GETTING WOMEN TO THE TOP IN MONTANA GOVERNMENT

by

Michele Fletcher Janota

A professional paper submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Public Administration

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

September, 1988

AP378
I 2645
Cop. 2

APPROVAL

of a paper submitted by

Michele Fletcher Janota

This paper has been read by each member of the committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

9/23/88
Date

Richard L. Haines
Chairperson, Graduate Committee

Approved for the Major Department

9/23/88
Date

Glenn W. Cerven
Head, Major Department

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

11/29/88
Date

Henry L. Parsons
Graduate Dean

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this paper are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made.

Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this paper may be granted by my major professor, or in his/her absence, by the Director of Libraries when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this paper for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Michael F. Janota

Date September 21, 1988

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to the many people who have helped me along the way. Without the support of family and friends, those who give you the strength to persevere, life would be much more difficult. Not to be forgotten are those who share your experience, Marlene and Dan. I would also like to thank those, in Helena, who gave of their time, Russ McDonald, Linda Davis, and especially, Ron Wilson. Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to my committee members, Dr. Krishna Tummala, Dr. Richard Arthur, Dr. Jack Olson, Dr. Karen Hedblom, and Dr. Richard Haines.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL	ii
STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABSTRACT	viii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Statement of Purpose	6
Summary	6
2. REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE	10
Concept of Representative Bureaucracy	10
Representativeness--Strategies and Barriers	13
Passive Representation	14
Active Representation	15
Possible Solutions	19
3. MONTANA EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION	24
Historical Review	24
Current Status	30
4. SURVEY METHODS AND RESULTS	33
Caveats of the Research	33
Survey Methods	34
Survey Analysis	36
Results	43

5. THE FINAL ANALYSIS..... 46

Conclusions..... 47
Recommendations..... 48

REFERENCES CITED..... 52

APPENDICES..... 56

Appendix A - Survey Instrument..... 57
Questionnaire..... 58
Appendix B - Qualitative Responses..... 62
Change a component of managerial training..... 63
Comments/recommendations..... 65
Appendix C - Raw Data..... 69

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Representation of Women in the Montana Labor Force Compared to Montana State Government.....	30
2	Yes-No Questions About Management Training Programs.....	36
3	Perceptions About Montana Management Training.....	39
4	Program Content Questions.....	40

ABSTRACT

Although the State of Montana has committed itself to eliminating discrimination in employment, women are underrepresented in the administrative category. In order to provide recommendations to increase the number of women in the administrative recruitment/selection pool, this professional paper will analyze female administrators' perceptions about Montana management developmental training programs .

To study the problem of underrepresentation, a survey was taken of women in administrative positions in Montana Government. The survey asked whether: (1) women had management training prior to their selection/promotion; (2) prior training had been a factor in their selection/promotion; and (3) more or different training needed to be offered to increase the number of women in the administrative selection pool.

The survey respondents perceived that prior training was a factor in their selection. However, they reported that: (1) there was not enough training offered to increase the number of women in the recruitment/selection pool; and (2) that, once in the job, there was minimal training to enhance job success or develop skills for promotion.

An analysis of the collected data indicates that in order to enable women to overcome barriers and allow them to compete in administrative pools, more developmental training has to be offered. Further, training has to be accessible, timely, and valuable to present and potential managers.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Representative Bureaucracy, a concept developed by J. Donald Kingsley, in his book, Representative Bureaucracy (1944), links the government with its citizens. Focusing on the evolution of British middle class bureaucracy out of "government by gentlemen," Kingsley wrote, "In a democracy competence alone is not enough."[1] The public service must also be representative, in order to reflect the character of the national social structure. Kingsley suggests that only representation from broad social groups will make the bureaucracy more responsive to political currents, thus, liberating rather than enslaving its citizens.[2] Further, he warned, that to "be able to maintain popular government depends almost wholly today upon our success in developing and maintaining 'representative bureaucracies;....' "[3] While Kingsley's concept of representativeness does not insure decision-making based on a wide range of cultural views, his concept is symbolic of values (i.e., a public service open and responsive to its citizens, and equality of opportunity) important to Americans.[4]

Charged with protecting important American values, and noting that personnel practices discriminated against certain groups, Congress made it unlawful to discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in Title VII of the Civil

Rights Act of 1964. Later, the breadth of the Civil Rights Act (CRA) was interpreted in a Supreme Court case involving selection examinations. In Griggs, et al. v. Duke Power Company (1971) the Supreme Court declared it unlawful to administer selection examinations that were not based upon bona fide occupational qualifications (BFOQ's)[5]. The decision stated that selection examinations must be job related, and thereby it "resolved the question of whether an employee is prohibited by Title VII of the CRA of 1964 from requiring of its job applicants either a high school education or the passing of a standardized, general intelligence test as a condition of employment in or transfer to jobs."[6] Later, in 1972, equal employment was extended to the public sector through the Equal Employment Opportunity Act.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Act (EEOA), an amendment to the CRA of 1964 which added sex and religion to Title VII, extended to women and minorities the same protections in state and local government employment as those afforded to the employees and potential employees of the federal government and the private sector. It barred discrimination, and required affirmative action. In addition, the Act established a monitoring system for women and minorities in state and local government.

Despite these efforts, legislative attempts have not been entirely successful because the EEOA does not address underrepresentation.[7] For example, although the number of women in the work force is rising,[8] figures in 1984 showed that 80 percent of the women in the work force were concentrated in 20 percent of the

427 job categories of the U. S. Department of Labor. Those job categories were low paying and low status.[9] Although this statistic is partially attributed to a lack of skills,[10] the example testifies to the fact that, generally, women are clustered in lower level positions, and are not being promoted into high level government jobs where it is hoped that they would represent the interests of other females.

Furthermore, in light of recent demographic trends and fiscal developments, representation for females may become even more difficult. Affirmative action programs for women will be heavily affected by promotion slowdowns due to "aging and plateaued bureaucracy."[11] Baby boomers who have reached top level management are stable and aging, and there is little expectation of movement or advancement for at least the next ten years. To make matters worse, Frank J. Thompson states that the Reagan Administration has made a "rapid withdrawal from the area of affirmative action [which] results in an erosion of oversight capacity, especially that of the EEO Commission and the Justice Department."[12]

While some may contend that government intervention does not solve underrepresentation, a study by Clynch and Gaudin concluded that federal oversight does facilitate the recruitment of disadvantaged groups into the workforce.[13] The findings of a study by Slack (1986) suggest that some sort of federal presence in the policy area is vital. Without federal intervention, Slack warns that "new federalism" may turn into a "new feudalism."[14]

Realizing that the states needed backing from the federal government to help solve underrepresentation, on July 2, 1986 the U.S. Supreme Court, in two separate rulings, reaffirmed the legality of affirmative action in the American work place as a remedy for past discrimination against protected classes.[15]

This commitment meant that the states as well as the federal government have an obligation to provide all sectors of the population, including women, the opportunity to be hired or promoted into higher level positions. However, current literature shows that few women are holding administrative positions either in federal or state government.

The State of Montana is no exception to the finding. For example, in 1986, suggesting that women continue to be significantly underrepresented in the administrative category, and suggesting that traditional affirmative action methods were not working, a report to the governor of Montana stated that, "The state must explore new programs to reestablish the progress experienced in the early 1980's".[16]

Statement of the Problem

Whatever the impetus, representation for women in Montana may be difficult to achieve because Montana State agencies are divided between those that are and those that are not governed by "merit principles." While agencies under the Merit System must follow federal employment guidelines, the others are not bound to federal mandates unless under government contract.

According to a 1986 Montana Department of Administration "Report to the Governor," women comprise 45.4 percent of State Government workers. Of this number, females represent only 17.1 percent of the managers in State Government.[17] Although the number of women in professional positions (e.g., engineers, accountants) increased from 1985 to 1986 by .9 percent, FY86 is the second consecutive year with no employment gains for women in administrative positions.[18] This report indicates two things. First, there were positive gains for women in the professions; but, second, current measures (i.e., special recruitment, affirmative action) intended to encourage female representativeness in administrative areas are not working.

One reason for underrepresentation may be that many women choose traditional occupations such as teaching, and are classified in the professional category. Also, according to Montana officials, most women in higher level positions have been promoted from within the agency. This is especially true of women in administration. Traditionally men have had more administrative training, experience, and visibility; thus, they tend to dominate the selection pool. Women have had less or inadequate training, experience and visibility, and have not been able to compete with men in the selection pool. They have had to rely totally upon "paper qualifications" (i.e., college degrees, experience, or specialized training)[19] or on-the-job training for promotions. Career advancement from within the agency often takes years, and thus, limits the number of women in the selection pool. One way to

eliminate, or at least decrease discrimination in selection, and increase the number of women in the selection pool is to provide training. Management training designed with women in mind could expedite the promotion process, and could enhance the paper qualifications of those seeking administrative employment both from within and outside of the agency.

Statement of Purpose

This paper investigates the perceptions of women in higher government jobs in order to determine whether more can be done to increase the number of women in the administrative selection pool.

Second, since management training might be a possible solution to underrepresentation, this research will provide information about the utility of developmental training programs for women managers in Montana, and point out problems in the training programs or in the administration of the programs.

Summary

It is vital to representativeness that the number of females in the recruitment pool be increased. This is especially true considering demographic trends, cutback management, and the eroding oversight of the EEO Commission which all contribute to reducing the pool of female recruits, and ultimately, female representativeness. An increased number of females in recruitment pools should lead to more women securing jobs, and then, promotions. However, it is

important to train women so that they can gain the skills to get jobs, and once in a job, to get promoted.

Acting upon recommendations of the Governor's Council on Management, and the Forty-Eighth Montana Legislature (1983) management training was initiated for State of Montana personnel.[20] This research evaluates the extent to which Montana Government encourages the promotion of women into administrative positions by providing them management developmental training opportunities.

The next chapter reviews the arguments, attitudes, and problems surrounding the concept of Representative Bureaucracy and its application in the United States, especially as it applies to women managers. Also, Chapter 2 identifies studies which attempt to explain why there are so few women in management today.

Chapter 3 will present an historical review of equal employment in Montana, and conclude with a discussion of the status of management training programs offered by the State of Montana. Chapter 4 will present and analyze the findings of the research, and the concluding chapter will present a summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

Notes

[1] J. Donald Kingsley, Representative Bureaucracy (Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1944), 185.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., Preface.

[4] Frederick C. Mosher, Democracy and Public Service, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 17.

[5] U.S. Supreme Court, U.S. Reports 401: Amendments of Rules, October 1970, ([Washington: GPO, 1971]), 424-436.

[6] Ibid.

[7] U.S., Department of Commerce, 1980 Census of Population: Characteristics of the Population, Bureau of the Census, ([Washington: GPO, 1983]), vol.1. The OPM has developed an Underrepresentation Index (UI) that compares the per cent of a social group employed in a particular job category with that group's annual average representation in the civilian work force. If the number employed in a category is disproportionate with the number of that same group in the civilian work force, then that social group is underrepresented. If there is underrepresentation in any area, then the work force cannot be representative of the work force in all categories and at all levels.

[8] Montana, Department of Labor and Industry, Montana Women In The 80's ([Helena, Montana: Research & Analysis Bureau, 1985]), 3. In 1983, the female work force was 48.5 million. The number of female workers had grown by 173 percent during the period between 1947 and 1980. Males, in comparison, grew during that same period by 43 per cent.

[9] "Affirmative Action Watch," The Collegiate Career Woman 12, (Winter 1984/85): 9.

[10] Ibid.

[11] James F. Wolf et al., "Greying at the Temples: Demographics of a Public Service Occupation," Public Administration Review 48 (March/April 1987): 193.

[12] Ibid.

[13] James D. Slack, "Affirmative Action and City Managers: Attitudes Toward Recruitment of Women," Public Administration Review 47 (March/April 1987): 204.

[14] Ibid.

[15] The two cases on which the Supreme Court reaffirmed the legality of EEO/AA were: Sheet Metal Workers v. EEOC, and Fire fighters v. City of Cleveland. Two more recent cases which uphold affirmative action goals in selection/promotion are Johnson v. Transportation, Santa Clara County and U.S. v. Paradise. The former is a landmark case protecting women in the workplace.

[16] Montana, Equal Employment and Affirmative Action Programs, Report to the Governor, ([Helena: Department of Administration, 1986]), 18.

[17] Ibid., p. 19.

[18] Ibid., p. 2.

[19] Ibid., p. 21.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is threefold. First, it will discuss problems surrounding the concept of Representative Bureaucracy and its application in the United States. Next, barriers to Representative Bureaucracy will be identified through a review of the literature; and, finally, possible solutions to female underrepresentation will be examined.

The Concept of Representative Bureaucracy

A review of the literature suggests that there are several factors deterring Representative Bureaucracy from becoming a reality. When Donald Kingsley coined the concept in 1944, he noted that, "Everywhere the modern social service state is a bureaucracy...,"[1] but, for bureaucracies to be democratic they must be representative of the group they serve.[2]

In a discussion of Kingsley's work, Samuel Krislov points out that, "The notion of representative bureaucracy is that broad social groups should have spokesmen and officeholders in administrative as well as political positions."[3] Kingsley's sole reason for advocating representative bureaucracy is his concern that at least some administrators be sympathetic to the political climate, political neutrality by the ruling class being impossible, given human

nature.[4] However, Krislov adds that Kingsley is trying to urge the reformation of "caste selection processes" by imposing Marxist ideas upon American public administration. The attempt is unsuccessful because Kingsley's plan lacked thought and was, "a reflex action to the situation of the times."[5] In fact, in an examination of Kingsley's work, V. Subramaniam argues that representative bureaucracies may be difficult, if not impossible to achieve, because bureaucracies are middle class by nature.[6] He explains that the middle class has held the majority of civil service jobs in several countries around the world, regardless of their state of economic development. This is particularly true in the United States where the society is largely middle class. He adds that even though Kingsley's concept caught on, there is confusion surrounding the concept's definition and operationalization. To be specific, although Kingsley was not sure about the desirable degree of representation or the categories to be represented because of class lines, population, educational philosophies, etc., Kingsley was satisfied for the civil service to reflect the largest groups in society. He believed that a civil service mirroring the population could be entrusted with power. However, he was "anxious that the civil service should draw proportionately more from the working class."[7] According to Subramaniam, Kingsley's philosophy confused the literal meaning of "representative bureaucracy" in which every class is equally represented in exact proportion to its numbers in the population with the American interpretation of representative

bureaucracy. The later interpretation draws from all social, religious, and racial groups, but not in their exact proportions.

An extension of Subramaniam's discussion is offered by Kenneth Meier and Lloyd Nigro. They state that however powerful the concept of representative bureaucracy, it is deficient in conceptual and empirical validity.[8] Therefore, a representative bureaucracy cannot exist. They contend that demographic factors may not affect individual attitudes enough to influence behavior. Further, Meier and Nigro believe that agency socialization overwhelms attitudes grounded in social origins and childhood training. Agency decisions are made by the administrative elite; therefore, if the central purpose of representative bureaucracy is responsiveness, then the responsiveness of the bureaucratic elite is the crucial question.[9] However, Enid F. Beaumont's concern goes beyond the bureaucratic elite to the selection and recruitment process itself. Beaumont indicts the Merit System as a cause of underrepresentativeness, and states that until the Merit System undergoes giant reforms (i.e., new forms of testing, better job design, new incentive schemes and rewards, new methods of evaluating performance), hiring and promotions will not be truly competitive.[10]

Adding to Beaumont's argument, Nesta Gallas states that representativeness is important because it is implied in pluralism, and further, that the position of those who support representative bureaucracy is that only through representation can organizational responsiveness be, "realistically achieved."[11] Responsiveness is vital to efficiency and effectiveness. An organization that is

effective, and therefore productive, extends its responsiveness to its clientele.[12] That is to say that a bureaucracy must, "readily react to suggestions, influences, appeals, or efforts...."[13] of a pluralist society in order to produce the desired or expected response with the least input and the most output. Further, Gallas contends that the pluralist society involves both structural and cultural dimensions. In other words, representativeness creates a "dilemma of choice for those responsible for recruitment..."[14] The agencies must decide whether to treat persons solely as individuals, or as members of a group.

It is here that the merit principles of selection and advancement come into play. Selection and advancement are based solely upon relative ability, knowledge, skill, fair and equitable treatment, and personnel actions without regard to political affiliation, national origin, sex, or other non-merit factors (i.e., marital status, age, handicapped condition).[15] The problem is that merit principles assume equality at the time of recruitment.

According to Krishna Tummala, the concepts of equity and "merit" are "juxtaposed as competing values,"[16] but do not have to be. He elaborates that the, "two concepts could be compatible once we can get away from the orthodox thinking."[17]

Representativeness--Strategies and Barriers

Orthodox thinking does exist, and will be difficult to change. Nevertheless, there are those who believe that the bureaucratic system does pose barriers to representativeness, and is

disadvantageous to minority groups. If representation is to be an important democratic ideal, as congressional acts and recent Supreme Court decisions have declared it to be, then we need to examine the strategies and the barriers to representativeness. There are two philosophies for overcoming underrepresentativeness: passive and active representation.

Passive Representation

Passive representation is identified with equal employment opportunity, which removes discriminating barriers at the time of employment. Contending that representation for women will take a long time, Frederick Mosher makes a case for passive respresentation. Mosher states that female employment is a cultural division of labor, and can only be dealt with incrementally. He warns that perhaps women are demanding more than can be delivered in view of the recency of employment changes, and adds that women must enter the professions to change society's perceptions of women's roles in the work force. Even then, it will take many years.[18] Further, Mosher contends that female representativeness may take longer to accomplish because representation is tied to the merit system through the recruitment and selection process. This is problematic because, "Developments since World War II have befogged the meaning of merit principles and confused the content of merit systems."[19] His explanation is that the confusion is partly semantic. Americans tend to equate the merit system with employment

practices from the past which are of questionable value and of less relevance today. Mosher says that there are two distinct arguments: (1) that the word "merit" connotes deserving; and (2) that the word "merit" concerns the criteria of consideration.

> It is ironic that problems of public employment should grow out of a collision between actions taken to assure equal employment opportunity (EEO) and merit principles, themselves nurtured by the ideal of equal opportunity, an open public service, and equal treatment for all.[20]

However ironic public employment problems are, the fact remains that some sectors of society are being victimized. As Kingsley and others have suggested, for a society to be truly representative of its citizens, we must actively seek greater representation for large victimized groups. An incremental strategy, passive representation, is not enough.

Active Representation

Active representation, unlike passive representation, requires a concerted effort on behalf of the disadvantaged. In active representation, the administrator presses for a desired outcome for those s/he represents. For example, Harry Kranz, U.S. Department of Labor, views women as victims, and sees all the more need to push for a more representative bureaucracy. According to Harry Kranz, the bureaucracy has emphasized its service function; and therefore, has tended to override two other significant functions: (1) as a source

of job and economic betterment for citizens; and (2) as a means of group representation in a democracy. Kranz argues that the government is the largest single and fastest growing industry in the United States, employing over 19 per cent of the work force. Those heretofore excluded from full participation could benefit most from public employment; thus, government employment cannot be overlooked.[21] Regardless of the reasons, the dilemma is that the current bureaucracy is male dominated. The bureaucracy is a source of jobs and economic betterment for some citizens, but it does not have adequate group representation. If males and females had equal representation at all levels of the bureaucratic structure, then the two functions Kranz mentioned would be achieved, and perhaps the economic betterment of all citizens would result.

To achieve a representative bureaucracy and reduce victimization, Bernard Rosen proposes affirmative action (AA). Rosen sees affirmative action as the logical extension of a nondiscrimination policy in employment, and states that affirmative action is the key to achieving an equal employment opportunity for all.[22]

In addition to affirmative action efforts, other avenues must be explored. Martha Rader has studied and defends the cultural argument as a principle reason for female underrepresentation. Citing the results of a study that she conducted, Rader explains that when confronted with management opportunities, women holding traditional attitudes have too much anxiety to be able to perform.

She explains that women fear competition, lack self-esteem, and thus, avoid situations which may lead to success. Rader further contends that because of traditional sex roles, women often keep themselves in low-level jobs.[23]

A review of the Rader study suggests that management training is the key to helping more women get to the top. Rader's study found that a management development program for the women employed by the City of Phoenix, Arizona had a positive impact on administrative and professional participants' attitudes towards women and assertiveness behavior.[24] The study results indicated that females who aspire to professional and administrative positions will benefit from the training more than women who don't because women who hold traditional views often resist management roles.

Agreeing with Martha Rader, Naomi B. Lynn and Richard E. Vaden believe that, generally, too much blame and emphasis has been placed on agency socialization. Examining women who have overcome traditional sex barriers, and made it to the top, they note that these women have been stereotyped and classified in the "exceptional woman" syndrome.[25]

Dismissing training and nontraditional views, John Rehfuss maintains that women who make it to the top are "exceptional women," and that they manifest a "management ideology" that is identical to that of nonminority males.[26] It is this ideology that will make the difference for females. They will most likely get to the top in spite of sexist attitudes when they adopt a certain management ideology. However, Lynn and Vaden counter Rehfuss's argument and

state that women are not selected into top positions because they are labeled "not suitable" for such jobs.[27]

The results of an analysis of a public organization performed by Laura Vertz, in 1985, found that:

> Women at GS-11 and higher levels do not differ from men on important personality dimensions, such as self-esteem, aggressiveness, and management personality that are related to the ability to work efficiently with people and excel within a work environment. Significant differences on these traits exist, however, between women in upper- and lower-level positions.[28]

Vertz's study seems to suggest that women aspiring to higher level jobs need specific training. It is suggested that if women want to advance, they need to develop high self-esteem, an ability to be aggressive, a managerial personality, and nontraditional attitudes towards the role of women in employment. Nevertheless, Vertz warns that even these traits will not offset Veterans' Preference. "If Veterans' Preference helps career advancement, men have an edge over women."[29]

The Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 allowed points to be added to test scores of veterans and disabled veterans. Then, the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1966 extended those benefits to peacetime veterans with as little as six months service. Additionally, in Massachusetts v. Feeney, 134 U.S. 884 (1979), preferential treatment was extended to "reductions in force" so that nonveterans could be bumped by veterans. Considering that most women are not veterans, veterans preference is a barrier to

representativeness for women. However, recent Supreme Court decisions (i.e., Johnson v. Santa Clara County, U.S. v. Paradise [1987]) extended help to women by upholding Affirmative Action plans in hiring and promotions. In fact, in Johnson v. Santa Clara County, the landmark decision declared that women could be selected/promoted over men with higher test scores. Regardless of Supreme Court decisions concerning Veterans' Preference, other barriers exist.

The literature identifies structural (i.e., personnel practices) and cultural barriers (i.e., traditional attitudes) that preclude women from achieving top administrative positions. If representativeness is to be achieved, it is important to examine possible solutions.

Possible Solutions

Jean Couturier, Executive Director of the National Civil Service League (1974), examined the use of goals and timetables to speed up affirmative action. She cited U.S. Civil Service Commission Chairman Robert E. Hampton:

> There is no question in our minds that goals and timetables are in harmony with the merit system. The merit system provides the framework which permits goals and timetables to be an important management tool to assure equal employment opportunity.[30]

During the 1970's goals and timetables were reported to be effective, but their use has declined in the 1980's. Dometrius and Sigelman contend that this is because of the criteria used in assessing progress. They state that using a mathematical benchmark as an evaluative tool may not be achievable, and that perfect representativeness should not be expected.[31]

The question of whether perfect representativeness is achievable because of the measuring instrument clouds the issue. According to a time study by David Rosenbloom, "the implementation of goals and timetables in the federal government had no impact on the employment of women."[32] He found female employment to be slow-paced, but continually rising. Thus, solutions other than goals and timetables need to be studied.

In an attempt to help female representativeness, Martha Rader looked at solution alternatives. Rader wrote that since it is recognized that women tend to be concentrated at the lower levels of public administration, and since the lack of skills has been cited as a major reason, many states and local governments have implemented upward career mobility programs for women as part of a total affirmative action package. Combined with personnel policies that effect equal opportunity hiring, pay, and promotion, training programs may help women gain the skills necessary to become administrators.[33]

After having examined the literature, it is apparent that representative bureaucracy is desirable, but that the means to its

accomplishment is not clear. Despite Supreme Court decisions and legislation, barriers exist. Passive representation is a partial solution to female underrepresentation. For example, as more women matriculate from colleges and enter the work force, recruitment and selection pools will realize more females. However, college degrees do not necessarily guarantee management positions. Likewise, if women are hired, but are concentrated in lower positions and are not promoted because of the lack of skills, passive representation is not effective. Certainly, it is not expedient. If Rader's and Vertz's findings are accurate, then women aspiring to management positions will benefit from specific training which emphasizes management skills and assertiveness behavior. Career development and management training programs should increase the number of women in selection pools, and thus, cause more women to achieve higher level government positions. It is with this in mind that we examine EEO and AA in Montana.

Notes

[1] J. Donald Kingsley, Representative Bureaucracy (Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1944), 4.

[2] Ibid., p. 185.

[3] Samuel Krislov, Representative Bureaucracy (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974), 7.

[4] Ibid., p. 12.

[5] Ibid.

[6] V. Subramaniam, "Representative Bureaucracy: A Reassessment," American Political Science Review 61 (December 1967): 1015.

[7] Ibid., p. 1010.

[8] Kenneth John Meier and Lloyd G. Nigro, "Representative Bureaucracy and Policy Preferences: A Study in the Attitudes of Federal Executives," Public Administration Review 36 (July/August 1976): 462.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Enid F. Beaumont, "A Pivotal Point For The Merit System," Public Administration Review 34 (September/October 1974): 430.

[11] Nesta M. Gallas, "Representativeness: A New Merit Principle," Public Personnel Management Journal 14 (Spring 1985): 26.

[12] Ibid.

[13] "Responsive," The American Heritage Dictionary.

[14] Gallas, loc. cit.

[15] Ibid., p. 27.

[16] Krishna K. Tummala, "Merit And/Or Equity In Public Service," in Public Personnel Policy: The Politics of Civil Service, ed. David Rosenbloom (Port Washington: Associated Faculty Press, 1985), 81.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Frederick C. Mosher, Democracy and Public Service, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 223-224.

[19] Ibid., p. 217.

[20] Ibid., p. 224.

[21] Harry Kranz, "Are Merit and Equity Compatible," Public Administration Review 34 (September/October 1974): 435.

[22] Bernard Rosen, "Affirmative Action Produces Equal Employment Opportunities For All," Public Administration Review 32 (May/June 1974): 238.

[23] Martha Rader, "Evaluating a Management Development Program for Women," Public Personnel Management 8 (May/June 1979): 143.

[24] Rader, op. cit., 145.

[25] Naomi B. Lynn and Richard E. Vaden, "Toward a Non-Sexist Personnel Opportunity Structure: The Federal Executive Bureaucracy," Public Personnel Management 8 (July/August 1979): 213.

[26] John A. Rehfuss, "A Representative Bureaucracy? Women and Minority Executives in the California Career Service," Public Administration Review 46 (September/October 1986): 458.

[27] Lynn and Vaden, op. cit., p. 213.

[28] Laura L. Vertz, "Women, Occupational Advancement, and Mentoring: An Analysis of One Public Organization," Public Administration Review 45 (May/June 1985): 416.

[29] Ibid., p. 418.

[30] Jean J. Couturier, "Civil Rights In Civil Service," Public Administration Review 34 (May/June 1974): 243.

[31] Nelson C. Dometrius and Lee Sigelman, "Assessing Progress Toward Affirmative Action Goals in State and Local Government: A Benchmark," Public Administration Review 44 (May/June 1984): 241.

[32] Gregory B. Lewis, "Progress Toward Racial and Sexual Equality in the Federal Civil Service?" Public Administration Review 48 (May/June 1988): 705.

[33] Rader, loc. cit.

CHAPTER 3

MONTANA EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

This chapter presents an historical review of equal employment in Montana. This review is important because it provides insights into current problems regarding representativeness. In addition, this chapter will give a brief synopsis of the management training programs available to administrators and potential administrators in Montana government.

Historical Review

It is written in the preamble of the state constitution of Montana (1972) that the people desire "to improve the quality of life, equality of opportunity and to secure the blessings of liberty for this and future generations...."[1] It is apparent that Montanans hold democratic values in high regard. Looking specifically at equality of opportunity, prior to the rewriting of the constitution in 1972, Montana had the distinction of having had the first female representative in the U.S. House of Representatives. Jeanette Rankin served two terms in the House, from 1917-1919, and then again from 1941-1942.

In addition to the mention of democratic values in the preamble, several laws supportive of women have been enacted. In 1974, the Montana Human Rights Act was passed. This act prohibited

discrimination on the basis of race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, physical or mental handicap, marital status or sex in employment, education, and financial and credit transactions.

Next, the Montana Human Rights Commission adopted the federal guidelines on sexual harassment. Sexual harassment is considered not only in violation of the Montana Human Rights Act, but also of Title VII of the 1964 U.S. Civil Rights Act. Following the federal lead, Montana initiated a Montana maternity leave law which made it unlawful to fire a woman because she is pregnant or to deny her reasonable maternity leave. From 1975 to 1985, Montana instituted a series of laws and programs protecting and supporting women, The Marriage and Divorce Act, The Child Support Enforcement program, and domestic violence, rape and sexual assault programs.[2]

Then, in 1981, through Executive Order 24-81 and the State's EEO Policy (ARM 2.21.8106 to 2.21.8109), Montana committed itself to eliminating barriers to employment through state government and the implementation of an effective equal employment opportunity (EEO) program (EEO/AA). Montana had recommitted itself to equal employment opportunity. These new orders directed the State Personnel Division to review Affirmative Action plans submitted by state agencies.[3] In writing the Affirmative Action plans, agencies were making a special effort to encourage equal employment opportunity for all present and prospective employees in all personnel actions regardless of sex, race, color, national origin, religion, age, marital status and disability."[4] "The chief objective [was] to equalize access to all levels of agency employment for those classes of people who have

traditionally been denied equal access--minority group members, women and the handicapped."[5] Affirmative Action was the extension of the EEO mandate. According to Gary Wicks, Director of the Montana Highway Department, "Affirmative Action is a temporary program to achieve EEO and eliminate the effects of past discrimination."[6]

In 1983, the Personnel Division "initiated the first stage of management training for State of Montana personnel."[7] The Professional Development Center (PDC), of the Montana Department of Administration, designed a four-part, sequential management training program.

In designing the training paradigm, the PDC researched sources for "management developmental training." The first type of training considered was that offered by agencies such as the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM): Executive Programs Divisions in Washington, D.C.; Federal Executive Institute (FEI) in Charlottesville, Virginia; and the Denver Regional Training Center in Denver, Colorado.

Since state job training and development centers are expensive to maintain, require constant updating, and need trained instructors, many states prefer to take advantage of management training programs offered by the federal government, federal regional training offices, private contracting companies, and community or state institutions of higher learning. Such is the case in Montana. According to Betty Morris of the Department of Administration, while the State of Montana maintains a Professional Development Center, much of the employee training is done by sources outside the State.[8]

Training programs for federal and regional institutions follow curriculums developed for both general and specific administrative needs. For example, the FEI designs a core curriculum to deal with educational and developmental needs of the public administrator as a generalist; the participant takes an active part in role playing and game simulation. FEI training is done on-site, and attendance is selective. Candidates must communicate their interest in a particular seminar, and are then selected by position, need, and space availability. The cost ranges from one thousand to several thousand dollars.[9]

Less expensive and more specific are courses offered by regional training centers. Regional training from the Denver center adds technical and specific training to its curriculum. For example, the Denver Training Center has an extensive computer curriculum. Courses on computer can be taken in Denver, at a local site, or on-line (over the computer). An agency administrator must nominate any potential participant for a regional training program.[10] State and local, as well as national public administrators have an opportunity to participate in training from any of these entities. Agencies may also enhance their own training programs by transferring ideas from regional and national training centers to their own.

Second, the PDC examined existing Montana management developmental training programs. Montana programs include all courses available to new or potential and aspiring managers offered or contracted by the state of Montana. In-house training would keep

costs down, and would benefit more employees. However, according to Linda Davis, Department of Administration Coordinator for the EEO program in Montana, generally, professional development training is provided based first upon need, and then, demand. Because the Professional Development Center (PDC) is supported by revolving funds, not the general fund, training priorities must be carefully set.[11] The Department of Administration identifies problem areas in the workplace, and suggests courses to enhance employees' abilities. Once problem areas have been identified, they are encorporated into training programs by the PDC. Plans for the Montana management training program consists of four sequential seminars: (1) Essentials of Management; (2) Principles of Management; (3) Concepts of Senior Management; and (4) Executive Issues. "Essentials of Management," for example, is comprised of seven interrelated subjects designed to teach first-line managers supervisory skills such as leading, organizing, and delegating.[12] The four-part, sequential management curriculum was to be offered quarterly, July 1984 through December 1985. Currently, management training consists of "Essentials of Management" and "Principles of Management." "Basics of Management" is a newly designed course to be offered beginning in October of 1988. Additional "elective" classes were to be offered to support and expand this management training.[13] According to several sources, periodically, other public institutions and the private sector offer training programs which are available to the general public and to state employees through advertisement.

Davis also explained that in addition to problem areas identified by the Department of Administration, recent Supreme Court cases indicate areas where training is needed. For instance, for recent rulings on sexual harassment, wrongful discharge, and recruitment and selection, classes must be designed and implemented to acquaint employees with the new rulings and their potential impact upon the workplace. As in the case of sexual harassment, employees and administrators must be made aware of the subtle differences that exist between sexes in the workplace. These differences are sometimes discriminatory elements built into the system. As Davis sees it, the job of the PDC is to make employees aware of the far reaching implications of new rulings and policies. Montana training programs deal mainly with, "diversity in the workplace (i.e., people, situations, problems)."[14]

The PDC collects information, designs programs, and then, implements them. After new training programs have been integrated and tested for their utility, city government and private sector personnel are given an opportunity to enroll in the new training seminars. Training seminars may then go to field offices around the state. Both Linda Davis and Ron Wilson, EEO/Disabled Employment Specialist, believe that, in Montana, state professional development is the pacesetter for private industry. They feel that the state responds quickly to legislative suggestion.[15]

Current Status

In spite of the efforts to eliminate employment barriers, the, "representation of women in state jobs indicates mixed success during FY86."[16] Women continue to be underrepresented in administrative categories as is explained in Table 1.

TABLE 1.* Representation of Women in the Montana Labor Force Compared to Montana State Government

Job Category	%Female in Labor Force	% Female in State Government
Managers and Administrators	30.6	17.1
Professionals	49.1	37.0
Clerical	81.8	89.8
Protective Services	11.3	7.5
Technicians	49.3	53.3
Crafts	5.2	1.7
Others	34.6	45.4
TOTAL	42.6	45.4

*Montana Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action Programs, Report to the Governor, (Helena: Department of Administration, [1986]), p. 20.

Table 1 shows that 17.1% of the females in government during 1986 held management/administrative jobs. According to the FY85-86 report, this was a .2% decline in the number of females in the administrative category from 1985.[17] Some reasons cited for the decline have been traditional attitudes, lack of education

and skills, revenue shortfalls, and no new hiring. With cutback management, state affirmative action efforts seem to be concentrated on preserving existing programs. Table 1 also suggests that Private Sector bureaucracy is more representative than Public Sector bureaucracy.

Affirmative action may be particularly difficult to achieve when one realizes that Montana does not have a comprehensive merit system. "Vacancies can be filled without resort to a formal process of interviewing, screening, and justifying."[18] For instance, a governor may wish to make an appointment or place staff personnel in a particular job to create a bureaucracy more vigorous and responsive to the electorate. When a job becomes vacant, he puts pressure on the agency administrator to hire his choice.[19] Yet, recent Supreme Court decisions have further emphasized the need for affirmative action, particularly in regard to the representation of women.

Since there are fewer women in the selection/recruitment pools for higher level managers, the State of Montana wants to provide more opportunities for females to advance. According to Ron Wilson of the State Personnel Division, the State is compiling information on management training for women in an attempt to create management training programs which will better prepare women for the administrative selection pool.[20] It is with this intent that the research surveyed women administrators. The interpretation and analysis of the survey data will be reported in Chapter 4.

Notes

[1] James J. Lopach, ed., We the People of Montana... (Missoula, Montana: Mountain Press, 1983), viii.

[2] Ibid., p. 292.

[3] Montana, Department of Labor and Industry, Montana Women In The '80's, (Helena: Research and Analysis Bureau, 1985), 143-150.

[4] Montana, Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action Programs, Report to the Governor, ([Helena: Department of Administration, 1986]), 7.

[5] Montana, Department of Highways, Affirmative Action Plan, (Helena: 1986), 3.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Montana, Department of Administration, Professional Development Center, The Management Development Program: Essentials of Management, (Helena: 1985).

[8] Betty Morris, telephone interview with author, 16 April 1986.

[9] U.S., Office of Personnel Management, Federal Executive Institute: Program Announcement, (Charlottesville: 1985).

[10] U.S., Office of Personnel Management, Schedule and Catalog, (Denver: 1987).

[11] Linda Davis, interview with author, 20 June 1988.

[12] Essentials of Management, op. cit.

[13] Morris, loc. cit.

[14] Davis, loc. cit.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Report to the Governor, op. cit., p. 18.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Lopach, op. cit., p. 133.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ron Wilson, interview with author, 20 June 1988.

CHAPTER 4

SURVEY METHODS AND RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to further examine the prospects for enhancing the recruitment/selection pool of women in administrative jobs in Montana government. The chapter will research attitudes and perceptions of female administrators to determine: (1) whether women who have had management training prior to their selection/promotion perceived that training as a factor in their selection/promotion (H^1); and (2) whether female administrators perceive that more or different training needs to be offered to increase the number of women in the administrative selection pool (H^2).

Caveats of the Research

In order to evaluate the needs of females in or aspiring to administrative roles, it is important to assess the perceptions of current female administrators, be they similar or different from male administrators. Therefore, women administrators were used, solely, in this survey.

This research, among other things, will evaluate the effectiveness of management training programs for the state of Montana. Montana's management developmental training programs will not be compared with other states' programs, but with programs of the

Office of Personnel Management (OPM) at the Federal and Regional levels.

Last, since Montana is suffering from an economic drain, and cutback government spending, many potential and actual training programs have been reduced or eliminated.[1] Therefore, training that might have been available may no longer be.

Survey Methods

The population of the survey was identified by the EEO Division of the Montana Department of Administration, and was comprised of 105 women administrators in Category A (Officials/Administrators), grades 12 and above, as of June 30, 1986. While the population included women managers throughout the state, the survey population did not include administrators from universities, nor did it include elected or appointed officials or members of their staff.

The following two research questions and hypotheses were constructed for evaluation:

1. Do women administrators who had management training prior to their selection/promotion perceive that training was a factor in their selection/promotion?

2. In women administrators' perceptions, does more or different management training need to be offered in order to increase the number of women in the administration selection pool?

H^1 Women administrators who had management training prior to their selection/promotion perceived that training was a factor in their selection/promotion.

H^2 In women administrators' perceptions, more and different management training needs to be offered in order to increase the number of women in the administrative selection pool.

The questionnaire was designed to do the following: (1) to test the hypotheses; and (2) to seek possible solutions to the underrepresentation of women in high government positions. The survey tool (see Appendix A) consisted of 25 closed ended questions, the response categories of twelve of which were divided into two Likert Scales to measure administrator attitudes about training. One of the scales asked the respondents to rate (i.e., strongly agree...strongly disagree) statements about Montana management training programs. The expectation would be that the answers to the "yes-no" questions would correlate with similar questions in the two scales. The second Likert scale, rated from 0-4, made an inquiry about the content of existing management programs.

Besides the quantitative questions, two open ended qualitative questions were asked so that survey respondents could voice opinions or make recommendations about the management training available.

The surveys were sent to Ron Wilson, EEO/AA Personnel Specialist, at the Department of Administration in mid-April, 1987.

Wilson added a memo to the survey, and then, identified and sent the questionnaires to the respective administrators. Respondents were located both in Helena and in field offices. Of the 105 female administrators surveyed, 69 (66%) filled out and returned their questionnaires by May 15, 1987. Returned survey results were compiled using percentages.

Survey Analysis

This research determined the extent to which present women managers in Montana government who had had management training perceived that training was a factor in their selection or promotion. Table 2 displays the results of three "yes-no" questions concerning management training programs.

TABLE 2. Yes-No Questions About Management Training Programs.

Question	% Yes	% No	% No Response	Total
Mgmt. development training prior to hiring.	40.6	47.8	11.6	69
Montana training programs adequate.	36.2	26.0	37.7	69
Agency has own mgmt. training programs.	15.9	68.1	15.9	69

40.6% of the respondents had had management developmental training prior to their selection. Of those, 51% perceived that the training was "partly" responsible for their selection/promotion (see Appendix D). Three (6%) had received their management training from

their college curriculum, and two (4%) cited "limited" management training from their agency employers. Three respondents did not know whether training helped, and one respondent thought that the question was not applicable. Of those who responded that they had not had training prior to hiring or promotion (See question #4, Appendix A), three (6%) attributed their promotion "partly" to on-the-job training. One administrator stated that her promotion was "entirely" due to training because she, "had training through the years, but no in-depth training regarding (her) new position at (the) time of hire." On-the-job training had an impact on the promotion of this woman, and must not be overlooked as a source of training.

From a review of the first hypothesis, one could conclude that the majority of women did not receive management training prior to their hiring or promotion, and of those who did, only 51% perceived that training was a factor in their selection or promotion. Second, there was not enough evidence to conclude whether the available training was perceived as adequate. Finally, a more significant finding was that 68.1% of the respondents reported that there were no agency training programs available to them.

Next, the analysis reviewed the findings of the second hypothesis to see if administrators perceived that more or different training would benefit aspiring female managers. Program content questions were of particular importance to the Department of Administration, since a 1986 report to the Governor recommended an executive development program which would help, "overcome employment

barriers to women...to allow women to gain qualifications through a means other than traditional job experience."[2]

Content questions were constructed from a list of programs common to the OPM training courses and divided into two Likert scales. The OPM training paradigm includes developing: communication skills, management strategies for improving productivity, planning, role expectations and responsibilities, and applying role expectations and responsibilities (see also, Chapter 3).

The first Likert scale (Table 3) was a series of questions designed to test the knowledge and attitudes of administrators about Montana management training. 62.3% replied that there were management training programs, but only 43.5% responded that programs were available to potential managers. 49.2% affirmed the need for more specialized training, while 14.5% disagreed, and 17.4% did not know if more specialized training was needed.

There was agreement by 46.3% of the respondents that agency administrators were supportive after training, helped to apply training and encouraged further learning, and 49.2% agreement that government agencies support centralized training. The two final questions in Table 3 dealt with training accessibility. When asked if training programs were readily accessible to employees, 33.3% agreed, and 34.8% disagreed. 13% were undecided. Possible variables responsible for the administrators' differences in responses to this last question might have been: (1) potential managers are recommended for training by agency administrators; (2) training might not have

been advertised well enough; (3) training might have been offered only within certain agencies; and (4) financing for training in some agencies might have been limited or unavailable.

TABLE 3. Perceptions about Montana Management Training.

Question % that:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR*	Total
State of Montana provides training programs for managers.	7.2	55.1	7.2	10.1	1.5	18.8	69
Training programs are provided for potential managers.	2.9	40.6	20.3	14.5	2.9	18.8	69
Need to offer more specialized training.	21.7	27.5	17.4	13.0	1.5	18.8	69
Agency admin. is supportive after the training.	7.2	39.1	17.4	13.0	4.3	18.8	69
Government agencies support centralized training programs.	7.2	42.0	11.6	17.4	2.9	18.8	69
Training programs are readily accessible to employees.	5.8	27.5	13.0	26.1	8.7	18.8	69
Women are encouraged to enroll in management training programs.	2.9	34.8	24.6	14.5	2.9	20.3	69

NR* is no response.

37.7% of the women managers felt encouraged to enroll in management training programs while 17.4% did not, and 24.6% were undecided.

The second Likert scale (Table 4) asked administrators to rate the extent to which specific content was emphasized in Montana

management training. The respondents were told to rate their perceptions from 0 (non-existent) to 4 (strongly emphasized).

TABLE 4. Program Content Questions.

Question	% of: 0	1	2	3	4	NR*	Total
What extent is improvement of managerial comm. skills stressed in mgmt.training	0.00	2.9	14.5	27.5	18.8	36	69
Are strategies taught for improving performance and productivity	0.00	8.7	8.7	44.9	4.3	33	69
Does mgmt. training teach how to implement improvement plans and strategies	1.5	7.2	21.7	29.0	4.3	36	69
Are mgmt. trainees taught role expectations and responsibilities	1.5	10.2	26.1	18.8	5.8	38	69
Are management trainees taught to apply those expectation and responsibilities to themselves.	1.5	13.0	23.2	18.8	7.2	36	69

NR* is no response.

In Table 4, 46.3% of the administrators answering this set of questions gave high ratings (3-4) to the emphasis placed on communication training. An even higher percent, 49.2, rated the second question (Are strategies taught for improving performance and productivity?) a 3 or better. The implementation of improvement planning and strategy training were rated lower (2-3) by 50.7% of the respondents. The last two questions, pertaining to the teaching and

application of role expectations and responsibilities, were perceived as having been given the least emphasis, the largest number of responses having been rated a "2".

In question five, respondents perceived that training about the application of role expectations and responsibilities, was average, and 66% of the respondents rated it a 2 or 3. Again, these questions were formulated from management training programs offered by the OPM, the content of which corresponds to the Montana "Essentials of Management" program. Responses might have been due to a variety of factors such as perceptions, question interpretation, and program nomenclature. Finally, female administrators were given the opportunity to write comments and make recommendations.

The open ended questions allowed administrators to express their feelings about Montana training programs. The administrators were asked two open ended questions: (1) What component of managerial training would you most like to change; and (2) Do you have any comments/recommendations. The responses were categorized into two general areas--problems and needs.

The responses to the first question were divided into three problem areas: (1) budget shortfalls; (2) unavailability of training; and (3) poor training schedules. In the second area, there were three needs: (1) communications; (2) more specific or different training; and (3) prepromotion training. There was also a category for "other."

Responding to the budget shortfall, one administrator summed up the feeling, "It is hard to find training dollars in tight state

budgets, and this may keep good people from getting the training." The second and third perceived problems concerned the training itself, its availability and timing. Respondents who were in the field, or who had not had access to training wanted it; and those who had received management training thought that it was too limited or poorly scheduled. The respondents requested training over a longer period of time to accommodate specific needs. Several others wanted "refresher" courses. The miscellaneous category spoke to the performance appraisal system, and to top management support.

The second area of responses was employee needs. One group of respondents stressed the need to work on communications from the top levels down, and throughout the agencies. Another group of administrators addressed different training (i.e., new management styles, motivation, specialized management, situational management). And yet, a third group expressed a desire for prepromotion training for both administrators and potential administrators. One administrator said, "Many managers are thrust in without proper training. This is being set up to fail."

The answers to the second open ended question (Do you have any comments/recommendations?) resembled those of the first question, but revealed two additional categories--discrimination and practicality.

The discrimination issue addressed the lack of women between Grades 18 and 20, and above Grade 20 (agency heads and governor appointees). The, "Montana classification system shows almost no women above Grade 18, and none above Grade 20. One subcategory of

the second question addressed the need for practicality and ascending the hierarchy on your own. "Those who are truly interested and motivated for that next promotion will show that they are by investing their personal time (and money) to acquire the necessary skills and background."

There were several other comments praising the Professional Development Center (PDC) for current programs; asking for more consistency in training; noting the improvements in state government over the past five years; and requesting time management courses.

Results

The findings of this research substantiate the data in earlier discussions stating that once on the job, women remain clustered in lower level positions. Results of the survey indicated that 51% of the women administrators who had management training prior to their selection/promotion perceived that training was a factor in their selection/promotion. However, 68.1% of the survey respondents reported that there was no agency training available to them. These two facts are consistent with the responses to the open ended questions in the survey.

The majority of the respondents took time to answer the open ended questions, and articulated their attitudes about and needs for management training. Of the 69 respondents, 49.2% expressed a need for more and different training. A review of the comments indicated that: (1) there was not enough training to increase the number of females in the recruitment/selection pool; (2) there was indecision

about the amount of training that existed after selection; and (3) there was minimal training available after hiring to enhance job success and develop skills for promotion. The findings of the first hypothesis leads to yet another investigation.

In the Chapter 2 literature review, passive representation was addressed as a possible solution to underrepresentation. Frederick Mosher and others contend that more equal representation for women will take time, and become more of a reality as women become better educated and more visible. Of the 69 respondents to the questionnaire, 65% of the female administrators surveyed possessed some education above the high school level, and 55% held at least one college degree. The lack of a formal education does not appear to be the key factor in keeping women out of top level positions. But, with further examination, the findings revealed that 87% of the respondents were hired or promoted from other agencies or from within the agency. When other questions were examined, it was found that 41% of the 69 respondents were promoted from four to nine years ago, while only 29% had been promoted within the last three years. These figures suggest that women are not rapidly ascending the career ladder. A large percentage of the administrative promotions were made some time ago, and promotions are now on the decline for women. Passive representation is not effective enough to increase the current recruitment/selection pool. A more active path to representation needs to be researched.

Notes

[1] Betty Morris, telephone interview with author, 16 April 1986.

[2] Montana, Equal Employment and Affirmative Action Programs, Report to the Governor, ([Helena: Department of Administration, 1986]), 21.

CHAPTER 5

THE FINAL ANALYSIS

Representative Bureaucracy is a valuable democratic concept,[1] but it has not been achieved. Women, particularly women administrators, are underrepresented in Montana Government as well as in the U.S. Government. Noting that personnel practices have been discriminatory against women, it has been the focus of this research to investigate ways of increasing the number of females in the administrative selection pool.

This study began by defining the concept of Representative Bureaucracy, and then applying it to the U. S., particularly to the female population. This research reviewed relevant literature and legislation affecting representativeness in an attempt to familiarize the reader with the barriers deterring Representative Bureaucracy. Because representation is moving at such a slow pace,[2] recent U. S. Supreme Court decisions have been handed down which support goals and plans to remedy past discrimination of protected classes.

In the State of Montana, George Turman, Acting Governor, in Executive Order 24-81, recommitted Montana to Equal Employment Opportunity, and declared that a goal of the State of Montana was to eliminate discrimination barriers throughout state government. Since one of the most underrepresented groups in Montana is women administrators, this research examined management

training as a means of increasing the number of women in the administrative selection pool.

A survey instrument was distributed to female administrators in Category A, of the Montana Government to gather perceptions of those administrators by qualitative and quantitative means. The responses were analyzed to form conclusions about existing management training programs in Montana Government.

Conclusions

The data suggests that in order for women to become administrators, they must be able to compete in the administrative selection pool. However, the evidence indicates that structural and cultural barriers preclude women from competing in that pool. While Frederick Mosher and others contend that time will take care of underrepresentation once women gain a formal education, experience, and visibility,[3] time is not in the best interest of those victimized by the system. Thus, laws and court decisions have provided avenues to help alleviate the injustice of past discrimination and move closer towards Representative Bureaucracy.

The analysis of the research revealed that education seems to be a factor in the recruitment/selection process, but not necessarily the key factor. Further, past practice has been for agencies to promote from within. 87% of those women in administrative jobs were promoted from across agencies or from within their own agency. However, the number of promotions has decreased in the last few years. According to James F. Wolf, et al., promotion slowdowns will

become even more prevalent for at least the next ten years.[4] Steps must be taken to help women obtain administrative positions.

Recommendations

To move closer to Representative Bureaucracy and to increase the number of women in the administrative selection pool, it is imperative that the State of Montana firmly commit itself to Affirmative Action and other measures which will result in the hiring, promotion, and appointing of women into top management jobs, in spite of cutback spending and promotion slowdowns.

In most cases Affirmative Action plans are in place, but since Affirmative Action is a voluntary process, maybe agencies need to set goals to strengthen the commitment to promoting women. Goals and timetables worked during the 1970's,[5] and indeed, they exist today. Morever, perhaps a government "blueprint for success", which commits State agencies verbally or in writing and gives not only attention, but financial support to Affirmative Action Plans needs to be a priority. Visibility and acceptance of women will probably not result from a token woman here and there, but emphasize the "exceptional woman syndrome." A monitoring and evaluation system exists for EEO and AA, but it is not a force to be reckoned with. The State should make Affirmative Action a priority, and bring pressure to bear upon those agencies not recognizing and honoring the State's committment. In addition to recognition and active support of Affirmative Action Plans, the state needs to commit itself to training and financial support.

Training for potential and aspiring administrators needs to be offered. If agency training is not an alternative, perhaps centralized training would be. Women who have management interests or needs, but who are not selected to participate, or are not employed by the state must be invited to participate.

Centralized training would mean that training could be offered to larger numbers of employees, in Helena. Field administrators could be brought to Helena, motor there for weekend classes, or attend classes at field locations once a program has been declared successful. Participants would have an opportunity to partake of a diversity of training programs. They would be able to interact with and learn from other participants as well as the instructor. Employees could form networks and could participate in group problem solving.[6]

Since cutback management is a fact, and the PDC sustains itself by a revolving fund, centralized training might also be more cost effective. Costs could be shared, tuition charged, or assessment fees could be levied. Examining the alternatives, it might be possible for administrators or experts to donate their time teaching specific units or lessons, or conduct group sessions.

It is recommended that training courses be offered over several weeks' time, or in week long seminars. In-depth studies (i.e., case studies and role playing) allow participants to integrate lessons into real situations, and then give and get feedback. Feedback allows the participant to apply what s/he has learned, and to provide valuable program information to the instructors.[7]

In order for management training to reach those for whom it is designed, courses should be scheduled at convenient times. Convenient times could mean offering classes in the evening or on weekends. As was mentioned in the survey responses (see Appendix B), many people are too busy with their work to get away during the day.

Finally, since the research shows that there is a need for specialized and different training, the State of Montana needs to design programs similar to those offered by the OPM. The OPM has found that, "The Management Excellence Framework (MEF), a competency-based model of effective managerial performance" works best for training Federal managers.[8] The MEF is descriptive, and identifies common indicators of managerial effectiveness in a three dimensional model: (1) management functions; (2) effectiveness characteristics; and (3) management level. Any employee can be trained by first determining the appropriate management level, and then, by defining skills and duties associated with that level of management. The effective manager understands the scope and substance of h/her job (see also, Chapter 3).

An aware and firmly committed state government, with a plan of action, and a diversified management training program, scheduled at convenient times, and widely advertised, should draw wide interest from the female population, and thereby contribute to the increase in the number of women in the administrative pool.

Notes

[1] Frederick C. Mosher, Democracy and Public Service, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 17.

[2] Charles Levine, "Beyond The Sound and Fury Of Quotas And Targets," Public Administration Review 34 (May/June 1974): 240.

[3] Mosher, op. cit., 223-224.

[4] James F. Wolf et al., "Greying at the Temples: Demographics of a Public Service Occupation," Public Administration Review 48 (March/April 1987): 204.

[5] Joseph Cayer and Lee Sigelmen, "Minorities and Women in State and Local Government: 1973-1975," Public Administration Review 40 (Sept./Oct. 1980): 449.

[6] Gerald L. Wilson, et al., Organizational Communication (New York: Harper & Row, 1986), p. 107. Wilson, Goodall, and Waagen explain that through networks, formal and informal, employees can "learn the ropes" of the organization. Networks allow the group members to collect, disperse, and exchange information.

[7] Joseph S. Wholey, Evaluation and Effective Public Management (Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1983), p. 109. Joseph Wholey stresses the need for rapid-feedback evaluation for "quick preliminary program assessments.

[8] U. S. Office of Personnel Management, Programs of Executive Seminar Centers 1987, Kings Point, New York.

REFERENCES CITED

REFERENCES

"Affirmative Action Watch." The Collegiate Career Woman 2 (Winter 1984/85): 9.

Beaumont, Enid F. "A Pivotal Point For The Merit Concept." Public Administration Review 34, no. 5 (September/October 1974): 426-430.

Cayer, Joseph and Lee Sigelmen. "Minorities and Women in State and Local Government: 1973-1975." Public Administration Review 40, no. 5 (Sept./Oct. 1980): 443-450.

Couturier, Jean J. "Civil Rights In Civil Service." Public Administration Review 34, no. 3 (May/June 1974): 243.

Davis, Linda. Personal interview. 20 June 1988.

Dometrius, Nelson C. and Lee Sigelman. "Assessing Progress Toward Affirmative Action Goals in State and Local Government: A Benchmark." Public Administration Review 44, no. 3 (May/June 1984): 241-246.

Gallas, Nesta M. "Representativeness: A New Merit Principle." Public Personnel Management Journal 1 (Spring 1985): 25-31.

Kingsley, J. Donald. Representative Bureaucracy. Yellow Springs, OH: Antioch Press, 1944.

Kranz, Harry. "Are Merit and Equity Compatible." Public Administration Review 34, no. 5 (September/October 1974): 434-440.

Krislov, Samuel. Representative Bureaucracy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Levine, Charles. "Beyond The Sound And Fury Of Quotas And Targets." Public Administration Review 32, no. 3 (May/June 1974): 240-242.

Lewis, Gregory B. "Progress Toward Racial and Sexual Equality in the Federal Civil Service?" Public Administration Review 48, no. 3 (May/June 1988): 705.

Lopach, James J., ed. We the People of Montana.... Missoula: Mountain Press, 1983.

Lynn, Naomi B. and Richard E. Vaden. "Toward a Non-Sexist Personnel Opportunity Structure: The Federal Executive Bureaucracy." Public Personnel Management 4 (July/August 1979): 209-215.

Meier, Kenneth John and Lloyd G. Nigro. "Representative Bureaucracy and Policy Preferences: A Study in the Attitudes of Federal Executives." Public Administration Review 36, no. 4 (July/August 1976): 458-569.

Montana Department of Administration. Equal Employment and Affirmative Action Programs. Report to the Governor. [Helena: Department of Administration, 1986].

Montana Department of Administration. Professional Development Center. The Management Development Program: Essentials of Management. [Helena: Department of Administration].

Montana Department of Highways. Affirmative Action Plan. [Helena: Department of Administration, 1986].

Montana Department of Labor and Industry. Montana Women In The 80's. Research & Analysis Bureau. [Helena: Department of Administration, 1985].

Morris, Betty. Telephone interview. 16 April 1986.

Mosher, Frederick C. Democracy and the Public Service. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Rader, Martha. "Evaluating a Management Development Program for Women." Public Personnel Management 3 (May/June 1979): 138-146.

Rehfuss, John A. "A Representative Bureaucracy? Women and Minority Executives in the California Career Service." Public Administration Review 46, no. 5 (September/October 1986): 454-460.

"Responsive." The American Heritage Dictionary.

Rosen, Bernard. "Affirmative Action Produces Equal Employment Opportunities For All." Public Administration Review 32, no. 3 (May/June 1974): 237-239.

Slack, James D. "Affirmative Action and City Managers: Attitudes Toward Recruitment of Women." Public Administration Review 48, no. 2 (March/April 1987): 199-206.

Subramaniam, V. "Representative Bureaucracy: A Reassessment." American Political Science Review 61, no. 4 (December 1967): 1010-1019.

Tummala, Krishna K. "Merit And/Or Equity In Public Service." Public Personnel Policy: The Politics of Civil Service. Ed. David Rosenbloom. Port Washington: Associated Faculty Press, 1985.

U.S. Department of Commerce. 1980 Census of Population: Characteristics of the Population. vol. 1. Bureau of the Census. [Washington: GPO, 1983].

U.S. Office of Personnel Management. Federal Executive Institute: Program Announcement. Charlottesville, Virginia: 1987. See also, U.S. Office of Personnel Management. Programs of the Executive Seminar Centers 1987. Office of Training and Development. Washington, D.C.: 1987.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management. Programs of Executive Seminar Centers 1987. Kings Point, New York.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management. Schedule and Catalog. Denver: 1987.

U.S. Supreme Court. U.S. Reports 401: Amendments of Rules. October 1970. Washington: GPO, 1971.

Vertz, Laura L. "Women, Occupational Advancement, and Mentoring: An Analysis of One Public Organization." Public Administration Review 45, no. 3 (May/June 1985): 415-423.

Wholey, Joseph S. Evaluation and Effective Public Management. Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1983.

Wilson, Gerald, et al. Organizational Communication. New York: Harper & Row, 1986.

Wilson, Ron. Personal interview. 20 June 1988.

Wolf, James F. et al. "Greying at the Temples: Demographics of a Public Service Occupation." Public Administration Review 48, no. 2 (March/April 1987): 190-198.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER.

1. What is your grade or GS rating?
   ____9-12
   ____13-14
   ____15-18
   ____above

2. Were you:
   ____hired externally (outside of government)
   ____hired from another government agency
   ____hired from the federal or another state government
   ____promoted from within the agency

3. If you were promoted from within the agency, how long ago did the promotion take place?
   ____1-5 months
   ____6-11 months
   ____1-3 years
   ____4-9 years
   ____10-15 years
   ____longer

4. Did you have management development training prior to your hiring or promotion?
   ____yes
   ____no

5. Was management development training a factor in your promotion?
   ____entirely
   ____partly
   ____no

6. (IF THE ANSWER TO THE ABOVE QUESTION WAS "NO", THEN GO ON TO NUMBER 7.) If the answer to number 6 was either "entirely" or "partly", then answer this question.

   How long were you employed before you had the training?
   ____1 year
   ____2-4 years
   ____5-10 years
   ____longer

7. What is your age category?
   ____18-21
   ____22-29
   ____30-39
   ____40-49
   ____50-59
   ____60+

8. What level of education did you last complete?
   ___elementary
   ___high school
   ___G.E.D.
   ___vo-tech/2-year program
   ___BA/BS
   ___Master's
   ___PhD
   ___other

9. What is your ethnic/racial affiliation?
   ___White
   ___Black
   ___Hispanic
   ___Oriental
   ___Native American
   ___Other

In the next set of questions, we would like you to rate your agreement or disagreement with each of the statements. You should rate them according to whether you: strongly agree, agree, are undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree. For example, if I were to give you the statement, "Montana is a large state," you would probably strongly agree since it is the fourth largest state. But, if I were to give you the statement, "Coal is our number one industry," you would probably disagree strongly since Montana has coal, but coal is not the foremost industry.

Now, please read the statements, and then check the response that best fits your perception of the statement.

10. The state of Montana provides training programs for managers.

__Strongly agree __Agree __Undecided __Disagree __Strongly disagree

11. The state provides training programs for potential managers.

__Strongly agree __Agree __Undecided __Disagree __Strongly disagree

12. The state of Montana needs to offer more specialized training.

__Strongly agree __Agree __Undecided __Disagree __Strongly disagree

13. Agency administration is supportive after the training.

__Strongly agree __Agree __Undecided __Disagree __Strongly disagree

14. Montana agencies support centralized training programs.

__Strongly agree __Agree __Undecided __Disagree __Strongly disagree

15. Training programs are readily accessible to employees.

__Strongly agree __Agree __Undecided __Disagree __Strongly disagree

16. Women are encouraged to enroll in management training programs.

__Strongly agree __Agree __Undecided __Disagree __Strongly disagree

(IF YOU HAVE NOT HAD MANAGEMENT TRAINING FROM THE STATE OF MONTANA, GO TO QUESTION 25.) The next set of questions are to be rated on a scale of 0-4, 4 being the highest, and 0 being the lowest or nonexistent. For example, if you were asked to rank the importance of water, you would probably rank it a 4 since man cannot live for very long without water. Circle the number that you think best answers the question.

17. To what extent is improvement of managerial communication skills stressed in management training (i.e., leadership, communication, influence)?

___0___1___2___3___4

18. To what extent are strategies taught for improving performance and productivity?

___0___1___2___3___4

19. To what extent does management training teach how to implement improvement plans and strategies?

___0___1___2___3___4

20. To what extent are management trainees taught role expectations and responsibilities?

___0___1___2___3___4

21. To what extent are management trainees taught to apply those expectations and responsibilities to themselves?

___0___1___2___3___4

22. Do you find Montana management training programs adequate?
____yes
____no

23. Does your agency have its own management training programs?
____yes
____no

24. What component of managerial training would you most like to change? Why?

25. Do you have any comments/recommendations?

Return by: May 15, 1987

A stamped envelope and mailing address have been provided. Just fold the survey so that the address appears in the envelope window. Thanks.

Please return to: Michele Janota
418 W. Babcock, Apt. C
Bozeman, MT 59715

APPENDIX B

QUALITATIVE RESPONSES

24. What component of managerial training would you most like to change?

Problem: Non-availability:

Having only attended one, I am limited in my ability to adequately address this question. Basically, there have been few courses offered, and never are they offered in the Eastern part of the state.

Have more training offered in Lewistown.

If one has not been to a managerial training, you can't say what component to change.

Would like to have more local training on handling difficult staff; how to develop and carry out corrective action plans; and how to work with legislature (lobbying).

I would just like more training in any area, but don't expect it because of the budget.

More training. Better planning.

Problem: Scheduling:

Workshops that are held at regular intervals, over a period of time, are more useful in that the material can be applied/tested and then reworked.

Institute a "brush up" course yearly to reinforce what you've learned--a refresher.

Would like to have it in smaller blocks of time or evenings to facilitate attendance. It is hard to get away for two or more days. I signed up once, but had to cancel due to other priorities and deadlines.

The managerial training I have received was an excellent two day course. "Refresher" courses could possibly be beneficial.

Training is oriented to private enterprise. It does not cross over to good application within the governmental units.

Don't cram so much in such a short time, and follow up training at spaced intervals. It takes approximately twenty-one days to break bad habits--perfect. Practice makes perfect.

Problem: Budget Shortfall:

It is hard to find training dollars in tight state budgets, and this may keep some good people from getting the training.

State legislature doesn't support training programs and is loathe to fund them!

I would like to see it made more readily available to agencies at a reasonable cost.

Should be less expensive. Agencies can no longer afford these charges.

Need: Communications Training

Communications. Most important aspect of working with, for, and supervising others.

More emphasis on handling people; continue stressing communications.

More training for upper level management such that their skills are as good as ours.

State government offers a restrictive environment with rigid chains of commands and limited opportunities for change, feedback, and new ideas. Employees feel frustrated, isolated, and apprehensive. Management should develop training and procedures within each department to develop goals and incentives to improve morale.

Need: Pre-promotion Training

Process used to screen and hire subordinates. It seems so much is left to an individual's own interpretation. All the court action over hiring has us paranoid in our selection process.

I'd like to see pre-promotion classes offered which would give people a chance to role-play management roles, enabling them to see if that sort of job "fits" them.

Need for potential managers to come along. Generally have been pleased with workshops.

"Beef up" the role expectations, responsibilities and realities.

More training for new hirees because, currently, it is "sink or swim."

Definitely need specific management training prior to job entry. Many managers are thrust in without proper training. This is being set up to fail.

Need: Different Training

Should be geared to the new management styles. Montana is still suffering from male dominated, non-feeling, non-caring management.

Motivation--in state government. Incentives are very limited. It would be nice to have new methods of motivating employees.
I think in state government it needs to be more specialized since most managers are working managers--such as centralized services managers, program managers, etc.

I would give more specific examples of use of managerial principles, or results of non-use. I think the principles are more of less common sense.

Other

Unsure

Top management support. The state has an excellent management program, but it is not integrated into overall personal management. Training, in my opinion, should be required for certain positions. State departments are very different in their attitude toward training, and the Governor's Office is unsupportive of the very concept of training.

Don't get me started. It's a whole essay.

Performance appraisal system--it doesn't work.

25. Do you have any comments/recommendations?

Convince management of the importance of training.

Problem: Discrimination

I think training is important, but also something needs to be done about the discrimination. In our agency, the majority of the employees are women. However, the Governor brings in outside men to be our top managers.

The ICCW has been a great organization to make people aware of women in the workplace and the needs of women in the work force. I think there is a big gap in state government when it comes to promoting and training women. Even of women receive the training, it is still a fight to get the position.

Montana classification system shows almost no women above Grade 18 and none above Grade 20. This information is no longer reported in EEO/AA reports.

Problem: Budget

There are various courses available; however, the budgets do not always allow participation. Cost of attending has risen to compound problem.

Although there is a perceived commitment by the Department of Administration that managerial training is necessary for effective and responsible state government, the failure of the legislature to appropriate funds makes it a moot point. Even when there are workshops offered which I would like to attend, or send other staff to, we have no money to pay for the registration.
Rhetoric aside, is there money in the budget for training? That's the real test.

Funding levels have prevented me and potential staff from attending any training this past year. I feel good training is available (through PDC) and private training firms, but not within agencies.

Need: Field Training

It is difficult for Eastern Montana to participate in ongoing, in-depth programs. Should consider more packaged material on-site.

Would like to see more training locally so don't have to travel.

Need: Management Training

State government should develop a progressive managerial training program, and then give recognition to the individuals that seek advancement. At present, the key to promotion is: No. 1- a degree; and No. 2-years of service.

More time management and motivational type training.

The only management training which I believe is good was developed for State Government managers is the "Essentials of Management" coursework sponsored by the Professional Development Center at the

Department of Administration. Jim Burgess is the training manager. These sessions are very good, and would be valuable for state employees. My ratings throughout this exclude their workshops as I would rate all their work that I have been exposed to very highly. I just don't feel that that is enough training for managers. My department has never offered any management supervision training for state office workers that I am aware of, and I have received promotions in the past few years. A tragedy is that top managers do not participate in training sessions when they probably suffer from mis-management the most. Montana government is still ruled by the "Good old boy" male managers. It's tough to survive in this atmosphere.

Management training is great, but does not get taken or is not offered to those that most need it. I have been lucky in being afforded the classes. Many agencies just do not offer training to managers. There needs to be a statewide policy and funds.

Managerial training classes should be made available more often than they are. These classes are so few and far between and when offered have not been convenient to attend.

Training program availability varies from division to division, department to department.

I think the present training needs to be reformatted, given the lack of support from the top. The state's program teaches a series of classes in a management "program" which is ideal and should be a prerequisite to any person assuming supervisory responsibilities. But, since it isn't required, then the training should be offered in small, short, cheap (inexpensive) doses so that it is accessible to the most employees.

Biggest need is for follow-up, ongoing training. Seems like managers get a class or two and then get thrown back into their job with little or no follow-up. They (managers) need to get together in a facilitated environment in which they can talk freely about their management problems and potential solutions. So they can keep thinking about how to be a good manager and keep working on their skills instead of falling back into their old familiar rut.

Need: Practicality

The questionnaire was very difficult to answer since most of the management training at the state is provided once an individual attains a management position. Training relates to hiring, interviews, performance appraisals, state policies, etc. The state of Montana has barely enough money to provide necessary training for employees to keep up in their current positions, and therefore, "trainee" type education is almost non-existent. I think this is as

it should be. Those who are truly interested and motivated for that next promotion will show that they are by investing their personal time (and money) to acquire the necessary skills and background.

I do not believe that generalized "management" training usually accomplishes much or is well-focused. In fact, I'm inclined to see greater abuse, rigidity, non-thinking from managers whose training is management. While exposure to principles/ideas for managing may help, I advocate strongly discipline-based management and a light touch of management training.

The amount of training permitted varies from agency to agency, and even bureau to bureau. Our bureau management is very supportive of training programs and encourages educational development. Other agencies, however, depending on budget and other priorities, discourage training. I don't think training is at all consistent within the state.

This is a resource agency and success for in-house promotion depends heavily on your performing your specific job, your understanding of the content, and your ability to practically apply academic principles to actual situations; also on your ability to focus on the larger picture beyond your specific job, and to exhibit common sense. Management training would have had little effect on promotion to a management level job.

I think the state has improved a great deal in the past five years. We need more women as trainers in all types of training.

Other

Notices of training opportunities are not distributed well. We find out about training more by accident than design. Management training is not encouraged in this agency, but does seem readily approved if the employee requests it.
I'm probably biased.

I appreciate the "Women in Management" and "Essentials of Management" classes. I took the P.D.C.

I have had a lot of management related college courses. I want to add, however, that my employer has been very supportive of my requests to attend meetings of professional associations of which I am a member, and has provided some financial assistance to facilitate my attendance. Tuition waivers are also granted for employees in this office wishing to take college courses at a state supported university or college.

I have taken advantage of some training provided by state administration, but it was not managerial (computer skills).

APPENDIX C

RAW DATA

RESULTS OF SURVEY
Raw Data

1) What is your grade or GS rating?

9 - 12	1
13 - 14	8
15 - 18	39
Above	6

2) How were you Hired ?

Externally	7
From another govt Agency	7
From Federal or Other State Govt	3
Promoted from within agency	50

3) How long ago did the promotion take place ?

1 - 5 months	1
6 - 11 months	3
1 - 3 years	16
4 - 9 years	28
10 - 15 years	2
Longer	3

4) Did you have management developmental training prior to your hiring or promotion ?

Yes	24
No	33

5) Was developmental training a factor in your promotion ?

Entirely	1
Partly	16
No	35

6) How long were you employed before you had the training ?

1 year	5
2 - 4 years	4
5 - 10 years	7
Longer	1

7) What is your age category ?

18 - 21	0
22 - 29	0
30 - 39	9
40 - 49	14
50 - 59	4
Over 60	0

8) What level of education did you last complete?

Elementary	0
High School	10
G.E.D.	2
Vo-Tech/2 yr. Program	0
BA / BS	19
Masters	17
PhD	2
Other	7

9) What is your ethnic / racial affiliation?

White	55
Black	0
Hispanic	0
Oriental	0
Native American	2
Other	0