have to do that as a union steward." I said, "Even when you know he's wrong?"

32. He probably would have lost face if he hadn't tried to put up some kind of argument.

Yeah.
Ms. Kim Ferris

Entry
Ms. Ferris entered a medium-sized federal agency a little over two years after she was graduated from college with a bachelor's degree in English in the late 1970's. She had initially gone to law school right after her graduation, but dropped out halfway through because she realized "it was not what I wanted to do for the rest of my life." Her legal training, however, enabled her to take a GS-5 investigator's job in the agency.

Early Encouragement and Opportunities
Ms. Ferris noted that her supervisor, a young female division director, saw potential for Ms. Ferris to achieve in her career. The division director gave Ms. Ferris assignments that employees at the journeyman level in the shop were doing. Ms. Ferris, for her part, felt confident in her job relatively quickly, maintaining that she met the high expectations set for her.

"She gave me lots of encouragement," Ms. Ferris noted. "This matched my own desire for as much leeway and autonomy as possible."

In her year and a half in that office, Ms. Ferris was promoted to a GS-7.

Reorganization and Career Change
After the election of 1980, Ms. Ferris's division underwent a reorganization. Ms. Ferris's job classification also changed to that of a criminal investigator as the division's mission was altered. Ms. Ferris did not want to take that type of job, and, accordingly, decided to move into a policy analyst job in another division of the agency.

Ms. Ferris once again found her legal studies valuable in
understanding the legislative and regulatory processes which her new position required. During her three years there, she was promoted to a GS-12, but she said that she received no training from her agency to gain skills to help her learn her new job. "Internal training was abysmal," Ms. Ferris declared. "The training department here experienced drastic funding cuts. There weren't very many courses available, and what was available, I couldn't use."

Another Career Move
Ms. Ferris's interest in taking training led her to developing a friendship with the coordinator of the training division. The coordinator arranged for employees in headquarters, regional offices, and the private sector clients to take skills training through instruction contracted with external vendors. Ms. Ferris applied for and got a training specialist job. After a short time on the new job, Ms. Ferris reasoned that her position could, and should, provide more than contracted training. By designing and developing training to suit the particular needs of her organization, Ms. Ferris believed, training would be more cost-effective and more useful to clients. Because the department had restricted hiring additional staff, however, Ms. Ferris realized that her ideas could not be put into effect easily. To bring the ideas to life, Ms. Ferris felt she should do the entire training, from designing, developing, and conducting, herself. Without any formal training, but with the sanction of her supervisor, Ms. Ferris became a one-person training shop.
Ms. Ferris's function introduced her to a variety of employees and managers in the headquarters and in the regional offices. In addition, she also met several officials working with private and non-profit organizations which did business with Ms. Ferris's division. Understanding how the needs of her division and those of external clients manifested themselves in day-to-day operations, Ms. Ferris was able to design programs which were highly effective. Ms. Ferris developed a reputation among the internal and external clientele for competence, reliability, and diligence.

To supplement her on-the-job experience, however, Ms. Ferris did not receive in-house training herself. Realizing that she needed additional skills in human resource development, Ms. Ferris began signing up for courses and seminars which private vendors offered. Since the agency did not have funds to fund such training, Ms. Ferris paid for the programs with her own money.

At the same time, Ms. Ferris joined a nationwide, professional society of human resource developers from the private as well as the public sectors. Ms. Ferris participated in monthly meetings of her local chapter as well as in workshops, seminars, and annual conferences. In the gatherings, Ms. Ferris volunteered to give speeches and conduct training to members. "It allowed me to meet a variety of experienced people," Ms. Ferris commented. I developed a network of contacts for information, and that was very helpful to me."

Choosing a Management Career

The opportunity for Ms. Ferris to move into management came when her supervisor's job
became vacant. Because
of Ms. Ferris's training skills and
her excellent rapport with client
groups within and outside the divi-
ion, Ms. Ferris's second-level
supervisor encouraged her to apply
for the job.
For her part, however, Ms. Ferris
was not sure she wanted it. In her
organization, crises happened fre-
quently, political groups clamored
for hearings, and leadership changed
often. Then, there were Ms.
Ferris's two co-workers; she had
developed positive working
relationships with them, but being
their supervisor would put her in a
different role. What frightened Ms.
Ferris perhaps the most was that she
would be responsible for supporting
not only her ideas and interests but
also those of her staff and of her
constituents to upper management.
She knew from experience that
going ideas upward in the
bureaucracy was difficult; creative
ideas for changing outmoded, con-
flicting, and rigid procedures
rarely made it through the first
stratum above. There were numerous
responsibilities, and Ms. Ferris did
not know if she had the energy, the
persistence, and the courage to meet
them. Not having sufficient
experience and management training
produced further doubts.

Confronting Difficulties
Ms. Ferris shared the problems as
well as the oppor-
tunities for professional
advancement as she viewed them with
her husband. Phil was not a
manager, nor did he work for the
federal government. He did, how-
ever, show Ms. Ferris that she had
the potential for resolving her
fears about managing the politics
of upper management, former peer
relationships, and the process of
using creative ideas to influence
Ms. Ferris listened to Phil; and believing that she had the ability to manage, she would gain the confidence of those above and below her. She therefore applied for the position and was thereafter selected for it. Ms. Ferris's decision to think through the costs as well as the benefits of becoming a manager allowed her to contemplate what would lie ahead of her. In actuality, she did confront realities of supervising former peers, of managing bureaucratic structures, and of utilizing influence. In some ways, some of her anticipated conflicts have been as expected, and Ms. Ferris has developed skills for meeting them. In others, the course has been less charted and unexpected difficulties have prevented smooth resolution. In relation to Ms. Ferris's staff, Ms. Ferris hired an additional five specialists and clerks. Remembering the value of her first supervisor's recognition of potential to later achievements, Ms. Ferris noted that she takes special care to reward employees who demonstrate talent and creative application of skills. Ms. Ferris continues to sense residues of resentment among her former co-workers for having been selected for the supervisory position. She also has come to believe that she must make decisions which will not always be popular with staff regardless of the kind of relationship she has developed with them. She stated that this does not deter her from carrying out her responsibilities for oversight. Ms. Ferris's acceptability among upper managers, however, has been more troublesome for her. "They see me as a brash kid," Ms. Ferris confided. "I'm only 33, and
Ms. Ferris explained that she had obtained a promotion not long after accepting the supervisory position. She realized that her job had much more inter-agency coordination responsibilities than were indicated in her official position description. When she asked her second-level supervisor to re-write the position description and to upgrade her new job, he agreed that revision was needed. However, he said that Ms. Ferris needed to re-write it herself, since she was most familiar with the specific responsibilities involved, and to take the document to personnel for approval. Ms. Ferris did so and was promoted after personnel approved the revised position description. Not only is Ms. Ferris one of the highest ranking women in her organization, but she is also one of the youngest. Ms. Ferris pointed out that the older and more experienced male managers with whom she interacts have failed to recognize the value of Ms. Ferris's expertise and creative ideas. Ms. Ferris has used assertiveness skills in attempting to get her ideas across. She admits that they have helped reduce some barriers, but the continuing need to apply them has drained her energy and commitment.

**Limited Prospects**

Since becoming a manager, Ms. Ferris has intensified her involvement in the national professional society has continued to take management and training courses through private sector providers. She also keeps on expanding her network of professional relationships. She wants to learn more about training and development, especially in positions outside government.

"The biggest hurdle is not having my
ideas heard and
not being allowed to change
structures," Ms. Ferris related. "I
feel boxed in by the bureaucracy. I
am hoping to leave government soon."
Ms. Margie Benet

Entry

Before entering the federal government to work on the National Bicentennial Commission, Ms. Benet had combined several roles: a student, college instructor, and urban planner. After obtaining a master's degree in international affairs, Ms. Benet worked briefly in a municipal agency involved with urban violence. She later worked briefly in a non-profit housing organization in the same Midwest city. From there, Ms. Benet instructed in a community college and obtained a scholarship. Returning to graduate studies, Ms. Benet received a fellowship in urban and regional planning in the Washington, D.C. area. Following a transfer to another university, but staying in urban planning, Ms. Benet obtained a summer internship that turned into a full time job. In time, however, she became frustrated with that job, and found a GS-7 position with the Bicentennial Commission. Ms. Benet enjoyed the young, dynamic cohorts on the Commission, and she was promoted to a GS-12. Before the Commission's charter expired, Ms. Benet got a job in planning and budgeting in the Office of the Secretary of a large federal organization.

Mentorship

Before Ms. Benet became a manager, she learned many managerial skills from her supervisor, Jack. "Jack was an incredible young man in a powerful office," Ms. Benet remarked. "He was a brilliant analyst. He taught me how to analyze situations, how to solve problems, and who to deal with on the Hill. He was so smart. Everyone relied on him." Ms. Benet said she had a first-hand
opportunity
to "observe sound management
practices" from him.
"He would call me into his office," Ms. Benet explained," and he would
critique my work in a nonthreatening way. He would also give me lots of
responsibility," she went on. "I
dealt directly with the
Administrator, even through I was
only a GS-12. Very early, I got used
to dealing with political appointees
and was close to the Hill."

Male-Dominant Power Structures
Most of the managers with whom Ms.
Benet interacted
were older and highly technical
males. As a young woman, Ms. Benet
felt she was not taken seriously.
"Every year I aged," she joked, "I
felt I was more accepted. Being
married has also helped. I think
that's the reason why I haven't
experienced sexual harassment."
Ms. Benet said she is "constantly
having to prove" herself and to be
"smarter than the men in order to
gain "If you read documents [given
before meetings,]
you are 90 percent ahead of most
people," Ms. Benet quipped.
Ms. Benet explained that she earned
credibility with the male-dominant
power structures, in part, by
playing the role of "translator."
Many of the male managers, she
maintained, were engineers who
"couldn't write or speak in plain
English" in drafting proposals for
the Congress and in coordinating
with trade associations.

Protectors and Allies
Ms. Benet described two additional
ways in which she has managed
relationships with male managers.
One is through forming associations
with powerful men of equal or
greater rank and another is through
gaining skills which women in her
career have found effective.
Ms. Benet pointed out that a political appointee who had offered her a GM-15 job in economic analysis had given her a special status in a group. "He gave me lots of responsibilities [on that job,] and I had independent status and authority...I had put together the job, hired staff, and figured out what I had to do to get the job done. People knew I had access to him and had his confidence," Ms. Benet summed up. Ms. Benet also noted that associations with the head of the agency, a female political appointee, also enhanced stature. "The agency head was quite interested in developing women," Ms. Benet commented. [I was working in her office,] and we set up a group of eight women, drafted initiatives, and set up nine programs for women, including training."

Ms. Benet pointed out that she had applied for the Senior Executive Service Candidate Program, a federal government-wide, two-year developmental program to prepare managers with skills needed for taking an SES position. No women, however, had been selected in the organization of over 100,000 employees when the female agency head was appointed. The agency head, however, insisted that women be selected for the training. Ms. Benet, who was one of ten women chosen among the 170 applicants for the next program, credits her being selected as a result of the strong, top-level support of the female agency head. Ms. Benet added that since the Secretary was appointed, the numbers of women managers has increased substantially, and 12 women have been appointed to the SES in the last three years.
The increasing numbers of women managers in Ms. Benet's professional area joined with women professionals from trade and non-profit organizations outside government to form their own network. Ms. Benet became an officer for a local chapter, and later she became a board member of the national chapter.

Ms. Benet explained that she has also learned skills for coping with pressures exerted from male-dominant structures through working with a young female political appointee. "Most men were skeptical when she was appointed to the position," Ms. Benet recalled of the young woman. "But she didn't let it stand in her way. She was herself: humorous, light. She could handle the pressure of being looked at all the time. She was young and had people skills...She was in a powerful position and was able to demonstrate [the skills]."

Ms. Benet feels she has been fortunate in having a "mentor in the front office." But, she adds, "You absolutely need, if not a mentor, a protector: someone who can protect you. If you fail, you are so obvious. No one has to set you up. You just stand out."

"For instance," she went on, "in dealing with Congress on very sensitive issues, most [interaction] is done verbally. It's easy to say 'So and so said this.' you can do yourself in very quickly unless someone's willing to back you up and say, 'No, this is really the way it was.' If you don't have them, you won't last very long."

She added, however, that she is supported by two male counterparts who "help take the hits" for her.

"They know I'm doing a good enough
job. Men cover for each other all the time. [But with women who are all alone,] even minor mistakes can be fatal," she observed.

Another protector is Jack. Ms. Benet transferred out of his agency some years ago, but he recently called Ms. Benet and told her that "if she got into trouble to let him know, and he would find a place" for her in his office.

**Independent Work**

Before Jack left, he had given Ms. Benet much encouragement. "You're smart," Ms. Benet remembered him telling her. "You can do this."

After Jack moved, he asked Ms. Benet to join his staff. Ms. Benet took the position—her first as a supervisor.

"The program was difficult to put together," Ms. Benet recalled. "I didn't have an engineering or a physicist's background. So I hired some great, young, excellent staff. This program," she went on, "was a major event in my career. A major improvement in a product came about and its results can be seen today in the industry."

After this job, a political appointee offered Ms. Benet a position in economic analysis; Ms. Benet took the job, which was a promotion to a GM-15.

After Ms. Benet had completed the SES Candidate program as an economic analyst, she found an SES position as deputy budget director in the largest of nine sub-organizations in her agency. In that position, she faced several crises. The major programs had been cut back substantially; deadlines were stringent, and, Ms. Benet confided, staff had been beaten down. Ms. Benet coped, however, by "giving people lots of encouragement."

Ms. Benet became acting budget director for three months, during
which time she proved to herself and her agency that she could do the job.

Training and Development

Taking a cue from Jack, who said that training was a "total waste of time," Ms. Benet has taken only three management development programs in her career: (1) the Senior Executive Service Candidate Program; (2) a two-week, university-based executive training program; and (3) a two-week executive development seminar sponsored by the Office of Personnel Management. The latter, she chuckled, was "...eighty-eight percent good. Not bad. I liked being exposed to people in other agencies. But the training program wasn't up to date. There was nothing novel or state-of-the-art. Also, there was little emphasis on management techniques. If someone is being mistreated in my organization of 4,000, how do I know about it? Government training programs are too academic," she concluded.

On the other hand, Ms. Benet profited from the direct experience she gained through the year-and-a-half fellowship in a congressional office. She had applied as a GM-15 through a non-profit, professional organization engaged in studying political processes.

"I had a wonderful time," Ms. Benet remarked. "It gave me lots of contacts. I learned how things work on the Hill. I learned there was a bias for action, and this appealed to me."

"The second thing I liked," she noted, "was getting immediate, direct feedback. I didn't have to go through a lot of bureaucratic layers."

Ms. Benet added that her experiences while working with the Congressman were critical to her being selected
Coping with Stress in the Current Position

Ms. Benet is presently a director of a new office: a position which she has created herself. Establishing the office was difficult. It entailed moving out a male and setting up an office from scratch, without office space, and, as she stated, "status.

Ms. Benet was given the task, however, because she had developed a reputation for being able to implement new programs smoothly, and had developed a reputation for competence among officials in the agency.

Ms. Benet pointed out that the initial stress associated with setting up the office, however, has not subsided. In fact, it has worsened.

"I'm not up to hardball politics," she intimated. "People still question what I am doing in my position. People want to know what happened to good old so-and-so [the male preceding her.]"

"And then there's dealing with Congress everyday," she interjected. "You can't duck. You're visible and accountable. In this agency, you must take blame for [public safety accidents."

Advice to Women

Ms. Benet emphasized that women who want to get into management must cope with "being on the firing line."

"When you're down, it seems a long way up the chain," she noted. "When you get there, you wonder if it's worth it. I feel that you shouldn't sacrifice your values, however. Know who you are."
Ms. Margie Benet

1. "Jack" taught you how to analyze various situations. Were there others who taught you analytical or problem-solving skills on the job? I learned from observing people both in managing staff and in dealing with other organizations.

2. "Jack" also taught you how to deal with the Hill. What was involved in that? Did you gain additional skills in that after working with "Jack." Please give examples.

He had a good personal style. I watched how he was able to bring people around to his view. He was successful; some people would say he was aggressive. You have to figure out how that aggressiveness worked to his advantage. Some people are aggressive and abrasive, and it turns people off.

He almost always took me to the Hill. That empowered me. It gave me visibility. People knew that I knew what he knew. It gave me a lot more access to people and staff on the Hill. I dealt with staff people on the Hill. I found out very quickly that it is staff people you have to convince. I was working on re-authorization bills and worked with both sides.

A lot of people I met when I worked with him are people I still work with. There's a long continuity. People have known me for years and I've established my own credibility. Having those introductions is very important, and the earlier, the better.

Jack left before I did. I was independently dealing with staff people. It was an opportunity to practice what I'd learned. I was very successful with those people. It's developed into solid relationships.

3. In dealing with older, more
highly-technical males, what were some examples of ways that you, as a young female, had to "constantly prove" your competence?

Not until I got into my present position was I challenged openly that I don't have the technical credentials to even to be in the same meetings with these people. The current situation has been the worst of all I've faced. The advantage is that I've had 20 years of working experience and am over 40 years old, and things they say don't bother me.

4. You mentioned that you gained additional "credibility" with the men by forming associations with powerful men and women in your organization. You also provided some examples of how these associations helped you. How did you learn to form these associations? Were there earlier instances in your career that enabled you to learn how to make contacts and to enlist their support?

You have to have some access. You can't just go up and introduce yourself and become fast friends. I worked very closely with political appointees. I started in the Secretary's office and so my second-level supervisor was a political appointee, and I was in a very visible position. If you are working with political people, you have a better advantage than if you work with bureaucrats, because, many times, political people know they have a short tenure, and are looking for people who are smart and who can pick up programs and move with them. They're not as threatened; they know they'll be short-tenured. They already have their positions. They won't be there two years later. It is much harder to be picked up by a
mentor in the old boys network in
the old sense. It's hard to work
up. It's pretty closed. There are
certain expectations. I've had many
more opportunities because of the
political people I've worked with in
both parties. They were young,
dynamic people. I'm sure if you're
in the bowels of an organization,
and the only people you have tow
work with are your branch chief,
there are limited opportunities.
You have to decide whether you like
your job to stay or to leave. But
that's a big leap for people.
5. You mentioned two terms that
captivated me: "mentor" and
"protector." Could you give me an
example of each? How are they the
same? How do they differ?
Well, I think in any large, complex
organization, there are so many
opportunities for running into
difficulties, where, especially if
you're a female or if you're a new
person in the agency, you're likely
to stumble and fall; and that could
be the end of your career, unless
you have someone who's willing to
say, "Let's give this person a
chance." Somehow, to open the door
for you so that all
the opportunities in the future are
not closed off by a mistake you
would have made.
I think it certainly goes on among
men, where people's reputations
don't seem to be damaged by small-or
even large-mistakes that are made in
careers. In careers, a relationship
is formed over the years, where
individuals are not held accountable
for what errors they make. Even
though we all like to think we are
working toward excellence and top
performance, there are going to be
mistakes along the way. If you
can't afford to make a mistake and
survive it, you're going to have a
very short tenure. I think that, in
my career here in this agency, I have always felt that any mistake I made would be the end of my career, no matter how minor. It creates a lot of anxiety that I don't know that everyone walks around with. It just seems to me that if you don't have some allies in the agency, you just wouldn't survive. And I think that's one thing I've been able to do. Every two or three months, I really take stock. I go down the list—mentally, not written, of the 20 senior managers here and say, "Where do I stand with each one of these people?" There are some people I know for whatever reason, no matter what I do just about, are going to be supportive of me.

6. How did you develop that relationship with these people? I think a couple of them I have worked with or for directly. They recognized I had some talent; whereas the people I hadn't worked with would just write me off as nobody of any consequence. There are some other people in the agency who feel we need a change in the profile and make-up of the agency. Frankly, white males who are willing to throw their support behind any female or almost any minority. There aren't many of these people around—kind of like the old "knee-jerk liberals." But there are a couple of them. A couple of the opportunities that have been offered to me, which I have not accepted, were really based on that. You can call it "tokenism" if you want, but you've got to start somewhere. And there are a couple of men in this agency who, I think, just feel we need a change, and you can count on them for support.

7. What kinds of people? What are their characteristics? You called them "knee-jerk liberals." I used that because it probably sums
up the views of people in this agency have of them that they are not discriminating based on technical expertise. Technical expertise seems to be the one criterion for getting anyplace in this agency. All the other factors that OPM looks at and most managers look at are really not relevant here. It really is your technical background. You were either an air traffic controller or a pilot, and maybe an engineer. And those were the only choices there are for management.

The two individuals I'm thinking about are very different in character. One is very highly-educated, and that might be it. While his background is technical, his advanced degree in a human resources management area. Highly educated, one. The other one, I really don't know who to explain, except that he has been exposed to a lot of different job environments. He has not spent his entire time with [this agency] even though he has been an [agency] employee for his entire career, I believe. But he has spent two years in a foreign post as a part of an international organization; he's spent at least two or three years on the Hill under one of the programs; and he's spent a year at Princeton in an advanced degree program sponsored by the agency. He's obviously the kind of person who was seeking those things out, and I think they just broadened his view of what's out there. That the technical expertise, and the way we run the agency is not exactly the only thing we should look for. I think the other, as I said is that I mentally take stock of who the senior managers are and what my relationships are with them; and then, what I've had to decide is
whether it's worth cultivating any
of them or not. Some of them I have
just written off; there's no point
in dealing with them. Some, I kind
of vacillate back and forth, and
thin, "Should I make an effort with
this guy or not?" At any rate, I
think that if you don't keep tabs on
where your support is, you're
probably making a big mistake,
because everybody needs it sooner or
later; you just can't get through
doing it on your own.
8. You had talked about
cultivating that on a day-to-day
basis.
Right.
9. You had also talked about women
not having a technical background
and having a difficult time being
accepted in a male-dominant power
structure. You discussed the tactic
of "hard-ball politics,"
which I was fascinated by. Would
you give an illustration of that?
I think hard-ball politics is when
you go after the individual. The
primary objective is to undermine
the individual. I think we all see
situations where you can disagree on
the issues and you can have a pretty
heated debate (and we certainly do
in this agency) on technical
questions. Where do you stand on
this issue? I really see hard-ball
politics as ad hominem: going after
the individual. I think it's much
easier to do when the individual is
vulnerable, such as women in a
technical organization or women
without a technical background.
Although, I have to say, this agency
doesn't discriminate as far as your
background. I've seen women with
technical backgrounds be undercut as
quickly as women without. I think
it's just the fact of being female.
10. ...like being personally put
down? Not taken seriously?
Exactly. I've had people in this
agency who are not sophisticated at
all or subtle in their dealings with
each other from a human relations
stance. I think there's a lot of
pretty latent, aggressive
collection. I think because of
that environment, it's easy to
become a victim, because people just
blow up at you and come on very
strong.
I've actually had that occur a
couple of times. In each case, the
individual has come and apologized.
The fact is that the damage has
already been done. You wonder why
the individual has bothered to
apologize at all. And that's
essentially what I've told them when
they've come in.
10. What are some ways that you've
found effective in dealing with
that?
When I first came here, I had one
situation that I related to my boss.
His view was--and maybe this is how
men handle it because they're much
more frontal that you go back after
them, and you get them, and you make
sure they know you got them. I
decided it wasn't worth my
effort to go back and get anybody. I
don't care about getting them-being
vindictive. I don't really know if
that's how men treat each other, but
that's what I've been advised. If
somebody really undercuts you, you
make sure you set up an opportunity
to undercut them next time. My view
is, I don't really care enough to
get into that kind of tit-for-tat.
On the other hand, I try not to come
across as a martyr. My view is
that, if you get me, you get me. To
what end? I really have tried not
to get into that and to stay above
that level.
11. Has that been effective for you?
Well, I really don't know how
effective that's been. I think
maybe it's been more a matter of
being lucky to get away with having
an aloof attitude: "You can come
after me, but I'm not going to do
anything about it."
I think part of the reason I've been
able to get away with it is that
I've been able to develop enough
support. When people seen the
negative behavior that occurs in
this agency, it doesn't necessarily
diminish you; it's more a comment on
the person dishing it out. But I
think I've developed enough support
and a track record for doing the
work that I can just turn around and
walk away from it. But, at the
time, it hurts me—it hurts my
feelings. I try not to let it drag
me down. I really don't intend to
be a martyr.
My view is that I never really
expected to get anywhere, anyway.
The fact that I've gotten this far
is the surprise. In one sense, I
don't feel I have anything to lose.
I've already achieved more than I
ever thought I would. If somebody,
or the system, gets me, I almost
expect it. My view is, "Well, I'll
just go somewhere else." That is
not the end of my life. My whole
life is not tied up with this job.
12. The people that you rely on for
support, do they come to your aid in
these situations?
Yes. That is really the most
gratifying thing; to have somebody
come and tell you they've had
private conversation with so-and-so
in order to support you.
13. Like a third party?
Yes. That's what keeps you going,
because even though some of the hits
are pretty hard, I've always had
people tell me, "I've taken that
subject up with that individual
and let them know that they really
have been out of line or
overreacted."
I don't think there's any point in
being vindictive as a woman; you can
win. I don't think you can win. I
think that all it does is further
undercut you.
14. If you try to play a win-lose
game with them?
Right. I don't see a purpose in
that. Frankly, I have been in
offices where I recognized that I
was being undermined by someone-in
one case, a woman. I just decided
not to take it on, and I left. It's
easier to run than fight. I just
decided I didn't have the energy or
the interest in fighting her every
day-taking on the battles I knew I
was going to have with her on work-
related issues. Maybe that's what
molded my views on this whole thing.
15. Was this your first encounter
with a win-lose situation?
Yes. I just decided, "You win!". It
really didn't mean that much to me
to get into a battle over the job
and the turf. The idea of going to
work every day and dealing with a
person where there is a lot of
tension and conflict is not very
gratifying. I really love to work,
and a lot of pleasure at work comes
from dealing with people, not
necessarily the paperwork or the
project I'm working on. If I don't
enjoy the people, if there's
constant conflict, I don't want to
be there anymore. I really don't
know how to sum that up, but I just
decided that hard-ball politics and
undercutting and undermining people
is not really something I want to
do; so I would rather leave than get
into that. As I said, I think I've
been lucky to some degree that I've
had a lot of support when I've run
into unfortunate behavior of others.
I wonder—I'll always wonder—what my
reputation is, whether I'm
considered a pushover or very
independent. I don't know. You
really never know these things about
yourself, I guess. Even your staff won't tell you what the consensus is.

15. Have the people you've been associated with, like the mentors and protectors, given you feedback? Yes, generally; though it's always been very positive. I have tried to open the doors for constructive criticism, also. I think it's easier to accept criticism from people that you know like you and are trying to help you. So I've always tried to open up doors to those people and say, "Please give me a heads up," especially if I'm really out of line. Unfortunately, I've never gotten what I consider constructive criticism. That makes me nervous. I think that there's a real gap in providing constructive criticism. Neither men nor women get the kind of "heads up" they need to save them from a serious setback. There are men around here that have just about stepped into that black hole, never to return again because no one has sat down with them and told them that they are just way off the mark. Everybody in the building may know it except the individual. That is what's so amazing to me. There may be a consensus, but you never get the message; it's never passed on.

16. Until a disaster hits? Yes. And then they're gone. Then it seriously affects their reputation.

We have one new white male in this organization who I think has ruined his career here, even though he appears to be hanging on. There was a crisis over the summer which he seems to have overcome, and now, he's hanging on. I think, however, his credibility has been diminished. Maybe, over time, he will rebuild his reputation. He's a good case study, too, because
he came into the agency at a fairly high level. I don't think that he's done anything to form alliances, and now he needs them. He really doesn't have a support structure here at all.

It's organizational: how to build the infrastructure to keep you where you are, and not to let unnecessary things derail your career. There are some things you can't really avoid. In this agency, everything is so visible that even a small mistake, if you are in a highly visible job, will finish you.

17. True. I think it's an art to... pick your way through-to weight the risks and the consequences. In one sense, even though I have had a lot of anxiety on this job, being a bridge between my organization and the next level up has provided me with some advantages. It means I have some contacts with that next level up so I'm better able to form alliances at that level and also to judge whether I'm really in trouble or not. Most of the other offices and sub-elements of this agency don't have enough dealings on a day-to-day basis to form a good reputation with the departmental level. As soon as there's a misstep, they're really in trouble; and they don't know it, either.

In a sense, I have a difficult job, but it does give me more information to act on. 18. Unless contacts can be established on a daily basis. Yes. There again, my contacts at the departmental level have been heavily influenced as much by members of my network as my day-to-day working with them. The "network" is really a cliche and my be overworked, but it really served me well. I know what my connections are. I know that people that I've worked with 10 years ago have made
positive comments on my behalf to various officials at the departmental level, and that can't help but improve the situation. It makes that individual think twice about whether my intentions are well-meaning, or whether I'm over here plotting against them. I think that my reputation is such that, even if there were some allegations, they would have enough information about me to know that it's not the way I operate. If there's a screw-up, it was inadvertent and not intended. I think I've had a lot of help from people I've known over the years. The networks really are critical.
Dr. Mary Frances Delaney

Entry

In the agency which Dr. Delaney has worked for the last 22 years, specialists from outside government are brought in to read and evaluate grants proposals from academic institutions. It was through this route that Dr. Delaney, a faculty member of a small college, came in. The agency offered to convert her temporary position as a consultant to a permanent status position. Delighted at the prospects of managing programs at the federal government level, Dr. Delaney accepted the offer. Within a year of the offer, she moved from a GM-13 to a GM-15.

Challenges from Varieties of Assignments

Dr. Delaney said that her early program assignments had provided her several opportunities to expand her skills and abilities. One such opportunity, she noted, took her out of her specialty area and gave her an understanding of organization development: a comprehension that became instrumental in the later part of her career in the agency. The agency, during Dr. Delaney's early career, participated in a fellowship program with the Organization for Economic Co-operation. Each year, managers from throughout government attended seminars on managing the change process through the Paris-sponsored organization. Training was held both locally and abroad. Dr. Delaney explained that, through the seminar skills and the applications to her position in managing educational programs with many different constituencies, she found challenge. After two years in the agency, she decided to remain in
the federal service.

Opposition

Dr. Delaney cited an example of how the skills in managing complex change in organizations benefitted her. The program which Dr. Delaney administered had only recently been established by legislation to promote equity in women's education. Oversight for its administration came from not only the Congress and the agency, but also from various special interest groups. Several different views on the focus of such a program converged in Dr. Delaney's office, and Dr. Delaney frequently had difficult administrative decisions to make. In this instance, a feminist interest group had insisted on, as Dr. Delaney explained, "making the program a forum for feminist issues." Dr. Delaney, however, believed that such a program should be more representative of a broader population of women; hence, she resisted the feminist group's demands. Leaders of the feminist group pressured the agency director for a resolution of the conflict, and he ruled in favor of the interest group.

"I was given a non-assignment after that," Dr. Delaney confided. "I administered a program that had no funding and was of minor political importance."

At about the same time, Dr. Delaney described how she had to act to establish fairness in her own career. When Dr. Delaney was a GM-14, her supervisor's division director job opened. Dr. Delaney applied for it, but, she explained, "an incompetent male was selected."

Dr. Delaney went to the selecting official and confronted him about his choice.

"He said that he hadn't even thought of promoting a woman," Dr. Delaney
maintained. "I then made a case of the matter to EEO. But before the case was resolved, I was given the slot."

Reorganizations: Choices for Growth and Non-Growth

In the early 1980's Dr. Delaney's agency underwent several reorganizations. In the first of these, Dr. Delaney moved out of her "non-assignment" and into a position as deputy director. In this position, which she continues to hold, two program areas were combined and placed under her direction.

Since the first reorganization, Dr. Delaney has utilized several means for developing her managerial skills. She continued the enhancement of organization development skills through both formal classes and on-the-job applications. For instance, she took a week-long Executive Seminars Center program through the Office of Personnel Management. She found especially useful instruction in team building and interpersonal communications skills. From the Federal Executive Institute and from various workshops sponsored by the National Training Laboratory, a private sector organization specializing in management training and organization development, Dr. Delaney gained additional skills. Dr. Delaney said that she also utilized the help of an internal management and organizational development consultant in the agency. When she had a difficult problem or needed advice, she asked him; she found his insights particularly useful, she said.

After the first reorganization in her division, Dr. Delaney went to her personnel office and asked for assignments which would enhance her skills and abilities. Through that
office, Dr. Delaney learned that a task force was being formed to examine the interrelationships between socio-technical systems, staffing, budgeting, and agency mission. Believing that the experience would provide a laboratory for further understanding organization development, Dr. Delaney accepted the three month assignment. She said that she was able to develop case studies for various programs and projects which the task force examined before a second organization-wide reorganization occurred.

Following the disbandment of the task force, Dr. Delaney volunteered to participate on another one with a similar reorganization charter. Dr. Delaney commented that the competencies she had acquired from the training and development, as well as the informal opportunities to learn management and organizational development have considerably increased her effectiveness as a manager. In fact, they have given her competencies which could allow her to move into the Senior Executive Service; but Dr. Delaney does not want that.

"I've had lots of opportunities to be promoted into the SES," Dr. Delaney commented, "but I turned them down. As a 15, I already have had sufficient responsibilities. Besides," she added, "I feel that SES members are subjected to several forms of political abuse. For instance, SES members have been transferred at the whim of a political appointee. Sometimes, they are used as buffers," she mused.

Competence Dr. Delaney related that she has not encountered a great deal of resistance from male managers in
her organization for two reasons: 
"I don't display certain 
stereotypical responses to pressure 
or to male-dominant power," she 
noted, "such as ranting and raving 
and pouting. I try to gain their 
respect," she added. "Gaining a 
reputation for competence is 
important. And they also recognize 
me within and outside the 
organization for my expertise as a 
college professor."
Ms. Meghan Logan

Entry

Ms. Logan had explored several routes to obtaining permanent federal government employment before she was graduated from a university with a Master's degree in Public Administration. She obtained a summer internship in administrative management as a GS-7 in a large federal organization. She decided she liked the Federal government and wanted a job there. After the internship, she sought two means of entry:

(1) she applied for a two-year Presidential Management Internship, which was for highly-qualified MPA graduates nationwide; and (2) she sent out 20-30 letters of inquiry to agency managers in the Washington, D.C. area. Ms. Logan eventually got in as a GS-7 management analyst on a temporary, 750 hour assignment at a large federal agency. After the temporary assignment expired, Ms. Logan's job was re-categorized as a GS-5 in the same office. Ms. Logan took it to acquire permanent status; but less than a year later, she found a GS-9 job in a medium-sized organization.

Management Interviews

Ms. Logan's job as a management analyst introduced her to not only key functions of the organization but also to managers responsible for the effective operation of those functions. Ms. Logan wanted to find out more about how the functions were interlinked and about how managers who operated the programs got their skills. She got this information by interviewing managers to learn what kinds of competencies they had acquired to get ahead. Moreover, she decided a rotational assignment was one of the best ways of getting them.

III. Working on a Sub-Committee
Ms. Logan worked on a sub-committee with Congress for nine months. The sub-committee members included several males, some of whom were over sixty years old. Ms. Logan said that as a young female with little direct experience in the kinds of programs the sub-committee dealt with, Ms. Logan had difficulty in being recognized. To cope with this, she said she "worked hard" on the tasks assigned: doing a great deal of research, asking questions, and stating her opinions. She said she sensed that women were not easily accepted. She also believed that raising issues might hamper getting the work done by posing barriers to effective interpersonal relationships.

Her strategy was to demonstrate competence and to gain the men's respect.

Promotion and Moving to Headquarters
Ms. Logan's assignment to the sub-committee was followed by several rapid career changes. When she returned, Ms. Logan took a personnel position involving the revamping of the agency's recruitment program. During this time, she developed a supportive professional relationship with a male Senior Executive Service member, Greg.

Ms. Logan continued to apply for jobs—especially those that had potential for the GS-13. She made the "best qualified" list for the jobs, but she received only one offer: in a division where she had worked on a project earlier in her career. Not wanting to return, but unable to turn down the GS-13, Ms. Logan accepted the offer.
Ms. Logan's new supervisor, an SES member, was a strong supporter of his staff's career development. Ms. Logan recalled he frequently trained his employees in skills he himself was picking up through an executive
101 development program. Ms. Logan
102 found such information sharing
103 important. She had earlier formed a
104 similar relationship with a male,
105 with whom she continues to
106 communicate.
107 Training and Development
108 Ms. Logan noted that she is quite
109 active in a professional society of
110 male and female public managers.
111 Elected as president of the local
112 chapter, Ms. Logan has also chaired
113 a section for women in management,
114 was elected for a three-year term on
115 the society's regional council, and
116 has participated in designing annual
117 conferences.
118 Ms. Logan said that she has
119 initiated most of the formal
120 training she has taken as a manager.
121 She has taken a few courses designed
122 by her agency, and, during the even-
123 ings, she has enrolled at a
124 community college in courses in
125 principles of accounting and
126 statistics. She has also taken a
127 one-day seminar given by a private
128 consulting firm for women managers
129 in business and government.
130 Promotion Prospects
131 Since moving to the headquarters
132 division, Ms. Logan has continued
133 looking for a promotion.
134 Although Ms. Logan enjoys her
135 current job, she is skeptical about
136 prospects for moving up. She has
137 recently had her second child, and
138 she believes that having small
139 children has limited her involvement
140 in informal professional
141 organizations and in the time she
142 can devote to her career outside the
143 regular nine-hour workday.
144 "Family obligations," she remarked,
145 "compete with my career for my time,
146 energy, focus, and devotion."
147 Ms. Logan also pointed out that,
148 although her agency has a fairly
149 significant number of women
150 managers, most of the top jobs are
151 still occupied by men.
152 "I have noted a large influx of
153 younger women recently," she
154 observed, "but some of them seem to
155 leave after making it through the
156 career ladder, perhaps because they
157 see few role models in top-
158 management positions. Affirmative
159 action and Equal Employment
160 Opportunity policies have had the
161 effect of changing male attitudes.
162 The women's attitudes, too, have
163 changed. They don't feel they have
164 to act like Army sergeants," she
165 concluded.
Ms. Ramona Chisholm.

Entry

Before joining the federal
government, Ms. Chisholm had
experience as an educator at the
local and state government levels
and in private industry. Following
college graduation, Ms. Chisholm
worked as a special education
teacher, and, after obtaining a
master's in administration, became a
principal in an elementary school.
As a school administrator, Ms.
Chisholm developed management
techniques which, she pointed out,
helped her overcome obstacles to
staff acceptance. A black female
and younger than most of the
teachers she supervised, Ms.
Chisholm stated she experienced much
fear of being accepted as a leader
at first. She said that she
overcame the anxiety by practicing
ways to "be in touch with the real
world issues" which her staff
confronted.

"At staff meetings, for instance,"
Ms. Chisholm stated, "I made a habit
of soliciting staff input,
encouraging comments on decisions
that were made. I also frequently
visited their classrooms and taught
their classes to observe and
experience what was going on and
regularly discussed things with
them."

Ms. Chisholm left her administrative
post after three years and became an
administrator of a proprietary
school.

After a year of what she described
as "boring," however, she left to
work for a state agency involved
with school desegregation.

Ms. Chisholm later took a job as a
program manager in a regional office
of a medium-sized federal
organization. She declined. Not
long afterwards, however, Ms.
Chisholm decided to take a position
at the Washington headquarters
office. A promotion to a GM-13, the
job offered her a chance to grow
professionally.

II. SPECIAL TRAINING PROGRAM
Ms. Chisholm's agency launched a
special training program for mid-
level career managers in process
consultation skills. The year-long
program featured two residential
training programs, six day-long
training programs in such topics as
organizational development and
interpersonal communications skills,
and a consultative project carried
on collaterally with
the participants' other duties as
managers. Ms. Chisholm applied, and
she was one of fifteen managers
selected to attend.

"It fostered an awareness of
issues," Ms. Chisholm recalled.
"These surfaced as a result of my
team members working on
a project feeling free to share
information and receiving support
from the manager. It also gave me a
greater sensitivity to political
issues in the agency."

Ms. Chisholm's project for the
training program was to assist the
managers of another division in the
agency with a major programmatic
reorganization. Ms. Chisholm and
her client, a political appointee,
had developed a written contract
outlining specific ways in which Ms.
Chisholm had agreed to help. During
the year in which Ms. Chisholm was
in the program, however, her
politically appointed boss was not
confirmed by Congress. Her new
supervisor had other plans for Ms.
Chisholm's project. Shortly after
coming to his new office, the new
supervisor ordered Ms. Chisholm to
break her contract and to start up a
new project in her own division.
Frustrated and dismayed by this, Ms.
Chisholm nonetheless cancelled the
earlier commitment, apologized to the client, and started the new project.

III. POLITICAL BARRIERS

Afterwards, the special training in which Ms. Chisholm took part survived only three years. Ms. Chisholm felt that it lasted that long because the agency Secretary during the pilot program supported it. Two years after the program's inception and after the Presidential election the following year, the new Secretary ordered its cancellation. "We might still have it," Ms. Chisholm confided, "if political appointees were allowed to participate in it."

Ms. Chisholm went on to describe other encounters with political appointees in her agency. After completing the program, Ms. Chisholm served on a Presidential council for recognizing individual student contributions in education. The agency nominated Ms. Chisholm because of her credentials as an educator. "It was composed of political ideologue," Ms. Chisholm noted. "We were supposed to be improving the education of children, but my job was only ceremonial. All I did was pass out pencils and plaques."

"It's similar to what I did on the agency's women's equity council," Ms. Chisholm added. "I am disturbed because money was being spent for spouse attendance, catered breakfasts, and shopping trips," she said of the Presidential task force, "while at the same time, money for careerists to monitor programs and provide technical assistance in their programs was out." Ms. Chisholm related that she has found ways to accommodate the agendas of political appointees with whom she works without compromising her
"Sometimes, I have to hide the way I feel," she remarked. "I was at a luncheon not too long ago in which I had to introduce the guest speaker [a woman who had spoken on the behalf of the Presidential Administration and who had expressed opposition to certain programs.] I had to simply put on a smile and act as if I enjoyed it," Ms. Chisholm stated.

In relation to her present supervisor, a man unfamiliar with the agency programs and uncooperative with career staff, Ms. Chisholm said that she offers "as much help as possible. I've tried to keep a smile on my face."

Ms. Chisholm regretted that no plans had been made for using graduates of the special training program in which she had participated. She noted that the agency had discussed with the outgoing Secretary the possibility of using the graduates as mentors for entry-level career interns. After the new Secretary was appointed, however, the plans were eliminated.

Ms. Chisholm noted that providing support has been beneficial in her own career development. In spite of difficult people appointed politically, Ms. Chisholm maintains that she has developed "warm, collegial relationships" with many of her supervisors, both career and noncareer.

"There were many supportive people at high levels," Ms. Chisholm noted. "They recognized my competence and provided opportunities for me to participate in departmentwide details."

Ms. Chisholm described a female division director who was especially helpful.

"After I came on board, I met her.
She was a GS-9 who worked down the hall from me. She subsequently was promoted up to a GM-15, and she was very instrumental in helping me get ahead."

V. A. DOWNGRADE
Ms. Chisholm's division was reorganized recently. In the re-shuffling, Ms. Chisholm was downgraded to a GS-12. She is a team leader of a project right now. Ms. Chisholm chose to stay in the agency, hoping eventually to move into a position in which her former grade would be restored and that she might move upward after that. "With the next administration, things have to change," she concluded. "Right now, the agency is just limping along."
Ms. Ramona Chisholm: 2
People in management positions are not trained to be managers. They view management from a perspective of sitting in a lofty place dictating to people. Management is not that at all. It's being a team player and a coordinator: being able to play any position on a team, so to speak, and keeping things going—having win-win kinds of situations.

For example, the other day, we have a project that I designed and is now being segmented among several people. I did it all to get people together. In the segmentation, there are some aspects of it that are considered technician types of work. We have a technician, but I have assigned to the professional staff, so to speak, certain functions that they were having difficulty with. They said to me, "We feel this could be done better if the technician were assigned to it." I said, "What is the problem?" "Well," [they replied,] "some people are more diligent than others." And I said, "Well, it sounds like the kind of argument you may have given your mother when she asked you to wash the dishes, because women are more diligent at keeping the kitchen. You can be diligent at anything you want to be. But let me work on it."
So what I did was to work it out, where the technician would still assign the numbers, but they would still do their part, which they viewed as a higher level, but still part of the same process. That to me is a win-win situation, they still are happy to get the job done, but everyone's happy about how it's being done. That's the kind of
thing I try to do. I try to encourage people to do their best, to be fair, to spread the good aspects of the position around, as well as the grunt work. I find here, as might exist in many organizations, the old boy network prevails. Those people who have of fended, by virtue of being here, are the ones who are pre sumed to be knowledgeable—and therefore get to go to the conferences and get to do all the "goody-good" things. So for others, people coming in, it's almost as if they have to wait for people to leave by attrition or whatever. I'm trying to do something differently. I have a supervisor who is very innovative. My second day on the job, I gave her a management plan as to how I thought this branch should function—move. And I gave it to her from the perspective of something to discuss, so that we would have a map as to where we want to go—rather than operating in a crisis mode. No one had done that before, and it's taken them a little time. I do feel this, it was used as a basis for developing the performance agreements for the branch, which tells me that it's very positive. She likes it and is moving with it. The one thing I want to do is to develop the speed at which people work. There has been the feeling that people tend to look around. And if somebody else is working at a snail's pace, then they adapt to that. I'm trying to get people not to worry about how somebody else works, but to
do their best. And if they can get something done in half the time, do it. For me, those are my inner motivations not my external expectations. Reinforcement is what the group says. The group says, "This is fine," or the group will say, "No, if you do it, and management likes it, then we'll have to work more." But there are ways you handle that. And I think, for me, it's been to let the person at the top know what your work ethic is.

1. Did you try that kind of approach when you were the administrator? No. I haven't lived long enough to have experience to know to do it that way. Actually, a lot of that came from my Senior Managers. I looked in my box of materials at all the models and the various ways you can approach organizational structures. And having had that insight, I used the first year I was here to find out what the lay of the land was like: who's who, what's what, what's acceptable, what's not acceptable-based on the players. When I moved into the position, I knew exactly where I wanted to go. It's almost like getting to the marketplace early with your wares. That's the way I've been able to do it, even to the point of which regions I've wanted assigned to my section, because I've worked with all of them and I knew where the strengths were. And I didn't try to take all of the good, so to speak, and forget the bad. I tried to balance it, so to speak, so that there was an even balance. It's worked out really well for me. It's almost like trying to teach a baby to be a high jumper. You have to be ready for it, and I think you have
to have enough experiences to be able to apply new knowledge and information. But I don't think I could have come into this setting without some kind of training, such as that I received in Senior Managers and be in a supervisory position in a year. And that's what the program was designed to do—do to prepare to do that.

2. You talked about being in touch with real world issues. How were you, as a young female administrator, able to develop support? Not only support from school staff, but also from parent groups. For example, to get any items or activities in the school building that cost more money—that weren't in the budget: no funds for—I utilized the staff as well as the parent groups to request it and show the need for it.

3. Were you able to use persuasion in that? How were you able to do that? More or less in terms of relation to the staff. After having been in the classrooms, I'd say, "I noticed certain things that would make your job easier in terms of working with children. However, in talking with my supervisor, we have run into a budgetary problem. That's the caveat. So I need your help to help them understand that there is a need and this is what we need to have. I think I got more assistance from the parent groups because they didn't have anything to lose, so to speak, than I did from the staff. But we all worked together. It was a joint effort.

Certain letters had to be prepared;
certain teachers had
to work with the parent group in
preparing them.
4. Did you learn those skills when
you were in graduate
school? Or were they something you
picked up along the
way?
I would say they were something I
picked up along the
way, watching my family operate—my
mother—she was also a
teacher, my aunts, and my
godmothers—were all educators.
I thought I would not be. I wanted
to do something
different. I started out in
chemistry. You know what
really let me know that chemistry
was not for me? It was isolating,
and we were shut up in a lab, and
you didn't
interact with people; it was one-on-
one. But I'm a people
person. At least, I think that's
where I think my
strengths are.
5. Especially when you had to
negotiate with these people.
You realized, as an administrator,
your staff needed some
things. And yet, you knew what the
realities were. You
couldn't go back to them and say,
"Look, I'm sorry. We
can't do this," and left them
without any options. That
probably would have been a turn off
to them and you would
have lost some credibility.
You remember the exercise—I think it
was Alan who took
through the negotiating act. When
my supervisor talked
with me about taking over this
position, many people would
say, "Oh, goody, goody! Yes!" Well,
I said, "Okay, if you
want this from me, this is what I'd
like from you. I
would just like to be on an official
acting detail sit
uation where I have documentation in
my personnel record
that I performed this
responsibility." She said, "Fine."
So a 52 has been initiated and I
will get a 50. Now, the
other two people don't have that.
6. I'd like to come back to the
parts in which you talk
about your dealings with the
political appointees.
The situation of being
prostituted.
7. That's interesting. What's meant
by that? Like a com
promise of your personal beliefs
system?
Using you for your knowledge and
capabilities, but not
really being rewarded appropriately
for it via promotion,
being put in for certain jobs, but
trying to use you in
terms of...It was tried on a
personal level. Say, a
political appointee would try to be
a buddy-buddy to get
information and knowledge and know-
how. But it would be
used, but I wouldn't get credit.
Example: we have one
deputy undersecretary I was helping
through his personal
assistant to get ready to go up for
confirmation hearings.
And I was getting all this
legislative information-where
are we in terms of our bills, at
what stage are the-and I
was preparing briefing books-giving
them to the assistant.
So I happened to see the deputy
undersecretary, and I said,
"Here's the information that I have
been preparing for
you." And he says, "What
information?" And I gave him
some of the names. And he said,
"Oh, you do that? Tom
told me he did that." I said, "No,
I am the one that's
been busting my ___ (I didn't say
that) getting the in
formation." I said, "Okay, this is
how I'm going to handle
it in my mind." From then on, I
prepared two. I gave one
directly to the deputy
undersecretary and one to his
assistant,
just as I always had done. And
I never said anything.
I let him hang himself. And I felt
that it was the easiest
way to do it.
8. Again, was this based on your
intuition?
I let him hang himself because if I
had confronted
him, he would have known how to hide
it. They were in
charge, and no matter what I said,
he would have been
protected, and I would be the loser.
He would no longer
have been the personal assistant.
9. So you felt like you had to play
a certain role that
you weren't committed to in this
instance. Had you done
anything else, it might have put you
in a lot of jeopardy.
Even if he had confronted me, I
could have said, "Why
did you do that?" I could have
said, "I wanted to make
sure he had it in case he wanted to
ask a question. No, I
didn't tell him because I knew you
told him it was your
work and I knew it wasn't and I
wanted you to fall on your
face." But I guess you might say
it's devious.
10. Is this something you just
developed? Had you had
other kinds of experiences like this
before?
All the time. It's part of being black, it's part of being female, it's part of surviving.

So, you had experiences like that before. Umhumm. At different levels and in different ways. Even back to the time when I went to college, which was my first encounter in a desegregated situation, and I found myself with a roommate from Chicago who was Polish. Her parents were having fits because her roommate was black, but they didn't want her to have to move. They wanted me to move. So what they did was to talk to the manager of the dormitory, who was from Covington, Tennessee, who worked out a little route to get me out. She came to me in the middle of the night with a flashlight, with a paper, and said, "It's a form you didn't sign when you checked in, and I need to have it because I'm completing my files. I didn't question it. I signed it. The next day, I had a notice in my box that I was to move. And when I inquired about it, I was told, "Well, you signed the room check."

And then, it all came back. So I went to the head of housing because I was furious. The head of housing was also furious. He said, "This is not the way we do business, but I'm going to ask you to do something that's very hard, and that's to go on and move; we're going to monitor the situation. I moved.

Later on, at Thanksgiving, I went home for vacation.

While I was away, the train
schedules were changed.

During those days, we had hours at the dorm. I was the only person on the train coming back going to Woody Hall, where I lived. There were other people on the train going to the campus, but they lived in different dormitories. I got to the dormitory about ten minutes after it closed, and the counselor had to let me in. She reported me to the off-campus judiciary committee for breaking curfew. And when I explained what happened, they dismissed it. But still, I had to go through the trauma. To make a long story short, at the end of the year, her contract was not renewed. She was fired. Today, I am on the board of directors of the alumni association for that university— that kind of thing. So I could recognize a lot of things that were happening. I think there's a way to handle any situation where you come out the winner. And I think, deep down, the other person knows it; but you have never laid a hand on them. They do it to themselves. If I told him, and he knows the kind of work I've done, for example, in this position. He knew the work I had done. But I was supposed to settle for next time.

12. On page 3, you mentioned feeling frustrated by your politically-appointed boss. Had you experienced similar situations in your career before this? I've never really had that type of dealing with them.
before I came here because when I
was in the regional
office, there was only one politico
in the whole office.
Everybody else was career.
Everytime we had an election
and the heads changed, we just
changed the pictures on the
wall; but the people remained. I
had not been out in the
trenches.
13. I think we've talked about
some of the frustrations.
You felt like you didn't have many
options. They were in
control and you had to respond in a
certain way, even
though you didn't feel like it.
The lesson that I have now is the
fact that I have a director of the
office that is a fair, objective
person.
If she were part of that same
system, it would still be the
same thing—the same system. And
then, I would handle it a
different way. So my goal is to do
my job the way she
would prefer.
14. You feel like you have leverage;
you can negotiate with person-be
proactive.
It's a shame we don't have Senior
Managers anymore—it really, really
is.
You can stand out because not
everybody takes the kind
of approach I did.
15. Is it that they don't know?
It's like you will see job
announcements, and they think people
have already decided who's going to
get in. My feeling is you never
know unless you try. I feel I have
as much to offer as someone else.
16. You've got to learn what the
expectations are and then,
as you were saying, you've got to
learn to adapt.
17. I just have one more question.
On page 5, you mentioned you had both career and non-career people in high positions who gave you support. Can you give some examples of the kinds of support you were given?

Networking. I have people whom I've known—some of them for a long time. Because of their position, and because they are in different careers, they may move from place to place. They may still be here. They may be at different levels or at different jobs now. But we are still in contact. These are people I call on from time to time, and say, "What do you think about this?"

One of them is the person who was the previous supervisor here. They're barometers. I use them to bounce ideas off of or to share certain things. For instance, "This is how I'm thinking about handling it, and what do you think about it?"

The one thing that I've said to all of them is, "If you think I'm operating too much from the ego level, don't hesitate to tell me, because that's what I try not to do. Once you do, you're in trouble; you're not in control."

I have what I call a "taking it in the audience" attitude. Whenever I find myself being pulled in emotionally,

I mentally take a seat in the audience and look at it as a drama on stage. Physically, I'm part of it, because I'm involved. But emotionally, I'm not.

And that's where you could divorce yourself from that political thing you encountered, where you couldn't bring yourself to accept their values and particular stances they took. And yet, you had to because of your position in support of them. But it works, and it helped me.

I've been in a training ground. I can truly tell you
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if I had run into some of these
situation I've run into here, even
just four years ago, I think they
would have drowned me.

19. By training ground, what do you
mean?
Each position has prepared me for
the next position I've been in.
It's almost like saying, "Oh! I've
seen this kind of situation before.
What didn't I do when it threw me
before?
But I'm going to do it differently
this time."

20. Do you do a lot of self-
analysis? Do you involve people?
Oh, yes. If I'm dragging, it's a
signal to me I need to
bounce ideas I feel confident in.
And they've been very
helpful to me. There's no need to
know people. To me, you're not
really utilizing people you know
effectively if you know people who
are in tight spots and you don't
take advantage of their own
knowledge and experiences. And I'm
also finding that I'm giving back to
other people who are in difficult
spots. I have a friend who's on the
Hill in Strom Thurmond's office,
who's now here in the Department and
I tend to feed back to her what
someone else feeds to me. So it's a
cycle. That's the way I operate.

21. What kinds of people have been
supportive? How would
you characterize them?
They run the gamut. All up and
down, even to the mailroom. If I
want to know the quickest way to get
something done, they're not
necessarily all professionals [I
rely on.] They would be in
key places. It's very important
that you know someone in the fill-
out position. If you need something
done quickly at the copier machine,
and they have orders ahead of you,
if you have established a
relationship with that one, but you don't make it a habit, you can get in right away. It may not be anything more than just recognizing them and saying, "Good morning. How are you?" But something that would make them want to do it for you. It sounds like you may be using some skills before when you used your staff to get them to buy into some things. Yes. Isn't that what you were trying to teach us?
Ms. Sharon Garret

Entry

Sitting in her office one day, as the local director of a special education program, Ms. Garret came across an intriguing announcement. A private, non-profit educational organization was sponsoring a year-long fellowship program. Education leaders would be selected to work in a variety of settings where education policy is developed.

There would also be weekly conferences and two major seminars, one in Washington and one at a state location, to supplement learning.

Spurred by the possibilities the opportunity presented, Ms. Garret applied in 1981 and was selected for the fellowship.

Ms. Garret worked on the Congressional sub-committee having jurisdiction over nine education programs, including handicapped education. Ms. Garret was responsible for analyzing proposed legislation, researching the implications of current and proposed legislation, participating in hearings, and writing speeches. She was hired by the sub-committee after the fellowship program and continued working in the same role.

In a medium-sized federal agency with which Ms. Garret had been communicating in her role as a Congressional aide, a legislative position opened. The office needed a person of Ms. Garret's background to relate to Congress. Ms. Garret applied and was hired as a GM-13 in 1983.

Working in a Bureaucracy

A key challenge for Ms. Garret in making the transition from Congress to executive department was to learn to articulate the agency's stance in reporting on programs for the disabled. Ms. Garret learned this position through her close
association with the assistant
secretary for that program, Ms. Valdez. After having met Ms. Valdez
during trips to meet with Senators, Ms. Garret found their philosophies
about the disabled similar. Ms. Garret incorporated these views in
preparing legislative proposals. Eventually, Ms. Valdez hired Ms.
Garret as the deputy director of one of the programs she administered.
Ms. Valdez also hired Dr. Schmidt, a former state director of handicapped
education as the director. Dr. Schmidt's appointment was for a year, but both Dr. Schmidt and Ms. Valdez expected it to be extended
beyond that.
Ms. Garret quickly "learned the ropes," as she put
it, from Dr. Schmidt. As Ms. Garret learned about managing a nationwide program, Dr. Schmidt gave her additional responsibilities and coached her in carrying them out.

Thrust into Director's Position
Dr. Schmidt's appointment, however, was not extended.
Consequently, after a brief time as deputy director, Ms. Garret was put in charge of the entire program. Ms. Garret stated that the abrupt transition created some difficulties initially, but that she learned to manage the changes by doing a variety of things: (1) she appointed a veteran manager as deputy to manage the day-to-day affairs; (2) she sought out the advice of Ms. Valdez and held daily meetings with Ms. Valdez's experienced deputy, Ms. Perkins; and (3) she held frequent consultations with annual work plans and program priorities.
Ms. Garret pointed out that the division directors on her staff had been used to much personnel changes at the top.
"There had been a lot of turnover in my position, Ms. Garret explained. "Every six months to a year, a new director would come in. But I coped with this stress by using the same style as Dr. Schmidt, which both I and the

**Handing Over the Reins**

After a year and a half of being vacant, the director's job was about to be filled. Ms. Garret was one of the two top candidates for it. The other was a man who had been a consultant to the organization and who had come from a university. Ms. Valdez had to make the choice, and she picked Dr. Overby.

"Ms. Valdez explained that my strengths were in administration, but the other candidate had administrative skills as well as knowledge about research and development, which I didn't have," Ms. Garret commented. Ms. Valdez felt I could learn some of those skills while working under Dr. Overby.

"I supported Ms. Valdez's views," Ms. Garret continued. "My motives, in retrospect, were not what they should have been. It would have been the highest position in my field: an SES director for the whole department. But if I'd continued in that position without strengths in research and development, it wouldn't have been good all right; we maintained status quo. But in that agency, you can't do that for very long. I couldn't have handled it much longer," she concluded.

**Learning Under Dr. Overby**

Ms. Garret expressed relief in moving back into the de-puty director's position.

"I was so pleased to not be in line to make the final decision," she sighed. "It gave me an opportunity to have a life outside the office for the first
time in a long time."

Dr. Overby, once appointed to the position, frequently involved Ms. Garret in meetings to design research plans. Ms. Garret explained that through being involved in such meetings, she learned how research needs were formulated, how professionals from the field of special education were brought in to help with the diagnosis and planning process, and how strategies were forged to move from need identification to putting a program into place.

Dr. Overby also assigned Ms. Garret to chair a task force based on her specialty area in handicapped education. "Dr. Overby's emphasis was integrating students in the least-restrictive environment," Ms. Garret observed. This was also my area of expertise. I spent a lot of time working on it. The task force built integration into work priorities. I worked with Dr. Overby sometimes and then would get back to the task force. The task force was the most direct learning experience I had with Dr. Overby. He was a good model." Ms. Garret, however, did not always agree with the way Dr. Overby handled personnel situations. "The level of accountability he required was incredible," Ms. Garret remarked. "In meetings, for instance, he would have tasks to be carried out, dates, and who was responsible. That was a very good system, mechanically. It was clear who was responsible for what. But it was also a threatening way of doing business. Minutes were distributed to divisions and posted out in the hallways. So if someone were having problems, if things weren't going well, it was public
information for everybody.

Sometimes the reason the task didn't get completed was not under the control of the employee."

Ms. Garret agreed that accountability was vital to achieving purposes. But Ms. Garret saw that staff reacted hostilely in a climate that was less than nurturing. She sometimes pointed out the negative consequences of Dr. Overby's style to him and suggested he work with problem staff one-on-one, and not in group situations.

"Differences in the way of handling personnel problems was something he could learn from me," Ms. Garret told him. "This is how Ms. Valdez said we would complement one another. He was pretty receptive," Ms. Garret added. "But his style was pretty fixed."

Return to Legislative Analysis

Pressures escalated during the year that Ms. Garret worked with Dr. Overby. Ms. Garret said that her office experienced a chronic staffing shortage. Vacancies would occur, but a combination of hiring restrictions and lowered esteem of federal employment among the public prevented their being filled. On top of that, Ms. Garret's division was charged with starting up two major programs.

"The buck stopped at my desk," Ms. Garret maintained.

"It got to be too much. Not much fun anymore. I worked from early in the morning until late at night and I was feeling I was getting further and further behind.

"Plus," she continued, "I was doing a lot of travel and giving speeches. Traveling and giving speeches were perceived by the organization to be good rewards.

But I found writing speeches to be
stressful. I was exhausted afterwards, and I didn't see the situation as changing."

When a more manageable job opened up in another office, Ms. Garret took it.

Training and Development

Aside from the specialty training she received in her fellowship and the required 40 hours of supervisory when Ms. Garret first became a manager, Ms. Garret has not had much formal development. Through the tutelage of Ms. Valdez, Ms. Perkins, Dr. Schmidt, and Dr. Overby, however, Ms. Garret has learned a great deal about how to integrate values and beliefs about her special area of expertise into legislation and into objectives for a program to serve diverse, nationwide interests and needs; much of her learning has been through experience. She shared that, in part, in the advice she offered to women aspiring to be managers:

I don't think of myself as a woman first. But my advice to people who want to get into management is to do more than what's required. Keep people informed and give them accurate information. Know who to go to when you need something. You get a sense of who you can depend on. You have to learn to depend on staff. You also need to be flexible and to be a team player. Some people are very bright, but are unable to listen and to negotiate. You also need to know where you want to go and to develop a plan for getting there."
Ms. Sharon Garret 2

1. How did you learn to articulate
the agency’s stance?
I read external documents on the
administration’s position: how and
why it was developed. I also talked
to several people in the department,
especially program people and co-
workers.
2. "Susan" helped you learn the
ropes for your job. Can you give
some examples of assignments she
gave you to help you learn?
I shadowed her. I sat in on a good
number of meetings that she had, and
was a part of the management team.
That’s how I learned her style and
the way she tried to influence
things. Then she would give me
assignments on my own. For example,
if we were at a meeting and we
determined we needed a policy, she
would send me off to develop a draft
policy or ask me to put together a
group to sit down and address
issues, and I’d report back to her
on how we’d done. I worked with her
day in and day out. We did almost
everything together. Meetings were
with the internal staff and
external.
Her style was participatory
management. She would have an
agenda for each meeting and start
off by asking if there were any
additions; and people had the
opportunity to put on the table
anything they wanted to discuss. As
we went through each one of the
items, assignments would be made and
dates for when they were to be
completed.
She was interested in hearing; she
wasn’t a dictator at all. She was
interested in hearing what anybody
had to say about topics. She wanted
them to come up with ideas on how to
carry something out. Typically, she
had something in her back pocket,
but that came out either after
everybody had given their input or if people had already given their input. Or, if people had already covered it, then we just went with something everybody was comfortable with. But she was very much into staff participation and making decisions.

3. Did you have similar experiences with [Ms. Valdez?]
I didn't have that kind of relationship with [her] or with others on her team except when I was acting director; but that was not [her] style so I didn't have the opportunity. I was on the other end of [her] style when I had my meetings with her. So I didn't have the opportunity to use that kind of management style. It's the kind of management style I was comfortable with when I was the manager at the local level— director of special education with staff under me...I believe very much in having the staff come up with or participate in the decisions, particularly when they were going to carry them out. No question about it. They're more likely or more effective in carrying out decisions that they've participated in or helped develop. That's something I've believed in for a long time, and that's something [Dr. Schmidt] did and I felt real comfortable with and had not problem continuing in. I think even just the structure of the meeting that she used is something I carried on with and probably would have done differently if I hadn't seen her to do it at first. But it worked well, and I liked the way she did it.

4. Was this something you'd developed from experience when you were at the local level? I took management courses, several courses in supervision, and that's one of the models I'd learned in
supervisory courses and felt most comfortable with and happened to believe was the most effective. I learned this before I came into government—when I was in graduate school. I developed my style when I was director of special education before I became director of special education.] I think I first tried out this style in those roles, and then because it was compatible with [Dr. Schmidt's,] and got some finesse with it. It became my style then. It was just a more formal setting than what my job was back then when I was director of special ed. in Indiana. I had very small staff—there were four of us—so it was a real small group. But you can use the same kind of skills, the same kind of techniques and develop that early on.

5. I want to come back to that later when we talk about Dr. Overby. You mentioned three ways that you used to manage changes. Where did you acquire these skills? I think a lot of it was just intuition. Some of the initial decisions I had to make. And I suppose you can't separate intuition from experience. I think some of the initial things were just my gut feeling about what needed to be done. Other decisions that the skills...I'm trying to think back to those initial days and remember, 'What did I do?'

As I indicated, I tried to maintain the status quo as much as possible for a long period of time to get over the upset of the director leaving. I participated in the day-to-day management of the operations for about three months. Because of my relationship with the organization prior to becoming the deputy director, I knew a great many
of the staff and the programs. With those two things combined, I think I had a sense of how things were operating on a day-to-day basis. And I really carried that out. Decisions that were most difficult for me to make were externally-related. I think the thing I was most uncomfortable with were decisions I had to make with the various advocacy organizations or the groups I had to deal with outside the organization. I think I was most comfortable internally. That was a new experience dealing with the external organizations the way I needed to.

6. Did you feel like you used the expertise of the careerists to help? I sure did. I would have them sit in with me. I knew who had the expertise. I think the skills that were most helpful to me were just plain public relations skills and being an effective listener. When you're new in a role, you have the beautiful opportunity to say, 'I'm new; tell me what I should know. What should I be learning? What should I be listening for?' I think listening skills and people skills were important initially in the transition with the external field.

7. You've probably used these skills earlier. This was perhaps another application in a different setting. Having to work with new staff and develop new roles perhaps gave you a new incentive for learning. Right. I did.

8. In relation to Dr. Overby, you used a certain skill to provide feedback on his style. Did you have similar experiences before this? I don't think I have had to confront a superior. As I look back now, I learned a lot when I was a volunteer at a crisis intervention center for a number of years. We
did all kinds of skill-building activities constantly. I was not only a volunteer, but also a trainer of new volunteers and then a trainer of trainers for new volunteers. We worked a lot with confrontation because that is one of the things you get when you get on the phone with a person who is-or who believes-they are in crisis. I had a lot of practice with those kinds of skills, but never in a relationship with a supervisor.

It was risky, obviously, and I think probably the only reason why I did it was because it was so serious. If that behavior continued, it was going to have a serious impact on a lot more than just the person the behavior was directed at. And secondly, I think that I knew [Dr. Overby] respected my judgement and my opinions and I sensed that he would try. That he would, first of all, listen to me and second, may try to make some changes. I also weighed the outcome very carefully. I know that after we'd have this discussion, the initial reaction was a little bit defensive, but then it got beyond that immediately. The very next meeting was a lot different. It was not a total change in that person's behavior, but he did try. I felt like he did hear something I said, and I feel like it did have some merit. I tried something and I really reinforced it every time he did. Ultimately, the person was moved out of the position anyway.

Actually, there were a couple of people in different situations. That was with the senior management. There was another person in just internal office management in which the same kind of thing happened all the time. They were both moved out.
of the situation. I think where I learned the skills was through the crisis intervention training. Why I chose to do it was what I've laid out to you. Interestingly, I did that with the Assistant Secretary one time. [Before Dr. Overby, when I was the acting director.] We had a meeting with staff that were under me and she made a comment. She had accused them of something during the meeting and I think she referred to an incident that had happened when these people were out doing a monitoring site visit and they were working with parents who had come to give their input on how things were going in the state. And she sat around the table and she said she got calls in later complaining about our staff behavior. Of course that was from the people who were on the other side—the people who would be upset when they heard people that criticize their program. And she made the assumption that our staff had done something wrong. And the comment that came out was, 'You ruined the relationship between the parents and the state education agency.' That's what she said to our staff sitting around the table. I was mortified. When staff left, I stayed. I told her that what the staff believed she thought of them was very important because, first of all, she didn't even understand that; that when staff are called down to her office, that is a big deal, and they want to do their best because she is the big boss. She didn't understand that. And she didn't think that she had said exactly how it came out. The very next meeting with those people, she was very complimentary. She was typically not a complimentary kind
of person in those kinds of things.
She became defensive with me, and I
though I got nowhere when I left the
meeting. But I did see a change
after that.
I was willing to take the risk, I
was so upset. It was so unfair to
those people. But that's another
person that I felt I developed a
relationship with that it was okay to
do that. I think that is the part
where you use your judgement in that
way depending on what your
relationship is like.
9. Dealing with political figures
and the male culture is something
that has come up in many interviews.
Some people have said that there are
separate systems: a separate set of
rules for women, and that women have
found their transitions to that
system difficult. Have you
experienced something like that?
I don't recall it in graduate
school. I was in a female-dominated
environment in graduate school. I
was in audiology and speech
pathology, and we were almost all
women. When I left graduate school
and got my first job, we were
speech therapists. It wasn't until
I got into the special ed. end of it
that I started to working with
administrators, because those were
the men. When I became an
administrator, I made that switch
the first time and I guess I really
didn't notice that difference. I
was the only female administrator on
that team. I didn't notice...I had
to live with some comments that were
probably different than what they'd
have said if I hadn't been
there—that if they were talking to
their colleagues who were male. I
don't mean anything like 'sweetie'
or 'baby;' nothing like that. But
like they were talking to another
female who wasn't a professional.
It wasn't talking down, just...part
of it was because I was in special ed. and they were so unfamiliar with it. Special ed. was my responsibility and I was there to get it off being their responsibility. So it seems they would talk to their colleagues about other problems they had in common. but they would talk to me about social things-things that weren't really related to my job. But never denigrating. I assumed it was that special ed. was not their deal. Their colleagues shared what was their concern and their issue. I never really thought of it as...I knew it was a little bit different. And I knew the kinds of conversations that would go on when we were sitting around waiting for the meeting to start or if we would all have our meeting over lunch. It may have been different than if I hadn't been there. But only minor. and I never saw a set of rules for men. That things were different for me.

9. It might be this organization. This organization has a lot of women in management. I guess the situation I'm talking about that was a male-dominated environment.
Ms. Tara Murphy
Entry
Before entering government, Ms. Murphy worked as an attorney in the midwest. Ms. Murphy liked the work, but she had been examining several options for finding jobs elsewhere. A friend suggested that she try government. Ms. Murphy said she would think about it, and, after returning from a trip abroad, decided to submit her SF-171 qualifications statement to the local federal personnel office. "I wasn't too concerned about it, however," Ms. Murphy mused. A few months later, however, Ms. Murphy received an offer to work in the regional commissioner's office of a large federal agency. She accepted the GS-11 job as the first female attorney on the staff. Although Ms. Murphy had been hired to examine grievances, she in fact examined only one. "My boss felt women shouldn't do cases involving enforcement," Ms. Murphy commented. "He said women shouldn't deal with 'mean' people." Ms. Murphy, who had several times before the job prosecuted foreign offenders under hostile conditions, laughed. During her three-year stint in the regional office, she worked closely with Mack, who was head of the office. "Mack was a wheeler-dealer who was successful at government games," Ms. Murphy observed. "He was also an astute person who never looked back." Mack wanted to help Ms. Murphy succeed, and he arranged to have her become more visible to top officials at the agency headquarters office. "He would have me go deliver packages," Ms. Murphy chuckled, so that I would just be seen by other people."
When an opening in the headquarters labor relations office came up, Mack called the hiring official and asked him to consider hiring Ms. Murphy. The official reviewed Ms. Murphy's qualifications and interviewed her for the job. Ms. Murphy was selected for it and accepted it.

Move to Headquarters

Ms. Murphy's new job was difficult, however, and Ms. Murphy did not like it. Less than a year later, she decided to leave. Through a man who worked in one of her client agencies, Ms. Murphy became aware of an opening in that organization. The job, a GM-14, had promotion potential to a GM-15.

Ms. Murphy applied for, was interviewed, and accepted the job. She found it much different than her old one.

"I was fat and happy," she remarked. "There was little pressure."

At the same time, however, Ms. Murphy sought out challenging assignments. Ms. Murphy succeeded at the challenges, and developed a high degree of competency in managing labor relations cases. Her skills and expertise were seen as valuable, so much so, in fact, that a man who had observed Ms. Murphy called her and told her about a chief of labor relations opening in his agency. Ms. Murphy was delighted with the opportunity, and she agreed to an interview over the telephone with the selecting official. After the official offered the job to Ms. Murphy, he talked to Ms. Murphy's supervisor and arranged for her transfer.

Promotion into SES

The challenge from the new job as chief of labor relations, however, did not materialize.

"I was bored," Ms. Murphy said. "It was a very quiet job."
Through a series of personnel changes in her office, however, Ms. Murphy's attitude changed. Both the director of personnel policy and the deputy director left. Before leaving, however, the men selected a temporary replacement director: a "very young and ambitious man," Ms. Murphy remarked. "He wanted to change things in a very short time."

After ten months of futile efforts to change the organization, the young man became disgusted and left. Before he did, however, he asked Ms. Murphy to take over temporarily. Ms. Murphy had no background in personnel policy, but because she had little motivation for her present job, she took it. Without training, Ms. Murphy was the acting director of personnel policy for ten months. After her temporary appointment, Ms. Murphy confronted a dilemma. She applied for the deputy director's position, but she had also heard of a chief of labor relations job in a sub-component of the agency. Ms. Murphy knew the organization well and felt confident that she would be considered for that job. She applied for, and was interviewed for it. "I thought the job was made for me," Ms. Murphy revealed. in fact, I debated even going to the interview. But I did. and I'm glad, because during the interview, something intuitively didn't fit. I don't know what it was. I went away that weekend and considered it. In the end, I chose the deputy director's job."

In taking that position, Ms. Murphy was promoted into the Senior Executive Service. Management Training After becoming an executive, the Office of Personnel
Management told Ms. Murphy that she had to attend the Federal Executive Institute. Ms. Murphy, who had no previous management training up to that point, balked at the order; but she said, "It was a waste of time. I already knew how to be an executive," she remarked. The course Ms. Murphy wanted to take, a two-week executive development program put on by a local university, was obtained only after a struggle. "My old boss didn't want me to go," Ms. Murphy explained. He took my name off the list of nominees. I told him he was discriminating against women, and I got back on." "The course was fun, but not terribly helpful," Ms. Murphy went on. "High quality people from outside government were brought in." Ms. Murphy's only other formal training program was a weeklong one the agency designed for women in management. "It was a terrible course," she commented. "Touchy feely."

Move into Contracts Administration
One of the agency's assistant sectaries recently asked Ms. Murphy to consider running an office in contracts administration. "I thought it was because I'd complained enough about how bad the processes were," Ms. Murphy laughed. "But needed someone in there who could provide counsel for the agency, and I was chosen." Ms. Murphy enjoys the new job, but she said that one of the most difficult things she does is managing difficult people. Ms. Murphy explained that she has had to deal with
some long-standing problems
connected with the job. Her
predecessor, a male who had been in
the job for several years, took no
action to look at troublesome people
and situations in the office.
One particularly difficult male
staff member, Ms. Murphy explained, "gets his kicks
out of making life miserable."
"Dealing with difficult people is
simply part of
life," she explained. "People will
play games. The key is to figure
out why they are doing obstructive
things. I realize there's a lot of
jealousy with competitive sit-
uations, but this person will
eventually self-destruct. He's plain
dirty. Some battles aren't worth
fighting."
"People are afraid to confront
difficult problems.
It's tough to tell people they're
doing a bad job. I don't get a big
joy out of it. After I've had to do
it, there have been times when I've
come back in my office, closed the
door, and cried."
Advice
Ms. Murphy believes that women who
aspire to
management need to think through
their motivations.
"They need to ask themselves about
why they want to
be managers," she stated. "There
aren't a lot of rewards in this
job."
Appendix G:
Memo: Use of Mentors and Role Models
In Early Career Stages

In the case histories, it was notable that informal learning played a significant part in the career development histories of the women managers. Within this realm, moreover, mentors and role models were prominent. In fact, in several cases in the early stages of careers, respondents relied upon mentors and role models heavily. The revelation of this pattern of learning activity was intriguing. To explore it further, some concepts from learning theory were brought to bear. Three possible hypotheses were then formulated to illumine this finding:

1. mentors and role models knew the organization well.

In order for individuals to apply learning in a specific context, they need to understand conditions that exist—or will exist—in that context. Since mentors and role models had familiarity with the contexts, including the unarticulated assumptions which managers in the environment carried about, they could be seen as an accurate and reliable resource for applied learning. Dr. Solomon (Ms. Henry, second interview, 632-745) was quite instructive. He was able to analyze cues from the
male culture, the political culture, and with external organizations and relate them to situations Ms. Henry faced.

2. mentors and role models knew the individuals well, and tailored experiences to capitalize upon their strengths and reduce weaknesses.

Dr. Overby (Ms. Garret, first interview, 154-180) is exemplary. He was able to suggest Ms. Garret participate on a particular task force in order for her to learn how research was formulated by a particular interest group and how it was applied in setting program objectives. Ms. Garret had lacked those skills initially.

Learning which recognizes the needs and interests of the learner and which involves the learner in the process achieves its aim.

3. mentors and role models emphasized specific results to be achieved and provided support in achieving them.

Ms. Benet remarked that government training was "too academic" (first interview, 272-278.) On the other hand, her mentor gave her specific feedback on a particular project that she could use to improve her performance (first interview, 54-60.)

Learning that allows the learner an immediate and concrete aim to achieve and which provides a simulation of
the exact environment in which concepts and techniques are to be applied facilitates transfer of knowledge.

Respondents may have discovered that informal learning processes were more valid for their situations than were government training programs. Moreover, the training programs, perhaps lacking knowledge of specific organizational contexts as well as nodes of support for incorporating principles and techniques, could not be as effective; hence, they were not as likely to be used.
Appendix H:

Memo: The Valuation of Experience Over Formal Learning
In Organizations

In the analysis of data from informal and formal learning activities, it was observed that respondents used comparatively few training courses in their histories. Moreover, training courses were not generally favored. Some respondents saw them as "irrelevant" (Ms. Rogers, 183-193;) "somewhat good" (Ms. Benet, first interview, 266-269;) "abysmal" (Ms. Ferris, 54-64;) and "not useful" (Ms. Harris, 197-203.) In addition, other respondents took training to earn a credential by which they could advance from jobs with limited mobility (Ms. Henry, second interview, 242-271 and Ms. Pierce, first interview, 108-114.) Others, such as Ms. Thompson (109-125) and Ms. Rogers (183-193) had already informally learned the management concepts and techniques from on-the-job training before they took long-term programs late in their careers.

The utilization (or underutilization) of training observed in the cases may point up several unarticulated assumptions within organizational contexts. These may be placed in four categories:

(1) Managers do not support it.

443
Ms. Pierce, for instance, was not allowed to attend training because her supervisor felt workload responsibilities took time precedence (first interview, 33-49.)

(2) It was not relevant.

Ms. Benet's supervisor told her that training was a "waste of time" (first interview, 266-269).

(3) It was not experience-based.

Dr. Jones maintained that, in relation to mobility qualifications, top management values experience, not training (Dr. Jones, 176-178). The cultures of the federal government appear to reward performance rather than knowledge. It is possible that the culture delineates the two rather than seeing them as intertwined.

and

(4) It was non-rigorous.

Ms. Pierce pointed out that managers in her organization regarded training as an "easy way" to earn experience. (Ms. Pierce, second interview, 129-147). If cultures reward performance, and especially that which is job-related, they may see training in the sense Ms. Pierce described.

Organizations rewarded technical experience (Ms. Benet, second interview, 204-207; Ms. Rogers, 149-152; and
awareness of this favoring that respondents strove to
develop competence and to nurture reputations as being
expert, reliable, and a resource. Demonstration of
competence to top management could reveal an application
of experience. Moreover, demonstration also led to being
recognized, in many cases, by persons of degrees of power
and influence. By using experience as a basis for job
learning, respondents could receive both reward and
opportunities for advancement.
Appendix I

Imposed Accrued Responsibilities:

Leader Behavior in "Acting" Roles

It was observed in instances of vacant supervisory positions that respondents, as acting supervisors, engaged staff to a great extent in the transition process. Examples of involvement included shared leadership (Ms. Lindstrom 21-224;), participative decision making (Ms. Garret, first interview, 78-107;), positive motivation (Ms. Benet, first interview, 242-253;), and open communications channels (Ms. Rogers, 73-90.). What common threads in these situations might have contributed to the use of staff involvement versus individual methods when staff were placed in temporary manager roles?

To identify the elements, it was appropriate to identify three major conditions affecting the supervisory vacancies: (1) environmental conditions; (2) similarities of leader behavior; and (3) common characteristics of group membership.

Environmental Conditions

It was noted that the conditions surrounding the supervisory vacancy were (1) unexpected and fairly abrupt; (2) positions had responsibilities that required managing an entire range of functions. This often resulted in
respondents' making decisions that had nationwide, rather than organizationwide, impact; (3) organizational functions in the unit had several linkages with external entities; (4) these functions required broad versus parochial perspectives; and (5) the positions were temporary, but were of fairly lengthy (such as one year) duration.

**Leader Characteristics**

Respondents showed several common management behaviors: (1) they all had varying degrees of tutelage from previous supervisors immediately prior to the vacancy; (2) they all had voiced concern or had taken active roles in group intervention processes specifically where communications issues involving a single group member had contributed to dysfunctional processes or outcomes; (3) the acting leader had come from within the group; and (4) the acting leader displayed both task and group maintenance behaviors.

**Staff Characteristics**

The individuals who were being supervised had the following common traits: (1) they were experienced career professionals; (2) intergroup relationships had some uneasiness, particularly with one member who was not communicating well with the others; but the tension was
not so severe that it threatened cohesiveness or fostered extreme intergroup rivalry; and (3) respondents did not allude to conflict existing between the group and themselves as acting leaders.

**Observations**

In light of these observations, relationships between environmental conditions, leader characteristics, and staff behaviors can be explored in future research studies. Several hypotheses can be put forth and tested in experimental research designs:

(1) In acting leadership situations in which there are multiple linkages with external organization entities and in which there are low degrees of intra-group conflict, leaders who have been members of the group will practice participative decision making.

(2) Managers who had been group staff members before an abrupt leadership vacancy and who were temporarily promoted into an "acting" leadership role will exhibit task and group maintenance behaviors.

(3) Managers who had received informal development through a mentor or role model in group process techniques will exhibit participative management behaviors when they are temporarily promoted into acting managers of their groups.
(4) In situations of an "acting" supervisory position, staff members will engage with the "acting" leader in consensus decision making provided that intra-group and group-manager relationships have not been characterized by dysfunctional conflict.
Appendix J:

Memo: Motivation in Dead-End Jobs

It was observed that two respondents in positions of limited career mobility exhibited a great deal of self-responsibility for their career development. Specifically, they used a variety of formal and informal learning activities to move out of dead-ended jobs. They were unlike the women whom Kanter described (1977) in that they showed a strong desire to overcome structural limitations of their jobs.

A review of motivation for careers indicated a number of possible contributors. Birth order, marital status, educational background, reward orientation, and socio-economic family status influenced career drive. Martin et al (in Gutek and Larwood, 1987,) show how ideology, such as conservativism versus liberalism, influence how women perceive the desirability of a career.

Boardman et al examine the achievement motivations of "negative prediction defiers:" women who had come from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, for instance, who had managed to overcome great obstacles to become successful professionals (1987.) The authors maintain that these women exhibited great achievements because they had met with significant barriers in their lives. Powell
et all also observe that women who have had many hurdles in their career have honed a high-performance motivation.

In relation to the present study, since motives for advancement remain quizzical, it was felt that identifying some salient forces that contributed toward achievement, as well as those which hindered it, would provide a basis for further research. The two cases in which the motivations for dead-ended jobs were observed include Ms. Henry and Ms. Pierce.

In this vein, the following were observed to facilitate desire for career advancement:

a. need to take action versus letting a particular issue stand (Ms. Henry, first interview, 67-68 and Ms. Pierce, first interview, 95-98;)

b. supportiveness of supervisor, where encouragement to innovate and to learn new skills is strong (Ms. Henry, second interview, 41-75 and Ms. Pierce, first interview, 244-253;)

c. opportunities to develop new ideas or programs; (Ms. Henry, second interview, 146-157 and Ms. Pierce, first interview, 249-253;)

d. seeing training as a major route to advancement (Ms. Henry, first interview, 76-78 and Ms. Pierce, first interview, 102-107;)
e. fairness of supervisor (Ms. Henry, first interview, 217-230 and Ms. Pierce, first interview, 227-248;)

and

f. willingness to use personal resources for self-development (Ms. Henry, first interview, 173-186 and Ms. Pierce, first interview, 175-187.)

Some conditions which were identified in the study as restraining development of the careers included:

(a) supervisor who restricts assignments and other developmental opportunities (Ms. Henry, second interview, 514-521 and Ms. Pierce, first interview, 33-49;)

(b) discriminant personnel management decisions in such areas as selection for positions and for training (Ms. Henry, first interview, 92-102 and Ms. Pierce, first interview, 267-278;)

and

(c) lack of familiarity with technical functions of the organization (Ms. Pierce, first interview, 246-253 and Ms. Pierce, second interview, 151-167.)

Future research can be conducted among other populations of women managers who have described conditions surrounding limited jobs. An account analysis participant observation, and structured interviews on the conditions noted in the present study would reveal
additional data from which inferences about motivation could be made. Various statistical tests of correlation could be undertaken at a later point to further explore the phenomena.
Appendix K:
Memo: Development of Organization Culture Sensitivity: The Role of the Supervisor

In two particular case histories, the concept of organization cultural sensitivity was examined in depth. The concept emerged as a separate data category when it was observed that it was related to, but distinct from, informal learning activities and was a component of the category, credibility.

Organization cultural sensitivity was believed to be an important element in the career socialization process. It was operationally defined as how respondents "learned the ropes" from organization socialization literature (mainly, Schein, 1984.) From the literature review, it was observed that the socialization process includes (1) knowledge of the organization, functions, key players, and relationships to external political entities; (2) awareness of what is rewarded and what is not; and (3) ability to know the circumstances effecting applications of management principles.

The two cases, Ms. Benet and Ms. Pierce, were selected for further analysis because they offered contrasts in the development of the phenomena. By analyzing points of contrast, a greater insight into what
organization cultural sensitivity was and how it was
developed was believed to result.

The two respondents had some similarities. Both were
line managers in large, male-dominant bureaucratic
structures. Both had entered at entry-level professional
grades in government after having had short-term jobs
interspersed with university education. Both had over
fifteen years' experience and had remained in the same
organization, for the most part, during their federal
careers. Moreover, both were active and were leaders in
professional organizations.

In addition, several differences were noted. Ms.
Benet had a master's degree in a field that was related to
her entry-level position. Ms. Pierce had a bachelor's
degree in a field that differed from her first job.
Lastly, Ms. Benet's entry-level experiences could be
described as positive: she was a member of a dynamic and
collegial work team. She also had a supervisor who gave
her assignments that allowed her to expand her skills and
to meet top-level individuals both within the organization
and outside it. In contrast, Ms. Pierce's first
experiences in the federal government might be
characterized as restrictive: her supervisor refused to
allow her to attend required training, she was not able to
secure a permanent position in a program area she desired,
and she had little or no contact with officials in positions of power or influence outside the organization.

The divergence of the histories following entry offers further insights into how organization cultural sensitivity was developed. A key to understanding appears in the descriptive accounts of the first supervisors. Schein and others had pointed out that supervisors establish climate in their organizations. Moreover, since first supervisors' climate-establishing practices influence on-the-job development, it may be seen that practices of first supervisors have a pivotal effect upon development of socialization. Their actions may be seen as contributors to individuals' developing sensitivity to organizational expectations and rewards.

The accounts present several clues to how the sensitivity might have developed. Some inferences which can be drawn on the basis of these accounts are:

(1) The supervisor is a guide who takes an active role in sharing insights and knowledge. Ms. Benet, for instance, remarked that her supervisor was a "brilliant analyst" upon whom many people relied for information and who respected him for his knowledge (first interview, 42-44.)

(2) The relationship is characterized by support, introduction to key organization players, and a
willingness to provide intervention when differences with peer managers arise (Ms. Benet, first interview, 209-211.)

By contrast, Ms. Pierce's supervisor appeared not to provide a great deal of help in terms of recognizing and supporting on-the-job development (first interview, 33-49.)

(3) The supportive relationship developed early and was based, in part, on mutual trust. Ms. Benet, for instance, affirmed that she was able to establish support among peer managers for a new program by having earned the confidence of her supervisor, who was respected in the organization. In Ms. Pierce's case, however, the support of her first supervisor appeared lacking from the beginning. Moreover, Ms. Pierce related that she complained to personnel in order to allow her to complete the required training (first interview, 50-55.)

(4) Ms. Benet indicated that her first supervisor introduced her to powerful individuals within the organization as well as on Congressional staff and provided her skills in interacting with them (second interview, 24-41.) He also gave her explicit coaching in problem solving techniques that were useful in that particular organizational environment (first interview, 39-49;) constructive performance feedback (first interview, 50-59;) interpersonal communications techniques
(second interview, 15-23;) and understanding and dealing with conflict in a male-dominant organization (second interview, 323-346.) Moreover, he continued to support Ms. Benet after she had transferred to another office (first interview, 204-211.) As a result of his help, Ms. Benet said she was empowered to do an effective job of managing (second interview, 24-26.)

(5) Ms. Pierce, by contrast, appeared to lack either direct instruction, positive performance feedback (first interview, 83-94; 140-146; 154-161; and 162-173) or a long-term relationship of support until late in her career (first interview, 197-207; and second interview, 232-260.)

From the two case histories, what are some inferences about the role of the first supervisor in promoting understanding of the organizational culture and how to manage within its contexts? Some possible ones are:

(1) shares cultural insights explicitly and by example;

(2) provides knowledge of formal and informal organizational relationships;

(3) garners respect of peers and persons outside the organization;

(4) advocates development through informal, on-the-job learning;

(5) provides for empowerment;
and

(6) provides support over an extensive period of time, even when the employee has left the office.
Appendix L:

Credibility Memo

A question: Developing sensitivity is a kind of competency. But it occurs, it seems, at various times and in different circumstances in a career. "Sensitivity" is knowing the systems: knowing which buttons to push and which to leave alone; which buttons will produce which results, and which are likely to produce results under what conditions. It is a learning process which, in its more advanced stages of abstraction, is complemented by power (defined by Kanter as the ability to do) and by influence (similarly in Kanter, the ability to get someone else to do.) At its lowest levels, it is an awareness that a response or a set of connected responses has not produced the results it/they should have. It grows through an analysis of some possible contributors and an evaluation of their observed effects. Ultimately, it leads to the uncovering of hidden assumptions and to a connectedness, conceptually and philosophically, among the assumptions.
Appendix M:

Memo: A Possible Intervention Program
to Foster Valuation of Women as Managers

A human resource development consultant (or team of consultants) can help a particular organization that wishes to improve practices in hiring, promoting, and developing women as managers. The following may be used as a guide in developing a program that utilizes training as part of an organization intervention process.

I. Organization Entry: Contracting

Top-level management of an organization wishing to change practices calls in or is referred to the consultant team. The team, after hearing from the client's view the "problem," requests to gather further information on the perceived difficulty and to report back. The team requests help in collecting information from the client in the form of names of people to be interviewed, documents to be examined, and programs or operational areas to be observed. The client and consultant are on roles they will play in the process, goals or aims they expect to achieve, and levels of estimated resources (time, finances, and material.)
II. Possible Types of Data Collection and Analysis Techniques

a. Interviews

The consultant team may utilize an open-ended questionnaire that examines perceptions of employment practices for women at various levels or departments in the organization. The interview can be utilized from a list of names provided by the client to include both male and female managers. The consultant team may also incorporate the "snowball" technique whereby referrals of interviewees occurs in order to discover key informants.

b. Observations

The consultant team may observe interactions of male and female managers in a variety of workplace settings: in meetings, in project management planning sessions, in cafeterias, and in informal, interpersonal encounters in hallways. The consultant team may observe management interactions involving mixed gender as well as male-only and female-only situations. To minimize researcher effects, the consultant team should consist of persons of both genders; male researchers could attend male-only functions, while female researchers could attend female-only activities.

c. Document Analysis
The consultant team could examine a number of employment records, such as trends analyses, exit interviews, policies, regulations, and current statistics. Organizational historical documents may also be utilized for further information.

III. Feedback

After the consultant team has collected and analyzed data, they would prepare a written report comparing findings with what the client perceived the problem to consist of. The report would also be presented orally at a meeting with the client. At the meeting, client reactions to the data would be sought and a decision on the client's part to proceed made. At this stage, the consulting team would negotiate further steps that might be taken in regard to the employment practices and perceptions of them and specific client-consultant roles to be played.

On the assumption that the client has responded favorably to the report feedback and decides to initiate steps to resolve structural policies and practices gaps as well as perceptions among managers, several courses of action may be considered.

IV. Some Further Steps

The consultant team may wish to gather some additional perceptual data to verify, to strengthen, or to
support earlier findings. Use of standardized instruments may be considered to establish quantifiable indicators of change as well as baseline data. Moreover, respondents can be selected for in-depth interviewing and a structured interview schedule developed.

The consultant team, after further data collection and analysis, may recommend priorities for change to the client. The client, on the recommendations, may then choose which area to change first, what level of resources to devote to the change effort, and who needs to be involved in the change process. The consultant team helps the client establish commitment to areas of change and offers to work with individuals identified as internal change agents. Examples of intervention projects the client managers may wish to initiate first, for instance might be an alignment of policies and practices, a climate diagnosis and building program, perceptual awareness and sensitivity training, and a re-structured management development system.

The consulting team, as part of the program implementation phase, works closely with internal human resources development professionals and managers (assuming the consultant team is external.) The joint effort would include setting program objectives, developing content, and linking the programs to sociotechnological systems.
within the organization. It is important that new structures be established, rather than superimposing the programs on existing ones. Foisting the new upon the old would create confused objectives and would launch the intervention effort into a sea of turbulence. A possible outline for such a management development curriculum appears in Appendix N.

V. Program Review and Evaluation

The consultant team, using indicators of change and standards of measurement and evaluation the client has agreed upon, periodically reviews the progress of intervention initiatives and reports back to the client. At the end of a particular initiative, a formal evaluation is made. After the intervention has been installed for a period of months, the consultant team may assess the effects on other operational systems. Further adjustments may have to be made.
Appendix N:
A Possible Curriculum Outline for Management Development

The integration of formal learning with informal development in the career histories in the study has several possibilities for management development curriculum design. Concepts and techniques acquired in one type of learning activity can be reinforced or applied in another. Moreover, by developing a tailored and flexible Individual Development Plan for managers and prospective managers, such formal and informal development can be begun early in one's career.

Before the planning, however, the human resource development professional should observe the organizational environment for various supportive mechanisms, such as rewards and incentives, as well as potential hindrances to career growth. The present study has uncovered several organizational phenomena that may affect career advancement, particularly in federal bureaucracies:

(1) management supportiveness of training

A supervisor should recognize and promote potential talent regardless of personal qualifiers, such as race or gender. Top elected and career managers should develop a policy statement specifically addressing the value of
employee development and expressing strong support of liberal use of formal and informal learning activities both on and off the job. The statement should be supported with mandatory performance elements and standards relating to human resource development and both incentives for providing career advancement opportunities as well as sanctions for non-development should be explicit.

(2) flexible job structures

Job responsibilities should permit incumbents opportunities for restructuring tasks, for problem identification and resolution, and for taking responsibility for implementation.

(3) remove low ceilings

Jobs having limited mobility potential or management jobs having a fairly high number of technical tasks attached should be re-examined, and, as necessary, re-classified. Individuals wishing to leave dead end jobs should be provided opportunities for either developing the jobs on their own or should be moved into "bridge" positions as paraprofessionals or, in the case of first line supervisors, mid-level management.

(4) linkages with professional societies and networks

Formal and informal development should be integrated with learning opportunities offered through professional
societies and networks. Opportunities for gaining leadership skills through membership and for attending conferences should be accessible and encouraged for all employees. Organizations should permit liberal use of attendance at functions during work hours. Employees who choose to attend should receive credit and have their accomplishments in activities recorded as job experiences in their Official Personnel Folders (OPF's.) Recurrent education should be strongly encouraged and applied in government organizations.

(5) provision for mentor development

Human resource development professionals should provide recognition and training support of individuals who wish to be identified as mentors. Some preliminary qualifications of such people might include:

a. androgynous or transpersonal values orientation;

b. broad base of educational experiences, including long-term developmental assignments inside and outside the agency or in residential training programs;

c. record of achievements inside and possibly outside the organization;

d. willingness to share information about the organizational culture: provide an insider's view of "government games" and how to play them and survive.
Outline of Possible Curriculum

1. Planning
   a. identification of performance needs, career expectations, and motivations; profile of interests and values established and discussed. Ideally, this should occur with a career counseling unit or staff resource person.
   b. identification of possible formal and informal options in and outside the organization;
   c. discussion, review, and modification of plans as needed.

2. Pre-Management
   a. developmental assignment or high-level task force; experiences should provide either an organizationwide or an intra-agency wide focus and examine issues of importance to the functioning of the organization. These experiences should occur early in one's career.
   b. course in basic elements of supervision either in-house, through a local university program, or through the Office of Personnel Management.
   c. participation in professional societies or networks on a continuing basis. Individuals should be encouraged to seek out leadership roles which will provide them experiences at managing entire organizations.
d. selection of one or more mentors. This may be a mutual process or, as it was observed in relation to referral opportunities in this study, be at the initiative of a mentor. Developees should be made aware of techniques for displaying novel ideas and potential management talent as well as recognizing individuals in the organization who can and will help them to advance.

2. Initial Phases of Management

a. individuals selected as managers should understand the relationships of their immediate units to the overall functioning of the organization. Informal meetings between units, such as brown bag lunches with managers from other units and top-level managers, should be encouraged.

b. Training should focus on managing individuals and teams. Interpersonal communications skills and conflict resolution techniques are essential.

c. Managers should establish networks of individuals outside their organizations whom they can call upon for information sharing and idea development and support. Reference persons can be located in professional societies or networks as well as in external entity groups. Managers can be taught ways to establish rapport and cultivate open communications channels both formally and through mentors.
3 Expansion Phases

a. Managers should be taught skills for diagnosing organizational climate in an informal learning session with an experienced group of managers and with human resource development professionals. Managers should learn how to apply the skills to their own units and how to take responsibility for fostering a climate conducive to effective employee growth and productivity.

b. Managers should learn skills to foster innovation through participative teamwork and through reducing structural or systemic organizational barriers.

c. Managers should acquire group process skills, such as active listening, facilitation, confrontation and feedback techniques, and assertiveness.

d. Managers should receive training in providing constructive performance feedback and conflict resolution skills.

e. Managers should receive training in building effective communications networks. This could include an overview of formal and informal communications channels in bureaucracies, techniques for identification of key players or nodes of power in communications networks, and ways to manage intra-organization communications.

f. Managers should be provided opportunities for interunit and interagency understanding. Developmental
assignments to other agencies or to Capitol Hill should be featured as a standard component of mid-level management training and not assignments given to only a few individuals.

g. Managers should be given training in understanding and interacting with political appointees. Developmental assignments or possibly a short-term detail in a high-level office of the organization should be considered.

and

h. Managers should receive skills in employee development. This training should foster the awareness of need to develop human resources, ways to encourage informal development, ways to motivate professional employees, innovative rewards for accomplishments, and encouragement of training. Managers should be encouraged to acquire skills for being mentors.
Appendix O: Memos in Data Analysis

Work Assignments

Assignments appeared to play an important role in how and what respondents learned informally. Ms. Henry's second interview is filled with examples of how assignments were used as informal learning mechanisms. One example is the spontaneous development, through a "brainstorming" session with a coworker, of how to put together an orphan benefit program (second interview, 94-144). In another example, assignments appear to be the results of an application of specific skills. For instance, after Dr. Solomon had suggested ways Ms. Henry dress to relate to male superiors effectively, Ms. Henry said that she wore her "Mrs. Ryan suit" in working to get the approval of a powerful male military commander (second interview, 847-859). In Ms. Henry's accounts, assignments also include applications from training programs (for instance, Ms. Henry's learning how to fill out an SF-171 in the first interview, 125-141).

Competence Acquisition

After the first four interviews had been conducted, it was clear that learning came about through classroom activities as well as through structured situations. Unstructured situations were termed, "informal learning"
experiences, and included: (a) a mentor (Ms. Thompson, 85-105), (b) interviews (Ms. Logan, 34-49), (c) developmental assignments (Ms. Logan, 50-54), and (d) apprenticeship (Ms. Harris, 13-17). Formal learning became apparent, also. Some learning took place through external institutions, such as Dr. Delaney, 43-51), through year-long, residential programs (Ms. Thompson, 107-125), and (c) through vendors (Ms. Logan, 118-129). Formal and informal learning are ways in which individuals acquired job competencies.

Dr. Delaney's case provided a variety of both formal and informal learning activities. She took training for an OECD project in which her agency participated, she followed it up with application of techniques for managing change (22-40), and she used an OD consultant to help her learn to implement changes as a result of a reorganization (137-144).

Informal Learning

"Mentor" was used to describe all types of supportive persons under the assumption that "supportive" included a teaching function. However, this definition, and hence, category, was changed as a result of an observation from Ms. Henry's second interview. "Mentor," in the sense of a "coach" or "teacher," did not seem to apply easily to one who helped Ms. Henry get her complaint resolved (second
interview, 427-441). The help of the support person, in this case, a secretary, gave Ms. Henry information about the informal ways in which complaints were processed. But the goal of the support person was not to impart information, clearly.

It then occurred to the researcher that "mentor," as a category, had to be broken up. The label, "resource person" seemed more descriptive of the individuals who facilitated the career learning process. Specific definitions of "mentor" and "role model" then were delineated. "Mentors" were those individuals whose jobs involved gaining insights, understanding culture, providing examples of effective management in a particular context, and provided ideas on implementation. Dr. Solomon, in Ms. Henry's second interview, is an example (second interview, 652-659).

"Role model," on the other hand, was more difficult to define. In Ms. Garret's case, the issue required clarification. Ms. Garret's description of people in "mentor" roles were those who gave assignments so that certain skills would develop (Dr. Overby account, first interview, 189-225). Ms. Garret, however, did not emulate the "level of accountability" Dr. Overby seemed to exact of his employees. Rather, Ms. Garret emulated the participative style of Dr. Schmidt when Ms. Garret became
the acting director (first interview, 103-107). This suggested that "mentor" involved both teaching and modeling certain forms of behavior. The concept of "role model" was distinguished from "mentor" on this basis.

Referral Agent

One way in which respondents learned about mobility prospects was through individuals originally labeled, "job brokers." "Job brokers," as in Ms. Murphy's case (82-94), helped respondents obtain jobs in which skills could be more fully used. "Brokers," however, was not applicable in Ms. Lindstrom's case (47-61). Coworkers had observed a particular ability and had commended her to her supervisor. Through their recommendations, the supervisor eventually promoted Ms. Lindstrom. Ms. Lindstrom had achieved a position of greater responsibility, but the coworkers were not "brokers." On this basis, the category, "job broker" was broadened to "referral agent" to reflect the aspect of being recommended to another. It was also observed, from Ms. Lindstrom's and Ms. Murphy's histories, that recommendations were made to higher levels of responsibilities.

Responsibility Accruals

Respondent structuring of particular job responsibilities was apparent in Ms. Garret's description of Dr. Overby's accountability and the actions she took
(second interview, 215-243). In this account, she employed the skills of an intervenor, but her continuing use of the skills with Dr. Overby (and with at least two other individuals later) suggested that she had added to her responsibilities as a manager.

This passage was difficult to code. It was an informal learning activity based on an application of a previous set of skills in crisis intervention. When the skills were repeated in the context of Ms. Garret's responsibilities for staff management, the skills were seen as responsibilities that evolved.

In this passage, also, it appeared that the responsibilities were ones that Ms. Garret initiated. She wasn't given an assignment to do so, as was the case with some respondents who had begun projects (Ms. Benet, first interview, 101-167). Thus, responsibilities that respondents initiated themselves changed the content and scope of their jobs. In addition, however, certain conditions, such as an assignment in Ms. Benet's case, called for additional responsibilities. Ms. Benet, given meager guidelines to follow when she was given the assignment to start a program in economic analysis, developed her own ways to structure her new assignment. The assignment, in this case, was the impetus for change, not, as in Ms. Garret's instance, a possibility a
respondent seized upon for further development. Responsibilities that respondents accrued seemed to happen, in these two cases, in two different ways: those which the individuals initiated and those which were thrust upon them. On this basis, "self-initiated accrued responsibilities" and "imposed accrued responsibilities" emerged.

**Advancement Issues**

"Advancement Issues" was difficult to categorize; the learning processes which respondents used seemed to differ from learning activities categorized under "informal" and "formal" learning.

Summaries of strategies used for reducing barriers and coping with issues were examined in the cases. It was decided that a matrix, "Issues and Conflicts in Careers," would be an efficient way to tabulate the coded responses. The matrix included the respondent's name, an antecedent event, a description of the issue or event, the respondent's reaction, outcomes, and respondent insight. After posting the coded data from four cases, it was apparent that there were different types of conflict: peers, staff, difficult people, political appointees, and training. The "personnel" conflict was too broad, and training, as it was referred to, was a type of personnel management decision. It was also noted from the
descriptions that other types of personnel management
decisions, such as selection and promotion, also affected
career mobility. It appeared that issues related to
people and those related to personnel management decisions
were the two most common in the category. On the basis of
the two kinds of issues, those related to personnel and
those related to people, two sub-categories of data emerged.

It also appeared that these two sub-categories could
be further broken up. People issues appeared to be of two
types. "Difficult people" often meant males: male
supervisors (Ms. Pierce, second interview, 224-230), male
subordinates (Ms. Murphy, 194-220), and male peers (Ms.
Benet, second interview, 300-319). Difficult women were
not mentioned as often. Some examples were coworkers (Ms.
Thompson, 39-54 and Ms. Lindstrom, 76-92). Difficult
women who were mentioned were also political appointees
(Ms. Garret, second interview, 260-305). Political
appointees were also male and were more numerous than
females (Ms. Chisholm, second interview, 264-317, for
instance). The
differences in "difficult people" were suggested to be
males and political appointees, and on this basis, the
sub-category, "people" was divided into "males" and
"political appointees."
The matrix revealed that women had a difficult time moving from a GS-12 to GM-13 (the grade at which women become managers as defined by the regulations.) The data also contained some clusters of responses that suggested possible explanations: (1) women who were not promoted did not have technical backgrounds; and (2) supervisors tended to hold back women by keeping them in specialist roles. Moreover, regarding personnel management decisions as apparent from the matrix, five individuals had mentioned that less-qualified males were chosen for jobs; two other respondents said that "good old boys" got jobs over more qualified female applicants.

In the "peer" column of the matrix, moreover, the issue of professional recognition was clear. Two respondents related that they felt they had been set up to fail in assignments. Three others said they were not recognized as professionals at meetings. "Professional," according to the respondents' peers, meant something such as "coming up through the ranks;" "proving oneself by having passed through a school of hard knocks;" "having hands-on experience with operations;" and so forth. Respondent's definitions of "professional," however, seemed to vary. Ms. Pierce (second interview, 287-313) seemed to indicate it was through going to formal training, acquiring credentials, and demonstrating
competency. Ms. Benet (first interview, 312-318) maintained that such recognition came from having developed a "reputation for competence among officials in the agency."

Ms. Benet brought up "hardball politics" as a means by which male peers engaged each other in frontal attack (second interview, 323-339). Her definition seemed to shed light on a win/lose, competitive environment. Under such conditions, it would not be likely that individuals would engage in collaborative or participative problem solving activities. If so, then it would not be inconsistent that creating weakened competitors (women in non-technical areas) would serve their ends. Denying training, failing to select them for promotions, giving them assignments that would enable their growth, and belittling their contributions, for instance, are conceivable outcomes. Hence, it might be seen that there is an underlying connection between the male-dominant culture and personnel management decisions—both of which appear to have limited women managers' advancement.

Formal Learning

To assess the frequency and type of formal learning activities from respondent descriptions, a "Training Utility Matrix" was formulated. To develop the matrix, coded data were placed on note cards and sorted into three
major piles: agency, Office of Personnel Management, and external. Agency training included both short and long-term. "Short" meant less than one week. Office of Personnel Management training was similarly divided into short and long term (over one week). The latter was observed to contain the Senior Executive Service Candidate Program, a special program designed to prepare managers for the Senior Executive Service. It also included the Federal Executive Institute for SES members as well as for GM-15's and the Executive Seminar Centers, which included programs two weeks in length for GM-13's to 15's. Long-term training also was provided from vendors, such as through a contract with a particular agency or through a residential university-sponsored program.

The matrix revealed that only Ms. Henry (second interview, 209-226) and Ms. Pierce (first interview, 94-99) had taken management training before becoming managers. They also appeared to be the only ones who valued training as a means for career advancement and who took training after they had become managers. It seemed to be that the valuation of training as a means for mobility was directly related to the type and amount of training taken. Among respondents who did not find training useful, either to learning their jobs or to
moving ahead, little training was taken either before or after becoming a manager.

The matrix also revealed that individuals took a variety of training through institutions, most usually, a university. In the external category, it was noted that there was one two-week program and two one-year residential ones. There was also a fellowship program sponsored by a non-profit organization. The respondent taking the fellowship program noted that she found it useful (Ms. Benet, first interview, 279-291).

The matrix also pointed up eight mobility issues. Of these, six had to do with denial of training: four related to an individual's lack of qualifications to participate and two were based on a supervisor's decision. The denials were ultimately overturned following individuals' filing complaints. In the other two issues, training funds were cut, necessitating individuals paying for their own development. From the issues, it was clear that undervaluation of training was a theme. Support for individuals' advancement, particularly in limited jobs or in early career stages, appeared lacking.

In the first four interviews, it was discovered that there were two distinct categories of educational and developmental histories: some respondents had had careers and training prior to entering government and some had
not. Data were coded "prior" and "non-prior" to reflect the respective types of historical development. Data were put on 5 x 8" note cards and sorted into two major piles for analysis.

Of the "prior" career class, three sub-categories emerged: (a) type of college or university major; (b) prior professional career experience; and (c) special routes into government, such as internships, fellowships, and temporary assignments. This latter sub-set was especially interesting because it appeared that women who had had these specialized experiences tended to take more training after they had entered, seemed to enter at higher levels, and seemed to progress faster in their careers than those who had not had the experiences.

Of the women who did not have prior career experience, development appeared to be more informal and training taken was non-supervisory. Some examples of the types of post-entry development included (a) technical training internship, (b) apprenticeship, (c) on-the-job training, (d) non-specialty training taken through a private vendor, (e) task forces and developmental assignments, and (f) college courses.

The patterns of development of respondents in the "prior" and "non-prior" classifications were traced as additional data were collected and analyzed. After
fourteen interviews, a "Paths in Development" chart was prepared to examine the usage of formal and informal learning. This chart contained career socialization phases referenced in Van Maanen and Schein: pre-entry, entry, mid-career, and expansion. Formal training was segmented into agency-provided, OPM-provided, and external; informal development was sectioned into on-the-job training, special task forces, mentor, and self-directed activities.

The chart revealed that women who had taken formal training early in their careers had also used few mentors. Of these women, two had been former academics. The women who had entered with professional experience also tended to initiate more developmental projects and to serve on agency-wide task forces. These women also sought out opportunities to increase their contacts within and outside the organization, to develop team or interpersonal skills communications, and to try to understand the relationships of their organizations to external structures.

Women who had entered government from college, on the other hand, had used a variety of mentors or supportive individuals. Two of them were in dead-end jobs. The latter saw training as a chief means for advancement, and took a variety of management courses in their agencies and
through universities. These women also used professional societies to acquire qualifying management experiences for promotion. Others in this category used training and professional societies, but not to this extent.

It was also noted that, in the "non-prior" category, women who took management training took it too late; Ms. Thompson, for instance, had already learned management skills from on-the-job experiences and observations (107-125).

The respondents in the "non-prior" category also were referred to jobs in other organizations. Job brokering did not appear to be as prevalent among prior-career entrants.

The less-prevalent brokering and the use of self-initiated learning projects among respondents with prior education and experience was intriguing. Establishing "contacts" was perhaps perceived differently among the two groups. The prior-career respondents sought out visibility and opportunities to expand their skills; the non-prior career respondents sought out recognition. The prior-career respondents indicated that they had already established a reputation for competence and had attained credibility over time. The non-prior career respondents may have been trying to establish the base for becoming credible. The use of "contacts" to extend skills among
prior-career respondents may be a result of their having used a meaning scheme for learning new information, which they applied to their careers in government. Non-prior career entrants, on the other hand, many not have understood how to find out how to map the new territory.

The chart pointed up the low valuation of training throughout the respondents' organizations. Experience, especially the demonstration of competence, seemed to be more important. The low valuation of training might account for the sparse offering and the apparent lack of supervisory commitment to it in the early phases of the respondents' careers. The training that was taken was done rather late in the careers and was often foisted upon the respondents to fulfill particular training requirements. Training was seen as "too academic" (Ms. Benet, first interview, 276-278). Moreover, some respondents had already grasped management techniques from observation and experience by the time they took training. Training may not be valued on the premises that learning something already known is wasteful and credentials are not be important when one is considered for promotion.

Where training programs were attached to informal, followup activities, such as Ms. Benet's fellowship program and in Ms. Chisholm's (first interview, 72-79), Ms. Lindstrom's 142-160), and Ms. Pierce's (first
interview, 267-278) cases, training appeared to be of benefit. It might be that seeing the use of training, having the opportunity to apply specific concepts to particular situations, and having the training supported by management are ingredients in the successful use of training for career learning and advancement.  

**Goal-Directed Learning**

Goal-directed learning was defined on the basis of Tough's self-initiated learning projects. An individual has the primary responsibility for constructing his or her own learning format, plan, objectives, and outcomes. Self-initiated learning appeared throughout the case histories.

Ms. Chisholm's case showed several instances. The description of a management plan (second interview, 70-90) is a kind of project which she used to map a strategy for program management. The special training program (first interview, 56-79) was followed by a learning project based on the training (first interview, 80-103). Moreover, she learned a great deal about cultural cues from having grown up observing her minority family (second interview, 350-354) and from working with political appointees (second interview, 241-259).

Goal-directed learning appeared prominently in the use for formal learning in Ms. Henry's history as a means
for getting her ticket punched to be a manager (first interview, 67-77).

Goal-directed learning appeared to be part of formal and informal learning processes. It was difficult to define it because of its widespread usage in formal and informal learning contexts. Because of this difficulty, "goal-directed" examples were re-classified under more precisely-defined categories of "formal" and "informal" learning activities.

Supportive People

In analyzing fourteen cases, minus the five in-depth interviews, it was recognized that supportive people played key roles in helping respondents advance in their careers. The kinds of supportive people were identified first by functions they performed in the accounts. After underlining contexts in which the support people appeared in the data, the coded instances were placed on 5 x 8" note cards. There were 12 different functions identified: (a) coworkers, (b) supervisors, including politically-appointed and career, (c) friends, (d) internal consultants, (e) retired female managers, (f) secretaries, (g) spouses, (h) family members, (i) protectors, (j) allies, (k) mentors, and (l) training officers.

The original labels did not tell much about the kind of relationships the supporters had with the respondents.
It was noted that one of the kinds of relationships, for instance, was that of referral agent; respondents displaying a particular talent were referred to positions of greater responsibility by individuals who had some degree of power or influence in the organization. An analysis of the relationships the support people played was made by returning to the contexts and listing varieties of relationships. These included, besides the referral agent, (a) go-betweens (those who interceded for the respondents on difficult issues,) (b) cultural interpreter, (c) pathfinder (through the bureaucratic red tape,) (d) matchmaker (those who deliberately placed opposite personality types or skills backgrounds together in a common work environment to strengthen a work team,) (e) role models, (5) gatekeepers, (6) reformed villain (a supervisor who had been unsupportive, but who had had a change of heart,) and (7) encouragers (who gave counsel when respondents were discouraged.)

The "reformed villain" category and the "matchmaker" each had only one instance. "Cultural interpreter" and "pathfinder" were both performed by mentors, and were, therefore, combined into that category. "Mentors" were defined as individuals providing cultural interpretations for a given topic or issue and who provided some instruction in it. "Role models" also provided
instruction, but, unlike the "mentors," provided patterns of behavior which the respondents emulated. A category of "technical expert" was created to include individuals having specialized knowledge or experience on an issue of concern to the respondents. "Allies and protectors," referenced by only one individual, were defined in a restricted context. "Gatekeepers" were exclusively support personnel, such as secretaries; thus, this was included under "support personnel." Similarly, "encouragers" was a particular role played by family and friends as well as by "spouses;" a category, "family and friends" was created to encompass the roles as well as to distinguish and elaborate the kinds of encouragement provided.

The category, "mentor" was broadened, and a more descriptive label, "resource person," established. Subsets of "resource person" included protector/ally, role model, mentor, technical expert, support personnel, and friends and family.

The category, "referral agent," was tricky. On one hand, it was a way that resource persons helped the respondent advance. However, advancement through the referrals was an indirect process: the respondents would prepare for a referral by demonstrating a particular competency (such as Ms. Thompson's use of interpersonal
skills) and would be noticed by an influential person in the agency. Referral agents chose respondents, and opportunities were given on that basis. To explore this issue further, a separate matrix, showing the relationship of referrals to visibility, was created.
Appendix P: Research Issues

In the collection and analysis of data from fourteen case studies, five major themes emerged: (a) the uses of training and development differed among women having careers before government and those entering directly from colleges or universities; (b) women taking special management training found the experiences helpful in both learning careers and in advancing in their careers; (c) respondents learned a great deal about their jobs and about their organizations through informal, on-the-job learning experiences; (d) respondents contended with various issues affecting their career advancement; and (e) respondents used a variety of individuals as supports in career advancement.

The themes were developed into issues for further research. They were stated thusly:

In respect to a particular group of women managers employed in five different federal government organizations, the following are posed as issues for further research:

(1) In what ways have training and development prior to entering management participated in advancing the careers of certain women managers?
(2) How have learning opportunities from special training and development programs been utilized in the development of careers of certain women managers?

(3) How have selected women managers applied non-goal-directed learning in their career histories?

(4) How have selected women managers employed learning strategies in reducing barriers to their career development?

(5) How have various kinds of supportive people participated in developing the careers of particular women managers?

To find out information regarding the issues, the researcher decided to conduct additional interviews of selected respondents in the fourteen case studies. As a first step, the researcher returned to individual cases in which the themes appeared prominently among the coded data in context. The researcher then listed names of respondents and key illustrations of incidents which appeared to illustrate the themes the best. The researcher believed that selecting instances that were opposite or which provided extreme examples might provide many dimensions to the themes.
The researcher then prepared a matrix of variables that appeared from the data where the themes were exemplified. Six variables were thus identified: (a) training, (b) informal learning, (c) promotions, (d) individual supports, (e) numbers of women managers in a particular organization, and (f) prior career, education, and job-related experience. Respondents whose careers contained contrasting scenarios of the variables were then ranked. A scale of one to three was used: "three" represented the most important, "two," moderate amount, and "one," less amount. The ranking enabled the researcher to see more clearly the salience of the themes in individual case histories.

The researcher then developed questionnaires that related to the themes in cases containing particular examples. The researcher telephoned five respondents, explained the purpose of the additional data gathering, and promised to provide taped, transcribed copies of the in-depth interviews for verification and correction of factual information. Each respondent agreed to be interviewed a second time. Interviews were each one to three hours in length and held away from the respondent's office.

The following is a summary of the in-depth interviews. To facilitate clarity and to provide logical
inferences from events in particular case histories, the research issues were summarized for each individual respondent. A final summary of the research issues from all five in-depth interviews appears at the end of the report. Moreover, the case descriptions were written in the following order: the first two respondents had careers before government; the third and fourth respondents had short-term jobs before government and had completed at least a bachelor's degree; the last respondent entered government directly from college, but she had also done so before the passage of Civil Rights legislation.

Illustrative Cases

Ramona Chisholm

Research issue 1: prior career and education

Before she entered federal government, Ramona Chisholm had had several years' experience as a teacher and elementary school principal. A black female, Ms. Chisholm recalled several incidents in her professional career during the 1960's era of racial integration that shaped her attitudes toward managing people.

Nearly all her family members, from her mother, aunts, and godmothers, had been educators. Ms. Chisholm said that she picked up educator skills early from "watching my family operate" (second interview, 209-212).
When she entered college, however, Ms. Chisholm wanted to study something other than education. She chose chemistry, but, finding it isolating, switched to education. Two incidents in college were particularly difficult.

I found myself with a roommate from Chicago who was Polish. Her parents were having fits because her roommate was black; but they didn't want her to move. They wanted me to move. So what they did was to talk to the manager of the dormitory, who was from [the south] and who worked out a little route to get me out. She came to me in the middle of the night with a flashlight, with a paper, and said, 'It's a form you didn't sign when you checked in, and I need to have it because I'm completing my files. I didn't question it. I signed it.

The next day, I had a notice in my box that I was to move. And when I inquired about it, I was told, 'Well, you signed the room check.' And then, it all came back.

So then I went to the head of housing because I was furious. The head of housing was also furious. He said, 'This is not the way we do business, but I'm going to ask you to do something that's very hard:
that is, to go on and move. We're going to monitor the situation. I moved.

Later on, at Thanksgiving, I went home for vacation. While I was away, the train schedules were changed. During those days, we had hours at the dorm. I was the only person on the train coming back going to [the dormitory] where I lived. There were other people on the train going to the campus, but they lived in different dormitories. I got to the dormitory about ten minutes after it closed, and the counselor had to let me in. She reported me to the off-campus judiciary committee for breaking curfew. And when I explained what happened, they dismissed it. But still, I had to go through the trauma.

To make a very long story short, at the end of the year, her contract was not renewed. She was fired. Today, I am on the board of directors of the alumni association for that university...(second interview, 362-426)

When Ms. Chisholm became a school administrator, she used a variety of negotiations techniques to gain acceptance of staff—most of whom were white and older than she. She stated that she had a fear of becoming a leader at first, but that she found ways to cope by being "in touch with real world issues" (first interview, 22-26).
At staff meetings, for instance, Ms. Chisholm said she made a point of encouraging comments on decisions that were made. She also visited classrooms and discussed issues with teachers frequently.

Ms. Chisholm left her administrative post after three years and became an administrator of a proprietary school. After a year of what she described as "boring," however, she left for a state agency involved in school desegregation (first interview, 37-41). At the agency, Ms. Chisholm reported that she came into work one day. A stranger stormed into her supervisor's office, pulled a gun, and shot the man. Living in fear in spite of FBI protection, Ms. Chisholm left six months later for a post in a regional office of a medium-sized federal agency.

Research issue 2: special training

Ms. Chisholm was one of 15 mid-level managers selected for a pilot training program in consultation skills her agency had produced. The year-long training program featured three, one-week residential skills-building sessions and an application project based on crucial organization problems. The training program ...fostered an awareness of issues. These surfaced as a result of my team members working on a project feeling free to share information and receiving support from the manager. It also gave me a greater
sensitivity to political issues in the agency (first interview, 72-79).

Ms. Chisholm related that the team management skills have been especially important in achieving "win/win" outcomes in decisions:

For example, the other day, we had a project that I designed and is not being segmented among several people. I did it all to get people together. In the segmentation, there are some aspects of it that are considered technician types of work. We have a technician, but I assigned to the professional staff, so to speak, certain functions that they were having difficulty with. They said to me, 'We feel this could be done better if the technician were assigned to it.' I said, 'What is the problem?' 'Well,' they replied, 'some people are more diligent than others.' And I said, 'Well, it sounds like the kind of argument you may have given your mother when she asked you do wash the dishes because women are more diligent at keeping the kitchen. You can be diligent at anything you want to be. But let me work on it.'

So what I did was to work it out, where the technician would still assign the numbers, but they would still do their parts, which they viewed as a
higher level, but still part of the same process. That, to me, is a win-win situation. They are still happy to get the job done, but everyone's happy about how it's being done. That's the kind of thing I try to do. I try to encourage people to do their best. To be fair; to spread the good aspects of the position around as well as the grunt work (second interview, 15-55).

Research issue 3: non-goal directed learning

Ms. Chisholm pointed out also that the special training program enabled her to understand and use organizational structures. The skills learning was timely, for two years after the program, Ms. Chisholm's office was reorganized; in that move, she lost one grade.

Immediately after the reorganization, Ms. Chisholm said she found out "what the lay of the land was like, who's who, what's what, what's acceptable and what's not based on the players." After a permanent director was hired for the reorganized office, Ms. Chisholm presented her with a fifteen-page management plan. The document contained several charts of budget and staffing figures and a detailed description of each of the programs and staff responsibilities. Ms. Chisholm explained that the plan was intended as a "map of where we want to go together, rather than operating in a crisis mode." She
added that the new director liked the plan and used it for developing performance agreements for the whole section (second interview, 70-90).

Ms. Chisholm commented that she learned from the training program to get to "the marketplace early with your wares (second interview, 122-136).

**Research issue 4: managing advancement issues**

In her position before the reorganization, Ms. Chisholm worked with political appointees. Before she moved from the regional office to headquarters, she had no direct experience with high-level officials. Her headquarters position, however, required her to quickly learn the processes by which political appointees performed their responsibilities, such as working with Congress and being a liaison with career managers.

Developing the skills was difficult because Ms. Chisholm did not support the political appointees' activities or programs. For example, Ms. Chisholm served on an interagency Presidential council that recognized individual student contributions in education. Ms. Chisholm had been nominated by her agency because of her experiences as an educator. She said that her job, however, was only "ceremonial:"

All I did was pass out pencils and plaques. It was similar to the agency's women's equity council.
I was disturbed because money was being spent for spouse attendance, catered breakfasts, and shopping trips. At the same time, money for careerists to provide technical assistance in their programs was out (first interview, 119-146).

Ms. Chisholm added that she was able to find ways to accommodate the agendas of political appointees without feeling as if she had compromised her personal integrity.

I was at a luncheon in which I had to introduce the guest speaker [a woman who had expressed strong opposition to the programs Ms. Chisholm had administered earlier in her career as an educator]. I had to simply put on a smile and act as if I enjoyed it (first interview, 152-162).

In another instance involving a political appointee, Ms. Chisholm noted that she has applied skills from "being black; it's part of being female, it's part of surviving:

I was getting all this legislation information: where we are in terms of our bills, at what stage are they; and I was preparing books and giving them to the assistant. So I happened to see the deputy undersecretary, and I said, 'Here's the information that I have been preparing for you.' 'What information?' [he asked]. And I gave him the names.
And he said, 'Oh, you do that?'
And I said, 'No. I am the one that's been busting my
---- (I didn't say that!) getting the information.'

I said, 'Okay, this is how I'm going to handle
it' in my mind. From then on, I prepared two. I
gave one directly to the deputy undersecretary and
one to his assistant, just as I had always done. And
I never said anything. I let him hang himself. I
felt it was the easiest way to do it (second
interview, 351-353; and 283-317).

Research issue 5: supportive people

Ms. Chisholm used a variety of individuals in
developing support for her career advancement. For
instance, she cultivated the support of both career and
non-career superiors who "recognized my competence and
provided me opportunities to participate in departmentwide
details" (first interview, 191-195).

One example was a woman who worked a few doors down
the hall just after Ms. Chisholm had moved to
headquarters. The woman, who was a GS-9 at the time, was
promoted to a GM-15 in a few years. After the woman's
advancement, the woman gave Ms. Chisholm information on
opportunities for advancement, such as serving on details
(first interview, 200-205).
Ms. Chisholm also pointed out that she finds developing friendly, informal relationships with people in "fill out" positions helpful to getting work accomplished. If you need something done quickly at the copier machine, and they have orders ahead of you, if you have established a relationship with that one, but you don't make a habit of it, you can get in right away. It may not be anything more than just recognizing them and saying, 'Good morning. How do you do?' But that something would make them want to do it for you (second interview, 597-607).

Summary

Ms. Chisholm's pre-government career was set in an era of transition for black people. Learning cues from the black community was only one of several others which she had learned before coming into government: college student, teacher, and school administrator. Dealing with issues at the junctions of these roles, such as the two racial incidents Ms. Chisholm described as a college student and also the violent one in her office, created the need for developing different kinds of conflict management skills. Informally, through numerous socialization processes of the roles in particular cultural settings, Ms. Chisholm acquired these skills. The more salient, appearing in the case history, include
developing insights into cultural expectations, developing insights into conditions that motivate staff members, developing a range of staff incentives; developing goals by bargaining and negotiation; developing listening skills; inviting comments from staff on decisions considered; and developing skills for dealing with conflict so that hostile emotions are kept in balance.

Formal learning enhanced these skills and brought about a greater clarity of issues. It enabled Ms. Chisholm to analyze more precisely the interpersonal and organizational ingredients in situations supervisors face daily, such as motivating staff, directing resources, and planning and organizing projects. Moreover, the special training gave Ms. Chisholm a set of new tools, such as the management plan.

One of the most challenging tasks of Ms. Chisholm's career appeared to be developing effective working relationships with political appointees. The political issues Ms. Chisholm described were ones that touched upon her survival skills as a black and as a female as well as ones for which she had strong feelings as an educator. To maintain her professional integrity, Ms. Chisholm learned to hide her feelings under a smile and to be assertive in obtaining credit for contributions to assignments.
Ms. Chisholm also cultivated the support of people in high-level career and non-career positions as well as individuals who could expedite work for her. Supportive people not only enabled Ms. Chisholm to find career mobility opportunities but also to accomplish the mundane aspects of her daily work.

Sharon Garret

Research issue 1: prior career and education

Like Ms. Chisholm, Ms. Garret had been a teacher and a school administrator before coming into government. Similarly, she had learned several techniques for confronting and negotiating with people from her earlier career.

A notable example was Ms. Garret's experience as a volunteer in a crisis intervention center for several years. She remarked that, in this position, she had been a volunteer, a trainer of volunteers, and a trainer of trainers of volunteers. She observed that managing tense situations with individuals who believed they were in a crisis was critical to learning her job.

She also learned to understand differences in sex role behavior in organizations as a school administrator. Ms. Garret stated she became aware of certain differences in the ways in which meant interacted with women in
groups. She described being the only female school administrator in a particular district:

I had to live with some comments that were probably different than what they'd have said if I hadn't been there—that if they were talking to their colleagues who were male. I don't mean anything like, 'sweetie' or 'baby' or anything like that. But like they were talking to another female who wasn't a professional. It wasn't talking down, just...Part of it was because I was in special ed., and they were so unfamiliar with it. Special ed. was my responsibility and I was there to get it off being their responsibility. So it seems they would talk to their colleagues about other problems they had in common. But they would talk to me about social things—things that weren't really related to my job. But never denigrating. I assumed it was that special ed. was not their deal. Their colleagues thought of it as...I knew the kinds of conversations that would go on when we were sitting around waiting for the meeting to start or if we would all have our meeting over lunch. It may have been different if I hadn't been there. But only minor (second interview, 324-376).
Following her position as a school administrator, Ms. Garret became a local director of a special education program. It was here that she came across an announcement for a year-long fellowship program with a Congressional sub-committee. The program featured both seminars and informal, on-the-job learning experiences in developing educational policy. Spurred by the possibilities, Ms. Garret applied and was selected. A year after finishing the program, Ms. Garret was hired by the sub-committee.

As a sub-committee member, she interacted with several federal agencies. When she learned of an opening in one of them, she applied. Shortly after, she accepted a position at the agency as a GM-13.

**Research issue 2: special training**

After Ms. Garret entered the agency, she took a week of supervisory training, which the federal government required of newly-appointed managers. She did not take any additional training.

**Research issue 3: non-goal directed learning**

In her job, Ms. Garret worked closely with the assistant secretary who oversaw the program, Imelda Guzman. Ms. Garret and Ms. Guzman often went to meetings of the sub-committee together and discussed their views of issues being discussed. Ms. Garret added that her views were quite similar to those of Ms. Guzman. Ms. Guzman
recognized the similarity, as well, and offered Ms. Garret a job on staff. After Ms. Garret had accepted the position, which was a promotion, Ms. Garret worked for a political appointee, Dr. Susan Schmidt, who was prominent in her field.

Dr. Schmidt was hired on a year-only appointment. Because of her expertise, however, it was expected that the term appointment would be extended. Dr. Schmidt taught Ms. Garret a wide range of administrative skills, from budgeting, staffing, and providing liaison with various interest groups. She observed Ms. Garret, provided coaching, and gave additional assignments as she felt Ms. Garret could manage them competently.

At the same time, Ms. Garret incorporated Dr. Schmidt's style into her tasks. Ms. Garret did this through a "shadowing" process:

I sat in on a good number of meetings that she had and was part of the management team. That's how I learned her style and the way she tried to influence things. Then she would give me assignments of my own.

For example, if I were at a meeting and we determined we needed a policy, she would send me off to develop a draft policy or ask me to put together a group to sit down and address issues. And I'd report
back to her on how we'd done. I worked with her day in and day out. We did almost everything together.

Her style was participatory management. She would have an agenda for each meeting and start off by asking if there were any additions, and people had the opportunity to put on the table anything they wanted to discuss. As we went through each one of the items, assignments would be made and dates for when they were to be completed.

She was interested in hearing. She wasn't a dictator at all. She was interested in hearing what anybody had to say about topics. She wanted them to come up with ideas on how to carry something out. Typically, she had something in her back pocket; but that came out either after everybody had given their input. If people had already covered it, we just went on with something everybody was comfortable with. But she was very much into staff participation and making decisions (second interview, 14-58).

Dr. Schmidt's appointment, however, was not extended, and Ms. Garret was appointed the temporary director. In the year and a half in this position, Ms. Garret noted that she experienced many difficult moments. She survived, she maintained, by maintaining the participatory management style of Dr. Schmidt. Moreover, she used three
tactics she felt were effective in managing the transition: (a) she appointed a veteran manager as her deputy in charge of day-to-day affairs; (b) she sought out the advice of Ms. Guzman and held daily meetings with Ms. Guzman's experienced deputy, Ms. Bagby; and (c) she held frequent staff consultations to keep track of annual work plans and priorities (second interview, 128-184).

Ms. Garret also said that she developed skills for interacting with several special interest groups associated with the agency program. These skills, Ms. Garret pointed out, were public relations skills, effective listening techniques, and creative problem-solving. She stated,

When you're new in a role, you have a beautiful opportunity to say, 'I'm new; tell me what I should know. What should I be learning? What should I be listening for (second interview, 158-184)?

Dr. Schmidt's position was filled by Dr. Sam Overby, a former university professor and consultant. Like Dr. Schmidt, Dr. Overby gave Ms. Garret numerous opportunities to learn the agency's roles and relationships with external interest groups. He was especially helpful in enabling Ms. Garret to understand development of client needs, gathering information to meet the needs, and formulating a nationwide program.
Ms. Garret described a task force in which Dr. Overby had placed her as chairperson, as typical of how he enabled her to acquire program management skills. The task force was comprised of individuals having specialty knowledge in Ms. Garret's field. Thus, Ms. Garret provided informed leadership in the decision making process. In creating nationwide goals for the program, however, Ms. Garret became a liaison between the task force and Dr. Overby. With his guidance, Ms. Garret was able to translate the task force goals and recommendations into plans for action (first interview, 154-185).

Working with Dr. Overby, however, was not easy for Ms. Garret. His style, she stated, required a high level of staff accountability; at staff meetings, he would question individuals on program problems and would post copies of the meeting minutes on bulletin boards. In order to work effectively with Dr. Overby, Ms. Garret decided to confront him with how she perceived the staff reacted and to offer an alternative way for managing them:

I knew Sam respected my judgement and my opinions, and I sensed he would try [to change]. I also weighed the outcomes very carefully.

After we'd had this discussion, the initial reaction was a bit defensive; but then, it got beyond that immediately. The very next meeting was a lot
different. It was not a total change in that person's behavior, but he did try. I felt like he did hear something I said, and I feel like it did have some merit. I tried something and I really reinforced it every time he did [it] (second interview, 221-241).

Ms. Garret recounted an earlier situation in which she confronted a dysfunctional management practice of a superior. In this situation as well, she became aware of the greater harm of an action, took on the role of group advocate, and decided to intervene. She added that, as with Dr. Overby, having developed a positive relationship with the individual made a positive response likely:

We had a meeting with staff that were under me and [my superior] made a comment. She had accused them of something during the meeting and I think she referred to an incident that had happened when these people were out on a ...site visit...They were working with [the interest group] who had come to give their input on how things are going in the state. She sat around the table and said that calls came in later complaining about our staff behavior. Of course, that was from the people who would be upset when they heard people criticize their program. She made the assumption that our staff had done
something wrong. The comment that came out was, 'You ruined the relationship between [the interest group] and the state...agency.'

I was mortified. When staff left, I stayed. I told her that what the staff believed she thought of them was very important because, first of all, she didn't even understand that; that when staff are called down to her office, that is a big deal, and they want to do their best because she is the big boss. She didn't understand that. She didn't think she had said exactly how it came out.

The very next meeting with those people, she was very complimentary. She was typically not a complimentary kind of person in those kinds of things. She became defensive with me, and I though I got nowhere when I left the meeting. But I did see a change after that. I was willing to take the risk, I was so upset. It was so unfair to those people. But that's another person that I felt I developed a relationship with that it was okay to do that. I think that is the part where you use your judgement in that way depending on what your relationship is like (second interview, 256-314).

Ms. Garret noted that she had her training and experience as a crisis volunteer was helpful in enabling
her to apply the skills to the two confrontation incidents.

**Research issue 4: managing advancement issues**

Ms. Garret maintained that she has not encountered issues in her career advancement in government.

**Research issue 5: supportive people**

Support for Ms. Garret's career came from three mentors: Ms. Guzman, Dr. Schmidt, and Dr. Overby. Each one provided assignments which enabled Ms. Garret to use existing skills in novel contexts. Moreover, each provided coaching to enable Ms. Garret to set and to achieve goals in areas which were not her strong points, such as research and managing external client relationships. Ms. Garret gained from these individuals several critical skills that developed her career as a manager: understanding the roles and relationships of the agency to other organizations, the development of sensitivity to the needs of staff, and the commitment to action for resolving transition management issues.

**Summary**

Ms. Garret's career development centered on the use of informal learning. In particular, this included skills learned from observing and talking to persons in mentor roles, through task force assignments, and through applications of crisis intervention skills learned before
she came into government. Moreover, Ms. Garret learned the use of participative management skills in a particular work context through observing the modeling of them in Dr. Schmidt.

Among the most notable kinds of skills Ms. Garret acquired informally were sensitivity to staff needs, risk taking, confrontation, behavioral modification, judgement, public relations, and listening. She also learned how to articulate the agency position on problems of national interest and before Congress.

The absence of formal learning is notable. Ms. Garret may have found her needs met adequately through the three key individuals mentioned. Moreover, she may have felt the training and development she had undertaken before government was sufficient. The lack of formal programs does not appear to be detrimental, however, in Ms. Garret's learning job skills or in career advancement.

Ms. Garret also did not indicate that she faced issues in moving upward. Particular reasons for this cannot be inferred from the career history. The presence of career learning opportunities, such as through the three mentors, might indicate some ways for future research in which a career may be developed effectively.
Katherine Pierce

Research issue 1: prior career and education

Hoping to find a career that would utilize her abilities and skills, Ms. Pierce, at mid-life, entered a large military agency as a procurement intern.

Several years before this, she had married, raised a family, and worked as a medical lab technician. She then decided to return to college and complete her undergraduate degree in psychology.

During her senior year in college, Ms. Pierce looked for jobs in her field, but was not able to find any. She thought that openings were few because of an economic recession that was occurring at the time nationwide. At the mid-year break, Ms. Pierce attended a job fair held at her college. She became aware of a two-year internship with a large military supply organization. She heard a program recruiter ask listeners who had a 3.5 grade point average to raise their hands. Ms. Pierce did so and was given an application form to fill out. When she turned it in to the application clerk, however, she clerk tried to ignore it. Ms. Pierce persisted, however, and saw that the application was submitted. A few months later, Ms. Pierce received notification that she had been accepted.
Research issue 2: special training

In getting the training required of the two-year internship, Ms. Pierce encountered resistance. An important feature of the internship was an Individual Development Plan (IDP). This plan, drawn up by mutual agreement between the intern and the program managers, included training and developmental assignments. Ms. Pierce and the program manager agreed to the plan and signed it. When Ms. Pierce was scheduled for the training, however, Ms. Pierce's supervisor refused to let Ms. Pierce attend. He told her that other employees did not receive such training; further, the workload would not permit attendance (first interview, 33-67).

Furious, Ms. Pierce called the program manager and wrote to the military officer in charge of the program. As a result of the complaint, Ms. Pierce was allowed to complete the training. At the same time, however, she decided to move into the field of program management, an alternate interest area.

After the internship, Ms. Pierce recognized that she was in a limited mobility position; to be promoted, Ms. Pierce believed that training was necessary. In addition, Ms. Pierce stated that she felt experience that would qualify her for management could be obtained by taking part in professional society activities. On these
beliefs, Ms. Pierce enrolled in a graduate program in management and joined a professional group of public administrators (first interview, 100-114).

Through the professional society, Ms. Pierce took a course in zero-based budgeting. She found this course quite useful when her supervisor, who was having difficulty with a particular budget problem, asked for Ms. Pierce's help. Using the zero-based budget techniques, Ms. Pierce resolved the problem and wrote a report to the second-level supervisor. The second-level supervisor became aware of Ms. Pierce's expertise, called Ms. Pierce's supervisor and praised Ms. Pierce's work, and offered Ms. Pierce a job with promotion potential on the staff (first interview, 175-207).

A third use of special training occurred in Ms. Pierce's selection for her agency's year-long program to prepare managers for advancement. A special feature of this program was the six-week developmental assignment Ms. Pierce took. This assignment, to a regional office, enabled Ms. Pierce to manage the complete range of operations for the 375-member organization (first interview, 254-266).

Research issue 3: non-goal directed learning

Ms. Pierce's case revealed the application of negotiations skills as an important non-goal-directed
learning. An example occurred in the procuring of funds and personnel for a program which Ms. Pierce was to initiate:

The first year [the commander] was here, they told me that, when I accepted the job, that I'd have two assistants. After I got in the job, I found out there's no budget, and I'm only going to have one assistant. Well, there's no way I'm going to do anything. So I got a budget together, and I went down to see [the commander]. And our comptroller wasn't going to let me have any money and wasn't going to let me hire a person from clear across the country. So I sat down with this [commanding officer], gave him a presentation, and explained everything I was doing. That presentation was only supposed to be 30 minutes, but it lasted over an hour. After it was over, he said to me, 'Ms. Pierce, it was a tough subject, but you did a good job of explaining it to me.' I said, 'Fine. But there are two things that I need. I need a certain amount of money to operate on. I don't have a penny. Will you release those funds for me?' He said, 'Yes. What's the second thing? Boy, did I ask for it now!' I said, 'I need to hire another person to get this work done, and you've given orders that we will not pay POV for
coming across country. I'm interested in someone across the country.' He says, 'What do you know about this person?' And I told him the background. He said, 'Do you think she'll be good?' I said, 'Yes.' He said, 'Okay.'

So when I got back to my office, my boss said, 'Are you going to write a memorandum for the record?' And I said, 'You bet I am.' I wrote all this down, and I sent it to [the commander]. Lo and behold, it came back, the original, a week later, with his initials on it. He had, 'Proceed' on it.

So I went to the comptroller and I said, 'You know that I wanted to start to use this money.' She wasn't going to release it. So I pulled out a copy of the original. And I said, 'This tells me I can.' She was just fit to be tied!

Research issue 4: managing advancement issues

Ms. Pierce pointed to several conditions that affected advancement in her organization. One of the most difficult was achieving recognition as a professional among male peers and superiors. Ms. Pierce noted that males thought that managers were professionals who had learned their jobs from "hands-on" experience with technical operations. Because the managers had demonstrated their skills at managing these functions,
they were recognized. Women professionals, on the other hand, lacked the "hands-on" experience and were not regarded with as much esteem. Ms. Pierce remarked that "Having such women in their offices would make them look bad...Their attitude was, 'We've got to make sure she doesn't do her job well (first interview, 83-94).'

She told of an incident in her career that she believed her supervisor set up for her to fail. Her supervisor had sent her to a major conference in which there were discussions of technical aspects of a new inventory parts system. Ms. Pierce was unfamiliar with this system, and she had only a week in which to prepare. She quickly gathered as much available background information as she could and spent all her time getting ready for the out-of-town conference.

She flew to the conference a week early. It was a wise move, she discovered, for the military officer in charge of the operations had unexpectedly shown up. When Ms. Pierce found out, she spent most of that evening preparing for her presentation.

Two weeks after the presentation, the military officer called Ms. Pierce's supervisor to commend Ms. Pierce for doing an outstanding job. Ms. Pierce's supervisor, however, chided her for not informing him as soon as she found out the officer would be attending the
meeting. The supervisor said he could have done the presentation himself (first interview, 308-349).

Ms. Pierce also stated that she faced difficulties in being recognized at meetings.

If you wanted to speak up at meetings, getting the floor was one thing. Or, if I offered a suggestion, it was met with funny looks, like, 'What do you really know?' But if a man came out with the same thing I said, the answer would always be attributed to the male, and I was never given credit for knowing anything (second interview, 44-54).

Ms. Pierce responded to the lack of recognition by using several strategies. To acquire the technical information for preparing reports for inventories, for instance, Ms. Pierce consulted her husband, a former radar specialist with the military. In addition, she located experts on the staff and read books. Moreover, she maintained she did an extraordinary amount of "homework." She said she went "overboard, knocking myself out and doing a lot more than was expected of me" (second interview, 582-605).

Ms. Pierce, however, came to realize that the intense effort to meet project deadlines, for instance, was not valued in the male culture. After a long while of
stretching to "prove her competence," Ms. Pierce changed tactics:

...I'd meet the deadlines on time and the others wouldn't. They'd say, 'She's just trying to show us up...[She] did this and she did a better job of it...'

Even now, it's one of the things I've had to learn politically: 'Don't take some of those deadlines seriously, because you may come up with an answer that maybe your boss didn't want you to come up with. And if you've given him that answer when it was due, then it makes him look as though he's got to do something with it in the meantime. He may give the excuse, 'Well, she needs more time to get additional information. (second interview, 606-624).'

When Ms. Pierce saw that meeting deadlines did not meet the politics of the group, she asked herself,

One of the things I've found out is just what are they looking for? Do they really want you to honor that date" If they do, do they want something quick and dirty? Or do they want something in depth (second interview, 619-625)?

Ms. Pierce's realization, followed by her adjusting meeting deadlines, produced changes in her supervisor's reactions to her. He began treating her "a lot more professionally," she noted. By this, she meant that her
supervisor was able to recognize that managers did not necessarily have to have learned technical information to manage. After his recognition, the supervisor recommended Ms. Pierce for promotion:

[He said,] 'I can see in this type of job you don't need that kind of hands-on experience. That's why you've been successful, because you knew that you could get that information from the equipment specialist.' And even they didn't have to have that kind of experience. All they had to do was study the blueprints, drawings, and everything else. Then, they would come back with it...he found out, too, that you had to have very good communications skills... It wasn't long after that I got my next promotion (second interview, 198-268).

Research issue 5: supportive people

Ms. Pierce cultivated support for her career from a former second-level supervisor, who had observed her zero-based budgeting skills. Ms. Pierce described the supervisors as

...an older man who went back to school to get his degree. He liked the fact that I brought problems as well as solutions to him. I remember him saying, 'That's how a manager thinks!' But he could be hardnosed as well. I had to convince him of my
recommendations. But he treated me fairly (first interview, 242-248).

Ms. Pierce also obtained support from three, high-ranking military officers whom she first met through professional society activities.

The first was Colonel Anderson, who had observed Ms. Pierce's professional society leadership qualities and had commended her when she received the "woman of the year award:

I didn't do anything to influence her [the female panelist], but I want to tell you one thing. If they hadn't selected you to be the winner, I think I would have ordered them all back there to take another look. I've been aware of everything you've done, and I don't see how they can hold you down (second interview, 334-343).

Through the professional society, Ms. Pierce also met General Brown. She had invited him to several luncheons as a guest speaker; on one occasion, he spoke on a panel of military officers who had come in from across the country to attend the event. Years later, Ms. Pierce took a job in General Brown's organization. It was General Brown who provided the funds Ms. Pierce requested to start a new program. Later, General Brown approved Ms. Pierce's
request to attend an executive training program when training funds for it were cut.

Ms. Pierce described General Brown as one who ...did not look down his nose at people. He required that people prove their worth, but he gave them the benefit of the doubt. He was a doer—not afraid of making a decision. Some people, though, didn't feel they could talk to him. But I always felt as through I could. And I think it was because I worked with him in a different capacity in this organization (second interview, 472-494).

During another professional society awards function, in which Ms. Pierce was honored for her contributions as president, General Cole was sitting at her table. He turned to her and said that he was impressed with the quality of her work and with her enthusiasm. Ms. Pierce recalled that she had invited him, the installation commander, to speak at several society luncheons.

Years later, General Cole became the third in command of the organization in which Ms. Pierce worked. He remembered Ms. Pierce's competent leadership activities and developed a first-name relationship with her in the organization.

Ms. Pierce remembered General Cole as being "pretty hard on people that make presentations." But, she added he did not make presenting difficult for her. She pointed
out that in presenting, if a question that came up required further information, she replied she would return in an hour with the answers. She said,

I heard later from people that you make a mistake pretending if you try to be something you're not. If you pretend to know all the answers, he'd rather you told him you didn't know something and you'd find out than if you told him an answer that he'd find out later wasn't true (second interview, 563-572).

Summary

In Ms. Pierce's career history, two issues became barriers to her advancement: (a) the limited mobility potential of her job, and (b) the difficulty she had understanding and adapting to male cultural expectations.

Ms. Pierce's account of "professional" revealed the junction of the issues. To be promotable in the organization, women had to have line or technical specialty experience. To Ms. Pierce, promotability consisted in knowing where to obtain information, having educational credentials, and performing tasks consistently outstandingly. When she came to the realization that her perceptions of "professional" were different from the males,' she changed her own standards to meet norms held by the male managers. When a key person in the male managers group observed the change, he likewise changed
his ideas of skill requirements managers needed in order to perform competently. The changes were corresponding. Once they had been made, Ms. Pierce obtained the promotion she coveted.

Supportive people, for the most part, came from outside the organization first. Through a professional society, Ms. Pierce was able to gain both leadership skills and recognition. Three military officers commended her competencies and developed informal, trusting relationships with her. The relationships benefitted Ms. Pierce's career afterwards when two of the three officers became her supervisors.

**Margie Benet**

**Research issue 1: prior career and education**

Like Ms. Pierce, Ms. Benet had a widely-varied series of jobs and educational background before she entered government. Unlike Ms. Pierce, however, Ms. Benet had completed a master's program in a field closely related to her government job before entry. Following completion of the program in international affairs, Ms. Benet taught similar courses at a community college. After leaving the college, she obtained a fellowship in the same field and studied under a person well-known in the specialty.

Ms. Benet had also obtained local government experience. After the fellowship, she worked on a summer
internship with an urban planning organization. Although the internship became a full-time job, Ms. Benet became dissatisfied with it after a short while. Through a friend, she found a GS-7 position in a temporary federal commission. After the commission expired, she took a job in planning and budgeting in a large federal organization.

Research issue 2: special training

Ms. Benet took only three special training programs in her federal career: (a) the Senior Executive Service Candidate Program, (b) a two-week executive training program for public and private sector managers at a local university, and (c) a two-week executive development seminar sponsored by the Office of Personnel Management.

Ms. Benet remarked that government training is "too academic," not current, and is not applicable to what managers actually do on the job. She maintained that the training programs did create opportunities for her to meet managers from other organizations, exchange ideas for solving particular management problems, and develop a list of references for future correspondence. Ms. Benet also noted that the year-and-a-half Congressional fellowship program, which she took through the sponsorship of a non-profit organization, gave her additional career benefits:

I had a wonderful time. It gave me lots of contacts. I learned how things work on the Hill. I learned was a
bias for action, and this appealed to me. The second thing I liked was getting immediate, direct feedback. I didn't have to go through a lot of bureaucratic layers (first interview, 279-296).

Ms. Benet remarked that the Senior Executive Service Candidate Program was the key to moving into top management ranks. She added that her participation would not have been possible, however, had the female agency head provided strong endorsement for selecting more women into the program. Ms. Benet said she was one of ten women the agency chose for the program of 170 applicants. In the three years that the female agency head served, twelve women were appointed to the SES (first interview, 126-144).

**Research issue 3: non-goal-directed learning**

Ms. Benet's first job in planning and budgeting in the agency allowed her to observe how the agency conducted business with Congressional staff, how critical issues were managed, how informal communications linkages facilitated information sharing, how decisions were negotiated, and how resources were allocated and used. She added that getting to know Congressional staff members and the key individuals in public interest groups associated with her particular function was essential to learning her job.
Ms. Benet also learned a great deal about program management through being cast into a temporary position as acting budget director. Ms. Benet stated that the particular program was the largest in all of the sub-organizations of the agency and that crises were prevalent. The major programs had been cut back substantially and deadlines for meeting requirements were stringent. Ms. Benet noted that the staff had experienced a great deal of stress and low morale. Ms. Benet said that she managed the change by providing encouragement to her staff. In the three months Ms. Benet was acting director, she said she proved to herself and the agency that she could do the job (first interview, 242-253).

In another situation, an assistant secretary had asked Ms. Benet to begin a program in economic analysis. Ms. Benet said that she lacked a skills background in physics or engineering, which the program required, she felt. She said that she managed to start the program, however, by hiring "great, young, excellent staff." She noted that the group produced a product that is still regarded as exemplary in the particular industry today (first interview, 222-230).
Research issue 4: managing advancement issues

Ms. Benet cited "hardball politics" as an issue that affected her career in the agency. "Hardball politics," she remarked, "is when you go after the individual:

I think it's much easier to do when the individual is vulnerable, such as women in a technical organization or women without a technical background. Although, I have to say, this agency doesn't discriminate as far as your background. I've seen women with technical backgrounds be undercut as quickly as women without. I think it's just the fact of being female...I think there's a lot of pretty latent, aggressive conversation. I think because of that environment, it's easy to become a victim because people just blow up at you and come on very strong (second interview, 276-310).

In managing the aggressive tactics of "hardball politics, Ms. Benet used a variety of strategies. One was to surround herself with "protectors and allies." She described such people as those who interceded for her in difficult situations:

You absolutely need, if not a mentor, a protector: someone who can protect you. If you fail, you are so obvious. No one has to set you up. You just stand out. For instance, in dealing with Congress on very sensitive issues, most interaction is done
verbally. It's easy to say, 'So and so said this.' You can do yourself in very quickly unless someone's willing to back you up and say, 'No, this is really the way it was.' If you don't have them, you won't last very long (first interview, 181-195).

Ms. Benet also used the status of powerful and influential individuals in the agency to support her programs. For instance, when she was given the assignment to initiate a program in economic analysis, Ms. Benet obtained the support of peers through the endorsement of an assistant secretary:

He gave me lots of responsibilities on that job, and I had independent status and authority...I had put together the job, hired staff, and figured out what I had to do to get the job done. People knew I had access to him and had his confidence (first interview, 106-113).

Ms. Benet also incorporated the style of a female political appointee whom she observed had managed interpersonal relationships with male career managers well:

Most men were skeptical when she was appointed to the position. But she didn't let it stand in her way. She was herself: humorous, light. She could handle the pressure of being looked at all the time. She was young
and had people skills...She was in a powerful position and was able to demonstrate the skills (first interview, 166-176).

**Research issue 5: supportive people**

Ms. Benet used a variety of supportive individuals in her career; many of them were those who enabled her to survive the "hardball politics." One of the most prominent types were mentors and role models.

Ms. Benet's first supervisor is foremost:

Jack was an incredible young man in a powerful office. He was a brilliant analyst. He taught me how to analyze situations, how to solve problems, and who to deal with on the Hill. He was so smart, everyone relied on him (first interview, 39-49).

Jack Ferris also gave Ms. Benet insights into the male-dominant culture, such as fighting under rules of "hardball politics."

His view was--and maybe this is how men handle it because they're much more frontal--that you go back after them and you get them, and you make sure they know you got them (second interview, 323-329).

Ms. Benet said that she watched how Mr. Ferris "was able to bring people around to his view." This was especially important in how he persuaded Congressional staff. He took Ms. Benet to Capitol Hill several times
and enabled her to learn techniques for developing effective interpersonal communications channels with the liaison staff. By accompanying him, Ms. Benet also acquired visibility among the Congressional staff:

He almost always took me to the Hill. That empowered me. It gave me visibility. People knew that I knew what he knew. It gave me a lot more access to people and staff on the Hill. I dealt with staff people on the Hill. I found out very quickly that it is staff people you have to convince. I was working on re-authorization bills and worked with both sides. A lot of people I met when I worked with him are people I still work with. There's a lot of continuity. People have known me for years and I've established my own credibility. Having those introductions is very important, and the earlier, the better (second interview, 15-42).

From the passage, Ms. Benet indicated that the establishment of "credibility" over time was an important contributor to her acceptance and support. By forming relationships built on trust with the Congressional staff, Ms. Benet established support for her administration.

Ms. Benet revealed that she routinely takes stock of her perceptions of credibility among peer managers and identifies where she may improve her standing. She noted,
I mentally take stock of who the senior managers are and what my relationships are with them; and then, what I've had to decide is whether it's worth cultivating any of them or not. Some of them I have just written off; there's no point in dealing with them. Some, I kind of vacillate back and forth, and think, 'Should I make an effort with this guy or not (second interview, 247-263),'

Lastly, Ms. Benet found support among "knee-jerk liberals" in the agency: highly-educated men who "just feel we need a change, and you can count on them for support (second interview, 190-196).

Summary

Ms. Benet used non-goal directed learning extensively in her career development. The forms of this type of learning included learning from mentors and role models and learning from experience how to cultivate effective interpersonal communications networks with internal and external sources of power and influence. Formal learning was limited. Ms. Benet felt that it was not as relevant to what managers actually do on the job as learning from others and from experience.

The case shows that cultivating support from individuals in positions of power and who are accepted by the dominant male culture is important for attaining
"visibility" and "credibility." Playing by the same rules of males engaged in "hardball politics," however, is not desirable. For Ms. Benet, energy is not best spent confronting this activity, but rather in building and nurturing alliances. In the establishing webs of support, Ms. Benet used a combination of self-reflection, assessment of verbal and non-verbal cues in interpersonal relationships, development of sensing devices for obtaining performance feedback, and developing listening, speaking, and writing skills to enhance negotiation.

Barbara Henry

Research issue 1: prior education

After graduating from college with a bachelor's degree in foreign affairs, Ms. Henry sought a career at the State Department. When she applied, however, the personnel officer told her that women were not hired for foreign service officer positions. The agency could offer her an entry-level clerk typist job and, the personnel officer explained, Ms. Henry might eventually work in the field of foreign service. It was a few years before passage of the Civil Rights legislation in 1964, which prohibited such hiring practices. Ms. Henry's recourse, however, was to simply try elsewhere. She found a GS-5 job in recreation management with a military organization.
Remotely related to her wish to work in international affairs, the job was in Asia.

Research issue 2: special training

After realizing that recreation management had limited mobility potential, Ms. Henry came to believe that taking training was a key to advancement. She came to this awareness in Asia as she talked over her career prospects with a Colonel. He recommended developing a set of career goals and mapping out a strategy for attaining them. "Ticket punching" was a tactic for reaching the top, he suggested:

'Why don't you consider your civilian training program like a twenty-year plan [he asked]? And I said, 'Well, we don't have anything like that.' And he said, 'Well, we have in the military. Every three years, we go to school. And after we do that, we go to work assignments, and then we get promoted. We have to do all things to punch our ticket.' And I said, 'On! I'll never forget that term, 'punching a ticket' (second interview 292-313).'

Ms. Henry found training limited in the Asian country. Through the assistance of the military training officer, however, she took a course, "Management for Supervisors." Because she was not technically a manager under the regulations, she had to take leave to attend and
to pay for it through her own funds. She decided to continue seeking out training programs in her career:

This was my first government course. It was fabulous. I said, 'I've got to figure out how I could get training because it was motivational for me, because I could constantly be creative. I didn't get any sort of fuel (second interview, 227-233).

When Ms. Henry returned to the United States, she completed a master's degree program in business through an evening program at a local base education facility. In addition, when she was transferred to a South American country with the military, she attended Spanish school on the installation for two years.

After Ms. Henry became a manager, she took a long-term program in foreign affairs and military strategy. Ms. Henry attended as a substitute and at the request of a military training officer, who believed that more women should attend the program.

Ms. Henry described the program as benefitting career advancement in the organization; but it also created some difficulties for her. During the first three weeks of training, Ms. Henry had little difficulty understanding concepts discussed; it was on the topic of foreign affairs. When the course of instruction shifted to military strategies, however, Ms. Henry became frustrated.
After a month of the program, she felt she was lost and was ready to go home.

Ms. Henry's sister and many friends encouraged her to continue. In addition, her supervisor suggested that she complete requirements for the program by submitting a research paper addressing a familiar topic: procurement in her agency.

Ms. Henry completed the paper and the program. And, at the suggestion of her supervisor, she presented the paper at a national conference of procurement officers. The paper was so well received that the procurement association had it published and presented Ms. Henry a $50 prize (first interview, 264-293).

The presentation and the completion of the program, Ms. Henry confided, was "a great breakthrough for me: I was seen as an author and as an expert whose work received public acclaim. It enhances credibility, an attribute very important the higher you go in management. You are regarded as someone who does more than the job (first interview, 309-317).

**Research issue 3: non-goal-directed learning**

Along with a great deal of formal learning in her career, Ms. Henry also learned on the job and from other people. Early in her career, for instance, Ms. Henry learned creativity in program development and management
from four other women. Two of the women, her supervisors, had been educators before coming into government and had also had years of experience in creative arts. The women, according to Ms. Henry, often pooled their creative experiences and ideas to formulate programs that were both effective and which met the needs of military members in on isolated assignments. Ms. Henry cited an instance of this in the development of a circus program:

...The ideas became so much bigger and bigger, to the point where my coworker invited a circus to come to the front lines of this ...division. We had a lot of orphanages over there run by nuns. We all worked with them in our spare time. She engaged the circus run by the [foreign nationals] to come up...She got the children from the orphanage and we got the [troops,] who paired off with each child. Then, we played games, and the dining hall people brought out the food and made special cakes. We ordered balloons and that sort of thing (second interview, 103-124).

Ms. Henry used not only learning through observation and practice, as in these examples, but she also initiated activities to expand her job responsibilities. She saw these activities as other routes out of recreation management. For instance, in a particular recreation management job, she was given collateral duties as the
equal employment opportunity counselor for the base. Ms. Henry revealed that the assignment was "intriguing," and she decided to study as much as possible about the topic on her own. She obtained a complete set of classification manuals on her own.

These books are carefully guarded by Civilian Personnel offices. But I was determined that I would have all information on qualifications for jobs such as management analysis. I wanted to know specific information I needed to meet so I could be considered eligible for jobs outside of recreation management (first interview, 172-182).

Ms. Henry also learned a great deal about managing in a male-dominant environment from a particular male psychiatrist, with whom she was friends. Ms. Henry described him as a sort of Dr. Doolittle: a knowledgeable person who enabled a woman understand and adapt to a prevailing culture. Dr. Solomon, in this case, taught Ms. Henry how to recognize particular features of individual males and to react to them on that basis. Ms. Henry remarked that a "Mrs. Ryan" suit was an example of the help:

General Ryan could understand what Mrs. Ryan would wear. [However,] General Ryan... might be threatened by [Barbara Henry] in a power suit. When I was going
to brief that man, I would wear a Mrs. Ryan suit. He could understand how he was supposed to behave because he could see his wife there and what she was telling him. And he, because he was Irish, (and this man, he had everyone in an ethnic background and what you could expect and everything). ...He was fabulous! (second interview, 665-678)

Ms. Henry continued:

He would say, ['Men are] struggling with their sexual fantasy, and they can't help it.' If you're up there talking about logistics, and they're thinking about something else,' he says, 'they can't help themselves or whatever is the problem. Many men would say, Oh! That is not me! They become defensive. He believes that's the case. He said the other thing is Mrs. Ryan; you must become conservative. You have to be so good that you're presenting your material that you have thought out so well that you've covered all the bases...(second interview, 774-798).

Research issue 4: managing advancement issues

Ms. Henry's career began, as noted earlier, before passage of Civil Rights. It was illuminating in that it gave insights into how women, in particular, responded then to situations which are now protected by laws.
Ms. Henry described another situation in which she was denied a job because she was female. When her supervisor left his position in recreation management, Ms. Henry applied for it. The personnel officer reviewing her application, however, refused to consider it because he did not feel she should inspect male locker rooms. Ms. Henry, who had done this in an overseas installation, pointed out that this would not be a problem for her. When the personnel director did not accept her arguments, Ms. Henry complained to the base commander. In her account of the incident, Ms. Henry showed the use of negotiation, rather than demanding consideration for her position:

I just went on my own, and asked for the secretary's help, recognizing that this woman was enormously powerful—that she would grease this. If I had not gone in alone, and said to the Colonel, "Hey! I think I'm not getting a fair shake here!' he would have been taken aback. She could find out what the climate was like and whether it would be worth my going in...I wouldn't have filed a complaint. I don't believe in it. There's always another way. When I went in to see him, it was with the idea that if I could present myself in the position that I could do the job, he would probably give me the job (second interview, 404-420).
From her own experiences as well as from training as an EEO counselor, Ms. Henry learned subtleties of the informal hiring process in the federal government and also techniques for using the processes to obtain positions. Ms. Henry offered the following insight:

In addition to the interview process, there's also the phone call business that goes around. And supervisors, selecting officials will say, 'Well, I've interviewed so and so. What do you really think about so and so besides what she's already declared?' And that's where it all hangs out. And in EEO complaints, nobody really knows where the gray area is. But it goes on, and it will probably continue to go on. And all you can do is the best you can so the votes will come up in your favor (second interview, 1080-1093).

Ms. Henry applied techniques so that she would do her best in applying for a particular management position. She called a long-time friend and associate who had worked in the agency with the vacant position and asked her to help write the qualifications statement to suit the agency's particular business. Ms. Henry also typed the form and attachments, made four photocopies, and prepared kits for panel members reviewing her application. Ms. Henry also called a former supervisor who had worked for
the selecting official and asked him to provide a reference for her over the telephone. Moreover, Ms. Henry found out that the selecting official was an attorney who lived in a neighborhood where Ms. Henry had lived previously. In addition, she prepared for the interview with the official by wearing clothing that an attorney of his background could understand (second interview, 965-1094).

**Research issue 5: supportive people**

In Ms. Henry's career history, several types of individuals played supportive roles at various stages. In the entry phases, Ms. Henry received recognition from women who had served as role models. Moreover, she received help from the Colonel who had resolved the complaint Ms. Henry had with the personnel director. Ms. Henry described him as one who "treated people fairly in spite of rank (first interview, 217-218)." Ms. Henry also received help from various kinds of support people, such as the Commander's secretary (first interview, 192-203); the training officer who encouraged Ms. Henry to attend the military program (first interview, 243-258); and the clerk who saw to it that Ms. Henry's name was added to the roster of presenters at the procurement society conference (first interview, 294-304). Lastly, Ms. Henry learned how to apply for positions and be
promoted through a retired female personnel officer who gave workshops for professional society members (first interview, 187-206).

Ms. Henry indicated that Dr. Solomon, the psychiatrist who "probably was the person who taught me the most about different personality styles (second interview, 652-656)," was perhaps the most supportive. Through his individualized instruction, Ms. Henry learned, besides personality types, norms of various male sub-cultures.

Summary

Ms. Henry's career history shows a great deal of formal and informal learning activities. The impetus to learn began at an early, precipitous time in her career. Ms. Henry began her career in a climate established by bright, creative women. The results she achieved, moreover, were rewarded from a number of sources: besides the supervisors, the military commanders, the service members, and the foreign national community. Ms. Henry described a motivation to learn; the suggestion of developing a life-plan to get her "ticket" punched fell on fertile ground. When she returned to the United States, she voraciously took up a master's degree program, several courses on her own in personnel management, and participated in training programs through a professional
society. The culmination of formal training was a military program; through a research paper she submitted to complete the course, she became recognized inside and outside her organization as an author and expert. She had established her "credibility."

Ms. Henry also gathered support from several individuals as she advanced in her career. Perhaps most notable was the psychiatrist who served as her mentor. Dr. Solomon was one who taught her subtle ways by which males from varying ethnic and social settings perceive and react to women as managers. Through his suggestions, Ms. Henry was able to learn how to manage many issues she encountered in working in a male-dominant organization.

Summary
Research Issue 1: Prior Career and Education

In individuals having prior careers, training appeared to enhance skills and abilities acquired either before entry or afterwards. In the two respondents who had had careers as educational administrators before entering government, leadership skills appeared to be established. Both Ms. Chisholm and Ms. Garret had used participative management styles with their respective staff before entry.

Ms. Pierce and Ms. Benet did not have careers in management before government. Both had a series of short-
term jobs. Ms. Benet's education and job experiences in municipal government organizations were related to the job she took upon entering federal service. Ms. Pierce's, however, were not. Both respondents used training and informal development after entry. Ms. Pierce used considerably more formal learning than did Ms. Benet. The former realized she was in a job with limited mobility potential and had few individuals who would help her move upward. Ms. Benet's entry position and career growth until she became a manager, by contrast, was characterized by both career development opportunities and supportive individuals in positions of power in the organization.

Ms. Henry, who entered the federal government directly from college, began her career in a field outside her major and before the passage of the Civil Rights legislation in 1964. The unrelatedness of the job to personal and professional goals, and the denial of two jobs because of gender, had profound effects upon Ms. Henry's later career development. Ms. Henry, like Ms. Pierce, looked at training as a means for attaining mobility. Moreover, like Ms. Pierce, Ms. Henry sought out opportunities through professional societies to gain experiences that would qualify her for management.
Research Issue 2: Special Training

Special management training appeared to facilitate respondents' management effectiveness as well as promotability. Ms. Chisholm, for instance, got the idea for a management plan to help her establish work and staff scheduling priorities following a reorganization. Moreover, she maintained that after the reorganization that resulted in her being downgraded, the management plan demonstrated initiative and capability to her new manager. Subsequently, the manager had Ms. Chisholm's grade restored. Ms. Benet's participation in the Senior Executive Service Candidate Program, moreover, gave her qualifications to be appointed as a top executive in her organization. Additionally, Ms. Pierce's and Ms. Henry's participation in their respective agencies' special training programs provided experiences of visibility and credibility. Ms. Pierce was recognized for her abilities in managing a 375-member organization, and Ms. Henry's research paper gave her the esteemed status of author and expert.

Research Issue 3: Non-Goal-Directed Learning

Much of the respondent learning occurred through various on-the-job vehicles. Most notable were (a) mentors and role models, (b) special work assignments, (c) assignments as temporary directors of organizations or
units, and (d) applications of particular skills acquired before government, through previous educational, training, and job experiences.

Respondents learned skills for performing management roles, such as the team-building skills Ms. Chisholm practiced or the liaison-building competencies Ms. Benet developed. Perhaps the most important, however, in terms of the respondents' survival as managers in the male-dominant organizations, was diagnosing and adapting to management behavioral expectations. For Ms. Chisholm, this involved learning to meet demands of politically-appointed supervisors; for Ms. Pierce, it was adjusting ideas of how a "professional" woman manager should complete assignments; for Ms. Benet, it was learning to develop bases of support in the game of "hardball politics;" and for Ms. Henry, it was learning to adapt dress and mannerisms.

Research Issue 4: Managing Advancement Issues

Advancement issues appeared to be most sharply felt among respondents who were in large bureaucratic structures predominately staffed by males and characterized by a technical or military mission. Ms. Benet, Ms. Pierce, and Ms. Henry's cases, in particular, describe instances in which women managers experienced difficulties in moving upwards.
Some issues which respondents mentioned as particularly problematic were failure to receive proper credit for work; failure to be treated like a professional; being undercut, ignored, or belittled at meetings; being passed over for selection or promotions because of lack of technical qualifications or because less-qualified males were selected; and being denied jobs because of gender.

Respondents used strategies developed through informal learning activities primarily in response to the issues. Insights developed through reflection, such as in Ms. Chisholm's case with double reports, and in Ms. Pierce's revising deadlines, were frequent. Moreover, insights often came about through direct instruction from persons in mentor roles. Ms. Benet's first supervisor and Ms. Henry's psychiatrist friend, for instance, enabled respondents to develop means to interact effectively with male managers.

Research Issue 5: Supportive People

Each respondent had more than one supportive person in her career history. Usually, this person was a mentor. Mentors not only gave individuals clues to unravelling cultural puzzles, but they also provided specific techniques for managing. Mentors, moreover, were often supervisors of the respondents. In this capacity, they
gave assignments which allowed respondents opportunities
to extend and to deepen abilities. This was important,
for such experiences prepared Ms. Benet, Ms. Pierce, and
Ms. Henry for promotions from specialist positions into
management.

Supportive people also provided encouragement and
advice. Sometimes, as in Ms. Henry's and Ms. Pierce's
cases, the supporters were secretaries. At other times,
family members, such as in Ms. Henry's and Ms. Pierce's
instances, were such resources. Supportive people, as in
Ms. Benet's case in particular, provided protection from
attack and intervention in conflicts with male managers.

Usage of In-Depth Interviews

After the in-depth interview information had been
coded and data collected and analyzed, summaries of the
five research issues were examined. The researcher then
used specific information in the following ways: (a) to
define more precisely data categories; (b) to provide
possible explanations for themes; (c) to provide a richer
description of patterns of usage of formal and informal
learning; and (d) to illumine understanding of individual
behavioral responses to particular organizational cultural
phenomena.
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