

2016

Voices of the First Women Leaders in the Federal Bureau of Investigation

Ellen Glasser
University of North Florida

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Suggested Citation

Glasser, Ellen, "Voices of the First Women Leaders in the Federal Bureau of Investigation" (2016). *UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 635.
<https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd/635>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at UNF Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UNF Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [Digital Projects](#).
© 2016 All Rights Reserved

Voices of the First Women Leaders in the Federal Bureau of Investigation

by

Ellen Glasser

A Dissertation submitted to the

Department of Leadership, School Counseling & Sport Management

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Educational Leadership

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

August, 2016

Unpublished work © Ellen Glasser

The dissertation of Ellen Glasser is approved:

Signature Deleted

Elinor A. Scheirer, Ph.D., Chair

Signature Deleted

May 17, 2016
Date

Anne K. Swanson, Ph.D., Committee Member

Signature Deleted

May 17, 2016
Date

Hope E. Wilson, Ph.D., Committee Member

Signature Deleted

May 17, 2016
Date

Georgette E. Dumont, Ph.D., Committee Member

May 17, 2016
Date

Accepting for the Department:

Signature Deleted

Christopher A. Janson, Ph.D., Interim Chair

Leadership, School Counseling, and Sport Management

6/2/2016
Date

Accepting for the College:

Signature Deleted

Marsha H. Lupi, Ed.D., Interim Dean

College of Education & Human Services

June 2, 2016
Date

Accepting for the University:

John Kantner, Ph.D., Dean

The Graduate School

Date

DEDICATION

For Carley, Daisy, Nelle, and Harry

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Over the last eight years, I have often felt alone. Despite being a woman committed to serving others, I have never been the type to ask for help for myself. This journey of writing a dissertation started in my default mode of working quietly and alone, but, along the way, I realized that completion of the task would require me to work with others and to ask for help. Like the participants of my study, I learned that relationships can be empowering and enriching. Many relationships have helped me translate my commitment toward this scholarly endeavor into meaningful action. I am deeply grateful to many people for their love and support as I have grown and evolved.

Words really do fall short when I try to thank the two women who have served as my truest mentors in this journey. First, I must thank Dr. Katherine M. Kasten for serving as my initial dissertation chair. Not only did I feel her unconditional support, she guided me toward an area of research that matched my interests and was relevant to educational leadership. She made sure that my proposal was complete before she retired and that I would be in good hands to conduct my qualitative study. Those caring hands belonged to Dr. Elinor A. Scheirer who has served as my dissertation chair and closest confidante for the last several years. Her wisdom, guidance, and patience have kept me on course. Dr. S. is known for being deeply devoted to all of her students, and I was no exception. I could always count on having her undivided attention for as long as necessary. She and I spent countless hours discussing the direction of my study, but we have also spent many hours talking through other personal and professional matters. She has literally been my lifeline. I could not have crossed the finish line without her.

I must thank the rest of my dissertation committee: Dr. Georgette E. Dumont for her frequent, kind encouragement and her advice related to the government institutions; Dr. Hope E.

Wilson for her interest in my research topic and her keen attention to detail; and Dr. Anne K. Swanson for her willingness to join my committee late in the process and her meaningful feedback on themes within my data. I did not plan for my committee to be entirely comprised of women, but, given the nature of my research, it benefitted me greatly to have a remarkable group of women scholars as committee members.

I must thank other colleagues in the UNF community who have supported, facilitated, and inspired me. Key among them have been Dr. Afesa Adams, Ms. Judy Chacinski, Dr. David Fenner, Dr. Cheryl Fountain, Dr. Sandra Gupton, Dr. Michael Hallett, Dr. Warren Hodge, Dr. Chris Janson, Dr. Joyce Jones, Dr. Chris Rasche, Dr. Pritchey Smith, Ms. Michele Verkerk, and finally, my department chair in the Criminology and Criminal Justice Department, Dr. David Forde. I have gained and learned something of value from each of these fine people. Their interest in my research topic, along with their gifts of time and wisdom, have been deeply appreciated. I would also like to offer a robust “Honk, Honk” as a small thanks to the wonderful flock of Cohort 18 geese who have shared this adventure with me.

I owe a huge debt of gratitude to the women of the FBI who participated in this study. In 2012, when I began work on a project to celebrate the 40th anniversary of female agents in the FBI, the direction of my research became clear for the first time. I knew that the early women leaders in the FBI had powerful experiences and that I was in a unique position to tell their stories. They did not disappoint. I feel privileged that these women trailblazers allowed me to share their voices.

Finally, I must thank the many members of my family who have loved me and shared me with UNF’s Educational Leadership program for the last several years. Thanks to Don and our children Beth, Nate, Carley, Daisy, Nelle, and Harry; they have all cheered me on despite feeling

my absence and the strain of this effort. Thanks to my twin brother—and hero—Robert, who has always inspired me to be the best version of myself. Thanks to my sisters Cynthia, Alane, Pamela, and Janet; they have been the best role models and female leaders I could have possibly known. Thanks to my dear, deceased parents, Irma Lee and Harry, who raised me to believe that I could actually be Miss America, or an FBI Special Agent, or whatever else I wanted to be in life. To my entire family: your unconditional love and support has been deeply felt throughout my life.

To my family, friends, colleagues, supporters, and students: I am very fortunate to have all of you in my life. I know I have never been alone. Thank you all very much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	xii
List of Figures.....	xiii
Abstract.....	xiv
Chapter One: Introduction to Study.....	1
Context for Social Change.....	3
Statement of Problem.....	5
Women in Dangerous Careers.....	6
Military Women.....	7
Policewomen.....	8
G-Women.....	8
Research Question.....	9
Study Design Overview.....	10
Theoretical Framework.....	11
Significance of Study.....	14
Chapter Summaries.....	15
Definition of Terms.....	17
Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature.....	19
The Feminist Perspective.....	20

A Modern Vision.....	21
Historical Feminist Frameworks.....	24
Overview of Feminist Theory.....	26
Feminist Standpoint Theory.....	35
Section Summary.....	38
Nontraditional Women.....	39
Female Leadership.....	39
Nontraditional Occupations.....	43
Women Trailblazers.....	45
Choosing a Career.....	59
Career Self-Efficacy Theory.....	62
Grit.....	65
Section Summary.....	66
Bureaucracy.....	67
Gendered Nature of Organizations.....	70
Tipping Points.....	73
Understanding Gender and Leadership in Organizations.....	74
Organizational Culture.....	77
Equilibrium.....	79
Section Summary.....	80
Conceptual Framework.....	81
Summary of Chapter 2.....	82
Chapter Three: Research Methodology	84

Qualitative Approach.....	85
Researcher as Tool.....	85
Self-Audit.....	87
Interviews.....	92
Participants and Access.....	96
Methodology.....	98
Summary of Chapter 3.....	103
Chapter Four: Data Analysis.....	105
Approach to Analysis.....	106
Educational Criticism.....	108
Use of Memoranda.....	110
Coding and Data Retrieval.....	112
Description Dimension and Typological Analysis.....	113
Typology 1: Women in Nontraditional Careers.....	114
Typology 2: Women Achieving Career Self-Efficacy.....	126
Typology 3: Women as Leaders.....	142
Typology 4: Women Negotiating Bureaucracy.....	163
Interpretation Dimension and Interpretive Analysis.....	184
Metaphors as Heuristic Tools.....	186
Supergirl Metaphor and Feminist Standpoint Theory.....	188
Target Metaphor and Career Self-Efficacy Theory.....	199
Clubhouse Metaphor and Organizational Tenets.....	209
Introduction to Evaluation and Thematics.....	216

Evaluation Dimension.....	217
Moral Obligation as Female Leaders.....	217
Need for Organizational Diversity.....	219
Thematics Dimension.....	222
Theme 1: Occupational Pride as Women.....	223
Theme 2: Challenge to Manage Multiple Roles.....	224
Theme 3: Inadequate Support through Relationships.....	225
Theme 4: Range in Feminist Views.....	227
Summary of Chapter 4.....	232
Chapter Five: Summary and Implications.....	234
Summary of the Literature.....	236
Summary of Research Methodology.....	247
Summary of Data Analysis	250
Limitations of the Study.....	259
Implications for Educational Leadership.....	261
Recommendations for Future Studies.....	263
Conclusions.....	265
Summary of Chapter 5.....	267
References.....	269
Appendix A: Archived FBI Memoranda	293
Appendix B: Factors and Items in Grit Scale.....	301
Appendix C: Developing the Conceptual Framework.....	302
Appendix D: Sample Interview Guide.....	303

Appendix E: Sample Questionnaire	304
Appendix F: Key to Data Coding.....	306
Appendix G: Key to FBI Terminology	307
Appendix H: Key to FBI Promotions.....	308
Permission to Reprint Letters	309
Vita.....	313

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Theoretical Framework of the Study.....	11
Table 2: Definition of Terms in the Research Literature.....	17
Table 3: Historical Theoretical Frameworks Explaining Women's Subordination.....	25
Table 4: Examples of Dualisms by Pairs.....	28
Table 5: Percentage of Women in Nontraditional Occupations.....	44
Table 6: Metaphors Used for Interpretive Analysis.....	186
Table 7: Sequence of Actions Impacting Early Female Agents in the FBI.....	221

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1: Topics in the Literature Review.....	19
Figure 2: Approaches to the Understanding of Women and Leadership.....	75, 211
Figure 3: Organizational Culture Types.....	78
Figure 4: Five Qualitative Research Paradigms.....	92
Figure 5: Data Analysis Strategies using Educational Criticism.....	108
Figure 6: Target Depicting Participants' Careers.....	201

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study utilized elite, semi-structured interviews of a purposive sample of the first women who became Special Agents and supervisors in the highly gendered Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The historical context for their experiences is significant in light of social and legal mandates for equal opportunity and the increased interest in gender-specific research that took place during the 1970s. Literature relating to feminist perspectives, the integration of women into nontraditional occupations, and the gendered nature of bureaucracy supported the conceptual framework. Guided by educational criticism, four strategies were used recursively: typological analysis was used to define categories of data; interpretive analysis was used to identify patterns and connections in the data; evaluation was used to attach value to the data beyond the participants, and thematics were used to analyze pervasive messages within the data as a whole. Typologies included the choice of nontraditional careers, decision-making, efficacy as leaders, and efforts to negotiate the FBI's bureaucracy. Three metaphors were used to interpret connections and patterns according to feminist standpoint theory, career self-efficacy theory, and various organizational principles. A *Supergirl* metaphor highlighted women's unique knowledge and complex roles; a *Target* metaphor highlighted complex patterns for high achievement and response to obstacles, and a *Clubhouse* metaphor highlighted masculine culture, the role of rules, and changes to an organization's equilibrium. Evaluation analysis addressed the moral obligation for women in leadership and the need for organizational diversity. Themes in the data included occupational pride, the challenge to manage multiple roles, an absence of relationship support, and inconsistency in feminist views.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO STUDY

“Let us face reality. If the credibility of the FBI is to be maintained in the eyes of the public, the lawbreaker, fugitive, deserter, et cetera, and if we are to continue a flexible, mobile, ready-for-anything force of Special Agents, we must continue to limit the position to males.”

J. Edgar Hoover (1971)

Throughout this nation’s history, women have worked diligently in jobs traditionally held by men, but they have not always been accepted or had equal opportunities in terms of hiring, assignments, and promotions. Legal mandates over the last century have signaled positive changes for all working women, including those in traditionally male careers. Although the number of women in nontraditional careers has increased steadily, the overall number of women and their representation in leadership in these careers has remained small when compared to men (Schulz, 2003).

The present study identified the significance of a group of women leaders who began careers in nontraditional—and even dangerous—careers during the 1970s. Specifically, this research focused on the perspectives of the first women to become Special Agents and supervisors in the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). While the study created a “time capsule” for the experiences of a past generation of women, it is relevant to current issues relating to female leadership in America. Analyzing the unique perspectives of these women leaders adds value to scholarship about female leadership and can assist educators, executives, and policymakers in the ways they think about organizational functioning (Martin, 2000).

J. Edgar Hoover served as the Director of the FBI from 1924 to 1972. As the FBI’s longest-serving director, he has been credited with shaping the FBI into a large and efficient

federal crime-fighting agency (FBI, 2015e). The FBI was one of the last law enforcement agencies to hire women as sworn law enforcement officers, largely because Hoover actively resisted hiring women as agents despite clear legal mandates outlined further in this chapter (FBI, 2015c). Following his death in May 1972, it took just two months for the first women to be hired as FBI agents. In July 1972, Joanne Pierce and Susan Roley entered training at the FBI Academy as the first female agents in the modern era of the FBI (FBI, 2015c). Four months later, and under scrutiny of the FBI and the public, these women completed training at the FBI Academy and were sworn in to be the first female agents in the FBI's modern history. Roley resigned from the FBI in 1979, and Pierce retired after a decorated 22-year career. Pierce was awarded the FBI's Silver Star for bravery in a firefight. She served in several FBI offices both as an agent and a supervisor (FBI, 2015b; J. Pierce, personal communication, September 13, 2012). After the first two female agents were hired, it would take six more years—until 1978—for the first 100 female agents to be hired and complete training to be part of the FBI's workforce (K. McChesney, personal communication, May 1, 2013).

Respected by law-abiding citizens, male FBI agents have been nicknamed “G-Men,” a reference derived from “Government Men” (FBI, 2015a; G-Men, 2013). The nickname dates to the 1930s when male agents were considered part of “Mr. Hoover's Loyal Legion” (Turner, 1972, p. 167). “Well-tailored-and-barbered” (Turner, 1972, p. 167), G-Men were known for wearing crisp dark suits and fedora hats and for carrying Tommy guns to hunt down gangsters and other public enemies. Borrowing from the reference to G-Men, female FBI agents have sometimes been referred to as “G-Women” (FBI, 2015b).

In this qualitative interview study, a number of the FBI's first “G-Women” shared their perspectives about historic change in the FBI that began in 1972, as the FBI began to transition

away from being the exclusive, largely White male organization that Hoover fiercely protected. They shared their perspectives on being trailblazers as agents and as supervisors and on being part of change in the FBI's bureaucracy. Using a three-pronged theoretical framework, the study provides analysis on their perspectives and the factors that contributed to their leadership, career efficacy, and impact on the organization.

As participants in the study underwent their FBI training, some recalled being told by male colleagues that the hiring of female agents was informally known as "the Female Experiment." Like Hoover, many of the agents of that generation did not believe that women would be able to perform as agents. In the study, participants revealed how they managed both as agents and supervisors, how the FBI impacted their lives, how they contributed to the FBI, and how they contributed to create a new vision for a more diverse FBI (Martin, 2000).

Context for Social Change

The 1900s represented a century of broad social change for women in America (Collins, 2009). Lawmakers and government leaders addressed women's issues in the context of civil rights legislation, equal rights, affirmative action, and equal employment opportunity for women (Klenke, 1996). Over the same period, women overcame a myriad of legal, social, and economic obstacles to become an essential and integral part of the American workforce (D'Agostino & Levine, 2011; Klenke, 1996). In 2014, working women constituted 47 percent of the total labor force, an increase from 30 percent in 1950 (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015c).

Despite progress, the American labor force remains sharply segregated by gender (Hegewisch & Liepmann, 2010). Most women and men still do not work in the same jobs, and women's jobs usually pay less. Even when women and men do have the same positions, women's pay is almost always lower. To fully appreciate issues related to women in the

American workforce, an understanding of legislation, the women's movement, and gender-specific research provides valuable context.

Important legislation in the 1960s and 1970s focused on gender equity. The Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1974 legislated mandates that were designed to close gender gaps in schools and workplaces and to make discrimination illegal on the basis of sex (Friedan, 1998). The Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) was an effort to make sex discrimination not only illegal but unconstitutional (Alice Paul Institute, 2013). Introduced into every session of Congress between 1923 and 1972, the ERA finally passed through both the Senate and the House of Representatives in 1972. When the proposed amendment was sent to the states as required, it was not ratified by enough states to become part of the Constitution (Alice Paul Institute, 2013). Thus, discrimination against women is not subjected to the same level of scrutiny that the 14th Amendment allows for discrimination on the basis of race.

In the mid-19th century, American women began to advocate for women's rights and gender equality. Since then, three distinct waves of feminism have contributed to increased opportunities for women (Hart, 2001). Each wave has been focused on a different aspect of gender oppression with the first wave focused on formal equality, the second wave focused on structural equality, and the third and current wave focused on substantive equality. The feminist landscape changed dramatically during the second wave that was timed with the women's movement of the 1970s.

In the 1960s and 1970s, scholars began to think differently about both leadership and organizational functioning. Until that time, leadership theories were focused on the traits of successful leaders, using men as models and emphasizing their traits, skills, and styles (Stogdill,

1948/1974). Women were encouraged to adopt masculine leadership traits and were often judged harshly as a result (Helgesen, 1990). Only in the last few decades have researchers focused on leadership in the context of gender, and a number of studies have indicated that women lead differently than men (Heidensohn, 1992; White 1995). Women are more transformational in their leadership style than men, and they have a positive impact on individual, group, and organizational performance (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & Engen, 2003).

Just as leadership theories have evolved to include gender, reforms in organizational theory have also evolved. Previously, classic organizational approaches were gender-neutral. These included the strictly ordered model of bureaucracy introduced by Max Weber (1946) and the configurations for organizations introduced by Henry Mintzberg (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005). In recent decades, however, questions about the influence of gender in organizations have been addressed in an increasing body of both mainstream and feminist research (Ferguson, 1984). Today's research emphasizes a theme that leaders in organizations must rethink the way their organizations are structured in terms of gender equity (Shafritz et al., 2005).

Statement of Problem

Past research has ignored the persistent nature of gender inequality in organizations and thus has created a blind spot in organizational research; this gap has resulted in a perpetuation of gender inequities and a tacit adoption of male-centric positions on how organizations function (Calas & Smircich, 1992; Martin, 2000). Therefore, it is incumbent on scholars to consider and actively explore issues of gender in their theory and research.

Women in law enforcement and military careers have historically faced pervasive hidden agendas of hegemonic masculinity; male-centric agendas have always governed the rules and

procedures within police and military organizations (Prokos & Padavic, 2002). Police and military organizations, and certainly the FBI, are hierarchical bureaucracies that have traditionally promoted dominant and competitive masculine behaviors (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Their organizational structures are not gender-neutral. Male-centric structures, masculine culture, and strong male imagery combine to marginalize women (Acker, 2006).

Learning how women function and lead within highly gendered organizations was central to the present study. Knowledge regarding the first women leaders in the FBI is relevant to other women in leadership and in nontraditional careers. This research adds to the field of educational leadership because greater understanding of female leadership can lead to greater appreciation of the need for workplace diversity and greater opportunities for female occupational empowerment (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). The present study is significant because no research about female FBI agents was located in the research literature. It also emphasizes the importance of future gender-specific research.

Women in Dangerous Careers

Within the workforce, nontraditional occupations (NTOs) are defined as jobs in which women make up less than 25 percent of the employee workforce (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015c). The range of NTOs is outlined in Chapter 2. Certain women gravitate toward nontraditional occupations and many reasons for this have been cited in the literature. Reasons include: (a) gender identity and socialization, (b) psychological influences and personality, (c) importance of relationships and family, (d) education and professional development, and (e) peer support and mentoring (Graham, 1997).

Careers in the military, law enforcement, and the FBI constitute a unique category of nontraditional occupations because an element of danger is associated with them. These organizations require that workers meet physical standards and carry firearms. Workers must be willing to kill if necessary, in order to protect themselves or others. The willingness to take risks is a job requirement. Historically, women working in these dangerous careers have met resistance, both internal and external and from men and women (Prokos & Padavic, 2002).

Research literature about women in police and military careers is relevant to female FBI agents. A brief summary of this reviewed literature follows, with detailed information provided in Chapter 2.

Military Women

Since World War II, women service members have been essential to the U.S. military because they have greatly contributed to satisfying critical mission requirements. Prior to 2016, however, women were excluded from combat positions, solely because of gender (Military Leadership Diversity Commission [MLDC], 2010; MLDC, 2011). The current process of women integrating into combat positions provides timely and relevant context for the present study.

In 2011, after years of review and many research studies, the Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC) recommended that combat exclusions for women be lifted (MLDC, 2011). In 2013, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta announced that women would be allowed in combat and that plans for implementation would be forthcoming (MLDC, 2011; Department of Defense, 2013). In 2015, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter confirmed that all positions would be open to women in 2016 (Kamarck, 2015). The elimination of the combat exclusion is expected to reduce obstacles to recruitment, retention, and promotion for women (MLDC, 2011).

The previous combat exclusion has negatively impacted the ability of military women to be promoted. Many Americans, both men and women, do not believe women should be assigned to dangerous combat roles (Center for Military Readiness, 1997). American citizens who were surveyed in 2007 rated their comfort level with women leaders, and, across all professions, respondents were least comfortable with women leaders in the military (White House Project, 2010).

Policewomen

Women have been participating in police work for over 100 years, and the number of women in police careers has steadily increased in recent decades (Heidensohn, 2006). Policewomen have not always been accepted by male peers, supervisors, or their departments (Martin, 1982; Worden, 1993). Policewomen have been treated as tokens and relegated to auxiliary assignments (Heidensohn, 1992). They continue to seek greater gender parity in many areas that include pay, physical standards, promotions and assignments (Heidensohn, 1992).

In addition to facing negative attitudes from coworkers, policewomen have also faced socially structured challenges inherent to a gendered society, such as parenting and marriage issues, gender role conflict, and sexual harassment (Martin, 2000).

Early research focused on women's physical, mental, intellectual, and emotional capacities to perform police work. Numerous studies have focused on their ability to do patrol work, respond to hazardous situations, perform academically, be physically capable, and respond to violent confrontations (Moldon, 1985; Townsey, 1982).

G-Women

As America's premiere federal law enforcement agency, the policy of Hoover's FBI was that women were not allowed to be FBI agents (FBI, 2015a). Hoover insisted that women were

unfit to handle the physical rigors of the job that included making arrests, taking part in raids, and engaging in self-defense (Hoover, 1971). He asserted that the FBI should be exempt from federal regulations concerning equal employment. Before his death, pressure increased to approve the hiring of female agents. For example, in March 1972, the Equal Opportunity Act dictated that employers could no longer consider gender or race in the hiring process (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2013). Also that year, the Supreme Court ruled that the Civil Rights Act applied to the public sector; for law enforcement agencies, this ruling meant that they would be potentially liable if they discriminated against qualified women in hiring or promotions (Friedan, 1998).

The present study highlighted an historic period for the FBI that started in 1972, just weeks after Hoover died, when the first female agents were hired. The present study explored the careers of women in this group who rose in the ranks to become supervisors. In their leadership positions, these women supervised many of the very male agents who resisted allowing women to be agents. The early attrition rate for female agents was high, with many women resigning during vigorous physical, defensive tactics, and firearms training at the FBI Academy (K. McChesney, personal communication, September 13, 2012). Over the last 40 years, the number of female agents has increased, and, by 2015, 19 percent of the total agent workforce was female. Today, female agents serve in a variety of leadership positions within the FBI (FBI, 2015c). Additional details are provided in Chapter 2.

Research Question

The overarching research question was: “How do the early women leaders in the FBI describe their experiences in a gendered organization?” This question was designed to gather data about the personal and professional perspectives of the first female agents in the FBI who

became supervisors. Through data analysis, the interpretations of their unique perspectives have added to understanding of female leadership in gendered organizations. Main components of the research question included: (a) being female, (b) working in a man's world, and (c) being leaders in the FBI. In addition to the research question, three sub-questions were framed:

1. How do these women describe their decision-making?
2. How do these women describe their career self-efficacy?
3. How do these women describe the role that gender played in the FBI?

The sub-questions tied to concepts related to female leadership and were developed during the literature review. The development of the sub-questions is described further in Chapter 3.

Study Design Overview

To address the research question, a decision was made to conduct a qualitative interview study. Qualitative research is used to gain understanding of underlying reasons and motivations of the topic being studied (Patton, 2002). Qualitative data collection methods vary, but the study was designed to use semi-structured interviews of the first women leaders in the FBI.

Of the first 100 female FBI agents, approximately 20 percent of them were known to have held leadership positions at some time in their careers (C. K. Jung & K. McChesney, personal communication, May 1, 2013). Using a methodical process to locate and contact potential participants, 15 participants were identified and agreed to be interviewed as a purposive sample (Patton, 2002). This group included women who had either retired and resigned from the FBI. All of the women who agreed to be interviewed were White women. The process to identify participants is explained further in Chapter 3.

The present study was framed using a phenomenological approach that examined the participants' unique experiences at a unique time. Phenomenology is the philosophical

perspective that is based on an individual's life world (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2009). Using this type of approach, a researcher is able to examine an individual's careful and conscious descriptions of her own world. Such an approach places value on rich descriptions, evoked constructed realities, and elicited subjective interpretations (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Guided by the descriptions of participants, the study was an effort to describe and analyze the conscious perspectives of participants as women, as female agents, and as leaders.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted to promote quality and depth of data. An elite interview approach was utilized (Tansey, 2007; Kezar, 2009). Participants shared perspectives about a myriad of factors and situations that contributed to their career decisions and outcomes. Many study participants had never shared their experiences and perspectives; thus, many of their voices have never been heard, despite their historical contributions to the FBI. Additional, detailed information on participant criteria and study design are described in detail in Chapter 3 as part of the research methodology.

Theoretical Framework

Adhering to a solid theoretical framework is necessary for any rigorous research study. For the present study, the theoretical framework, and how the theories were connected to the main ideas of central research question, are depicted in Table 1.

Table 1

Theoretical Framework of the Study

Main Ideas	Theoretical Positioning
Being Female	Feminist Standpoint Theory
Working in a Man's World	Career Self-Efficacy Theory
Leaders in the FBI	Organizational Theories

Theories are formal explanations of classes of events. They connect ideas and are used for the purpose of explaining phenomena (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). They are based on the belief that knowledge is constructed from multiple realities (Jaggar & Bordo, 1990). Theories “help us sort out our world, make sense of it, guide how we behave in it, and predict what might happen next” (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993, p. 120). Theories are formulated through human construction and include concepts and knowledge that are collected by humans through the use of their five senses. They are used to explain the relationship between the concepts and are grounded in human experience (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993).

The present study was framed using a three-pronged theoretical approach. Feminist standpoint theory and career self-efficacy theory were the first two components, and tenets of organizational theory comprised the third component. Together, these components facilitated the review of literature, and they were used to inform research design (Creswell, 2007).

Feminist standpoint theory was the first prong of the theoretical framework. This theory was used to promote a focus on the participants’ perspectives and unique *standpoints* (Smith, 1987) as women. Dorothy Smith referred to feminist standpoint theory as a way to explain how women create their social worlds using perspectives from their everyday worlds. In using this theory, participants were encouraged to describe situations and perspectives that were important to them. This theory supported adopting an open approach to the perspectives of participants and it informed many research decisions throughout the study. For example, the study was not designed to operate within a critical/feminist research paradigm that is typical for gender-related research, but rather it operated within a constructivist paradigm (Hatch, 2002). Research decisions about methodology, data collection, and data analysis have been further explained in Chapters 3 and 4.

Career self-efficacy theory (Betz and Hackett, 1981) was the second component in the theoretical framework. Bandura's (1986) theories regarding social learning and self-efficacy informed the development of career self-efficacy theory. Efficacy is a person's set of beliefs that motivates behavior, and behavior is a result of both cognitive and affective processes; thus, a person's personal beliefs are considered efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1994). Self-efficacy theory adopts the premises that people learn by watching others and that development is influenced by environmental, personal, and behavioral factors (Bandura, 1994).

Career self-efficacy theory was developed by Betz and Hackett (1981). This theory expands on the social learning aspects of self-efficacy theory to posit that career self-efficacy is tied to personal beliefs and confidence (Betz & Hackett, 1991). The theory suggests that a woman's career efficacy is tied to her personal beliefs and her confidence; a woman with high career self-efficacy beliefs is confident in her ability to perform a particular task or tasks (Rittmayer & Beier, 2009). In addition, the construct of *grit*, defined as the combination of perseverance and passion to achieve long-term goals (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthew, & Kelley, 2007), was introduced as a manifestation of career self-efficacy. Using career-self efficacy theory and qualities associated with grit, the present study examined the participants' perspectives regarding their career performance and outcomes.

As the third prong of the theoretical framework, a variety of tenets from both mainstream and gender-specific organizational research were considered. Feminist research over more than 40 years has significantly enhanced our understanding regarding the role of gender in organizations and leadership. A shift in leadership research has been outlined that provides evidence that women lead differently than men and that women have potential to operate as transformational leaders. The Weber (1946) and Mintzberg (1979) approaches to organizations

have been described within an historical context. Recent research on the gendered nature of bureaucracy and models of female leadership has been presented. The resistance of bureaucracy to change and the pervasive influence of masculine culture have been described as impediments to the integration of female agents into the FBI. Tushman and Romanelli's (1985) model of punctuated equilibrium was offered as an explanation for how changes in deep organizational structures can be accomplished.

Significance of Study

This qualitative research study involved the systematic analysis of the perspectives of the first women leaders in the FBI. The fact that the study was time-bound to their experiences does not lessen its significance. The review of relevant literature included a methodical review of studies about women in the American workforce, women in nontraditional occupations, women in military and law enforcement careers, women in bureaucracy, and background on women who became the first female FBI agents. The literature exposed a gap in knowledge of the impact of women leaders in nontraditional careers and within masculine hierarchical bureaucracies.

The study is significant in terms of what it adds to both mainstream and gender-specific research and the field of educational leadership. Feminist scholars maintain that mainstream organizational theory and research have ignored gender inequality in organizations (Martin, 2000). Feminist scholarship is needed to actively explore and add insight to the importance of gender in mainstream research (Martin, 2000). As scholars share knowledge about how women adapt to masculine cultures within highly gendered organizations, leaders in bureaucratic organizations should be encouraged to eliminate gender inequity and to place greater value on organizational diversity. This study has value to educational leadership because it serves to illuminate gender issues of significance for educational leaders. Research about how and why

women choose nontraditional careers can inform our knowledge regarding how these women succeed in their careers (Graham, 1997). This knowledge can be useful as women in nontraditional occupations continue to grapple with double standards and discrimination in the workplace.

Chapter Summaries

Chapter 1 provided the historical and legislative context in which opportunities for FBI and other women were created, and the modern feminist movement was summarized. Nontraditional occupations were introduced, along with an introduction to the early female FBI agents who were the focus of this research. Challenges facing women in nontraditional careers were described, as well as the tendency of organizations, like the FBI bureaucracy, to be highly gendered. Shifts over time in research paradigms relating to gender and leadership were outlined. The three-pronged theoretical framework for the present study was explained, along with overviews of feminist standpoint theory, career self-efficacy theory, and organizational theories. The research question and the overall study design process were described. Finally, the significance of the study to female scholarship was articulated in terms of the experiences and impact of women within highly gendered bureaucracies.

Chapter 2 provides a detailed review of research and literature about women in the workplace, and specifically within nontraditional careers. A historical overview of the American feminist movement sets the stage for the present study. The literature review is grouped into three sections: (a) the feminist perspective, (b) nontraditional occupations, and (c) bureaucracy. Within each section, the theories used for this study are outlined in greater detail. The conceptual framework for the study is explained. The research literature in Chapter 2 forms the basis for the conceptual framework and supports the research question.

Chapter 3 explains the research methodology for the present study. It begins with a justification for a qualitative study based on the research question. This chapter outlines the purpose of qualitative inquiry and explains the constructivist research paradigm (Hatch, 2002) that guided study design. The chapter includes my personal positioning related to the research topic. Design issues are explained that include participant contacts, participant selection, the use of interviews, and methods used in data collection.

Chapter 4 outlines the approach to data analysis. Eisner's (1998) educational criticism approach was the overarching strategy. Data were analyzed along the four dimensions of this approach—description, interpretation, thematics, and evaluation. Hatch's (2002) models for typological and interpretive analysis were used to analyze data in terms of the descriptive and interpretive dimensions of educational criticism. Typological analysis comprised the largest section of analysis, and this analysis linked interview data to predetermined data categories generated from the conceptual framework and the literature review. Interpretive analysis employed metaphors to interpret patterns and relationships between and among the data categories. Three metaphors were selected to correspond to the theoretical framework. The metaphor of the fictional *Supergirl* character was used to interpret data by applying feminist standpoint theory to participant's unique experiences. The metaphor of a shooting *Target* was used to interpret data by applying career self-efficacy theory to career and leadership decisions. The metaphor of a men's *Clubhouse* was used to interpret data about the gendering impact of women on the FBI bureaucracy. The evaluation dimension of educational criticism was used to evaluate data as a whole, to attach value to the experiences of participants beyond the study, and to consider the data in terms of major themes for women in nontraditional careers. The thematics dimension of educational criticism was used to identify pervasive messages in the data and relate

them to female perspectives not addressed by other data analysis strategies.

Chapter 5 summarizes the related literature and methodology of the study, offers a summary discussion of data analysis, presents conclusions drawn from the data analysis, describes limitations, identifies implications for educational leadership, provides recommendations for further research, and presents final conclusions.

Definition of Terms

A variety of technical and theoretical terms are mentioned throughout this dissertation. For ease in reference, these terms are defined in Table 2.

Table 2

Definition of Terms in the Research Literature

Term	Definition
Bureaucracy	A strictly ordered, hierarchical organization that is governed by strict rules and procedures and has two goals - efficiency and effectiveness (Weber, 1946).
Career Self-Efficacy Theory	Expands on self-efficacy that confidence is tied to personal beliefs, or efficacy beliefs, that the person thinks she is able to perform a specific task (Betz & Hackett, 1991).
Efficacy	A belief that determines how people feel and think. Belief motivates behavior and includes cognitive, motivational, affective, and selection processes (Bandura, 1994).
Feminist Practice	This practice promotes core female values such as mutuality, interdependence, inclusion, cooperation, nurturance, participation, empowerment, and personal and collective transformation (Bartlett, 1990).
Feminist Standpoint Theory	A theoretical explanation that focuses on the social world from the perspectives of women in their everyday worlds and the ways in which women construct their worlds (Hartsock, 1983).

Feminist Theory	An extension of feminism into theoretical or philosophical discourse that aims to understand the nature of gender inequality (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2009).
Gendering Agents	Women can shift power within their organizations (Bartlett, 1990).
Grit	A construct that combines perseverance and passion to achieve career self-efficacy in meeting long-term goals (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthew, & Kelley, 2007).
Nontraditional Occupation (NTO)	A male-dominated occupation, or career, in which women make up less than 25 percent of the workforce (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015a).
Phenomenology	A philosophical perspective that has a focus on the individual's life world and is based on careful descriptions and analyses of consciousness (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2009).
Phronesis	Intellectual virtue of recognizing and responding to what is most important in a situation (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2009).
Self-efficacy theory	Theory based on the idea that people learn by watching others, and their development is influenced by environmental, personal, and behavioral factors (Bandura, 1986).
Sensemaking	Processes by which men and women give meaning to their relationships and experiences in order to construct knowledge (Weick, 1995).
Tipping Point	Concept that strength in numbers in an organization can allow women to gain power (Kanter, 1997).
Trailblazer	An independent person who "makes, does, or discovers something new and makes it acceptable or popular (Merriam-Webster, n.d.).
Ways of Knowing	Epistemology of how women construct social knowledge. They experience reality and interpret their experiences through personal knowledge from which they draw conclusions about truth, knowledge, authority, and personal power (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldeberger, & Tarule, 1997).

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

"Sure, he [Fred Astaire] was great, but don't forget

Ginger Rogers did everything he did backwards . . . and in high heels!"

Robert Thaves (1982)

This chapter presents historical background and research literature relevant to the three main ideas embedded within this research question: "How do the early women leaders in the FBI describe their experiences in a gendered organization?" These ideas were: (a) being a female leader, (b) working in a man's job, and (c) being female leaders in the FBI.

The review of literature review has been organized with the main ideas of the research question and the theoretical positioning of the study in mind. It consists of three primary topics: (a) the feminist perspective, (b) nontraditional occupations, and (c) bureaucracy. These topics in the literature review are depicted below in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Topics in the Literature Review

The first section of the literature review focuses on the broad feminist perspective and begins with a description of the modern American feminist movement and then presents a broad range of theory and research about feminism and women's ways of knowing. This section includes discussion of historical feminist frameworks; social construction of knowledge; female

empowerment; and the concept of dualism. The section closes with a discussion of feminist standpoint theory.

The second section of the literature review focuses on nontraditional occupations and presents both historical information and research about women who have chosen nontraditional, dangerous careers. This section explores nontraditional occupations for women and presents background about women in the workforce and in nontraditional careers. Topics in this section include female leadership; career choice; and women trailblazers in police work, the military, and the FBI. This section then introduces career self-efficacy theory, which is the second theoretical screen. Finally, the technical construct, *grit*, as a manifestation of career self-efficacy is discussed.

The third section of the literature review focuses on bureaucracy and presents theory and research about the nature of bureaucracy and the gendered nature of organizations. This section includes discussions of organizational theory, masculine culture, and the value of female leadership in bureaucracy. It provides a review of organizational principles and introduces the concepts of women as *gendering agents* and *tipping points* as ways to promote gender equity in organizations. Using mainstream and feminist tenets from organizational theory leadership studies, this section outlines various types of organizational culture and how changes to deep structure and culture occur within a bureaucracy.

The Feminist Perspective

Men and women are different. Differences are often divided into two main categories: sex differences and gender differences (Belknap, 2007). Sex differences are the biological differences between males and females, such as differences in their reproductive organs, average body size, muscle development, and hormones. Gender differences are the differences between

men and women that relate to expected social roles, such as women's work, spousal and child-care responsibilities, and physical appearance. Historically, the roles of men and women in society have been viewed as biologically based; more recently, feminists have asserted that women's roles are learned and are socially determined (Belknap, 2007).

A Modern Vision

An historical snapshot of feminism in America is essential in order to understand the personal and professional experiences of working women. An historical view of women as the weaker sex was espoused by Dr. Charles Meigs in a lecture to male gynecology students in 1859, when he said of the woman: "She reigns in the heart. . . . The household is her place of worship and service. . . . She has a head almost too small for intellect and just big enough for love" (1859, p. 64). Roles of women have changed dramatically since then.

Rejecting the premise that women should be subservient to men, feminism today embraces a wide range of movements and ideologies that share common goals to define establish, and achieve equal political, economic, cultural, personal, and social rights for women (Beasley, 1999). Hart (2001) outlined three waves of feminism that have shaped the landscape for American women over the last two centuries. All have been rooted in activism and a desire for social change.

The first feminist wave took place from 1848 to the early 1920s and was focused on formal equality for women (Hart, 2001). This wave is known for the women's suffrage movement led by Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Alice Paul, and countless others (Hart, 2001). The suffragettes were mostly White, middle-class, educated women who wanted to rectify injustice by challenging White male dominance (Krolokke, 2005). Passage of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution granted women the right to vote in 1920. Thereafter, first wave

feminists fought unsuccessfully for passage of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) in the Constitution. Little other progress was made toward gender equality for several decades (Collins, 2009).

The push for gender equality was stalled during World War I and World War II when America's focus was on national security and unity (Krolokke, 2005). In this dormant period between the first and second waves, from the mid 1920s to the 1960s, the prevailing Western view remained rooted in the premise that women were the weaker sex, and that a women's place was in the home (Collins, 2009). This belief system offered an accepted, durable framework that only began to crack when economic necessity prompted women to seek work outside of their homes. Women found employment as field and domestic workers. Eventually, women began to work in traditionally male occupations but they were considered anomalies (Collins, 2009). Female doctors and lawyers were considered "mutations" whose achievements were described in gender terms, such as the "lady doctor" or the "lady lawyer" (p. 6).

During this dormant period, French philosopher Simone de Beauvoir (1949) began to advance arguments that radical feminists were beginning to adopt in America. She argued that women were as capable of choice as men and that marriage served to mutilate women. Further, she claimed that women had been historically treated as deviant or abnormal.

The second feminist wave, between the 1960s and the 1980s, was a post-war period known for the women's liberation movement (Hart, 2001). Second wave feminists focused on structural equality for women. These efforts included the creation of a National Woman's Party, renewed, yet still unsuccessful, efforts toward passage of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the formation of the National

Organization for Women in 1966, Title IX legislation in 1972, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 (Friedan, 1998).

The second wave was also marked by radical feminist activism with great emphasis on workplace equity, equal rights, and female reproductive rights. This wave marked the beginning of major shifts in the Western view of women by adding a new “feminine portfolio” of experiences (Collins, 2009, p. 5). Feminists Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinem emerged as leaders in the women’s liberation movement. These female icons promoted a collective female identity and encouraged women to seek fulfillment through self-development rather than through submission to men (Friedan, 1998).

Discussion of second wave feminism and the women’s liberation movement would be incomplete without some acknowledgement of the alternate, anti-feminist sentiment that was also present among men and women. Through her efforts to block the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment in 1972, Phyllis Schlafly became known as the public face of an anti-feminist movement in the United States (Tierney, 2005). During that period, tension existed between the two groups; the tension between feminists and anti-feminists had an effect on women who did not consider themselves feminists but who sought equal employment opportunities.

The third and current wave, from the 1990s to the present, has been marked by efforts to support substantive authority for women rather than formal or structural equality. Third wave feminism is motivated by the “desire of young women to bridge contradictions in their experiences and to embrace strategies of inclusion and exploration” (Krolokke, 2005, p. 16). Today’s feminists view themselves as capable, strong, and assertive social agents, and they perceive themselves as less pompous than the radical, second wave feminists (Krolokke, 2005). Third wave feminists advocate a different agenda that challenges the theme of universal

womanhood. This agenda honors contradictory experiences and is open to the myriad ways that women confront the “complex intersections of gender, sexuality, race, class, and age” (Krolokke, 2005, pp. 16-17).

Third wave perspectives have influenced many disciplines including the social sciences, psychology, family studies, sociology and political science, and education (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldeberger, & Tarule, 1997; De Lair & Erwin, 2000; Gergen, 2000; Noddings, 1990). The possibilities for women have changed dramatically during the lifetimes of women living today (Collins, 2009). Every modern institution is now open to feminist scrutiny. The condition of women in society is now considered a social construct, with feminists challenging all domains of women’s personal lives, such as marriage, family, and sexuality.

Historical Feminist Frameworks

Up until the 1920s, first wave feminists concentrated their efforts on the acceptance of women as a universal entity, their challenge to male dominance, and their desire for formal equality (Cott, 1997; Jaggar & Rothenberg, 1993). Since the 1960s, second and third wave feminists have focused more on structural equality for women and on women as unique individuals. Since the 1930s, however, themes of oppression and subordination have defined mainstream and, more recently, feminist theory and research (Hart, 2001).

Early theorists debated the root of male oppression of women. Some identified the root of oppression as based on sex and as evidenced by women’s lesser physical strength, their childbearing capability, and the propensity for rape (Hart, 2001). Others argued that the root of oppression was social, based on social structures, such as class, male control of sexuality, and child-rearing (Jaggar & Rothenberg, 1993). Modern feminists view the early debates about

gender primacy to be outdated, and they conceptualize gender, sex, race, and class in more interrelated and sophisticated ways (Jaggar & Rothenberg, 1993).

The frameworks depicted in Table 3 are representative of historical theoretical frameworks that have been used to subordination of women.

Table 3

Historical Theoretical Frameworks Explaining Women's Subordination

Lens	Theoretical Framework
Sex	Conservatism
Gender	Liberalism
Class	Classical Marxism
Sex/Gender/Sexuality	Radical Feminism
Sex/Gender/Sexuality/Class	Socialist Feminism
Race/Gender/Sexuality/Class	Multicultural Feminism

From Jaggar & Rothenberg (1993).

Understanding the concept of subordination through these progressive historical frameworks provides a more comprehensive understanding of the wide range of views regarding female experiences.

In the 1930s, the earliest feminist framework to explain female subordination was conservative, and Sigmund Freud explained it solely in terms of biology and sex (Jaggar & Rothenberg, 1993). The next accepted explanation was the liberal framework in which female subordination was viewed in terms of societal gender norms rather than sex. In the classical Marxist framework, female subordination was explained in terms of class and economic dependence in a capitalistic society. In the radical feminist framework, female subordination was explained in terms of patriarchal practices through which men controlled women's bodies,

procreation, and reproduction. In the socialist framework, women's experiences were explained in terms of a reciprocal relationship between patriarchy and capitalism. In the multicultural framework, subordination of women has been explained in terms of hierarchy and domination.

Today, four of these feminist approaches are routinely used when considering the source of women's continuing oppression by men (Grana, 2010). They are identified as liberal, radical, Marxist, and socialist feminism. Liberal feminism is based on the idea that women lack equal opportunity in education and employment. Radical feminism suggests women are treated as inferior to men within a patriarchal society. Marxist feminism suggests that women are oppressed because of a capitalist system. Socialist feminism is based on the belief that women are oppressed because of both patriarchy and capitalism.

Overview of Feminist Theory

Danner (1989) offered an overview of feminist theory as "woman-centered description and explanation of human experience and the social world" (p. 51). Acker (2006) described feminist theory as a form of social theory that explains the social arrangement inherent in society between men and women. In general, feminist theory focuses particular attention on the conditions of women's lives and requires that women's experiences must be viewed in terms of gender. Central to feminist theory are beliefs that women have not been treated or considered equal to men and women have been systematically subordinated by men (Acker, 2006). Feminist theorists encourage women to reject societal expectations about who and what women should be (Farganis, 1994).

Feminist theory considers historical, economic, religious, biological, and anthropological explanations for women's experiences (Keohane, Rosaldo, & Gelpi, 1982). Topics for study are

wide-ranging and include: the woman's body, roles of love and sex, gendered language, literature, history, film, politics, power, economics, leadership, and legal rights (Collins, 2009). Feminist scholars have attempted to make gender visible through analysis of social phenomena by asking if, how, and why social processes, standards, and opportunities differ systematically between women and men (Acker, 2006).

Assumptions about gender pervade society, and these assumptions are the basis for the organization of the world regardless of empirical realities (Acker, 2006). These assumptions often govern the way organizations function. Contemporary changes in work and employment serve to reinforce and increase inequality along gender lines (Acker, 2006). Also, gender inequality is inextricably intertwined with other systems of inequality, such as class and race (Acker, 2006; MacKinnon, 1989).

The overarching view of modern feminist theory is supported by three tenets that are further discussed in this section. They are: (a) the rejection of dualism as a means to understand the world, (b) the belief in social construction of knowledge, and (c) the commitment to the empowerment of women (Sprague & Zimmerman, 2004).

Feminist tenet 1: Dualism. Western patriarchal thinking is based on a central and absolute theme of dualism. Dualism is a view of world order that is based on dividing entities and concepts into opposed pairs (Plumwood, 1993). In each pair, one is always deemed superior to the other. The inferior concept in the pair is demonized and discriminated against by the other in the pair. Feminists argue that men with dualistic belief systems have historically defined the spectrum of female experiences. Feminist philosopher Val Plumwood (1993) claimed that dualism extends from logical thought processes inherent in gender relationships, and she asserted that dualistic beliefs justify the ongoing exploitation and oppression of women.

The classic dualistic paradigm embodies a hierarchy of entities based on their value or importance. They are ordered from most important to least important (Nelson, 1997). In the classic paradigm, god is most important, then man, then woman, and then animal (Nelson, 1997). Within the hierarchy, concepts and entities are paired with one entity being superior to the other. Examples of dualisms by pairs are provided in Table 4.

Table 4

Examples of Dualisms by Pairs

Superior Concept	Inferior Concept
man	woman
human	animal
reason	emotion
mind	body
activity	passivity
separate	connected

Adapted from Nelson (1997).

According to Western dualistic thought, men and women are considered unequal opposites, and men are superior to women. This way of thinking supports the view that typical female traits, such as emotion, the female body, passivity, and connectedness, are inferior to men's traits. As a tenet of feminist theory, feminists patently reject dualism as a way to explain women's experiences (Nelson, 1997).

Feminist tenet 2: The social construction of knowledge. Over the last 40 years, scholars across many social science disciplines have focused on the importance of gender in the construction of knowledge (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Gilligan, 1982; Kanter, 1977). Kanter (1977) claimed that the true perspectives of women—and working women in particular—have been overlooked because of a lack of understanding regarding how women construct knowledge.

Early research about the social construction of knowledge did not adequately take gender into account, and early researchers assumed that men and women construct knowledge in the same ways. For example, sociologists Berger and Luckmann (1966) were among the first to claim that all reality is socially constructed and that all individuals attempt to make sense of, and give meaning to, the social situations that occur in their daily lives. Appreciating the dimensions of everyday consciousness and action, they emphasized individual over collective approaches to knowledge construction through dual processes of habitualization and institutionalization (Appelrouth & Edles, 2007). Although they acknowledged gender as a social construction, they made no effort to address how women construct knowledge.

In addition, psychologist William Perry (1970) explained how individuals construct knowledge. He mapped the progression of human development to explain how individuals give meaning to experiences. His epistemological approach mapped how an individual's way of thinking progresses from a dualist to a relativist perspective. Learners progress from first knowing truth in absolute terms to then recognizing multiple versions of truth (Perry, 1970). Although his research was influential in the understanding of cognitive development, it was also limited because he only studied male students.

In addition, Karl Weick (1995) suggested that the social construction of knowledge is based on both individuals and relationships, regardless of gender. He designed a *sensemaking* model to explain the process, or set of process, by which men and women give meaning to their relationships and experiences in order to construct knowledge. When individuals experience cognitive gaps, they adapt and reconcile any dissonance in their understanding so they can find meaning (Dervin, 1983; Weick, 1995). Feminists believe Weick's model failed to address the

complexity of women's thoughts and how the sensemaking process operates in a gendered culture (Helms Mills & Mills, 2008).

Mainstream scholars have debated whether the primary locus of knowledge is based on both individuals and relationships, or whether it is based more on relationships (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldeberger, & Tarule, 1997; Dervin, 1983; Gergen, 1994; Jaggar & Bordo, 1990; Weick, 1995). Contemporary feminist scholars reject the dualist premise that women have uniform, simple roles, and they embrace a relativist premise that women have a multiplicity of competing roles. Many of them argue that relationships, more than the individual, dictate how women construct knowledge (Sismondo, 1995).

Drawing on the concept of sensemaking, Belenky, Clinchy, Goldeberger, and Tarule (1997) have argued that the social construction of knowledge for women relies primarily on relationships. Historically, the perspectives of women have been based on belief systems that have been shaped by male-dominated culture, and, as a result, their perspectives have mirrored those of men. Belenky et al. proposed a theory for women's development that described the importance of relationships to explain how women construct social knowledge, or to their *ways of knowing*. Women experience reality and interpret their experiences through personal knowledge from which they draw conclusions about truth, knowledge, authority, and personal power. Women find truth through five unique epistemological positions: (a) silence, (b) received knowledge, (c) subjective knowledge, (d) procedural knowledge, and (e) constructed knowledge. The positions are hierarchical, from the least advanced to the most advanced, but the model does not suggest that all women pass through all positions.

Silence is characterized by women's passivity and the presence of sex role stereotypes that prompt women to relinquish power in relationships. Words are perceived as weapons and

instruments for punishment, rather than as instruments for connection and empowerment; women in this position have little experience engaging in dialogue with others and have little sense of self.

Received knowledge is characterized by women's abilities to listen and understand the ideas of others in a concrete fashion and to accept truth as conveyed from external authority figures. Women in this position are open to the views of others but have little confidence in their own abilities to speak, and they are intolerant of ambiguity.

Subjective knowledge is characterized by women's private abilities to find personal truth. For women in this position, the shift toward subjectivism is often associated with a period of change in their personal lives. These women typically negate answers from external authorities and blame men for failing to protect them.

Procedural knowledge relates to connectedness and the ability of women to access the knowledge of others. Women in this position possess the capacity for empathy, and they are systematic thinkers. They typically support equal opportunity for women, but they do not question the structure of systems or institutions. These women may be conservative or liberal in their views, but they are not radical feminists.

Constructed knowledge is the most advanced position. In it, women challenge the systems in which they are operating. As with procedural knowledge, empathy is a central feature in this position, but women in this position are also able to feel closely connected to other people in spite of large differences. These women reflect continually on the moral and spiritual dimensions of their lives. They strive to transform personal and moral commitments into action, based on their caring and sense of community responsibility.

Feminist tenet 3: Empowerment through caring. Decades before gender was considered in terms of ethics or moral development, John Dewey (1903) argued that all individuals in service have an obligation to represent goodness and to serve as moral agents for others. He accentuated the essential nature of moral obligation in leadership and decision-making. Feminist scholars agree with this basic premise, but, in recent decades, studies of moral development and ethics have advanced to consider the differences between men and women, specifically in terms of the importance of relationships and caring.

Operating on the premise that relationships are the locus of knowledge for women, feminist scholars agree that emotions count as knowledge and that decision making by women is largely based on emotions (Jaggar & Bordo, 1990). It is the capacity of women to care—to form relationships and to draw on their emotions as knowledge—that empowers them. Still, mainstream and feminist scholars do not agree on how the framework for women’s emotions and relationships is built. Some point to the mother-child relationship as the primary framework through which women adopt a relational and caring view of the world (Ruddick, 2001). Others consider the mother-child relationship as a starting point upon which women develop relationships and start to form a sense of their moral worth (Baier, 1985).

Because of this focus on care and relationships, an emphasis on feminist ethics began in the 1980s. The ethics of feminism invoke principles of caring. Scholarly work in this field is grounded on the assumptions that women are essentially relational, not individualistic, and that they develop knowledge through emotion and caring (Burton & Dunn, 1996). Women emphasize caring in how they produce and build knowledge (Baier, 1985). Baier suggested that women do not consider themselves individually without considering others.

Feminist research on ethics and caring evolved largely from the seminal works on moral development by Jean Piaget and Lawrence Kohlberg, respectively (Duska & Whelan, 1975). Moral development is the process by which individuals decide between right and wrong. Most personal choices are dictated by personal ethics, ethical codes, and ethical relationships (Duska & Whelan, 1975).

Although research by Piaget and Kohlberg advanced the understanding of moral development, feminist scholars have criticized their work as flawed and sex-biased. Piaget (Duska & Whelan, 1975) developed two stages of moral development. The first stage is invoked through rules from authority figures, with a focus on consequences over intent. The second stage is invoked through maturation and autonomy, with a focus on intent over consequences. Kohlberg used Piaget's work to develop his stage theory of moral thinking. Kohlberg emphasized three primary stages (Kohlberg, 1958; Piaget, 1981):

Stage 1: Preconventional morality, focused on the individual.

Stage 2: Conventional morality, focused on the relationships.

Stage 3: Postconventional morality, focused on higher-level thinking and social justice.

Feminist critics have since asserted that both the Piaget and Kohlberg models of moral development failed to account for the differences between women and men. Indeed, Kohlberg (1958) believed women to be less morally developed than men, and his interview research was sex-biased in that he exclusively focused on male college students facing moral conflicts.

Carol Gilligan (1982), a Kohlberg protégé, disagreed with Kohlberg's stages of moral development. Disputing his view of traditional ethics that suggested a legalistic, self-centered approach to morality, she claimed morality does not center on rights and rules, but rather on interpersonal relationships and the ethics of compassion and care. She posited that men and

women speak and act in different moral languages. Men speak and act in terms of justice and rights, while women speak and act in terms of caring and responsibility. Women's morality is more contextualized, in that it is tied to real, ongoing relationships rather than to abstract, hypothetical situations (Kohlberg, 1958/1985). Gilligan (1982) developed a feminist model for moral thinking. She claimed that women move through three moral levels and attain moral maturity at the third level. In the first level, the self is the sole object of concern. In the second level, women establish relationships and participate in social life. In the third level, they are able to recognize their own needs and the needs of others.

Nel Noddings (2003) went further to formulate a general moral theory of care for women. In her approach, care is the foundation for morality, and justice is the superstructure that surrounds decision-making. Using her approach, ethics of care are focused on relationships and a woman's desire to be a good person. Noddings contended that each moral dilemma for a woman involves a unique relationship and, further, that neither conflict nor competition are involved in a woman's moral decisions.

Just as Piaget and Kohlberg may have undervalued the importance of women in moral reasoning, Gilligan (1982) and Noddings (2003) have been critiqued for overvaluing it. Clopton and Sorell (1993) contended that Gilligan and Noddings: (a) placed too high a value on friendship, (b) pitted caring and justice against each other, (c) represented the female as a relational self and not as an individual self, and (d) failed to adequately address how much care a person is capable of managing. Clopton and Sorell (1993) have suggested that women and men often choose the same solution as the right and moral choice. Further, they have claimed that men and women simply face different moral dilemmas, thus accounting for any perceived differences in moral reasoning.

Acknowledging Disagreement. Based on progress for women over recent decades, women have been positioned to significantly influence and transform traditionally masculine workplaces, such as military and law enforcement organizations (Reinke & Miller, 2011). Previous discussions in this chapter about feminism in America and feminist theory support this statement. Still, the reality is that feminists and scholars continue to disagree on a myriad of issues. For example, the feminist movement has primarily involved itself with peace movements, not women working in nontraditional careers (Krolokke, 2005). Also, feminist theory has contributed little to the understanding of problems and challenges facing women who work in masculine environments (Solano, 2006).

Further, activists in the feminist movement and feminist scholars have disagreed on what future steps are necessary. On one end of a broad spectrum, radical feminists have argued that patriarchy is a power system that subjugates women and asserts male supremacy, and they would advocate overthrowing the existing patriarchy through a radical reordering of society (Willis, 1984). On the other end of the spectrum, conservative feminist scholars have rejected the need for radical reordering of society as unnecessary and extreme (Carlson, 2003; Graglia, 1998). Others (Minogue, 2001) have argued that changes in women's roles, from women as primarily mothers to women as self-defined professionals, has been a social disaster. Minogue has claimed that changes in gender roles will ultimately result in social chaos, and radical feminism will contribute to the downfall of civilization.

Feminist Standpoint Theory

As previously stated, until the 1970s, mainstream researchers failed to take gender into account as they designed studies. Feminist standpoint theory was developed during the second feminist wave and became one of the most influential feminist theories to develop during that

period. This theory was selected to provide a theoretical positioning for the present study because it allowed for flexibility in analyzing a wide range of participant perspectives.

Feminist standpoint theory offers a meaningful theoretical approach that encompasses a range of social scientific disciplines (Longino, 1993). This theory, sometimes referred to as standpoint feminism, has foundations in both Marxist and socialist feminist theoretical frameworks in that the theory attaches significance to both gender and class (Jaggar & Rosenberg, 1993).

Advocating for this approach, Sandra Harding (2004) challenged prior scientific research by claiming that it left women invisible. The scientific approach requires that a question is posed, a hypothesis is formulated and tested, and conclusions are drawn from the data collected. Harding (1992) claimed that the scientific approach is not objective for feminist research:

The problem with the conventional conception of objectivity [traditional objective research] is not that it is too rigorous or too “objectifying” as some have argued, but that it is not rigorous or objectifying enough. It is too weak to accomplish even the goals for which it has been designed, let alone the more difficult projects called for by feminism and other social movements. (p. 438)

Calling for true objectivity in scientific research, Harding argued that all past research has reflected a male-centric point of view. She suggested that the inclusion of the experiences and ideas of marginalized groups provides a more robust and objective view of the phenomenon being studied. The goal should be to do a better job of producing “less partial and distorted results” by calling on multiple viewpoints to help provide a more robust description of the phenomenon (Harding, 1992, p. 437).

Dorothy Smith and Nancy Hartsock, as pioneers of feminist standpoint theory, advocated

that women's lived experiences, and particularly women's experiences in caring work, are the beginning of true scientific inquiry (Harding, 2004; Hartsock, 1983; Smith, 1987; Smith, 1990). Harding (2004) argued that feminist standpoint theory makes a contribution to epistemology, to methodological debates in the social and natural sciences, to philosophy of science, and to political activism (Harding, 2004).

The basic premise of feminist standpoint theory is to connect women's lived experiences with knowledge (Jaggar & Bordo, 1990). This theory calls on multiple viewpoints and relies on three principal claims. First, knowledge is socially situated. Second, marginalized groups are socially situated in ways that make it possible for them to be aware of things and to ask questions. Third, research, focused on power relations, should begin with the lives of the marginalized.

Feminist standpoint theory is based on the notion that, because the lives and roles of women are significantly different from men, women possess a different type of knowledge than men (Hartsock, 1983; Smith, 1987). Central to this approach is examining: (a) the connection between experience and power, and (b) the connection between power and the production of knowledge. Political power and social power are central to the production of knowledge (Hartsock, 1983). Feminist standpoint theory is descriptive in that it allows for describing and analyzing the causal effects of power structures on knowledge. At the same time, this theory advocates a specific route for inquiry based on standpoints that emerge from shared struggle within marginalized lives (Hartsock, 1983). Koertge (2006) described a woman's *standpoint* in this way: "What you see, what you find important, and how you understand the world depends upon your standpoint, and . . . an individual's personal standpoint can be one that they were born into or one that they deliberately construct" (pp. 560-561). Empowerment for women becomes

possible through their standpoints when their stories are shared and their voices are heard (Gilligan, 1982). Using feminist standpoint theory in research, the researcher cannot be a neutral observer and should be on the same intellectual level as study participants (Sullivan, 2001).

Feminist standpoint theory contributed to the theoretical framework for the present study for several reasons. First, this study was “women-centered research” that emphasized the need, “to begin with women’s lives, and as they themselves experience them, in order to achieve an accurate and authentic understanding of what life is like for women today” (Brooks, 2007, p. 56). Second, feminist standpoint theory embraces a position that is evident in the research question of this study; this position is that knowledge is constructed from multiple realities (Jaggar & Bordo, 1990). Third, like feminist standpoint theory, the present study shared a deep appreciation of women’s individual standpoints. Fourth, feminist standpoint theory offered a pragmatic approach to explain the concrete details of everyday experiences in the lives of extraordinary women (Sullivan, 2001). Finally, this approach fit with my own professional experiences in the sense that I, as a former female FBI manager and as the researcher, could relate to the participants’ experiences on a similar intellectual level and with a similar set of experiences.

Section Summary

An appreciation of the feminist perspective in America was essential in order to understand the individual perspectives of study participants. Evolving feminist frameworks were outlined to provide historical context on the subordination and oppression of women. Women, who were once considered biologically and socially inferior to men, now challenge this notion. Tenets of feminism have contributed to understanding women’s experiences through the rejection of dualist thinking, the social construction of knowledge and women’s ways of

knowing, and a belief in the empowerment of women through caring and relationships.

Finally, feminist standpoint theory, as one component in the study's theoretical framework, was introduced. This theory was described as appropriate to explain the lived experiences and multiple viewpoints of early women leaders in the FBI.

Nontraditional Women

Throughout American history, women have faced obstacles in the workforce; these have included personal, legal, and economic challenges (D'Agostino & Levine, 2011; Klenke, 1996). Since the 1960s, policymakers, legislators, and activists have addressed women's workforce issues in the context of equal rights, civil rights, affirmative action, school reform, pay reform, and equal employment opportunity (Klenke, 1996). In the 1970s, women's work was no longer described primarily in terms of mother and homemaker. By the 1990s, 60 percent of working women held clerical, service, or professional positions. Of women holding professional positions, most were concentrated in female-intensive fields, such as school teaching and nursing (Taeuber, 1991).

The percentage of women in the American workforce has increased from 30 percent in 1959, to 38 percent in 1970, to 47 percent in 2014 (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015). Today, women are blazing new trails in many career fields, such as in education, health, business, and science. The number of women attaining leadership positions in their chosen fields has risen, as women have overcome structural, societal, and individual obstacles to succeed (White House Project, 2010).

Female Leadership

Historical events and the feminist movement of the 1970s, as described earlier in this chapter, set the stage for women to formally integrate into previously closed, and traditionally

male, occupations (Collins, 2009). As employment opportunities for women have increased, a gap in knowledge about female leadership became evident. Much of the research on gender and leadership has been driven by the lack of women holding significant roles within organizations.

Gender was not mentioned in scholarly research studies until the latter part of the 20th Century (Eagly & Sczesny, 2009). Classical leadership approaches took the position that leadership in organizations was gender-neutral. For example, Stogdill's (1948/1974) "Great Man" theory identified traits, skills, and styles associated with successful leaders, and his research focused entirely on men. Conceptions of ideal leaders were concentrated on hierarchical organizations, such as military and law enforcement organizations, and they were typically described in masculine, aggressive, and competitive terms (White, 1995). Scholars took the position that women managers could be as effective as men managers, but only if they adopted masculine management styles (Powell, 2010).

Until the 1970s, the differences between women and men's leadership styles were minimized (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). Consistent with masculine, hierarchical leadership models, women leaders found ways to "fit the pre-established organizational situations through a pervasive theme of *no difference*, meaning [their goal was to be] 'as good as' men but without questioning who had defined this goodness" (Brandser, 1996, p. 6). Successful women leaders found individualized ways to survive, usually by adopting masculine styles. This survival pattern perpetuated the no difference stance and contributed to negative perceptions descriptions of successful women leaders as aggressive and bitchy (Kanter, 1977; Morris, 1994).

Over the last 40 years, leadership research has advanced beyond the trait approach and the no difference stance (Heidensohn, 1992; White, 1995). Instead of minimizing the differences

between women and men's leadership styles, research has focused instead on the qualities associated with effective leaders and the differences in how women and men lead (White, 1995). Such comparative research was focused on understanding how effective women leaders were uniquely different from men and the roles of personality, motivation, personal traits and skills in shaping leadership styles (Rosener, 1990; White, 1995).

Researchers determined that women and men demonstrate different values in their leadership roles (Marshall, 1984; Rosener, 1990; Silvestri, 2003). Feminine values are characterized by interdependence, cooperation, receptivity, and acceptance. Masculine values are characterized by self-assertion, separation, independence, control, aggression, and competition (Marshall, 1984).

Rosener (1990) developed a gendered model for leadership based on how women assessed themselves as leaders. Women create leadership paths for themselves by drawing on their socialization experiences. Successful women leaders described themselves as transformational leaders and ascribed their power to personal characteristics, such as charisma, interpersonal skills, hard work, and personal contacts, rather than organizational position. By contrast, men were more likely to describe themselves as transactional leaders, deriving their power from formal authority and organizational position. People with feminine characteristics are often suited for transformational leadership and those with masculine characteristics are often suited for transactional leadership (Heidensohn, 1992).

A number of research studies have provided evidence that women leaders gravitate toward a more transformational leadership style than men and that women leaders have a strong impact on individual, group, and organizational performance (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Eagly et al., 2003; Hegelson, 1990). In his research on managers in a wide range of organizations in the

United States and Canada, Robert Kabacoff (2000) provided evidence of these claims. Women rated more highly than men on measures of empathy, communication, and interpersonal skills. Women tended to score higher on leadership scales oriented to production and the attainment of results, while men tended to score higher on scales related to strategic planning and organizational vision. In supervisor assessments, men and women were reported as equally effective, but, in peer and direct assessments, women were reported to be more effective than men (Kabacoff, 2000). Kabacoff's findings suggest that women are better equipped than men to build inclusive, collaborative, and rewarding organizations in which all employees can perform optimally.

The goal of the transformational leader is to motivate others by transforming individual interests into the interests, or goals, of the group. Women do this by: (a) encouraging others to participate so they feel part of the organization, (b) sharing power and information to reinforce open communication and build loyalty, (c) enhancing the worth of others through praise and recognition, and (d) energizing others with enthusiasm (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Silvestri, 2003).

While women have made great strides to achieve positional success within these organizations (Sellers, 2007), they have been underrepresented in the higher levels of these organizations. Despite their increased numbers in the workforce, little progress has been made for career women to break through the barrier that is commonly referred to as the *glass ceiling* (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Eagly & Schnezney, 2009). Ironically, at the same time, major corporations have been incorporating management strategies to develop leaders with transformational skills (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Eagly & Schnezney). These strategies have included an emphasis on work teams, participatory leadership, and consensus building. Transformational leadership may be the best vision for future leadership in law enforcement,

replacing the previous emphasis on masculine traits, noting that “if police officers need interpersonal skills, rather than tough physiques, . . . then not only is the macho crime fighter model obsolete as a model, he may actually be a liability” (Heidensohn, 1992, p. 221).

Nontraditional Occupations

As an increasing number of women have chosen nontraditional careers, the definition of nontraditional occupations (NTO) has changed. In the 1980s, occupations with less than 30 percent being female employees were defined as nontraditional careers for women; those with 30 percent to 69 percent being female employees were considered gender-neutral careers; and those with 70 percent or more being female employees were considered traditional careers for women (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987). In 2010, NTOs for women were redefined as occupations in which women comprise less than 25 percent of the workforce, with the remaining percentages being either gender-neutral or gender-traditional (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015c).

Some historically male-dominated occupations, such as in law and medicine, have experienced higher rates of growth for women to the level that, today, they are no longer considered NTOs. For example, in 2009 the number of women attorneys had grown to 32 percent and physicians to 30 percent (U.S. Census, 2013). Table 5 below provides an abbreviated list of NTOs recognized by the U.S. Department of Labor (2015b) and the percentage of women in these fields.

Table 5

Percentage of Women in Nontraditional Occupations

Occupation	Percentage
Farmers	25%
Architects	24%
Criminal Investigators	23%
Computer Software Engineers	21%
FBI Agents	19%
Clergy	18%
Military	15%
Police Officers	13%
Electrical Engineers	7%
Pilots	5%
Firefighters	4%
Construction Laborers	3%
Mechanics	1%

From U.S. Department of Labor (2015b).

Traditionally female occupations, such as nursing and teaching, have been afforded less status and fewer benefits than comparable traditionally male occupations (Foss & Slaney, 1986).

Occupational segregation and wage discrimination have a disparate impact on women, with women more heavily represented in a narrow range of occupations traditionally considered appropriate for them and earning about two-thirds the salary of men employed in comparable occupations (Forret & Dougherty, 2004). Women in nontraditional occupations earn 35 percent

more than women in traditionally female occupations, but less than 10 percent of women work in a NTO (Forret & Dougherty, 2004).

Significant progress for women can be traced to federal legislation that provided educational and occupational remedies to promote gender equity and to close gender pay gaps. As occupational remedies, the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1974 legislated mandates to close the gender gap in America's workplace (Friedan, 1998). Also, in 1972, the Supreme Court ruled that the Civil Rights Act applied to the public sector and thus held law enforcement agencies potentially liable for discriminating against qualified women in hiring and promotion. As an educational remedy, Title IX of the Education Amendment Act of 1972 was a groundbreaking law that was intended to end sex discrimination in federally funded education programs and to close the gender gap in America's schools. Resulting in school reform and curriculum changes, this legislation was significant in terms of its impact on young girls and their future career opportunities (American Association of University Women [AAUW], 1992).

For the present study, professional sports careers might be considered relevant to the discussion of nontraditional careers for women, such as military and police careers, because of their shared emphasis on physical performance. Two distinctions are noteworthy that separate sports careers from military and law enforcement careers. First, separate career paths exist for women in designated female sports with rare exceptions. Second, the number of women participating in professional sports has surpassed the 25 percent mark so that professional sports careers for women no longer meet the definition of a NTO (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015b).

Women Trailblazers

A trailblazer is defined as an independent person who “makes, does, or discovers

something new and makes it acceptable or popular (Merriam-Webster, n.d.).

The present study was focused on women trailblazers who worked in masculine and potentially dangerous NTOs. Types of NTOs were relevant to the present study because their organizations met these criteria:

- They employ women as less than 25 percent of the organization's employees.
- They are governed by policies and laws mandating gender equity.
- They require the capacity to use deadly force in order to protect their lives or the lives of others.
- They require that minimum physical standards for entry and retention be met.

The categories reviewed for the present study included the U.S. military, police agencies, and the FBI.

Because the present study focused on the year 1972 as a starting point for female FBI agents, literature about women in the military, law enforcement, and the FBI was examined both in that historical context and in a modern context. Each section below outlines the status of women in and around the early 1970s and then their current status, based on available data. Each section is also accompanied by relevant research literature.

Military women. Experiences and perspectives of women in masculine, nontraditional occupations could not be fully considered without a review of the roles of women in the U.S. military. Women have served in every war since the American Revolution in both support and front line roles. D'Agostino and Levine (2011) pointed to many examples of women trailblazers in military service, to include Civil War nurse Clara Barton, Revolutionary War soldier Deborah Sampson, and Civil War Medal of Honor recipient Mary Walker. Women have served on active duty in the military since 1901, working mostly as nurses (Manning, 2010). During World

War 1, they integrated into other noncombat roles, and during World War II, recruitment efforts intensified to hire more women in an even wider variety of noncombat roles (Manning, 2010).

In 1967, the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 was modified to lift a ceiling on the number of women who could serve in the military (Manning, 2010). In 1988, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) opened 30,000 positions to women but established the Risk Rule that excluded women from all combat positions (Manning, 2010). In 1994, responding to the changes in the nature of warfare, Secretary of Defense Les Aspin announced the Ground Combat Rule that excluded women from units whose primary missions involved direct ground combat (Aspin, 1994). Changes to this rule were announced in February 2013 and all combat positions were opened to women in 2016. The change is described further in this section.

Representation and leadership. In 1970, women in all five branches of the military comprised less than two percent of all enlisted and officer ranks. After the military draft ended in 1973, with the expiration of the Selective Service Act, the number of women in enlisted and officer ranks has steadily grown (Manning, 2010). For over 40 years, our military has been a voluntary workforce, with women essential to satisfying the military's mission requirements.

Successful leadership in the military is synonymous with perceptions of ideal leadership in America (White House Project, 2011). Still, many American citizens are not comfortable with women as leaders in the military; in a 2007 survey, respondents rated their comfort level with women leaders, and, across all professions, and they were least comfortable with women leaders in the military (White House Project, 2010).

Despite being an essential part of the workforce, women in the military have remained underrepresented in leadership positions as compared to the numbers of men in these positions

(Kellerman & Rhode, 2007). Well into the 1980s, women constituted less than two percent of all senior military officers and less than four percent of the senior enlisted ranks (Manning, 2010). By 2010, these percentages had increased, and women represented 9.1 percent of senior officers and 8.9 percent of senior enlisted ranks (Manning). Variations in the number of women and their representation as officers by military branch reflect the differences in mission, leadership, and culture between the services (Manning). For example, the U.S. Marine Corps has the lowest percentage of women, and the U.S. Air Force has the highest.

Women in combat. Historically, women have not been allowed to serve in a variety of military assignments solely due to gender (Manning, 2010). Some positions were closed for practical reasons, such as a lack of adequate housing or facilities for women, but many were closed because they were combat positions. (McSally, 2007). The issue of women in combat has been widely debated. This issue is relevant to the present study because it has applications for women in other NTOs who aspire to leadership. In 2008, over 65 percent of all male military officers had combat assignments. The link between experience in combat assignments and promotion exposed a clear gender gap in military leadership (McSally, 2007). While the link between operational experience and promotion was clear, the relationship between gender and promotion was less clear (McSally, 2007).

By way of background, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) established the Risk Rule in 1988 that excluded women from all combat positions (Manning, 2010). In 1994, the Ground Combat Rule amended the rule to exclude women from units whose primary missions involved direct ground combat (Aspin, 1994). In 2009, the Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC) was formed to conduct a comprehensive evaluation and assessment of diversity policies relating to the promotion and advancement of minority members of the military (MLDC, 2010).

In 2011, the Commission recommended that President Barack Obama remove all combat exclusions for women (MLDC, 2011). In 2013, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta announced that combat restrictions for women were being lifted and plans for implementation were forthcoming (Bumiller & Shanker, 2013).

In 2015, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter confirmed that all positions would be open to women in 2016 (Kamarck, 2015). By eliminating the combat exclusion, obstacles to recruitment, retention, and promotion are expected to lessen over time (MLDC, 2011).

Detractors of women in combat have cited a variety of practical reasons unrelated to the capabilities of women, such as negative public perception, lack of facility accommodations, concerns about fraternization, women's biological issues, and the potential for sexual harassment (Center for Readiness, 1997). Detractors also express mission-related concerns that most women lack the strength and temperament for combat, and that the presence of women in combat units would have an adverse impact on unit cohesion and morale (Harrell & Miller, 1997).

Research. Harrell and Miller (1997) determined that the majority of men in the military believed that women should not work in direct combat assignments. Notwithstanding, Harrell, Beckett, Chien, and Sollinger (2002) determined that the presence of women in units deployed overseas had no impact on unit cohesion and morale. They studied women in jobs that took them into combat zones and found that they performed as effectively as men in those zones. McSally (2007) found that females performed well during deployments. In spite of these results, Harrell et al. (2002) determined that the setting of arbitrary physical standards for some positions has limited women from getting promotions. The connection between physical strength and specific work requirements has not been tested (Harrell et al., 2002).

Policewomen. The earliest police departments were established in the mid-1800s with police careers closed to women. In 1910, Alice Stebbins Wells was hired by the Los Angeles Police Department as the first American female police officer. By 1932, more than 1,500 women were police officers (Heidensohn, 2006). In the 1940s, World War I set the stage for more women to be recruited into police work as men joined the military to fight in the war (Heidensohn, 2006). By 1968, the Indianapolis Police Department made history by assigning the first two female police officers to patrol work (Schulz, 1995).

Over the last century, gender integration of police organizations has met strong resistance. Early women police officers faced many obstacles (Heidensohn, 2006; Horne, 2012; Martin, 2006). Women officers were regarded as “social workers” who received lower wages and were assigned duties with lower status, such as clerical, juvenile, and guard duties (Schulz, 1995). Until the 1970s, most policewomen were not permitted to perform the basic patrol duties that might have helped them to earn promotions. They were not permitted to take the same promotion tests as men could only be promoted within women's units (Price, 1996). Male administrators effectively blocked policewomen from advancement by denying them access to the requisite experience (Price, 1996).

Representation. Over the last 40 years, the number of women in law enforcement careers has been increasing, but their overall numbers have remained small and the pace of increase has been slow (Schulz, 1995). Numbers have increased despite qualified women being routinely screened out of the selection process, based on height and weight standards and on physical agility tests that were inconsistent or invalid (Lonsway, K., Moore, M., Harrington, P., Smeal, E., & Spillar, K., 2003b). The largest increase in numbers has occurred in agencies that were subject to consent decrees or other court orders that mandated the hiring and promotion of

qualified women. Such orders were imposed after women brought sex discrimination lawsuits against their departments (Lonsway et al., 2003a).

In 1970, only two percent of police were women (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1993). By 2008, this percentage had increased to 13 percent. At the executive level, however, only one percent of police chiefs were women in 2008 (Horne, 1980; Mroz, 2008).

Research. For more than 30 years, researchers have studied the capabilities of women to perform police work. Studies have consistently provided evidence that women are competent in these areas: (a) patrol work (Townsey, 1982), (b) response to hazardous situations (Elias, 1984), (c) academy academic performance (Elias, 1984), (d) physical capability (Townsey, 1982), and, (e) handling of violent confrontations (Grennan, 1987).

Policewomen have encountered obstacles to career success, primarily as a result of the negative attitudes and open resistance of male officers (Horne, 1980). Prokos and Padavic (2002) described the resistance to policewomen to be a function of a pervasive hidden agenda of hegemonic masculinity. Male officers expected women to fail on the job, and they perpetuated myths about women's lack of emotional fitness (Horne, 1980). Male officers doubted that women could perform the same skills as men (Bloch & Anderson, 1974; Melchionne, 1976). Younger, educated, officers have been found to be less negative toward female officers than older, veteran officers (Sherman, 1975).

Policewomen have also faced a number of socially structured challenges in their work lives that are inherent in the modern society. These include family responsibilities, role strain and role conflict, doubts about competence and self-worth, and sexual harassment (Martin, 2006; Glaser & Saxe, 1982). In addition, women officers have reported being harassed by men who think they will violate codes of secrecy about police corruption and violence (Hunt, 1990).

Women's behavior in police departments has been dictated by lack of opportunity, mobility, and power (Martin, 2006). Kanter (1975) argued that the structure and practices of police agencies, not individual factors, dictates occupational behavior. As a result, the frequent assignment of policewomen to administrative positions has historically cast them as *token* members of their departments (Heidensohn, 2006; Kanter, 1975).

Despite research that women are capable of performing the duties of police officers, arbitrary recruiting and promotion practices have served to keep the numbers of women in law enforcement artificially low (Lonsway et al., 2003a). Once on the job, women have often faced discrimination, harassment, and intimidation, as they moved through the ranks (Garrison, Grant, & McCormick, 1998).

Some scholars have argued that presence of women in police leadership may mollify complaints of excessive force and reduce corruption scandals in law enforcement (Grennan, 1987). Because women police officers rely less on physical force and more on communications skills, women are often better at defusing violent confrontations, and they are less likely to use excessive force (Grennan). The presence of policewomen also has significant implications for women victims of domestic and sexual violence (Cassidy, Nicholl, & Ross, 2001).

G-Women. Information for this section was obtained from my personal knowledge as an FBI spokesperson in the FBI's Office of Public Affairs from 1990 to 1993; my personal communications with other female agents; archived FBI memoranda; and the FBI website (FBI, 2015b; FBI, 2015c, FBI, 2015e). Archived memoranda are included at Appendix A.

When J. Edgar Hoover became FBI Director in 1924, two women, Jessie Duckstein and Alaska Davidson, were considered agents but they worked in limited capacities (FBI, 2015b). Both resigned that year as part of a reduction of force that Hoover orchestrated. An additional

female employee, Lenore Houston, was later upgraded to be an agent; she also worked in a limited capacity, and she was pressured to resign in 1928. Thereafter, no women were hired as agents until shortly after Hoover's death in 1972. Hoover considered women unfit to handle the physical rigors of the agent position, which included making arrests, taking part in raids, and engaging in self-defense.

In 1969, Hoover disregarded Executive Order 11478 issued by President Richard M. Nixon to prohibit discrimination in hiring. Hoover defended his position to prohibit the hiring of female agents by citing a previous Civil Service Commission regulation that the "bearing of firearms [were] exemptions to the basic policy that consideration of applicants shall not be restricted to one sex" (FBI, 2015e). In a March 11, 1971 memorandum, Hoover (1971) defended the FBI's policy to limit the agent position to males. In that memorandum, he described his vision of the FBI Special Agent:

The Special Agent in his appearance, approach, and conduct must create the impression to his adversary that among other qualities he is intrepid, forceful, aggressive, dominant, and resolute. The more the adversary senses he is overmatched by the personal and physical qualities of the Special Agent the more effective is our operation. . . . Our work involves basically man against man and is a body-contact profession where in the interest of good law enforcement we endeavor to minimize the use of firearms and violence by an aura of invincibility and by the presence of superior force. (p. 1)

Just days after Hoover's death on May 2, 1972, in an announcement dated May 12, 1972, FBI Acting Director L. Patrick Gray announced that women would be considered for the agent position (Gray, 1972). The announcement made reference to Executive Order 11478 and the

Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972. Archived versions of both Hoover's 1971 FBI memorandum and Gray's 1972 announcement are included in Appendix A.

FBI Special Agents. Historically, individuals have been hired as FBI Special Agents under one or more hiring categories. These categories reflect qualifications or skills from previous experiences. In 1972, the categories included language, law, accounting, and a modified group that included other complex work experiences. Today, the categories include language, law, engineering, accounting, computer science, intelligence expertise, military and police experience, special operations experience, and a modified group that includes other complex work experience (FBI, 2015d). Critical hiring needs change periodically, but the hiring process itself has remained relatively consistent over the last 40 years. All applicants, regardless of race or gender, meet the same entry requirements (FBI, 2015d).

The FBI's hiring standards are considered the most demanding among American law enforcement agencies (FBI, 2015d). To be eligible for hire today, applicants must be between the ages 23 and 37. For those hired in the 1970s, the maximum age was 35. The minimum education level of an undergraduate bachelor's degree is required, although many of those hired have graduate degrees. Applicants are screened for critical job-related skills. They must pass: achievement and psychological tests, drug tests, polygraph examinations, interviews, and background investigations. They must have medical examination and perform well on a preliminary fitness test. Educational history, career experience, reputation among peers, special skills, and character are considered in the process. Derogatory information that is revealed during a comprehensive background investigation can exclude applicants from consideration. Disqualifiers for employment include: poor credit, past illegal drug use, abuse of prescription drugs or alcohol, a criminal history, or negative comments by references.

If hired, agents are granted a top-secret clearance (FBI, 2015d). Newly hired agents are usually in their late 20s and early 30s and have career experiences before being hired by the FBI. Military and police personnel typically start their careers at a younger age and meet lower hiring standards. New agents must sign mobility agreements and agree to be transferred as necessary; they also must sign non-disclosure agreements that restrict them from speaking publicly about FBI investigations. All agents must meet minimum physical standards, must be capable of performing defensive tactics, and must be willing to carry a firearm and use deadly force if necessary.

After being hired but before being sworn in as agents, trainees must complete many weeks of residential basic training at the FBI Academy (FBI, 2015d). Since 1972, all training has been conducted at the FBI Academy located in Quantico, Virginia. Basic FBI training involves academic, firearms training, and defensive tactics and physical fitness components. Upon completion of basic training, new agents are sworn in and transferred to one of the FBI's 56 major field offices or to one of a large number of smaller satellite offices. Throughout agents' career, fitness and firearms testing are conducted regularly. In addition, annual performance evaluations are conducted by supervisors. Agents compete competitively for career advancement opportunities that often require transfers to other FBI offices or to FBI Headquarters (FBIHQ) in Washington, DC.

Representation. In July 1972, Joanne Pierce and Susan Roley were hired and entered training as the first female agents in the FBI's modern era (FBI, 2015c). Four months later, and under the scrutiny of their peers and the public, they completed basic training at the FBI Academy and were sworn in as agents. Roley resigned after seven years. Pierce was awarded the FBI's Silver Star for bravery in a firefight and retired after serving in several FBI offices (FBI, 2015c).

Between July 1972 and January 1978, 114 women were hired and completed basic training; by 1978, 1.4 percent of all agents were women (McChesney, 1987). Over that period, the FBI had no target goals governing the hiring of female agents (William H. Webster, personal communication, September 13, 2012). The early attrition rate of female agents was high because many women were unable to pass the physical, defensive tactics, and firearms tests in training (McChesney, 1987). Of the early women, an unknown number resigned during training or early in their careers. Of the first 100 female agents, approximately 20 percent held supervisory positions at some point in their careers (K. McChesney, personal communication, April 26, 2013).

In February 1978, FBI Director William Webster was dissatisfied with the pace of hiring women, and he directed that the hiring of female and minority agents be a top priority (W. Webster, personal communication, September 13, 2012). Since then, the FBI's goal has been to hire a diverse agent workforce that is representative of the population in the United States. Webster instructed top managers to increase efforts to recruit qualified women. As a result, from 1978 to 1984, the number of women hired had increased by 600 percent, and 871 women had been hired. The attrition rate for women was reduced, but many more women resigned than men. Of all women hired as agents between 1972 and 1984, 28 percent had resigned by 1985, compared to four percent of men.

Today, more than 2,600 women are FBI agents, and they represent approximately 19 percent of all agents (FBI, 2015c). Of the 56 FBI field offices, 11 offices, or 20 percent, are headed by female Special Agents in Charge (SAC) (Washington Post, April 4, 2013). Additional figures regarding the number of FBI women managers and the number in the senior ranks have not been made publicly available.

Christine Hansen Lawsuit. After Hoover died, the FBI entered into an era of reform in terms of its equal opportunity practices (Lichtblau, 2001). Concerted efforts were underway to hire female and minority agents so that the FBI would be more representative of the population and would be in compliance with the law. The integration of these agents was not without challenge as many women and minority agents felt they were victims of discrimination and harassment. A group of female agents prevailed in a case action lawsuit filed by Christine Hansen in 1977. A group of Hispanic agents prevailed in a class action lawsuit that was filed in 1987. A group of Black agents prevailed in a class action lawsuit that was filed in 1991. In all cases, courts ruled that the FBI had engaged in systematic discrimination against female and minority agents regarding assignments, promotions, evaluations, and disciplinary matters. When the FBI settled the lawsuit filed by Black agents, attorney David Shaffer commented that the FBI had continued to condone a dual-track system for promotions that “allowed people to be promoted based on who they knew and not how they did their job. This goes all the way back to J. Edgar Hoover” (Lichtblau, 2001).

Christine Hansen was one of the first female agents hired by the FBI. In 1977, she filed an administrative class action lawsuit against the FBI that alleged institutional gender discrimination (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986). She resigned that year. The procedural history of the case is complex, with allegations heard by the Civil Service Commission, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), and the U.S. District Court. In 1978, 2600 potential class members were provided notice of the action and given an opportunity to opt out. Of that number, approximately 2000 women were certified as members of the class. The class included women in these categories: (a) all female applicants for employment as agents, (b) all women forced to resign while in training at the FBI Academy, (c) all current female agents at that time,

and, (d) all women who had been agents before the action was filed. As plaintiff, Hansen alleged that the FBI, under Director Webster, had discriminated against women in hiring and training and in field assignments.

With regard to hiring decisions, Hansen alleged that the FBI had discriminated against women applicants in several ways (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986). Until 1972, the FBI barred all women from employment as agents despite legal mandates. Until 1975, the Bureau maintained a 5-foot-7 height requirement for agents. Until 1977, the FBI used a subjective interview process for selecting agents. Hansen argued that these requirements disproportionately and unfairly eliminated female applicants. While the lawsuit was pending, the FBI replaced its hiring procedures with a new selection system and adopted a set of transition policies. Hansen later argued that the transition policies also discriminated against women because they relied on ratings from the previous system to determine whether women would be reconsidered.

With regard to training issues, Hansen alleged that unvalidated physical and firearms training and testing screened out a disproportionate number of female trainees (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986). She contended that the testing requirements were not justified by business necessity.

Finally, with regard to field assignments, Hansen alleged that the FBI had discriminated against female agents in their assignments on the job. Discrimination was evident in promotions, training opportunities, case and squad assignments, transfers, and field office assignments (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986). Hansen alleged that these discriminatory workplace practices, as well as discriminatory hiring and training practices, had been shielded from challenge in administrative proceedings, in the courts, and in the FBI's equal employment opportunity (EEO) program. In court filings, the FBI's EEO program was described as grossly inadequate.

In 1981, the U.S. Justice Department issued a finding in favor of Hansen and the class of female agents in all areas except transfers. Following this finding, and before the final judgment was entered in the case, many FBI policies relating to applicant interviews, physical and firearms training, and promotions had to be revised in order to correct past disparate personnel practices (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986).

Choosing a Career

Research studies have discounted traditional beliefs that innate gender differences exist to make women unsuitable to work in traditionally male occupations (Graham, 1997). Research about how and why young women choose nontraditional careers has yielded knowledge of how they can become successful and effective in their careers. Graham grouped the variables that relate to female career choice into three primary categories: individual, family, and environmental. Individual variables included gender role socialization, personality, and psychological influences. Family variables included socioeconomic status, parental education, and role model/parental influence. Environmental variables included the influence of role models, mentors, and educational climate.

The following sections of the literature review outline some of these variables that relate to career choice in greater detail. These variables, and their roles in human experience, overlap.

Gender role socialization. Gender role socialization is paramount to an individual's sense of identity and eventual occupational choice (Graham, 1997). The different socialization experiences of males and females start early in life and result in complex patterns of career development (Fitzgerald & Crites, 1980).

Many studies have confirmed the differential treatment of boys and girls from birth by their parents and others in authority (Letarte, 1992). Authority figures in society impose

different sets of expectations and limitations on girls and boys, with these expectations also generating gender-specific patterns of behavior toward children (AAUW, 1992). Gender role socialization begins in the home as a function of: (a) parental attitudes and beliefs, (b) patterns of interaction, (c) expectations of appropriate and inappropriate behavior, (d) choice of toys, (e) philosophies on child-rearing, and (f) assignment of tasks and chores. This early gender role socialization frames the future decision-making of girls and young women (Letarte, 1992).

Educational climate. Numerous research studies have provided evidence that innate intellectual gender differences simply do not exist, thus disproving the belief that girls are less intellectually capable than boys, particularly in science and mathematics exist (Hyde, Lindberg, Linn, Ellis, & Williams, 2008; Monastersky, 2005). Intelligence quotient (IQ) tests have revealed little to no difference between girls and boys in overall intelligence (Blickenstaff, 2005; Lynn & Irwin, 2004). Academic competence is environmentally, not genetically, determined (Graham, 1997), and educational setting is a major source of sex role stereotyping (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987). LaFollette (1988) determined that, when young students read about a female who is involved in a masculine activity, both boys and girls think that females could—and should—participate in that activity.

Role models and mentors. Eccles' (1994) research on occupational selection determined that career choice is influenced by a person's individual values and expectations for success. One of the ways to increase a person's expectations for success is for the person to see and relate to others who are successful in their careers. Female mentors play significant roles for young women who are interested in nontraditional careers, but an insufficient number of female role models exist (Gilligan, 1982).

At all stages of life, female role models teach girls and women about personal efficacy.

At home, parents can serve as early and consistent positive role models (Graham, 1997). At school, girls respond to academic guidance from teachers and counselors as they begin to consider potential careers (Levin, Wyckoff, & Hussey, 1994; McDaniels & Gysbers, 1992). At work, peer-networking and personal mentoring help create atmospheres for productivity and success for women (Chesler & Chesler, 2002; Washburn & Miller, 2007). Mentors of women often emphasize group interaction, collaboration on tasks, and group visions of success (Gilligan, 1982).

Psychological and personality influences. Individual factors, psychological factors, and personality factors influence female career choices. Nevill and Schlecker (1988) cited assertiveness as an important individual factor that influences career choice for women. Osborn and Harris (1975) described an assertive individual as one who feels confident in personal relationships, who can express feelings and emotions spontaneously, and who is highly regarded by others. Assertive women are more likely to choose careers in law enforcement and the military than non-assertive ones (Nevill & Schlecker, 1988).

Female career choices have been tied to the psychological development of girls. Rogers and Gilligan (1988) described the early positive psychological development of girls:

Young girls show striking capacities for self-confidence, courage, and resistance to harmful norms of feminine behavior, as well as a detailed and complex knowledge of the human social world. Up until the age of 11 or 12, girls are quite clear and candid about what they think and feel and know. (pp. 42-43)

Early in their lives, girls possess self-knowledge about the role of gender. As they age, they learn to reconcile conflicting gender expectations in society and in school (Bush & Simmons, 1987).

For over 30 years, the Bern Sex Role Inventory (Bern, 1981) has been widely used to measure sex role stereotypes. In this scale, personality characteristics of men and women in various occupations have been categorized as instrumental and expressive. Instrumental characteristics are often considered masculine traits and include goal orientation and independence; expressive characteristics are often considered feminine traits and include a focus on relationships and caring (Colley, Mulhern, Maltby, & Wood, 2009). Women in NTOs have scored higher in instrumental characteristics while women in traditional careers scored higher in expressive characteristics (Letarte, 1992). People who scored high in instrumentality reported having greater responsibilities, higher salaries, greater involvement in professional activities, and greater job satisfaction (Jacinski, 1987a). Women with instrumental characteristics also scored high on masculinity scales; they had high self-confidence ratings and used problem-solving skills rather than emotion-focused coping when faced with workplace challenges (Long, 1989).

Felder, Felder, Mauney, Hamrin, and Dietz (1994) examined personality and gender differences in terms of performance. They determined that women view success or failure in terms of their ability. Women were found to focus on an internal locus of control; they blamed themselves for failures at work and attributed poor performance to their lack of ability. Conversely, men were found to focus on an external locus of control; they blamed others for their failures and they were less likely to question their ability.

Career Self-Efficacy Theory

A woman's belief that she can succeed contributes more to her future success than her

actual abilities or experiences, whether positive or negative (Nauta, Epperson, & Waggoner, 1999). Understanding how women gauge their success is integral to career self-efficacy theory, which is the second component in the theoretical framework for the present study. This theory is derivative of social learning theory and is based on the premise that people learn by watching others; thus, career development is influenced by environmental, personal, and behavioral factors (Bandura, 1986).

Using the tenets that framed social learning theory, Bandura (1986) developed the concept of *self-efficacy*, which centers on individual confidence or “the belief in one’s ability to perform a specific task” (Rittmayer & Beier, 2009, p. 1). The terms self-efficacy and self-esteem are terms are often used interchangeably, but they are actually different concepts. Bandura made this distinction, “Perceived self efficacy is concerned with judgments of capabilities, whereas self esteem is concerned with judgments of self worth. There is no fixed relationship between beliefs about one’s capabilities and whether one likes or dislikes oneself” (1997, p. 7).

Bandura (1982) proposed that self-efficacy beliefs develop and increase through four primary processes. These processes are: (a) mastering experiences, (b) learning through vicarious experiences, (c) receiving verbal persuasion, and (d) managing negative physiological states. These processes contribute to the development of positive, or high, self-efficacy beliefs or negative, or low, self-efficacy beliefs.

The first process, or having successful mastery experience, is the most influential source toward the development of high self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997). Mastery experience reflects a person’s interpretation of his or her accomplishments. Outcomes interpreted by an individual as successful tend to raise self-efficacy beliefs. The second source for high self-efficacy beliefs are vicarious learning experiences that occur when an individual observes role

models and models effective behaviors. Vicarious experiences include social influences and encouragement from others. The third source of high self-efficacy beliefs are the positive, verbal persuasions from others; persuasions are social cues that result from being encouraged and that reinforce an individual's sense of competence. Finally, the ability to manage negative physiological states, such as anxiety, stress, arousal, fatigue, and mood state, contribute to high self-efficacy beliefs. Not only does the ability to manage these conditions influence self-efficacy beliefs, having high self-efficacy beliefs can help to keep these conditions under control (Bandura, 1997).

Betz and Hackett (1981) developed a theory of *career self-efficacy* by applying Bandura's (1997) concept of self-efficacy to career-related behaviors. A career is defined as the combination and sequence of work roles that a worker experiences throughout a work lifetime (Super, 1980). Career self-efficacy is defined as a worker's judgments of his or her ability to perform career behaviors in relation to career choice, development, and adjustment (Betz & Taylor, 2001). Career self-efficacy beliefs lead to avoidance of, or motivation toward, career behaviors (Betz & Taylor, 2001). These beliefs, as with self-efficacy beliefs, range from low to high, or negative to positive.

Workers with low career self-efficacy beliefs tend to procrastinate when making work decisions and do not follow through on work tasks (Betz & Taylor, 2001). Workers with high career self-efficacy beliefs tend to visualize success for themselves and seek positive support from coworkers in the workplace (Bandura, 1993). Workers with high career self-efficacy beliefs tend to set higher career goals for themselves than those with low self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997).

Career self-efficacy is considered essential to successful job performance and can greatly

influence work behaviors, regardless of the worker's knowledge and skills (Bandura, 1997; Giles & Rea, 1999; Niles & Sowa, 1992). Nesdale and Pinter (2000) found that, across diverse populations, career self-efficacy was a significant predictor of an individual's ability to find employment. Career self-efficacy has also been found to be a reliable predictor of positive behaviors, such as exploring new career opportunities and seeking better outcomes (Niles & Sowa, 1992).

Applying career self-efficacy theory to working women, Betz and Hackett (1981) determined that self-efficacy beliefs of women in many traditionally male occupations was lower and weaker than it was for men. Generally, individuals reported higher degrees of self-efficacy beliefs in traditional occupations for their gender than in nontraditional occupations for their gender (Hannah & Kahn, 1989). Applying career self-efficacy theory to both gender and age, Clement (1987) found that age and self-efficacy beliefs for females were negatively correlated. Older females were found to have lower self-efficacy beliefs than younger females in male-dominated occupations. Older females were found to have higher self-efficacy beliefs than younger females in female-dominated occupations (Clement, 1987).

Grit

For the present study, the technical construct of *grit* (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthew, & Kelley, 2007) was incorporated in the study's theoretical framework as a manifestation of career self-efficacy theory. In the 19th Century, Francis Galton (1892) collected information on successful individuals, such as judges, statesmen, scientists, and musicians. Claiming that ability alone could not be used to predict success, Galton considered "high achievers to be triply blessed by ability combined with zeal and capacity for hard labour" (p. 33). In this century, Ericsson (2002) has claimed that the intrinsic nature of talent has been overrated, and that excellence is

attained through intense training and deliberate practice. He has referred to this quality as grit.

Duckworth, Peterson, Matthew, and Kelley (2007) developed the grit scale based on their research of professional men and women across a wide range of occupations. The scale was designed to test the hypothesis that certain qualities and individual differences are essential to high achievement. Two factors were determined as essential to achieve long-term goals: perseverance and passion. The Duckworth Scale was administered to Ivy League students and West Point cadets who ranked highly in the National Spelling Bee. The scale included a number of items grouped by two primary factors representing consistent interest, or passion, and dedicated practice, or perseverance of effort. These items and factors on the Duckworth Scale are summarized in Appendix B.

In Duckworth, Peterson, Matthew, and Kelley's (2007) research, participants also completed the Big Five Personality Test (Costa & McCrae, 1992) as a means to understand the relationship between personality and achievement. The assessments considered conscientiousness, extraversion, openness, neuroticism, and agreeableness. The study provided evidence that grit, as measured in terms of consistent interest and dedicated practice, contributed more to high achievement than personality traits or mental ability. Grit related more positively to conscientiousness than to intelligence, and conscientiousness related more positively to job performance than to other traits. Achievement of difficult goals was the result of not only talent but also sustained and focused application of effort. Perseverance was found to be at least as important as intelligence for success, and dedicated practice was a better predictor of achievement than mental ability.

Section Summary

The previous section positioned the study of women leaders in nontraditional careers.

The history of women in the American workplace and in nontraditional occupations was outlined. Key leadership studies were identified, along with a description of how gender-specific research over the last few decades. Research about women as transformational leaders offered understanding of women's potential as leaders in nontraditional occupations. Factors influencing women's career choices and retention were presented. In the absence of research about women in the FBI, research in relevant nontraditional careers for women, in the military and in law enforcement, was presented. The history of early female agents in the FBI was outlined, along with a description of the process involved in hiring and training agents. The legal challenges relating to past discriminatory practices in the FBI completed this description of FBI history. Finally, career self-efficacy theory was introduced as part of the theoretical framework for this study, and factors associated with female career self-efficacy and grit were presented.

Bureaucracy

The present study examined how early women leaders perceived their experiences within the FBI's highly gendered bureaucracy. An understanding of major tenets within organizational theory is relevant to understanding how bureaucracies operate and how participants were able to adapt within the FBI's bureaucracy with its masculine culture.

Max Weber (1946) is regarded as a leading theorist in organizational study regarding modern bureaucracy. Bureaucracy has been widely considered to be the ideal organization. A bureaucracy is a strictly ordered, hierarchical organization with two fundamental goals: efficiency and effectiveness (Shafritz et al., 2005). A bureaucracy is an environment in which employees work with a minimum of friction and they provide expert, impartial, and unbiased service to customers (Weber, 1946). A bureaucracy is an organization that is extremely rigid and stable and one that does not adapt quickly to change. Characteristics of a bureaucracy include the

presence of: (a) a division of labor, (b) a well-defined hierarchy, (c) established rules and procedures, (d) a general lack of personal interaction, and (e) a rigid promotion and selection process. In practice, the presence of these characteristics results in worker conformity (Shafritz et al., 2005).

In a bureaucracy, efficiency focuses on inputs, use of resources, and costs; and effectiveness focuses on outputs, products and services, and revenues (Burton, DeSanctis, & Obel, 2006). While all organizations value efficiency and effectiveness, some organizations may make one goal a dominant priority while other organizations focus simultaneously on both goals.

Henry Mintzberg (1979) is also widely regarded in classic organizational theory. His structural configurations depict how various functions are performed in five types of organizations, considering their relative size and the importance of functions in relation to the organization's mission and challenges. Within any of the configurations, functions are carried out by as many as six distinct components: (a) a strategic apex, or top management; (b) a middle line, or middle management; (c) an operating core, or operational processes; (d) a technostructure, or analytical processes; (e) support staff; and, (f) ideology, or norms and culture. Mintzberg's five configurations for traditional organizations are: (a) simple structure, (b) machine bureaucracy, (c) adhocracy, (d) professional bureaucracy, and (e) divisionalized organization (Shafritz et al., 2005).

The simple structure configuration consists of a top manager who directly supervises workers in the operating core. An example of this configuration is a relatively small corporation.

The machine bureaucracy configuration is defined by standardization. Work is very formalized, decision-making is centralized, and tasks are grouped by functional departments. Jobs

are clearly defined, formal planning and budgeting processes exist, and procedures are regularly analyzed for efficiency.

The adhocracy configuration applies to companies that function on an ad hoc basis to survive. These companies rely on experts to form creative, functional teams. Decisions are decentralized, and power is delegated as needed. An advantage of adhocracies is their flexibility to solve problems.

The professional bureaucracy configuration functions like a machine bureaucracy except that this organization relies on highly trained professionals with specialized skills. This configuration is complex with many rules and procedures. Output is generated by highly trained professionals who have autonomy and considerable power. These organizations have a large operating core of workers and respond slowly to external change.

The divisionalized organization configuration applies to organizations with a wide range of products or that operate in different geographic regions. In these structures, a central headquarters supports a number of quasi-autonomous divisions that make their own decisions. The key benefit of a divisional structure is that it allows line managers to maintain control and accountability. Workers report to mid-level managers who in turn report through a chain of command to the headquarters team at the strategic apex. The headquarters team focuses on strategic plans.

The organizational concepts of Weber and Mintzberg are relevant to understanding the structure, goals, mission, and challenges of FBI. The FBI, like most bureaucratic organizations, places equal priority on inputs and outputs (Burton et al., 2006). The FBI clearly meets Weber's (1946) characteristics of bureaucracy; the FBI is a strictly ordered, rigid, hierarchical organization that is equally focused on efficiency and effectiveness. Using Mintzberg's (1979)

organizational configurations, both the professional bureaucracy and the divisionalized organization, as previously described, resemble the FBI's structure and mission. The FBI and other hierarchical organizations, such as military and law enforcement organizations, are similar in that they require a large operating core of workers and respond very slowly to external change. Work is performed by quasi-autonomous units, with workers reporting to mid-level managers who in turn report through a chain of command to the headquarters team.

Gendered Nature of Organizations

During the late 1800s and early 1900s, a progressive organizational movement took place in America when government power shifted. Where government had previously been smaller and organized locally around courts and political parties, it shifted to become more centralized and larger to add bureaucratic structures and processes (Stivers, 1995). The shift was the result of a perceived need for government leaders to be better able to address complex national challenges (Skowronek, 1982). Stivers (1995) argued that the shift in power reinforced gendered divisions of labor. Although both men and women were involved in the effort to enlarge government structures, the process itself was almost entirely overseen by men. At the time, accepted gender roles were men as wage earners and women as domestic workers.

Gender was not seriously considered in organizational theory until the 1970s and 1980s, during the second wave of feminism. This period was a time of reform for organizational theory, marked by great strides in feminist research and guided by the theme that "organizational reform requires changes in organizational culture" (Shafritz et al., 2005, p. 415). Since then, a more gender-conscious understanding of leadership has been central to research in the context of bureaucratic organizations. Whereas Weber's classical orientation excluded gender as a variable,

feminist studies have been overtly political regarding organizations, and research has been framed with an agenda advocating gender equality (Macionis, 2004).

Ferguson (1984) described bureaucracy as the “scientific organization of inequality,” (p. 1) where both structure and process are controlled by power. She further described “bureaucratic capitalist society as a primary source of the oppression of women and men” (p. 1). Within bureaucratic structures, women have traditionally experienced patterns of subordination in the context of power relationships (Ferguson, 1984). The rules that govern bureaucracy serve to dictate and normalize women’s subordinate behavior (Arendt, 1958).

Ferguson (1984) suggested an alternative vision in which an organization could reflect the caretaking and nurturing experiences that are embedded traditionally in women’s roles. Claiming that feminist theory does not just relate to women’s issues but to the world, she advocated a feminist restructuring of work that rejects the hierarchical division of labor in favor of group planning and group performance of tasks. In this framework, tasks would ideally be performed by individuals who are responsible for both the creative and routine aspects of the task. Along with a concern for efficiency and effectiveness, productivity would include concern for both the needs of workers and the needs of the community (Ferguson, 1984).

Bartlett (1990) argued that women in the workforce can act as *gendering agents* to shift power within their organizations. Bartlett used this term to refer to the influence that women leaders can wield in military and law enforcement organizations. The use of feminist methods to improve the standing of women in organizations is referred to as *feminist practice* (Bartlett, 1990). Feminist practice promotes core female values such as mutuality, interdependence, inclusion, cooperation, nurturance, participation, empowerment, and personal and collective transformation (Ferguson, 1984). These values are in direct contrast with the values associated

with hegemonic forms of masculine management prevalent in most hierarchical organizations; these masculine values include competition and individual success (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Martin, 2006). Feminist practice is not restricted to feminists per se, as there are men and women who do not consider themselves as feminists but who possess similar values.

Acker (1992) attributed the persistence of male advantage in many organizations to gendered power imbalances. Gendered processes are patterned in male-hegemonic terms of masculine advantage, exploitation, and power (Acker, 1990; Connell & Messerschmidt, 1987). Hierarchical, powerful organizations, such as the military and law enforcement, are gendered through the following distinct processes: (a) the creation of work divisions, (b) an emphasis on images and symbols, (c) the interactions that maintain hierarchies, (d) the shaping of gendered components of individual identity, and (e) the creation of social structures (Acker, 1990). Acker argued that gender should not be viewed as an addition to these processes, but, rather, gender is an integral part of power relations because it is ubiquitous in the workplace.

Bartlett (1990) explained how gendered processes in organizations produce patterns that repress and subordinate women. For example, work division patterns are evident in the uneven division of labor and certain gendered behaviors. Images and symbols subordinate women through language and dress. Interactions that maintain hierarchies include patterns of dominance and submission, such as men interrupting women in conversations. Shaping of gendered components of identity include language use and clothing. Finally, gender contributes to power imbalances in a variety of personnel practices, such as in hiring, training, or evaluations.

In bureaucracies, organizational life favors one gender over the other, due to the effect of gender-related values (Morgan, 1988). In recent decades, feminist researchers have explored the role of gender in shaping organizational values, rules, and culture. Values shape the way an

organization's rules are constructed, and both explicit and tacit rules reinforce culture (Martin, 1990; Mills, 1988). For example, Martin (1990) framed a feminist account of culture in police organizations. Smircich (1985) addressed the impact of female values on how knowledge is produced within a prevailing social order. Heidensohn (1996) described female values that included: (a) encouraging innovation and policy improvements, (b) focusing on social and communication skills over physical skills, and (c) promoting proactivity instead of reactivity (Heidensohn, 1992). If rules and culture are to be reflective of women's value to organizations, female values must be embraced (Mills).

Tipping Points

As the number of women in nontraditional occupations increased in the 1970s, many early female leaders emulated the styles of their male counterparts. The most powerful organizational positions were almost entirely occupied by men with the exception of the "occasional biological female," described as a "social man" (Sorenson, 1984, p. 1). Although women attempted to blend in, men continued to treat them differently. Often, when women were hired or promoted, they were assigned—almost automatically—into support roles. Kanter (1975) noted that these women were treated as token members of their organizations. Thus, increasing the number of women in organizations and promoting women into support roles were not necessarily guarantees of acceptance or positive change (Silvestri, 2003).

The relationship between the number of women in the workplace and gender equality is not linear, positive, nor negative (Kanter, 1997). Kanter introduced the concept of the *tipping point* to signify that meeting a threshold in numbers within organizations is important to give power to women. Strength in numbers counteracts perceptions of women as tokens in organizations. Kanter posited that, when women number more than 15 percent of the workforce,

a tipping point is reached where women are able to form effective alliances and affect group culture (Kanter, 1977). When women comprise less than 15 percent of the workforce, men are the dominant group and prevent them from forming effective alliances. Researchers agree that potential disadvantages to women decline when 30 percent to 40 percent of workforce is female (Allmendinger & Hackman, 1995; Pfeffer & Davis-Blake, 1987).

Understanding Gender and Leadership in Organizations

Empirical data regarding how women function as leaders within organizations is lacking. As previously noted, pre-1970s mainstream organizational theory and research did not address gender. Subsequent research, particularly in the area of leadership, has contributed to how female leadership is framed in different types of organizations.

For the present study, the Alvesson and Billing (1997) model is relevant. They identified four fundamental research-based positions that guide the understanding of female leadership within organizations. These positions should not be considered as strict paradigms but as areas for consideration in a gendered world. As depicted in Figure 2, the four positions are arranged according to two dimensions: (a) emphasis on gender similarities versus differences, and (b) concerns about ethics versus efficiency.




Figure 2. Approaches to the Understanding of Women and Leadership

Note. From *Understanding Gender and Organizations*, by M. Alvesson, & Y. D. Billing (1997). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. p. 171. Reprinted with permission.

The approaches for women leaders in organizations include: (a) the equal opportunities position, (b) the alternative values position, (c) the meritocratic position, and (d) the special contribution position. In practice, an organization's policies may result in a switch between one or more of the positions, but one position will always be primary.

In the equal opportunities position, women have been viewed as victims of discrimination and have been denied opportunities to advance (Alvesson & Billing, 1997). Advocates of this position explain low numbers of women in leadership in terms of lack of education, different priorities in life, and unequal treatment. In this position, organizations must acknowledge that gender stereotypes have been reinforced and that women have suffered discriminated as a result. The basis for this position is primarily moral, in that women and men are entitled to equal opportunity and equal treatment in the workplace.

In the meritocratic position, people move up and down the occupational hierarchy according to their personal merit and contributions (Alvesson & Billing, 1997). In a meritocratic society, organizations place value on employee qualifications, presumably without regard for gender, class, or race. Historically, merit-based systems have been considered the most efficient

in terms of career building. Meritocratic organizations place value on productivity over qualifications in order to employ workers who will achieve the best results in a competitive workplace.

Unlike the equal opportunities and meritocratic positions in which the common traits of both genders are emphasized, the special contribution position highlights dissimilarities between men and women (Alvesson & Billing, 1997). In this position, women are believed to add value to organizations because women: (a) have people-oriented and democratic leadership styles, (b) emphasize less hierarchical social structures, and (c) exhibit empathy and intuition to improve the workplace climate. The special contribution position is increasingly popular as a reflection of societal trends that are more congruent with women's orientations (Fondas, 1997).

The alternative values position recognizes that men and women differ substantially, and it advocates that women and men do not share the same interests, priorities, or attitudes (Alvesson & Billing, 1997). This position is critical of male-dominated institutions. Alvesson and Billings described this position:

Traditionally, women have been socialized to live by the values of the private sphere, to be nurturing, to serve others, [and] to be emotional, while men have been socialized to live by the values of the public sphere, to deny vulnerability, to compete, to take risks, [and] to want to control nature. . . . Men and women belong to two more or less polarized worlds, one feminine and one masculine, one intuitive-communal and one logical-instrumental. (pp. 165, 166)

Advocating for alternative values, Martin (1993) claimed that women in male-dominated management structures should act in accordance with their own needs, without adapting to

dominating values and standards. In doing so, women have the potential to achieve at a higher level.

The Alvesson and Billings (1997) model provides a framework to understand gender in an organizational context and to explain how women might function as leaders within a bureaucracy. When assessing the applicability of this model to the present study, the qualities of gender similarity and organizational efficiency typically would tend to have primacy in a bureaucracy like the FBI.

Organizational Culture

Deal and Kennedy (2000) argued that a well-aligned corporate culture is essential to an organization's success. They identified six key elements that comprise such a culture. A bureaucracy, like any other organization, has interlocking elements that include: (a) history, (b) values and beliefs, (c) rituals and ceremonies, (d) stories, (e) heroic figures, and (f) a cultural network of storytellers. These elements provide context on a cultural level within an organization. Such analysis should include whether elements work positively to support the organization's values and mission for long-term success (Deal & Kennedy, 2000). With these elements in mind, Deal and Kennedy (2000) identified four primary types of culture as: (a) the work hard/play hard culture, (b) tough-guy/macho culture, (c) process culture, and (d) bet-your-company culture. The culture types are depicted below in Figure 3.




Figure 3. Organizational Culture Types

Note. From *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*, by T. E. Deal & A. A. Kennedy (2000), Cambridge, MA: Perseus. Reprinted with Permission.

The culture types are assigned to positions in four quadrants along two scales—risk and feedback from the environment—that exist along continua. An organization can fit within one or more quadrants simultaneously but one quadrant is primary. The tough-guy/macho culture caters to individuals who enjoy rapid feedback, rapid reward, and high risk, such as surgeons, athletes, and police officers. The work hard/play hard culture caters to high-energy individuals who need immediate feedback, such as sales people. The process culture is typified by low risk and slow feedback and would include bankers and insurance agents. The bet-your-company culture involves high risk with slow feedback and would include workers in the pharmaceutical industry.

Applying the Deal and Kennedy (2000) model to the present study, law enforcement and military organizations would generally be regarded as tough-guy/macho cultures, in which military members or police officers seek excitement and take high risks. In a process culture, excellence is valued, and employees focus on getting details right without necessarily measuring the actual outcome. FBI agents embody the characteristics of the tough-guy/macho culture type, but, because the FBI's investigative work is often long-term and focused on attention to detail, the FBI's culture could also fall with the domain of a process culture. As a result, the culture of

the FBI likely alternates between these two culture types, where either domain may have primacy at any given time.

In military and law enforcement careers, masculine culture is perpetuated by the significance that is placed on physical performance. When physical standards are used as a basis to exclude women from law enforcement and military careers, the intellectual capacity of women is minimized and masculine culture is perpetuated (Dorn & Graves, 2000). Masculine cultures are distinguished by competition and aggression (Reinke & Miller, 2011). Core values in masculine cultures include discipline, tradition, unity, and cohesion, and these traits are valued in dangerous occupations (Huntington, 1957).

In addition to meeting physical standards, law enforcement and military careers require that workers accept a degree of risk and be willing to use firearms to defend themselves or others (Reinke & Miller, 2011). With careers like these that involve risk, organizations emphasize training in a team setting, the use of weaponry, and the controlled application of violence. As a result, employees attach value to physical strength. Assignment to special operations teams in the military and law enforcement usually requires workers to meet even higher firearms and physical standards. Prokos and Padavic (2002) argued that masculine culture is entrenched in all facets of these professions. Masculine culture is reinforced because these workers take pride in their unique role as armed officers who protect citizens in society (Reinke & Miller, 2011).

Equilibrium

Bureaucratic organizations are resistant to change and must balance goals of efficiency and effectiveness (Weber, 1946). Although classic scholars have considered organizational change to be gradual and incremental in most cases, they have agreed that change can take place more quickly when significant pressure is exerted. Tushman and Romanelli (1985) suggested a

paradigm of punctuated equilibrium to explain how a less gradual process of change can occur within a bureaucracy. Their model has provided evidence that disruptive forces to an organization's equilibrium can speed broad organizational change. Gersick (1991) emphasized that disruption and turbulence promote change without threatening the goals of an organization or the stability of its deep organizational structures. She also outlined how organizations can evolve when "long periods of stability, or equilibrium, are punctuated by compact periods of metamorphic change, or revolution" (1991, p. 12). Tushman and Romanelli referred to this process within an organization as "incremental change during a convergent period" (1985, p. 178).

Using the punctuated equilibrium paradigm, two states— equilibrium and revolution— interact as change occurs within an organization's highly durable underlying order, or deep structure (Gersick, 1991). In the present study, the hiring of female agents in the FBI represented major change over a short period of time. The influx of female agents into the workforce created a disruption, or revolution, to the FBI's equilibrium. While the disruption did not threaten the stability of the organization, it served as a catalyst for change in the FBI's deep structure.

Section Summary

This section of the literature review positioned tenets of bureaucracy and organizational theory within the theoretical framework for this study. As the number of women in leadership and in NTOs began to increase in the 1970s, researchers interested in leadership began to challenge the previous stance that men and women could be viewed the same as leaders, and they acknowledged that women and men lead differently. At the same time, feminist scholars began to examine the gendered nature of organizations. Kanter's (1977) work on the

significance of tipping points to transform organizations was cited to explain the impact that sheer numbers of women in the workplace have. A practical model for understanding gendered leadership in organizations was introduced. With an understanding of the basic characteristics of bureaucracy and how organizations are configured, organizations must balance two basic goals: efficiency and effectiveness. Organizational culture and elements of masculine culture were introduced as relevant to the study. Finally, the change process within organizations was addressed in a discussion of Tushman and Romanelli's punctuated equilibrium model (1985), and the relevance of this model to the study was introduced.

Conceptual Framework

Generally, a conceptual framework can be understood as a broad set of ideas and principles that are taken from relevant fields of inquiry and used to design a research study (Smyth, 2004). The framework reflects a researcher's position on the research question to be answered and provides direction for a study (Smyth, 2004).

The conceptual framework for the present study was based on a broad set of ideas based on the theoretical framework presented in Chapter 1 and informed by key concepts in the literature review. The theoretical framework included feminist standpoint theory, career self-efficacy theory, and various organizational theories. The review of literature presented in Chapter 2 was focused on a feminist perspective in America, women in nontraditional occupations, and female leadership within a gendered bureaucracy. Together, these concepts demonstrated support for the research question and the necessity of research.

The present study focused on the perceptions of the first female FBI leaders regarding their experiences through the research question: "How do the early women leaders in the FBI describe their experiences in a gendered organization?" This was designed to explore and

explain the unique their perspectives within the FBI's highly structured, gendered bureaucracy. Because participants were hired between 1972 and 1978, the conceptual framework also reflected a distinct, time-bounded context.

The literature review brought attention to three focus areas that both reflected the theoretical framework and affirmed the research question for the present study. These focus directly corresponded to major concepts within the literature. These areas were a focus on self, a focus on career, and a focus on organization. The intersection of the literature, these focus areas and the data became relevant later during data analysis. A complete summary of the topics considered when developing the conceptual framework are included at Appendix C.

Summary of Chapter 2

Overlapping concepts described in the literature review included: (a) the feminist perspective, (b) nontraditional occupations, and (c) bureaucracy. A history of the modern feminist movement, including key historical legislative events, provided context for this study. Issues of gender inequality have been addressed through a variety of historical theoretical frameworks and with scholars who hold a wide range of feminist beliefs, from conservative to radical. Feminists agree that they reject dualism, believe in the social construction of knowledge, and are committed to female empowerment. Research about the importance of relationships, women's ways of knowing and sense making, and the ethics of care provide an expanded understanding of women and feminism.

Research and statistics concerning women working within highly gendered bureaucracies in nontraditional occupations also provided relevant background for the present study. The literature was useful in order to examine the perspectives and experiences of the study participants. Leadership and organizational theory and research over the last 40 years has

evolved from being gender-neutral to acknowledging that women and men are different and that they lead differently. Further evidence supports the claim that women tend to gravitate toward a transformational leadership style.

After combining the theoretical framework with key concepts from the literature review, the connection of the research question to both theory and research was explained and a description of the overall conceptual framework for this research study was provided.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

“The superiority of the male is indeed overwhelming:

Perseus, Hercules, David, Achilles, Lancelot, the French warriors Du Geslin and

Bayard, Napoleon – so many men for one Joan of Arc.”

Simone de Beauvoir (1949)

In this qualitative study, the first female FBI leaders described their experiences during an era of historic change in the FBI and in America. Participants described why they chose their careers, how they faced personal and institutional gender barriers, how they learned and interpreted their experiences, and how they negotiated careers within the FBI. Using the theoretical and conceptual frameworks described in previous chapters, a qualitative interview study was selected as the appropriate approach to answer the research question. The present study was designed to enhance understanding about female leadership in highly gendered organizations.

Eisner (1998) posited that the success of qualitative research depends on its coherence, insight, and instrumental utility. As such, this chapter explains the planning and design efforts to conduct successful research. Howe and Eisenhart (1990) described the requirements to be met in any rigorous study: (a) alignment between the research question and study design, (b) the transparency of the literature review, (c) a disclosure of the researcher’s point of view, (d) strict standards for rigor data collection and analysis, (e) overall study warrant and validity, and (f) the recognition of ethical standards and value to education. Adherence to these requirements has been considered in every decision during the course of this research.

Qualitative Approach

The goal of phenomenological research is to explore little-understood phenomena, to understand phenomena inductively, and to identify important categories of meaning (Hatch, 2002; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). The phenomenon being studied should unfold through the perceptions of participants (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). Phenomenological inquiry allows a researcher to explore the “meaning, structure, and essence of the lived experience of a phenomenon” (Patton, 2002, p. 104). A phenomenon is “anything that presents itself to consciousness” that is of interest and is the result of lived experiences rather than second hand experiences (Patton, p. 104). A phenomenological approach for the present study allowed for the exploration of the participants’ interesting, lived experiences.

A naturalistic approach was also appropriate to study the phenomenon of the experiences of these women. Naturalistic inquiry can be helpful to explain “the nature and meaning of experience and to interpret themes and patterns across participants” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 17). The present study was designed to reveal lived perspectives in rich detail; participants shared experiences seen and heard by them and recalled with their own voices. Focus was given to the particulars of situations and the meaning that participants attached to them (Johnson & Christenson, 2008).

Researcher as Tool

Eisner (1988) emphasized that qualitative research must acknowledge the perspective of the researcher. The researcher is an instrument, or tool, in the research process. As the researcher for the study, my position of “researcher as tool” (Eisner) must be acknowledged. In doing so, my philosophical stance, my personal subjectivities, my expertise in educational leadership, and my career experiences are outlined in this section.

A researcher's philosophical stance naturally informs choices regarding research methodology, provides context for the process, and grounds the logic of a study (Crotty, 1998). The researcher's stance informs decisions, given that theory is deep-seated in the human thought process (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). In qualitative research, researcher and inquiry cannot be separated. In fact, qualitative research is wholly dependent on the viewpoint and values of the investigator (Brickmann & Kvale, 2009). Howe and Eisenhart (1990) addressed the researcher's stance in terms of transparency and potential research bias.

The experiences of a researcher are enlightened by his or her personal views, such that qualitative endeavors are like visual arts, guiding one toward "seeing, rather than mere looking" (Eisner, 1998, p. 1). Eisner (1998) described educational connoisseurship as the personal process of learning to "see," and educational criticism as the process of enabling others to "see." Both connoisseurship and criticism focus on qualities, or the "features of our environment that can be experienced through any of our senses" (p. 17). Educational criticism is described further in terms of data analysis in Chapter 4.

Connoisseurship, or the process of learning to "see," is highly personal and comes from the qualities of one's experiences. It is the combination of: (a) professional and other experiences that comprise an experiential base, (b) educative experiences that comprise an academic base, and (c) other experiences that comprise other specialized bases (Eisner, 1998). It depends on three attributes of the researcher: perceptivity, qualitative intelligence, and knowledge (Eisner, 1988).

My personal connoisseurship drove analysis using educational criticism, or the process of enabling others to "see." My perceptivity and expertise as a former female FBI agent leader allowed me to discriminate between the experiences and perspectives that were shared by

participants. Qualitative intelligence allowed me to notice and understand the complex elements that were interwoven into descriptions of the participants. Finally, my knowledge was deepened by my ability to make connections between schemas and to understand that, the more I knew, the more I could observe.

Self-Audit

To understand how a researcher's experiences add to connoisseurship, a personal audit is essential to assure study transparency (Peshkin, 1988). Through a self-audit of personal subjectivities, the researcher is able to utilize personal experiences in a manner that informs research, thereby allowing for research to then inform practice and theory (Peshkin, 1988). Each person's self-audit is unique and includes the influences of people, events, and experiences that have had an impact on the beliefs, commitments, and knowledge of the researcher.

In the interests of transparency, this section discloses my philosophical stance, personal subjectivities, and connoisseurship. My philosophical stance has been derived from my values as a woman who is committed to education, public service, mentoring, and social justice. As an educated woman, and as an educator, I support many of the basic tenets of feminism. I reject the dualist premise that men are superior to women. I believe that women are uniquely capable to be effective, efficient leaders in nontraditional careers. I believe that women offer diverse perspectives, add value to policy discussions regarding women in the criminal justice system, and serve as positive role models for other women considering nontraditional careers.

Researchers should reveal their assumptions so that others are able to make judgments about potential researcher bias when evaluating data collection and interpretation (Crotty, 1998; Merriam, 2002). My personal assumptions about the world affected how I engaged in the research process. The following assumptions informed my research:

- The 1970s was a unique decade for working women.
- Multiple factors can contribute to career choices of women.
- Nontraditional occupations present unique gender challenges.
- Women may lead differently than men.
- Women face unique personal and professional obstacles in the workforce.
- Women can influence the culture of organizations.

These personal assumptions were based on the review of historical and empirical data and my personal and professional experiences.

Again, connoisseurship is derived from one's personal and professional life experiences. These experiences are described in this section. I am the product of my upbringing, my relationships with my family and associates, and my roles as daughter, wife, mother, FBI agent, student, volunteer, and educator. At age 60, I am able to acknowledge my wide range of my life experiences in a new and open ways. Disclosure of my personal and professional experiences poses minimal risk to me or to others in the context of the present study. Further, personal details of my life do not constitute sensitive areas for my family members, associates, or me.

My individual life experiences have added to my personal connoisseurship. I grew up as one of six children in an upper middle class, Southern family. My parents were both college-educated; my father was a physician and my mother was a stay-at-home mom. My father expected all of his children—five of whom were daughters—to go to college and have careers. After graduating from college and graduate school, I worked as a probation-parole officer before seeking employment with the FBI. My interest in an FBI career was the result of curiosity, my knowledge of the criminal justice system, my interest in advancing in public service, and a desire for adventure.

I was hired as an FBI agent in 1982. The hiring process was lengthy and intimidating with testing, interviews, a background investigation, and a strong emphasis on fitness and shooting proficiency. Before and after being hired, I was aware that the number of female agents was small, but, like many female colleagues I would later meet, I minimized the issue of gender throughout my career.

Early in my career, I married an FBI agent and became a stepmother to his two children. Throughout his career, he worked in dangerous operational assignments and on Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) teams that were exclusively male. During my career, female agents could apply for these more dangerous assignments, but few were able to meet both the physical and firearms standards to be on these teams. Although I was very interested in career advancement, my husband's unpredictable schedule made it difficult for me to seek promotions that would have helped advance my career.

During my career, my husband and I had four children, bringing the total number of children in my blended family to six. Four are daughters, a fact that resonated deeply for me while conducting this study. During my career, I was one of few female agents with several children, and I was aware that I balanced a masculine, work persona and a feminine, home persona. Being a mother limited my opportunities for promotion because having a family dictated my choices and limited my mobility. Life as an FBI agent, a wife, and a mother was challenging. While my supervisors were accommodating, I asked for no special accommodations and none were provided, other than taking maternity leave. For me, taking maternity leave involved using accumulated sick leave since no family leave was provided at the time. During my career, no institutional accommodations were made for agents with children or ailing family members until the 1990s, when a part-time program was initiated. Before and

during my career, no accommodations were made for female agents with families to either limit or reduce the moves, or transfers, that were required for career advancement. Two of five career transfers required me to move my entire family.

My professional experiences as a female agent added to my connoisseurship. My FBI career spanned 24 years. I understood the need for physical and mental toughness in a law enforcement career. Among the first 500 women to be hired, I was one of the first female agents in the state where I was assigned. When hired, I was a physically-fit, single woman, and I qualified for employment by virtue of my undergraduate and graduate degrees and prior experience as a probation-parole officer.

Throughout my career, I was accustomed to working primarily with male agents. For the first few years of my career, some male agents expressed interest in having personal relationships, but dating pressures subsided when I met and married my husband. Throughout my career, I benefitted from mentorship and association with both male and female agents, but I preferred to work alone, and I rarely asked for help.

In my career, I accumulated a wide range of operational and administrative experience. I investigated a wide variety of crimes and was considered a competent interviewer. I was a primary case agent for the Iran-Contra investigation and interviewed several high-ranking government officials. Eight years into my career, I was promoted to a supervisory position at FBI Headquarters (FBIHQ). There, I worked in congressional liaison and as a national spokesperson. After three years as a supervisor at FBIHQ, I was promoted to be a supervisor in an FBI field office, where I supervised numerous agents. There, I closely supervised violent crime cases and participated in tactical training with squad members. I worked on many high-profile cases and supervised several investigative task forces in conjunction with many other law

enforcement agencies. In that role, I was involved in a violent firearms confrontation that resulted in a significant shift in my career personal priorities. Although the outcome was successful from the FBI's perspective, my confidence as a supervisor lessened. Soon thereafter, I voluntarily opted out of the FBI's management program.

No longer in management, I accepted a transfer to Florida in 1999. My relocation was a conscious and voluntary choice to prioritize my family and children over my career. The transfer allowed me to be closer to other family members on the East Coast. After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, I formed and coordinated a joint terrorism task force in North Florida. I retired in 2006 on my 50th birthday.

Throughout my career, I had many opportunities as a female agent. I enjoyed positive relationships with male and female colleagues but had few mentors. For much of my career, I minimized gender and focused on hard work, thinking that my performance was the key to success. Although I did experience discrimination, I never filed an EEO action. In particular, I faced obstacles as a supervisor late in my career. The discrimination I experienced was based on gender, but I did not consider the obstacles I faced to be significant or insurmountable. I thought of my experiences as singular and unique, and was surprised to learn, in the course of the present study, that many of the participants shared perspectives similar to mine.

My personal connoisseurship has been enhanced by my post-FBI experiences. Since retiring, I have been very active in a national organization of current, former, and retired agents, known as the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Society). From 2013-2015, I was the first female elected to be national president of the Society. In retirement, I have worked as a substitute teacher, a researcher, a health-care consultant, and an adjunct professor. I have volunteered for several organizations and served on a number of

boards of nonprofit organizations. Presently, I am employed fulltime as an instructor in the Criminology and Criminal Justice Department at the University of North Florida (UNF).

Interviews

Operating on the epistemological presumption that knowledge is socially constructed (Brickmann & Kvale, 2009), qualitative interviews are useful to produce new knowledge. People construct their views of the world, based on their experiences and perceptions (Krauss, 2005). Interview research seeks to evoke constructed realities, elicited through subjective interpretations and using a holistic approach (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

Qualitative interview research should be undertaken within a specific research paradigm that dictates the data collection strategy (Hatch, 2002). A research paradigm provides guidance for the researcher to conceptualize the relationships between ontological, epistemological, and methodological issues and to acknowledge his or her assumptions. Ontology is the nature of reality, epistemology is what can be known, and methodology is how knowledge is accessed. Hatch outlined five qualitative research paradigms that are summarized below in Figure 4.

	Ontology (Nature of reality)	Epistemology (What can be known; Relationship of knower & known)	Methodology (How knowledge is gained)	Products (Forms of knowledge produced)
Positivist	Reality is out there to be studied, captured, and understood	How the world is really ordered; Knower is distinct from known	Experiments, quasi-experiments, surveys, correlational studies	Facts, theories, laws, predictions
Postpositivist	Reality exists but is never fully apprehended, only approximated	Approximations of reality; Researcher is data collection instrument	Rigorously defined qualitative methods, frequency counts, low-level statistics	Generalizations, descriptions, patterns, grounded theory
Constructivist	Multiple realities are constructed	Knowledge as a human construction; Researcher and participant co-construct understandings	Naturalistic qualitative methods	Case studies, narratives, interpretations, reconstructions
Critical/Feminist	The apprehended world makes a material difference in terms of race, gender, and class	Knowledge as subjective and political; Researchers' values frame inquiry	Transformative inquiry	Value mediated critiques that challenge existing power structures and promote resistance
Poststructuralist	Order is created within individual minds to ascribe meaning to a meaningless universe.	There is no "Truth" to be known; Researchers examine the world through textual representations of it.	Deconstruction; Genealogy; Data-based, multivoiced studies	Deconstructions; Genealogies; Reflexive, polyvocal texts

Figure 4. Five Qualitative Research Paradigms

From *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Settings*, by J. A. Hatch (2002). Albany, NY: SUNY Press. Reprinted with Permission.

The five paradigms for data collection are: (a) positivistic, (b) postpositivistic, (c) constructivist, (d) critical or feminist, and (e) poststructuralist. In an interview study, the approach to interviews and the subsequent findings may vary depending on the paradigm used (Hatch, 2002). Of the five paradigms listed above, only the positivistic paradigm cannot be applied to interview research.

Qualitative research for the present study utilized a constructivist paradigm. This paradigm values naturalistic inquiry and knowledge as a human construction, and it embraces the notion that multiple realities exist and are possible (Hatch, 2002). This paradigm offered a good fit with feminist standpoint theory. While a critical/feminist paradigm is often used in studies about women, I did not consider this paradigm appropriate for my research methodology. Rather than insert my values into interviews, my goal was that participants would lead me into the areas, issues, and situations where gender was a factor in their career choices and actions. I did not want to lead them. Thus, gender-specific data were collected without a preset feminist agenda.

In-depth, semi-structured interviews provided a means for detailed analysis of the participants' perspectives and experiences. Interviewing involves two distinct but complementary processes: developing rapport and eliciting information (Spradley, 1979). Spradley described these processes as, "the harmonious relationship between the interviewer and the participant A basic sense of trust must be developed to allow for the "free flow of information" (1979, p. 79).

Interviewing requires a researcher to be conscientious and alert while interacting with participants in interviews; a process known as *phronesis* was used in the interviews to build

rapport and elicit information. Brickmann and Kvale (2009) described phronesis as, “the intellectual virtue of recognizing and responding to what is most important in a situation” (p. 61). Phronesis provides ethical guidance to develop practical interviewing skills, to protect participants, and to convey respect and concern for them. Phronesis also guides a researcher’s probing skills for follow-up questions; probing questions require the researcher to be understanding and empathic.

The interview approach for the study borrowed incorporated an elite interview protocol. Feminist researchers often advocate the use of elite interviews because these interviews are more open-ended than other interviews, and they allow the researcher to shape and frame the discussion (Odendahl & Shaw, 2002). My approach was similar to an elite interview protocol in that my sampling of participants was purposive, interviews were open-ended, and participants were well-informed persons in the FBI community (Tansey, 2007; Kezar, 2009).

The differences between my interview protocol and the typical elite interview protocol are understood in terms of the participants themselves, the type of research usually associated with elite interviews, and access issues (Leech, 2002). Elite persons are generally influential political actors and elite interview research commonly has a journalistic flavor where comments are characterized as on-the-record and off-the-record. Elite interviews are often used in political science research. Also, researchers often do not record elite interviews, because, as a function of the participant’s limited availability, elite interviews are often short. Interviews of high profile people often create access problems for the researcher (Leech, 2002). None of these conditions applied to the present study.

My interviews had qualities typical of interviews of elite persons in that: (a) each interviewee was known to have participated in a certain situation, (b) information was used to

make a provisional analysis of the participant's status, (c) participants defined the situation or phenomenon to be described, and (d) an interview guide was used based on the review of relevant information (Merton, Fiske, & Kendall, 1990).

The main advantage to using an elite interview approach was my ability to access the valuable knowledge of participants. The main disadvantage was the potential risk that I would impose my personal experiences into the interviews. To access knowledge, I emphasized the participants' definition of the situations being described. Retrospection was used to encourage participants to recall immediate reactions rather than to reconsider situations. Participants were encouraged to structure their own personal accounts of situation and to describe what was most relevant to them (Odendahl & Shaw, 2002).

Guided by the conceptual framework, and also allowing for other possibilities and explanations, an interview guide was developed. The guide was designed with these specific goals: (a) to provide structure and organization, (b) to assure that all areas are covered for each respondent, (c) to establish channels for the direction and scope of discourse, and (d) to protect the larger structure and objectives of the interview (McCracken, 1988). As research literature was reviewed, three sub-questions were developed that supported the main research question and were focused on leadership. The sub-questions were:

1. How do these women describe their decision-making?
2. How do these women describe their career self-efficacy?
3. How do these women describe the role that gender played in the FBI?

These sub-questions were not used to direct the study; rather, they identified leadership concepts embedded in the central research question. They were helpful in designing the interview guide. The interview guide was designed to help elicit data regarding: (a) why participants chose FBI

careers, (b) why they made career decisions, and (c) what impact they felt they may have had as leaders on the FBI.

The interview guide included a list of open-ended questions. In creating the guide, it was important to build in flexibility so that participants would be able make free associations and change directions. When conducting the interviews, the guide was not prescriptive; it allowed flexibility for follow-up questions, probing, further explanations, and prompts. The interview guide is included at Appendix D.

Participants and Access

Participants for my research cohort were selected from the first 100 female FBI agents who were hired and completed training to become agents. A research cohort is defined as a group of people whose shared and unique life experiences are historically or socially constructed, whose experience occurs in a common generational framework, and whose experiences demonstrate reasonably stable effects that distinguish one generation from another over time (Rosow, 1978). As the first generation of modern female FBI agents, the experiences of study participants distinguished them from women with different life experiences and from women in the following generations of female FBI agents and supervisors.

Because the study focused on the first generation of female FBI leaders, study participants comprised a purposive sample (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Purposive sampling is a form of non-probability sampling in which decisions about who is to be included in the sample are made by the researcher. Decisions can be based on a variety of criteria that may include whether individuals have specialist knowledge or whether they are willing to participate in the research (Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Oliver, 2006).

The purposive sample for the present study required that participants had special knowledge as FBI supervisors and were willing to be interviewed. Considering the passage of time, I could assume that none of the women in the cohort would still employed by the FBI. They would have either have resigned, retired, or been terminated from the FBI, and participants would likely be in their 60s or older. Expecting that many of the potential participants were unlikely to be working fulltime, I could also assume a high level of availability.

Each participant was required to meet the following three basic criteria:

1. She was hired as a female FBI Special Agent between 1972-1978.
2. She met all training, fitness, and firearms requirements.
3. She held a supervisory position at some point during her career.

I possessed unique access to potential participants through personal associations and my previously-disclosed involvement with the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Society). I had access to contact information for Society members through a private member directory, and I had access to non-Society members through a variety of personal sources and social networking.

The Society is a membership organization comprised of approximately 8,500 current, former, and retired FBI agents. Membership is predominantly male with most members ranging in age from their early 50s to their 90s. Since retiring, I have been actively involved with the Society as both a local and national officer. Between 2013-2015, I served as the Society's first female elected president. In 2012, I coordinated a major Society event to recognize the 40th anniversary of women as FBI agents. For the event, a working list with contact information for the first 100 female agents was compiled. The list included names of women who completed FBI training from July 1972 to February 1978 (McChesney, 2012). Less than 30 percent were

found to be members of the Society, but I was still able to locate many of them through contacts with the FBI, shared contacts, private sources, and public sources (D. DuHadway, personal communication, September 13, 2012). At least five of the first 100 female agents were determined to be deceased. In this effort, I compiled contact information for the majority of the first 100 female agents.

In April 2013, I emailed two retired female agents who knew many of the first 100 female agents, and I requested their assistance to identify women in the group who had been supervisors at some point during their careers (C.K. Jung & K. McChesney, personal communications, May 1, 2013). They provided me with names of 23 women, from among the first 100 female agents, who had been FBI supervisors and were still alive. Most of the female agents hired during this period were White women; as a result, only two of the 23 early women leaders were Black. I attempted contact with all 23, and 15 were willing to be interviewed. The 15 participants who agreed to participate were all White women.

Because of our shared backgrounds, participants were very receptive to my invitations to be interviewed as part of the study. After determining that the 15 women who agreed to participate met the study criteria, this group became my purposive sample. The procedures for making formal contacts with potential study participants is outlined in the next section.

Methodology

The present study employed a qualitative research methodology designed to elicit perspectives from multiple viewpoints using face-to-face, in-depth, semi-structured interviews to collect data. A proposal was submitted to the University of North Florida (UNF) Institutional Review Board (IRB) that described my research methodology and a step-by-step plan. The IRB proposal was approved on November 19, 2013.

The research methodology was developed in consideration of the concepts identified in the literature review (Hatch, 2002). Harding (1987) distinguished between method and methodology in this way, “method refers to techniques for gathering empirical evidence; methodology is the theory of knowledge and the interpretive framework that guides a particular research project” (p. 2). This section further explains the theory of knowledge and the research methodology that guided the study. As previously disclosed, I adopted a constructivist research paradigm rather than a critical/feminist paradigm.

My initial goal was to identify at least 10 of the 23 women who had been identified as the first female FBI leaders and were willing to participate in the study. My informal efforts to identify potential participants were described earlier in this chapter. Initial contacts with the 23 potential participants were made by mail, email, and telephone. In formally recruiting participants, I sent a scripted introductory email to each of them, followed by a formal letter of invitation in the mail. I asked them respond to me by email or telephone. I made follow-up calls to the women who did not respond to me within three weeks. Before confirming participants, I contacted each woman by telephone to address and answer potential questions. An informal script was used for this call that outlined the purpose of the study, explained the interview protocol, and prompted for unanswered questions. Depending on the number of women who seemed interested in participating, I was prepared to do additional screening, based on where the women lived and the variety of their leadership experiences.

Of the 23 potential participants, 15 were willing to participate, four did not respond, three could not be scheduled in the data collection window, and one declined. Thus, I selected all 15 willing women as participants. In keeping with the IRB protocol to complete data collection over a six-month period, interviews were conducted between December 2013 and April 2014.

I contacted each of the participants by telephone to advise her of my intention to proceed and to set an interview date. I offered each of them the option to be interviewed by telephone and a video link in lieu of an in-person interview, but I told participants that I preferred to conduct interviews in person. Two of the participants opted to have the interviews conducted remotely, using a web-based link with both audio and video functions. No video record was made of these two interviews, but the video connection proved to be a valuable interview tool. Having the video connection facilitated my efforts to build rapport with these participants. In order to use a video link, these participants had access to Skype or Face Time software applications and were familiar with the technology.

For the 13 participants who agreed to be interviewed in person, I travelled to their home cities to conduct the interviews. In order to reduce personal travel time and expense and to be efficient in collecting data, I combined and scheduled interviews, based on the locations where the participants lived. I organized multiple interviews into trips that corresponded to four geographic regions. I conducted interviews in the Northeast, the Northwest, the Southeast, and the Southwest.

An informed consent document was mailed to each participant in advance of her interview to allow her ample time to make a final decision regarding her participation. Each participant was asked to sign—and did sign—this form in advance. The informed consent form outlined the purpose of the study, research parameters in terms of voluntariness and confidentiality, and the potential risks and benefits to the participant. It also provided contact information for participants to ask follow-up questions or express concerns. No payments were offered or made to any participant. Each participant was informed that she could refuse to answer any question or to stop the interview at any time. The signed forms were returned to me

by mail. Each participant was provided an extra copy of this form for her future reference.

I reminded each woman that her participation was voluntary and that her identity would remain confidential at all times. Names were not used in the recorded interviews, and all personal identifiers were removed from interview transcripts before transcriptions were finalized or analyzed. While the identities of participants remained confidential for this study, the identities and stories of some of the early female agents are a matter of public record. Some of their experiences are publicly known, and the experiences of others are not public but may be known to some within the FBI community. Also, for some of the participants, professional details about their careers have been shared publicly in interviews, books, and news stories. I stressed to participants that I would not focus on FBI cases or investigations. I advised them that I would make every possible effort to redact singular information or report information in a way that would limit the ability of readers to identify the participant. A promise of confidentiality was made to each participant to promote candor in the interviews.

The benefit described to each participant was her opportunity to have her unique experiences contribute to scholarly research. Risks were described as minimal. I considered that some participants might feel reluctant to have their specific experiences linked to them for fear of criticism, or that they might perceive some questions as negative for the FBI. I was very direct in assuring participants that the risk of criticism would be minimal given my efforts to protect their confidentiality. While I viewed these potential concerns as important for the study, the risks remained minimal.

Before each interview took place, I reviewed the terms of the informed consent form with each participant. Also, I asked each participant to select a personal pseudonym that would be used identify her throughout the study. In a symbolic gesture, each woman was asked to pick a

girl's name from a list of the most popular female baby names in 1972. The use of pseudonyms served to preserve the participants' confidentiality in that no personal identifiers were contained in written or digital media. Pseudonyms were used in the recordings of interviews to assure that no one, other than me as the researcher, would be able to identify the participant. I maintained all documentation that matched pseudonyms to participants and, like other data collected, I have afforded it appropriate security at all times.

With all interviews, the oral component was digitally recorded, using a primary digital recording device and a back-up recording device, and with the full knowledge of the participant. The recording of interviews was clearly outlined in the informed consent form.

Each interview was consistent in approach. Each interview was conducted in a private, quiet location that was coordinated in advance, was mutually agreeable, and guaranteed a comfortable setting. Each interview lasted 2 to 2½ hours. The interview guide at Appendix D was used, and a set of prompts and probing follow-up questions were available to assure that the interviews proceeded smoothly. The guide consisted of scripted, open-ended questions that facilitated the gathering of rich, detailed data. The use of open-ended questions allowed each participant the flexibility to frame and structure her responses. Having a structured interview guide allowed me to focus on the phronetic aspects of building rapport and establishing a meaningful conversation with each participant. I paid close attention to body language so that I could pose follow-up questions in a manner that conveyed concern and respect for the participant. Follow up questions were different in each interview and were posed based on individual participant responses. As necessary, one short break was taken during several of the interviews. Breaks were used to take care of pets, eliminate a source of noise, take bathroom

breaks, or regain composure. These breaks provided opportunities for me to conduct a status check to assure that the interview was on track or to change direction in the interview.

At the conclusion of each interview, I requested that each participant complete a questionnaire. A sample questionnaire is located at Appendix E. This form requested demographic and biographical information, as well as family and work history, and, in most interviews, it was returned in-person to me after the interview. Because time was not spent in the interviews to obtain this background information, I was better situated in the interviews to allow the participants to describe their experiences, and I was better able to focus on framing appropriate prompts, posing probing questions, and asking follow-up questions. I was also able to keep the interview sessions to manageable lengths. In a few cases, and with the video interviews, these questionnaires were returned to me by mail. I specifically requested this form be completed after each interview took place, in order to assure that the participant was not directed toward particular issues in the interview from the questionnaire.

All interviews were transcribed in their entirety. Following the interviews, digital files were stored on the UNF secure server and were afforded appropriate security at all times. Digital files are to be permanently deleted after transcriptions, reviews, and analysis are complete. Through the process described, a large volume of data were elicited through rich, thick descriptions of the participants about their unique experiences (Patton, 2002, p. 104). Data analysis and more information on the review of interview transcripts is described in detail in Chapter 4.

Summary of Chapter 3

This chapter introduced the decision to frame a phenomenological, qualitative research study using a constructivist paradigm (Hatch, 2002). My role as a tool for research was

explained to situate me in a position to recognize knowledge and to share it (Eisner, 1988).

A complete self-audit of my prior life experiences and gender roles, and the intellectual standing I shared with study participants, was presented. My experiences and perspectives as a female FBI agent and supervisor supported this intellectual standing and assured that I was in a position to obtain and receive knowledge from the participants.

All aspects of the research methodology were described, including the decision to conduct an interview study, a discussion of the elite interview approach, and an explanation of phronesis as a means to assure that interviews yielded detailed descriptions of situations. The steps taken to identify a purposive sample of study participants were explained in detail. Of the first 100 female FBI agents, 23 had been supervisors, and 15 agreed to be interviewed. Most interviews were conducted face-to-face, and my arrangements to cluster interviews by geographic region and travel to the participants' home cities were described. The time frame for interviews in 2013 and 2014 was explained. Finally, the study protocol that governed confidentiality, informed consent, recording of interviews, and handling of study materials was outlined.

CHAPTER 4 – DATA ANALYSIS

“Some of us try hard to make the world a better place than it was when we found it.

I know that's what I try to do. I won't always be successful. But that's life.

I'm Supergirl. This is my life And you know what? I'm pretty happy with it.”

Supergirl (n.d.)

The qualitative researcher draws sense and meaning from data in order to further understanding (Eisner, 1998; Patton, 2002). In this effort, this chapter presents analysis of data collected from participants who were both among a small group of the first female FBI agents and an even smaller group of these women who assumed leadership positions. The central research question for the present study was: “How do the early women leaders in the FBI describe their experiences in a gendered organization?” The question was designed to explore the unique perspectives of participants within the FBI’s highly structured, male-dominated bureaucracy. Sub-questions focused on participants’ perceptions regarding self, career, and organization and included their leadership style and experiences, their experiences in a nontraditional occupation, and their perceptions as the first women leaders in the FBI.

Several theories provided the theoretical positioning for the conceptual framework and the study design and allowed for openness in collecting the data. Using a three-pronged approach, theories included feminist standpoint theory (Smith, 1987), which is based on Smith’s explanation of how women adopt standpoints to function in the everyday world; and career self-efficacy theory (Betz & Hackett, 1981), which is based on Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory and the concept of self-efficacy. The third prong incorporated key concepts related to organization theory, bureaucracy, and masculine culture, and they were used to explain how women function and lead in highly gendered organizations.

Approach to Analysis

In keeping with Howe and Eisenhart's (1990) standards for rigor in data analysis, my approach to analysis included: (a) using selected data analysis strategies recursively and in combination with each other, (b) connecting data to the literature, (c) applying connoisseurship to understanding phenomena, (d) identifying data that was based on relevant literature, and (e) interpreting relationships and their meaning. These efforts allowed me to connect data to what was known, to interpret the relationships between what was known and what appeared to be unknown, and to learn the meaning underlying these relationships.

Data analysis employed several processes. Preliminary data analysis began during the interview phase of the study (Hatch, 2002). The research design included in-depth, semi-structured interviews of 15 participants. An interview guide was developed to promote open-ended interviews. A sample of the interview guide is included in Appendix D.

Each interview lasted between 2 and 2½ hours. Reflection after each interview included both examination of the interview data, as well as how those data contributed to the growing body of data across the entire group of participants. Along with the recorded interviews and transcripts, the complete data set also included biographical questionnaires that were completed by participants following their interview sessions. As described in Chapter 3, each participant was asked to complete a personal questionnaire that requested demographic and other biographical information. The request for this information after the interviews was a part of an effort to avoid leading participants toward any particular topics before the interview was conducted. All participants completed a questionnaire. A sample of the questionnaire is included in Appendix E.

The overlapping processes of transcribing, editing, and reviewing transcripts were all part of preliminary data analysis. Verbatim transcripts were prepared with the assistance of a professional transcriber, as noted in Chapter 3. The transcriber was closely supervised and had no access to any identifiable information about the participants. In reviewing first drafts of transcripts, I listened to the recording of each interview in its entirety and compared the typed draft transcript to the recording. Often this process required that I review the first draft while listening to portions of the recorded interview several times in order to develop an accurate second draft. Second drafts were mailed to participants for review. I worked with participants over several months to incorporate their editorial changes, to obtain their approvals of their transcripts, and to finalize the entire set of transcripts. Over this period, I reread the transcripts multiple times. During the extended process of transcribing, editing, and finalizing transcripts, I listened to every recorded interview in its entirety at least twice.

Although time-consuming, the editing and reviewing processes served as a valuable way to engage with the data prior to formal analysis. By listening to the interviews and by reviewing the transcripts, I was able to reflect on interviews, both individually and in combination with each other. The process facilitated deep engagement with the data and allowed for anticipating possible patterns that the data analysis might support.

Throughout the study, I maintained a research journal that served as a repository for reflective notes. These written notes included personal observations and reactions that occurred during the interview sessions, reflections on my own similar professional experiences, the processes of making specific research decisions in data collection, and ideas regarding possible strategies for data analysis. The journal was used to facilitate all steps in data analysis, and journal entries supported the rationale for research decisions made throughout data analysis.

Early consideration had been given to adopting a feminist research paradigm for data collection and data analysis. Qualitative research that is focused on the experiences of women often employs an overt feminist approach that is usually political or critical in nature (Hatch, 2002). Despite this typical leaning, an early decision was made *not* to use such approach. A keen awareness of gender was necessary and important, given that the present study was focused on women's perspectives, but a concerted effort was made to refrain from advancing any perception of a political agenda. In this regard, a clear goal for this research was to remain open during the interviews and to the data collected.

Educational Criticism

Although several strategies were used in data analysis, educational criticism (Eisner, 1998) served as the overall framework. Although each of the strategies is discussed separately throughout this chapter, data analysis was an ongoing and recursive process involving all strategies, both separately and together. The strategies and their interrelationships are depicted in Figure 5 below:




Figure 5. Data Analysis Strategies using Educational Criticism

Educational criticism includes four dimensions: description, interpretation, evaluation, and thematics. Through the first dimension, description, the researcher develops an overall

account of what is presented in the data. Such description provides a foundation for subsequent stages in the process of educational criticism. The second dimension, interpretation, involves making sense of descriptions and giving meaning to them. The third dimension, evaluation, embodies the researcher's responsibility to acknowledge how the focus of the research addresses important values. Finally, the fourth dimension, thematics, is the process of identifying "recurring messages that pervade the situation about which the critic writes" (Eisner, 1998, p. 104).

Typological analysis and interpretive analysis (Hatch, 2002) were used to facilitate the first two dimensions in Eisner's framework: description and interpretation. Hatch's typological approach allowed for a systematic and thorough approach to describing the complexity and richness of the data collected—what Eisner identified as the dimension of description. Hatch's interpretive approach facilitated the identification of linkages between and among typologies—what Eisner identified as the dimension of interpretation. The final strategies of data analysis focus on the remaining dimensions of educational criticism—evaluation and thematics—in the specific context of feminist perspectives, female career self-efficacy, and women in bureaucracy.

Data excerpts from participants were analyzed to extrapolate meaning from them using the analytical framework as described. Particular data excerpts were selected because of the emphasis placed on experiences by participants or because of the clarity and eloquence of the descriptions themselves. The primary objective for the selections of particular data excerpts was to make public the deeper, shared meaning of the participants' unique experiences.

Educational criticism is based on the concept of connoisseurship (Eisner, 1998). This approach assumes that a researcher's connoisseurship, with regard to a topic, operates as he or

she encounters new experiences with the topic. Educational criticism is an educative process that elucidates for others what the connoisseur or researcher knows.

Connoisseurship is the merging of professional connoisseurship, that is developed from the review of scholarly literature, with personal connoisseurship, that is derived from the researcher's own experiences (Eisner, 1998). For the present study, my connoisseurship was derived from a combination of my personal experiences as a female FBI agent and my professional experiences as a researcher that enabled me to develop the study's theoretical framework, review relevant literature, and operate within a conceptual framework. This connoisseurship was assumed to operate throughout data analysis, with educational criticism providing the structure to make my connoisseurship public.

Use of Memoranda

When transcripts were in their final form, a first, formal reading of all of the data was conducted. This reading began the examination of the data with consideration of Eisner's dimension of description (1998) that employed Hatch's typological analysis (2002). This reading helped solidify the major typologies and the beginning of a coding system for the data. A memorandum-writing process facilitated the identification of typologies used for data description. Later, these memoranda were also useful in conducting interpretive analysis.

The topical memorandum-writing process was utilized to facilitate my engagement with the data as a whole (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The decision to write analytic memoranda, using key topics, is in keeping with a belief in qualitative research that the writing process can clarify relationships and generate insights (Hatch, 2002; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). With a large volume of data, the process of writing succinct, one-page memoranda facilitated the identification of main ideas from the data as a whole. The process promoted a holistic

understanding of the participants' perspectives and helped to document my observations and reactions to the data.

Five general topics for the memoranda were selected based on my nascent understanding of, and my reactions to, the data as a whole. Each memorandum built upon key ideas that were apparent during the reading of the transcripts. The topics for the five memoranda were:

- Memorandum 1, entitled "Confidence," summarized personal judgments of the participants about their capabilities.
- Memorandum 2, entitled "Being First," addressed how and whether the participants perceived themselves as trailblazers in the FBI.
- Memorandum 3, entitled "Tokenism," addressed how and whether the participants felt they fit into the FBI hierarchy.
- Memorandum 4, entitled "Career Choice," addressed how these women decided to become FBI agents.
- Memorandum 5, entitled "Relationships," highlighted how relationships affected the participants' personal and career decisions.

Like the research journal, the memorandum-writing process was helpful to frame ideas and inform various research decisions. In particular, memoranda were used to define and refine the categories, or typologies, used in describing the data. Later, they were useful to identify salient data and to develop codes for sorting data for typological, descriptive analysis. They also suggested possible relationships and patterns within the data for interpretive analysis.

The five memoranda suggested five categories, or typologies, for describing the data. The typologies corresponded closely to the foci of the research question and its sub-questions. Although the typologies identified were not intended to correspond to the categories from the

literature review that guided the development of the interview questions, they were informed by them. Five main typologies were identified as: (a) women in nontraditional careers, (b) women achieving career self-efficacy, (c) women as leaders, (d) women negotiating bureaucracy, and (e) female perspectives. These typologies served as primary reference points for making coding decisions and for conducting data analysis.

Coding and Data Retrieval

A second reading of the data took place as each transcript was coded by typology. The complete coding key is included in [Appendix F](#). Once that reading was completed, the coded transcripts were used to develop summary sheets for each participant. These summary sheets highlighted significant personal and professional experiences that were described by each participant in her interview. These summaries facilitated retrieval of data from the coded transcripts later during data analysis.

A third reading of the data yielded a data file for key verbatim excerpts by codes from each participant's interview transcript. This file of key excerpts, as a subset of the full set of transcripts, facilitated later data analysis processes and the retrieval of coded data during those processes.

Thus, the initial data analysis processes occurred in the following order:

1. Reflecting on data in transcripts;
2. Selecting overall data analysis strategies;
3. Writing topical memoranda; and,
4. Coding and retrieving data.

The processes described above laid the groundwork for subsequent data analysis.

In the descriptions of the participants about their careers, various terms, acronyms, and

expressions associated with the FBI workplace were used. These terms are unique to the FBI. To facilitate analysis, a list of these terms, along with their meaning, was compiled. Knowledge of FBI terminology was necessary to facilitate understanding of what the participants shared. The list and meaning of FBI terms that were mentioned in the interviews is included in Appendix G.

Description Dimension and Typological Analysis

Typological analysis is a descriptive approach that allows for data to be described without judgment or interpretation (Hatch, 2002). Typologies are data categories generated from the conceptual framework. Data are divided into categories that are often predetermined, as they were in the present study. Categories for the present study mirrored the main concepts from the literature review, so interview data was collected in a manner that was congruent with a typological approach. However, this approach also allowed for openness to generating new categories during analysis.

Typological analysis, using Hatch's (2002) model, included four primary typologies: (a) women in nontraditional careers, (b) women achieving career self-efficacy, (c) women as leaders, and (d) women negotiating bureaucracy. This model for typological analysis corresponded with Eisner's (1998) descriptive dimension of educational criticism. The typological analysis section that follows presents excerpts of coded data within these identified typologies.

Five typologies were initially identified that were based on, and included, topics covered in the literature review, as well as the interviews that were structured around those topics. The fifth typology, relating to female perspectives, was bracketed after identifying how this typology was linked to the other four. Thus, a decision was made to limit typological, or descriptive,

analysis to only four of the five categories identified as typologies. These four typologies, and the topic areas within each of them, served as starting points for data retrieval that then allowed both rigor and openness during analysis. The descriptions of participants about their personal female perspectives were later analyzed during the thematics stage of educational criticism. Because the study design did not adopt a critical, feminist orientation, this approach facilitated a broad, integrative analysis of data without overemphasizing them.

The process for discussing data within each typology followed three steps. First, an overview of the data is provided and various major topics are identified. Second, the main ideas for these topics are summarized and supported with excerpts from the data. Finally, references from the literature, as more fully described in Chapter 2, are provided to ground these main ideas within the reviewed literature.

Typology 1: Women in Nontraditional Careers

Data within this typology had breadth and depth in the sense that all participants provided rich detail about their lives before they joined the FBI or early in their careers. Key topics in this category were: (a) family support, (b) being physical, (c) choosing the FBI, and (d) readiness. All participants described themselves as college-educated women who were interested in interesting careers rather than married life, motherhood, or traditional female careers. Many described that the FBI was an attractive career because it offered good pay and benefits that would allow them to be self-sufficient. The literature regarding nontraditional occupations for women and career choice provided background for this typology. Further, the historical context of the 1970s for women's rights and changes occurring within the American workforce provided context when analyzing the participants' perspectives as trailblazers in the FBI.

Family support. Participants described many family members who supported their

career decisions, but their parents exerted the greatest influence on their decision-making. The significant and positive encouragement of fathers and other male role models on the participants was a common thread in the data.

Many participants described the support of their fathers or family members who had served in the military or in law enforcement. Elizabeth described her father's military service: "My dad was in the Navy during World War II. I loved the fact that he served his country honorably." Deeply inspired by him, she recalled:

My father encouraged me [to apply to the FBI] because his vision of the FBI was Al Capone and all this gangster stuff. . . . I knew enough that that's not what it was about, but he still wanted to support me because he knew it would really fit my personality.

Kathleen and Rebecca were greatly influenced by their fathers and other family members who had been police officers. Kathleen described the influence of both her father and brother, who had been police officers, as "it was in the blood" for her to pursue a career in law enforcement. Rebecca's father was a police officer. She described feeling drawn to a law enforcement career and recalled, "I never thought about the girl thing. It's just that everything that I have ever done has been in the male-dominated field." The descriptions of Elizabeth, Kathleen and Rebecca were also similar in that their fathers, after they had daughters, came around to the idea that women might be suited for law enforcement careers. Rebecca's father wanted a boy to follow in his footsteps, but his views changed soon after she was born, "I was the Number One child—his daughter."

Ann's father, a former FBI agent, thought his daughter was special, and he encouraged her to apply to be an agent despite questioning the larger issue of whether women should be agents. Despite his ambivalence about female FBI agents, Ann recalled that he told his friends

and colleagues:

Don't anybody tell my daughter she can't do what she wants to do. . . . [I am] not sure if women should be agents, but my daughter can be, because I know what she is capable of, and I don't want anybody standing in her way and keeping her from doing something she wants to do.

Ann understood that her father believed that she was an exception among women and that she would excel as an FBI agent. In his view, he knew that at least one female—his daughter—could do the job.

Many participants described close relationships with their mothers, but mothers were often described as less encouraging than fathers of their daughters becoming FBI agents. Melissa remembered, “My mother was horrified. My father laughed and said, ‘Good for you.’” Karen recalled, “My dad was thrilled. He said, ‘You need to do this.’ But my mother was like, ‘What?’ I think she thought I was going to be getting married. . . . She was expecting the traditional path for me.” The examples of Melissa and Karen were indicative of the contrast between the reactions of mothers and of fathers to the decisions by some participants to become agents.

The research literature supported the role of family influences on career decision-making. Parents and family members are known to have a significant influence on girls who develop interest in nontraditional careers (Gilligan, 1982). Family, individual, and environmental variables also play contributing roles in the lives of women who choose nontraditional careers (Graham, 1997). Different socialization patterns for boys and girls also affect the complex processes for career choice (Fitzgerald & Crites, 1980). Parental support of young girls reflects a gender role socialization pattern that begins early in their lives (Letarte, 1992). The importance

of parental support was contained in the literature with little differentiation between mothers and father. In the present study, the explicit encouragement of fathers, over mothers, was clear.

Being physical. Participants described being physically active as girls. The majority of participants described themselves as active while growing up, either in sports or in carrying out physically demanding family responsibilities. They credited their physicality and sturdiness with helping them to develop strength and persistence that contributed to their success in the FBI. Doing physical work and participating in sports at a young age helped them to develop their self-described work ethic as adults.

Andrea and Monica grew up on farms where they worked alongside men to conduct physical labor. For example, Monica took on many of her father's duties starting when his health declined and after his death. She described her position in the family:

On a farm, you need somebody to work outside, kids to work outside, and so I was the "outside child." I worked side-by-side with the crews, driving tractors and working in the barns and then in the chicken coops. . . . I had always worked side-by-side with men. . . . I knew that I was perfectly capable of working at the same level as any man.

Through hard outdoor work on the farms, Andrea and Monica developed persistence and learned to believe that females were capable of doing anything that a male could do.

Participants also described a variety of physical activities as girls that later helped them work with men. Elizabeth described herself as a "tomboy" who competed with her family members:

I was never a doll player. I never did cutesy little things. I was a tomboy from the start. I could outshoot my grandfather who was a champion skeet shooter. I could beat my brother up when it came to physical activity. I was an athlete. I had horses all my

life. . . . That just fit my personality.

Similar to the examples of Andrea and Monica, Elizabeth believed, from an early age, that she was on an even footing with members of the opposite sex.

These examples provide self-described experiences of participants who engaged in physical work and sports. Being physical was preparation for them to meet the FBI's physical standards and demands of the job. They described that physicality helped them learn to work hard, to develop persistence, and to acquire a work ethic. When women were first hired as FBI agents in the 1970s, the career was considered physically demanding (FBI, 2015c). Before the policy prohibiting female agents was changed in 1972, women were thought to be unfit to handle the physical rigors of the job, which included making arrests, taking part in raids, and engaging in self-defense (FBI, 2015c). Women who were active in sports and physical work challenged the traditional expectations for women at that time (Bush & Simmons, 1987).

Meeting fitness requirements was challenging for the participants. Being physically fit was a measure of acceptance in training and later on the job. As described by the participants, their perseverance in early life to perform physically helped them in their FBI careers. The literature has described the connection between fitness and a hard work ethic by women in nontraditional occupations. Hard work, in turn, has been associated with perseverance, a quality associated with the concept of *grit* (Duckworth, 2007). Grit is a combination of perseverance and passion. In particular, perseverance is measured in terms of hard work, task completion, diligence, and overcoming setbacks.

Choosing the FBI. All participants described their decisions to become FBI agents. None of them had planned to be FBI agents as children, and none saw themselves as trailblazers. Participants described wanting an alternative to traditional women's work and married life with

children. They described wanting to have interesting lives and meaningful careers. Most of them had traditional, female careers before joining the FBI. Many described the pay and benefits of a federal job as contributing to their decisions to become agents.

Participants described the traditional jobs for women in the 1970s as teachers, nurses, flight attendants, or secretaries. Elizabeth described the career options for women: “You either were a nurse, a steno of some sort, or a teacher. Those were the three main choices for a professional woman in those days.” Nicole echoed Elizabeth’s view; she knew in college that she did not want to do what most women did:

I was kind of floundering at school. I didn’t know exactly what I wanted to do when I grew up. I knew what I didn’t want to do. . . . Most women were either nurses, teachers, or stewardesses, and I didn’t want to be any of the above.

Like Nicole and Elizabeth, all the participants wanted to do something nontraditional with their lives. An FBI career represented an alternative to more traditional jobs.

Participants described specific reasons for choosing careers in the FBI. Reasons included a desire for adventure, an interesting job, better pay, the chance to carry a gun, and job security. Karen described herself: “I was always adventuresome. And, so I just thought this sounded kind of neat and felt like, if it didn’t work out, I could always go back and teach school.” When Tonya heard the FBI was hiring women, she described her reaction: “I figured it would be a very interesting, challenging, and I was . . . bound and determined not to have a normal life. That’s what I remember.” Tammy summed up how adventure, better pay, and a good retirement plan all appealed to her:

I had no idea what law enforcement was, because I had never been around law enforcement. I always knew I had to have a career that would support myself, and I

looked at the salary of an FBI agent, and it was, you know, three times what I was making as a teacher. . . . I just wanted to get outside my comfort zone. . . . I guessed it would be an adventure, but I wanted to live in each part of the United States, see what the people were like, if they were different and had an interesting life. I knew I had to support myself, because no one had stepped forward to marry me. So I knew I had to have a career that would support myself. The biggest thing that I saw with the FBI was their retirement plan.

Similarly, Melissa reported that adventure and pay both figured into her decision: “By the third year [of teaching], I had already decided I wanted to get out and see the world and make some money. Teaching for so little money was going nowhere fast.” The recollections of Nicole, Karen, Tonya, Tammy, and Melissa were good examples of how participants described themselves as adventurous, independent, goal-oriented women.

Many of the participants had been teachers before joining the FBI. Some chose teaching because of financial realities, such as paying for college or needing a job with income. Teaching had been a backup plan that Elizabeth settled on, because of cost factors. She recalled, “I was going to have to pay my own way through college, and my parents couldn’t do it.” Melissa also settled on teaching because she could not afford to attend art school. She recalled: “I was accepted, . . . but my father said, ‘That’s nice, but you can’t eat canvas. Find something else.’ . . . Teaching was an interim job to get me out in the world so I could start making money.” The financial reality for participants like Elizabeth and Melissa was that teaching majors in college led to specific employment, in contrast to other majors. As such, parents of participants were often more willing to pay for their daughters to earn teaching degrees than other degrees.

Two of the teachers—Kathleen and Suzanne—had been nuns who decided to leave their convents. Suzanne described her decision to leave the convent after nine years:

Jesus Christ wasn't the most important person in my life any more. . . . I was well respected. I had been made a principal at a very young age in my career, and I know that I could have made a very good career there. But it just wasn't in my heart.

Suzanne described her life as a nun: "While I was in the convent, I lived with extremely independent, aggressive, well-educated women [who] were excellent role models for me. I wanted to be in an environment where I worked with that type of people." Kathleen and Suzanne both felt that their experiences as nuns were excellent preparation for being FBI agents.

In contrast to the women who previously worked in traditional careers, three participants—Monica, Nicole, and Rosemary—were already working in nontraditional careers for women when the FBI hired them. Two had been local law enforcement officers, and one had been in the military. They described different paths to nontraditional careers. Nicole chose the military over a singing career:

I got an offer to sing on a cruise ship. . . . I said [to my parents], "I know me well enough to know that, if I quit college, I'll never go back, but if I stay in college, I'll still be able to sing two years from now or a year from now when I graduate." . . . And I ended up in the [military].

On the other hand, Monica decided in high school that she wanted to be a police officer. She recalled making her decision:

In high school, we had to give a talk on what we wanted to do when we grew up. . . . I knew, if I was going to be a teacher or a nurse or a housewife, I wouldn't get an A. . . .

I did some research and found out [about] a program in police science, so you could learn to be a police officer. . . . So, I wrote off for . . . all this information. And there was just one sheet of paper and the final line on that read, “Police women who are sworn officers get equal pay.” And that became my career choice. And I never turned back. Monica was determined to earn the same pay as men. For many participants, the financial motivation was powerful.

The reviewed literature supported data in the present study that career choices can be tied to personality traits and perceptions of gender roles. The Bern Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), developed by Sandra L. Bern (1981), has been widely used to measure gender roles and how people identify themselves. Gender categorizations have been correlated with many stereotypical gendered behaviors (Bern, 1981). In the BSRI, personality characteristics of men and women in various occupations have been categorized as instrumental and expressive. Instrumental characteristics are often considered masculine traits, and include goal orientation and independence; expressive characteristics often considered feminine traits and include having focus on relationships and caring (Colley, Mulhern, Maltby, & Wood, 2009). In studies conducted, women in NTOs have scored higher in instrumental characteristics while women in traditional careers scored higher in expressive characteristics (Letarte, 1992). As the examples in this section point out, participants gravitated toward FBI careers because they possessed many instrumental personality traits.

Readiness. Participants reported unplanned, but specific, events that prompted them to consider FBI careers. They all described being ready for career change. These highly memorable personal events were serendipitous given the participants’ readiness for change. Serendipity is a social phenomenon that Louis Pasteur described as, “In the fields of

observation, chance favors only the prepared mind” (cited in Myers, 1992, p. 335). Data in this category had breadth and depth with all participants recalling—in great detail—an event that led them to pursue an FBI career. Many participants mentioned the death of FBI Director Hoover as a singular event that prompted them to consider careers as FBI agents.

All participants were receptive to change when an event took place that represented a major crossroad in their lives. Participants learned about opportunities in the FBI in a variety of ways. For example, Karen was a teacher looking for another career when a friend told her the FBI was hiring women. Her friend dared her to apply:

I called on a dare. I was teaching school . . . and my roommate’s boyfriend was a big fan of “The FBI” [a popular television series], and Efrem Zimbalist [the star of the series]. I was looking for another job that paid more. [I] had a Masters’ [degree], and he kept egging me to call the FBI.

In Andrea’s case, she was working as a nurse and happened to read a news article that the FBI was hiring female agents. With her newspaper in hand, she walked into the local FBI office to apply:

It was a lark. . . . When I went into the office to get an application for employment, the receptionist . . . brought it back. . . . I looked at it, and I said, “Oh, this is an application for a clerical position. I want to apply to be a Special Agent.” And she said, “Well, the FBI doesn’t hire women to be Special Agents.” And I pulled out my trusty *Washington Post* article and said, “The *Washington Post* says you do.”

Melissa applied to the FBI after a party where she met an agent, who was married to another teacher. She recalled:

He kind of zeroed in on me at a Christmas party . . . and started talking me up about the FBI. This was 1972. At the time, he had no idea what the female agents would be doing since there weren't any in the field. I decided that, if they were going to pay me good money, . . . what the heck, you know, I would give it a try. . . . [I considered it] absolutely an adventure. He promised I'd get a badge and a gun and be transferred around the country.

Kathleen recalled that an FBI recruiter visited her school to recruit students, and he ended up recruiting her: "The FBI came recruiting. . . . He gave me the application. . . . This was just a door that opened up." The recollections of Karen, Andrea, Melissa, and Kathleen were indicative of how their readiness for change factored into their decisions to join the FBI.

Monica and Nicole both reported life-changing events that led them to nontraditional careers in law enforcement and the military, before they became FBI agents. Monica recalled her decision to become a police officer so that she would earn the same pay as men:

When I was in grade school, . . . I read the PTA letter . . . and I saw in there that male teachers who were married were paid the most. Then, male teachers, unmarried, got paid the next. And then, women, married, single, whatever, were paid the least. And I said, "This will never happen to me."

As the only participant to serve in the military, Nicole reported an unexpected event that prompted her to join the U.S. Marine Corps. She recalled, "I was walking through our student union, and there was an . . . officer standing there recruiting. I stopped and said, "Do you have women in the Marines?" And he goes, "As a matter of fact, we do." Monica and Nicole's decision-making demonstrate the role of serendipity in their important, early career decisions.

Their previous experience in the military and in law enforcement positioned them to be recruited by the FBI and to become successful as leaders.

Several participants recalled learning the news that FBI Director Hoover had died. Tonya had always been interested in police work, but she was working as an administrator in higher education in 1972. She recalled, “I’m sitting on the bed in my apartment looking at the TV that he [Hoover] died, and I went to the phone and picked it up and called the [closest FBI] office.” Ann’s father had encouraged her to be an agent, but it was well known that women could not be agents while Hoover was in charge. She recalled a memorable conversation with her father: “[He] said to me, “Why don’t you go and join the Bureau?” and I said, “Dad, Mr. Hoover won’t take female agents.” . . . On my birthday in 1972, Mr. Hoover died, and Dad said, “Now go ahead and apply.” Kathleen was already working as a researcher for the FBI, and she knew women would never be agents while Director Hoover was alive. She described the FBI environment:

I can remember the day he died. . . . [We] sort of knew that, as soon as he was gone, that they [the FBI] were going to have to hire women because a couple of women had already sued to become agents. . . . Mr. Hoover died in May, and I was in class in July.

The experiences of Tonya, Ann, and Kathleen were examples of how participants sensed that immediate change would take place after Hoover’s death.

Historical FBI documents confirmed that FBI Director Hoover had an agenda to restrict women from being agents (FBI, 2015c). He resisted the hiring of women even when other employers were required to do so pursuant to legislation and executive order.

Typology 2: Women Achieving Career Self-Efficacy

In this study, career self-efficacy is considered to be a participant's judgment of her abilities to perform her job well in relation to her career development and choices (Betz & Hackett, 1981). Data described within this typology revealed several perspectives related to career self-efficacy. Among them were how participants integrated into the FBI workforce and their judgments on personal traits and job skills that were important for success. Participants described the role of personal and professional relationships. Reviewed literature regarding female perspectives and self-efficacy fit well within this typology.

All participants faced challenges in being among the first female FBI agents. They expected to face resistance from male agents. In part, they assumed that many men would resist actively female agents because they agreed with Director Hoover's position that women were not suited to be agents. Andrea described Hoover's influence:

There was an unwritten code from J. Edgar Hoover's day that White males are what we want, and I think that a lot of the older ones just got used to that. And they resented it when Black males became agents, and I think they resented it—I know they resented it—when females—of whatever race—became agents.

Excerpts from the data regarding career self-efficacy were sorted into these categories: (a) "the Female Experiment," (b) personal traits and skills, and (c) workplace relationships.

"The Female Experiment." The perspectives of participants, specifically about how they felt as the first female agents, have been included in this section. Participants' perspectives were framed by clear feelings of pressure to perform. Some participants described that male colleagues told them that most men viewed the process as an experiment that was informally

referred to as “the Female Experiment.” Male agents knew that women would be hired, but many of them were convinced, like Hoover, that women would not be able to perform on the job.

All participants reported memorable experiences as the first female agents, particularly in training and early in their careers. Participants described the pressure they felt, how they responded to scrutiny, and how their male colleagues treated them. Within a broad spectrum of both positive and negative experiences, the scrutiny described by participants was consistent. Further, they shared that their perspectives about the first female agents could not be separated from other strong feelings that included: their great pride in being FBI agents, their strong desire to prove themselves, and their strong desire to avoid failure. Excerpts for this subheading have been largely limited to the participants’ experiences during training and early in their careers. Perspectives of participants as the first female supervisors have been reported in the data for the leadership typology.

Melissa remembered feeling the pressure as a female trainee at the FBI Academy. She described her first day in training:

I was the first woman agent they ever saw. . . . They were all smiles until I went into the room . . . and then they would frown, and the remarks would start. “I would never work with a female agent. I wouldn’t do this. I wouldn’t do that. You don’t belong here.

Females don’t belong in the Bureau.” It seemed to me they were looking to get rid of us. Melissa’s example demonstrated the pressure that she and other participants were under to perform and to prove themselves.

After being hired, participants underwent approximately 11 to 12 weeks of basic new agent training at the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia. They were in the same training classes as male agents, and they were required to do the same activities as men, with a few modifications

to standards for the timed run, pull-ups, and push-ups. Starting in training and throughout their careers, participants described coworkers labeling them by gender as “female agents.”

A few of the participants had even more specific labels than just “female agent.” Nicole was labeled “The Marine,” and Kathleen and Suzanne were each labeled by coworkers as “The Nun.” Suzanne recalled, “Everybody said, . . . ‘She went from The Nun to the gun.’ That label [The Nun] followed me everywhere. It started in Quantico. I would be running around the gym, and they would say, ‘That one’s The Nun’.” Kathleen recalled how it felt to be labeled, “Sometimes you felt like you were in a fish bowl. . . . They [other agents] would say, ‘Which one are you, The Nun or The Marine?’” All participants were aware that they were labeled in training, and the labels were attached to them throughout their careers.

Participants described that, during basic training, men kept close track of the number of female agent trainees at the FBI Academy. Ann recalled that the trainers—all men—kept track of how many women began training, how many graduated, and how many failed. She noted that the attrition rate for female trainees was very high in the early years. In order to keep track of the female agents, Ann described that men assigned numbers to them:

We knew, when we went through New Agent training, what our “number” was, so we joked about having my number tattooed on some portion of my body. . . . I was “Number 48.” . . . It’s not like something I searched out, but . . . people were watching and tracking who you were.

No public lists were promulgated, but trainees knew their numbers. The numbering of the female trainees was not a secret.

At the FBI Academy, some participants felt encouraged, and others did not. Kathleen recalled that most men considered female agents to be a curiosity, but only some of them

displayed open resistance. She described walking through the dining hall with another female trainee:

We saw one of our classmates sitting there, so we went over and sat down with him. He got up and left. I just about died. . . . I know I started to cry, because I felt that was so awful. But that was him. He was [a New Agent trainee] . . . who barely made the height minimum. . . . He was just trying to be “Mr. Macho.”

The most resistance Kathleen felt at the FBI Academy came from the men in her training class.

Training at the FBI Academy involved three components: (a) an academic component, (b) a physical and defensive tactics component, and (c) a firearms training component. Many women struggled with the physical training and firearms components. Failure to meet requirements in any area meant that a trainee would be dismissed. Part of the physical training involved testing to meet minimum standards for a timed run, an agility run, push-ups, and a female version of pull-ups. Tonya described, “I had a terrible time with the running because, back [then], nobody ran . . . or, at least, women didn’t.” Passing the timed run requirement proved extremely challenging for all of the women.

None of the participants reported any difficulties with the academic component of training. In fact, in Ann’s training class, all of the women were very strong academically, and they frequently helped male trainees with academic assignments. Academic strength and the high test scores of trainees were not recognized, but weakness in physical and firearms testing was recognized in negative and public ways. Ann recalled that trainees who did poorly in physical and firearms tests had their names posted on a bulletin board, and they were assigned to “weak squads.” She described that, “all the women were on the weak squad in the gym, and we were all on—and some men—the weak squad for shooting.” When Ann asked her class

counselor if academic grades could also be posted publicly, he flatly refused and said, “No, we won’t do that.”

Many participants struggled with firearms, but a small number of them actually excelled in this area. Nicole was a very “good shot,” and she described learning how to shoot: “Firearms, it was a piece of cake. . . . I had good eye/hand coordination, and I wasn’t afraid. . . . The guys on the range, they really liked me because I could shoot.” Participants like Nicole who excelled in firearms training were more quickly accepted than other female trainees, as Melissa’s experience also demonstrated. Melissa’s shooting skills helped her to develop a positive reputation:

By the time I got out of training, I was shooting 98 [out of 100] constantly for [my] score. . . . If you could shoot well, plus [you] had a good attitude, . . . that raised you up in their minds. “She’s a girl, but let’s see if she can do it. Give her a chance.”

Proficiency in firearms provided an advantage to women who were “good shots” over other female agents. The good female shooters earned early respect from male colleagues that carried into subsequent assignments.

After graduating from the FBI Academy, participants were assigned as field agents to various FBI field offices around the country. Each participant was assigned to a squad in her respective office. Each participant was either the first woman, or one of the first women, in that office. At times, a participant would have been the first and only woman agent in her field office.

As participants completed training and reported to their field offices, most recalled that no consistent system was in place to dictate how female agents would be assigned and rotated among squads. All participants described feeling that they were being closely watched. Sarah described the feeling:

In my first office, they knew how often I wore the same outfit. . . . They knew how many times I went to the bathroom, how many cups of coffee I had, how often I talked on the phone, what I had for lunch. . . . They were “keeping book” on me.

Although experiences varied among participants, squads, and field offices, all participants reported feeling they were under intense scrutiny.

Participants described facing resistance from many sources in their first offices. For example, some participants met resistance from other female employees who were not agents. Other employees told Ann: “Damn it, because you’re here, [we] used to be able to do those special things. . . . Go to the restaurants and look like a date. . . . You’re taking away our fun stuff.” For other participants, resistance came from male agents who felt they had an extra burden to assume that involved protecting the female agents. Ann recalled that her first supervisor told male squad members: “God forbid a female agent gets harmed, and she’s on my squad.” For some participants, resistance formed because male agents were uncomfortable telling their wives they worked with female agents. Melissa remembered, “They [the men] were . . . stand-offish because they had wives. The wives were, ‘We don’t need you working with a woman.’” Monica recalled that women would sometimes be assigned to work with training agents who “didn’t take them anywhere . . . [and] didn’t tell their wives they had a woman working with them.” The resistance described by participants was not particularly surprising to them, so they just accepted it.

Despite the resistance and scrutiny that they accepted, participants described a range of both positive and negative experiences as the first female agents in their offices. A number of them recalled feeling accepted in their first offices. Nicole reported it was an advantage to be the first female agent in her office:

When you're the first female that gets to an office, you don't have to live up to, or live down, anybody else's reputation. So, I, kind of, made it for myself and for those women who followed. Hopefully, I left a good impression.

Like Nicole, some participants felt that, as the first female agent in an office, they earned early acceptance because their male colleagues had no prior negative experiences with female agents.

For some of the participants, being a female agent was an advantage because women could perform tasks that men could not. Kathleen described:

I think part of my [success] was because I was a woman. . . . There was one fugitive who had been gone for five years. . . . I knocked on the door. I said, "FBI," and he was just dumb-founded. . . . He couldn't believe it. . . . Sometimes we [female agents] got in quicker because they didn't suspect.

Tonya also described feeling valued in first office. She had good cases, but agents on other squads would ask for her help to work on cases. She described being accepted and gaining valuable experience:

I got to work on a lot of different squads . . . because they needed women . . . [and] wherever they needed a woman. It was a one or two shot deal, but I found that to be very enriching for me. . . . I was afforded anything I wanted. . . . I was treated very well, if the truth [were to] be known.

The examples of Kathleen and Tonya reinforced a belief, supported by their colleagues, that female agents added value to investigations.

In some cases, men responded to positive cues from other men who were well-respected and supported certain female agents. For example, when the SWAT team leader showed Rebecca respect, she remembered, "the heads starting turning like . . . maybe she isn't that bad."

Others had the support of respected agents or supervisors. Catherine reported the support of her training agent as “phenomenal.” Kathleen’s supervisor acknowledged her investigative skills and her mastery of FBI paperwork: “He let me prove myself. He gave me good case work.” As these examples indicate, women found support from men who recognized their capabilities, communicated their respect for them, and thereby positively influenced their male coworkers.

Positive experiences were not reported consistently. Many participants shared negative experiences and reported that they felt isolated, unfairly treated, and harassed because they were among the first female agents. For example, Karen’s supervisor assigned her to work alone in a prison setting. She later learned he had broken the FBI’s rules by having her work alone:

I don’t know if he . . . didn’t like women, I don’t know if he didn’t like me. I don’t know if he didn’t like first office [agents]. . . . I don’t know if he was mad because he was going to have to retire. I really don’t know. . . . I think they were waiting to watch me fail.

Tammy recalled a negative experience when she worked on a case for several months, and the case was reassigned at a key point because, “they didn’t think the guy [the target of the investigation] would be receptive to a female approaching him.” In another example, Teresa recalled that male agents in her first office would pit female agents against each other:

There were three of us [female agents]. It was very sexually harassing from the beginning. Lots of testosterone in that office. . . . I didn’t talk to the other women about it. . . . That was another ploy. Guys would take you out, and they’d say, “Okay now, you know, we’ve determined you’re okay, but the other ones we don’t want anything to do with.

Teresa described that men set the tone in her first office assignment that resulted in a hostile, and even dangerous, work environment for female agents.

Participants began their FBI careers during a time described by some as “the Female Experiment.” Data in this section provided descriptions of what they encountered in the male-dominated FBI environment. In the examples of Melissa, Nicole, Kathleen, Suzanne, Ann, Rebecca, Monica, Catherine, Tonya, and Karen, several points from the literature discussed in Chapter 2 were supported. First, the participants reported little difficulty as trainees with the FBI’s academic training; their experiences were consistent with the literature that minimized differences between men and women with regard to intellectual tasks (Lindberg, Linn, Ellis, & Williams, 2008). Second, participants’ experiences reflected the research of Belenky, Clinchy, Goldeberger, and Tarule (1997) about women’s development and their *ways of knowing*. Women give meaning to events and relationships that occur in a gendered environment, and they construct knowledge based on how they make sense of their experiences. In the study, participants described a wide range of positive and negative perspectives as the first female agents. Finally, participants’ perspectives also fit with Bartlett’s (1990) study of women entering bureaucratic organizations, such as police departments and the military services. Such women act as gendering agents (Acker, 1990). As women integrate into male-dominated workplaces, they initiate a process for these workplaces to adapt to the presence of women (Bartlett, 1990).

Personal traits and skills. The descriptions offered by the participants suggested that it was not enough to be qualified, competent, and hard working in order to gain the respect of colleagues and to be accepted. The data indicated that job skills were important, but so were certain personal traits. Participants described how they handled early challenges—with little to no guidance—and how their ability to respond effectively may have played a role in their career

efficacy. They described some of the traits that helped them as a sense of humor and confidence. In addition to their personalities, participants attributed career success to job skills that included a strong work ethic, assertiveness, superior writing skills, and organizational skills. Also, as reported previously, data revealed that, for those with good shooting skills, firearms proficiency was a specific job skill that opened a quick pathway to acceptance for those women. Literature that supports these main ideas follows the descriptions in this section.

Most participants reported that having a good sense of humor on the job was an indicator of a good attitude. A sense of humor was helpful to defuse tension or to deflect attention, especially when female agents were challenged in front of others. Participants saw these challenges as informal, acceptance tests. For Nicole, it was important to “keep them laughing. . . . Sometimes you could use humor to get your point across instead of screaming.” If male agents thought women had a good attitude, men more quickly accepted them. Participants had no guidance or mentoring to help prepare them for these random tests in the workplace. In her first office, Ann sat next to a cigar-smoking agent who would blow smoke in her face. He ignored her when she asked him not to smoke around her, and other agents on her squad were watching to see what she would do. She decided to assert herself:

I went out to the drugstore and bought a can of Lysol, came in, and put it in my drawer. . . . When he lit up his cigar, I took the can out and sprayed the back of his head. . . . The other guys on the squad and in the office, that went rampant, and everybody was just laughing. But I handled it.

Tonya remembered a respected female agent whose gruff humor she tried to emulate. This particular female agent deflected behaviors and comments with blunt language that, by today’s standards, might be considered sexual harassment. When men would make inappropriate

comments, Tonya recalled she would say, “‘Shut the fuck up,’ and the guys loved that.”

Tonya recalled this type of behavior as an example of how “humor [was] the single most important thing” for women to be successful FBI agents. For many like Nicole, Ann, and Tonya, being able to adapt to challenges from male agents with humor helped them, in their words, to “prove” they belonged.

For the most part, participants described themselves as confident throughout their careers. For example, later in her career, Karen was an instructor for other agents. She recalled, “I don’t know that I was any better than anybody else, but at least I was confident in the work I had done.” Tonya described herself as different from most agents who were conservative in their political beliefs. She was a “fuzzy haired liberal” who was self-confident and earned the respect of other agents, despite her liberal views:

People knew where I stood pretty much. Big, maybe overwhelming, confidence belied by my effectiveness or expertise, but I had confidence and always have had confidence. . . . And it’s helped a lot.

For many like Karen and Tonya, being assertive helped them to, in their words, “prove” they belonged.

The appearance of being in control was important, so participants attempted to conceal any perceived weakness they had from others. Some gave examples about how they resisted showing emotion because they thought it would make them look weak. Catherine described a meeting with a difficult boss:

The one thing he did get me to do—that I said nobody would—was, he’s the only person that ever got me to cry, and I fought it like crazy. But it happened, and I knew that, once I had done that, he had me.

Many of the participants reported occasions when they became emotional or their confidence faltered. Recounting these experiences prompted many of the participants to become tearful in the interviews.

Participants wanted to be accepted by their colleagues as competent. Each of them worked hard to earn the greatest compliment that an agent can pay to his or her fellow agent—to be called a “good agent.” Asked how they became “good agents,” participants consistently described themselves as highly competent, hard workers. Most thought they worked harder and worked longer hours than their male counterparts. Cynthia described her efforts, “I felt I had to be more competent than a man to get the same results. I think the recognition that I got, . . . I double earned it.” Catherine recalled, “I was the hardest damn worker on the squad. I produced results. It was absolutely undeniable.” Many of the participants thought their excellent writing and organizational skills were assets in achieving their success. These skills served them well to document complex investigations as agents and to function effectively later as supervisors. Andrea described one of her strengths as, “intellectually analyzing stuff, following the paper trail.” Similarly, Kathleen reported, “I was successful because I was who I was,” as she attributed her success to the strength of her analytical and writing skills.

Data excerpts regarding personal traits and skills were supported by the research literature about personality. Osborn and Harris (1975) described women with assertive personalities as more likely to choose law enforcement careers than non-assertive ones. Assertive women are confident in interpersonal relationships, are able to express feelings and emotions spontaneously, and are highly regarded by others (Osborn & Harris, 1975). These characteristics were evident in the examples provided by Nicole, Ann, Tonya, Karen, and Cynthia.

Data for this section also was supported by the literature related to *grit* (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthew, & Kelley, 2007). Using a scale to study women, Duckworth et al. found that personality traits do not necessarily translate into achievement. Instead, the study indicated that, although it was important for participants to feel accepted, female achievers are ultimately successful because of their sustained hard work, diligence, focus, and overall job performance. In this section, Cynthia, Catherine, Andrea, and Kathleen all referred to their personal success in terms of these attributes. Duckworth et al. attributed high achievement less to personality and talent and more to consistency of interests, or passion, and dedicated effort, or perseverance.

Workplace relationships. Participants described the influence of complex workplace relationships on their careers. Several main ideas were evident in the data compiled for this section. Workplace relationships were characterized as both professional and personal. Most participants described having support systems that consisted of both male and female colleagues. Those with the most positive support systems typically described having a large number of supportive male coworkers. Participants described sometimes having to manage perceptions about whether their relationships with men were strictly professional or also romantic. When female agents worked closely with men, other coworkers would often assume they were involved in romantic relationships. As part of this effort, some participants made a concerted effort to distance themselves from the female agents who dated other agents.

Participants benefitted from informal male mentorship. Karen remembered several men who took her “under their wings.” A male supervisor was the first person to encourage her to become a supervisor: “[He] asked me if I wanted to be a . . . supervisor . . . and he said, ‘I’ll help you . . . if that’s what you decide you want to do.’” Monica also had several mentors, including

her training agent: “They gave me one of the most respected agents in the office.”

Participants considered male relationships to be more helpful for career advancement than female ones.

Many participants had no difficulty cultivating good working relationships with male agents, but they faced a recurring dilemma with the married men. As Monica recalled, many married male agents “didn’t tell their wives they had a woman working with them,” because their wives would be jealous. Andrea described how she and some male colleagues handled this issue:

A lot of the guys . . . were married, and I didn’t want to put them in a position where some mean person would start talking. . . . In the early ’70s, you had to be sensitive to those issues. . . . One elderly agent told me, “When I go home and talk about what I’ve done with my wife, I don’t always tell her that the agent I was working with was you. Because she has a tendency to be a little jealous.”

Like Andrea, Elizabeth also knew that married male agents had to manage the perceptions of other people when they worked or spent time with female agents. One of Elizabeth’s mentors spoke at a luncheon and described working with her:

A lot of people gave me crap about the fact that I hung out with [participant’s name], but I’ve got to tell you something. If I was in a problem situation, and I had to call somebody, that’s the person I’d call. . . . She’s gonna back you up. She’s not going to turn and run.

Andrea and Elizabeth were examples of how female agents had to be sensitive to negative perceptions that their male colleagues sometimes faced when worked with female agents.

Data about participants' relationships with other female agents was varied. Some women reported having female support, but most did not. Female relationships were typically personal and did not contribute to career advancement. A small number of participants felt they had been mentors to other female agents. Some participants felt the support of their female colleagues as friends, but all did not share this viewpoint.

Of the participants who had other female agents as close friends, personal connections were strong and lifelong. As friends, they would serve as peer mentors to provide each other advice on negotiating gender issues in the workplace. For example, Sarah and Ann were assigned as partners in their first office, and they became lifelong friends. Sarah learned from Ann:

I saw how she dealt with people, and I tried to pick her brain about dealing with the politics. . . . She could play chess and see what was going to happen three or four moves down the line. Me, I was more of a checkers guy. . . . She would give me a set of options, and we would go through and figure out which one was best.

In addition to helping Sarah, Ann developed friendships with other female agents, and she frequently offered them guidance. Ann told them to not be apologetic:

You're too quick to say you're sorry. . . . You're implying that you made a mistake and, often times, it's the other person, and they won't say they're sorry. So, all you should be saying is, "I'm sorry we had this misunderstanding." . . . When you're going into a male organization, there are little things that you can do . . . to make you successful.

Ann considered the nature and habit of women to apologize—when they had done nothing wrong—to be a mistake; by making unnecessary apologies, she believed that female agents fostered an environment for men to assert power over women.

Because the early female agents were assigned to offices all over the country, most of the participants were not in contact with each other. Their small number and geographic distribution around the country, along with the demands of work and a persistent masculine culture, combined to create both literal and psychological distance among female agents. Teresa had women friends, but not many: “Some of us were friends, but I think we were all just trying to keep our heads above water.” Cognizant of how they and other female agents were regarded, some participants even acted consciously to distance themselves from other women. For example, Tonya avoided another female agent who was unpopular and was considered “too serious” by the male agents. She responded to the negative feedback by distancing herself from the female agent:

I didn't want to be associated with her . . . because she was very negative, always very negative. So, I didn't extend myself to her, [or] to any of them really, because we were busy on our own thing. I remember people thinking that there was a women's caucus, and we didn't want to be associated with that.

Tonya's experience was an example of how participants, like Tonya, managed perceptions that some female agents were considered “good agents” and others were not. Participants were gratified to be considered one of the “good” female agents, so they responded by isolating themselves from the other women.

Not only did many participants distance themselves from other female agents, some even felt betrayed by them. Andrea had been an advocate for fair treatment of women in her first office. She was surprised when a few female agents she had supported responded by distancing themselves from her. Andrea explained that they feared punishment or transfers, but, as a result,

she “pretty well felt betrayed by them.” In her experience, male agents were more supportive than female agents.

Many participants did not have female mentors to guide them with career choices. Ann mentored others, but she cited competition among female agents as one possible reason that she no female agents offered to mentor her:

There were women who wouldn't mentor and wouldn't give me the time of day because they were the first in a certain office, and they didn't like the fact that other women were coming in behind them. . . . I guess they saw it as competition.

Like Ann, Catherine had no female mentors, but she made an effort to be a mentor herself. She believed it was a “challenge and privilege” to mentor and encourage talented women to seek advancement.

The research literature supported the data shared by participants about the importance of relationships. Belenky, Clinchy, Goldeberger, and Tarule (1997) determined that, while women's perspectives are often similar to men's perspectives, women attach greater importance to relationships as they construct knowledge. Women consider their relationships as they interpret experiences and as they draw conclusions about truth, knowledge, authority, and personal power. Ruddick (2001) reported that women view the world wholly in terms of relationships. Baier (1985) argued that women build knowledge and view themselves as “second persons,” and they do not consider themselves individually, as men do. Women develop their sense of worth in terms of how they relate to others.

Typology 3: Women as Leaders

For this typology, excerpts from the data reflected the experiences of participants after they became supervisors. By the time participants entered FBI management, they had worked as

agents in the field for varying lengths of time. As they sought promotions, their perspectives shifted from their pre-FBI and early FBI perspectives to those related to leadership. Their recollections included: (a) their decisions to become managers, (b) types of leadership positions they assumed, (c) leadership self-assessments, and (d) challenges they faced as managers.

Being a field agent assigned to an FBI office was referred to as being in “the field,” and being a field agent is the journeyman position for any agent who is not in management. Because the FBI required all agents to sign mobility agreements that required them to move as needed, most agents who started their careers in the 1970s were required to transfer to one or more FBI field offices. Agents could choose to remain in the field for their entire careers. When an agent volunteered to enter the management program, he or she would first volunteer to be a Relief Supervisor to act in the place of the field supervisor, or the Supervisory Special Agent (SSA). Being selected as an SSA was the entry-level management position. This position meant a promotion, additional pay, and a possible transfer. A wide variety of management positions were located in FBI field offices around the country or at FBI Headquarters (FBIHQ). Several levels of management are above the SSA position.

Leadership experiences of the participants in the present study ranged from Relief Supervisor to Supervisory Special Agent (SSA) to Assistant Special Agent in Charge (ASAC) to Special Agent in Charge (SAC) of a field office to Assistant Director (AD), with other levels in between. For those who achieved the higher ranks, more job transfers were required.

During the careers of the participants, for the time period studied, men were in the positions to decide who would be promoted. Participants knew that promotional selections were often subjective. None of the participants started her career with specific long-range plans, but many did begin to set goals after they became managers. Some made it clear they wanted to

work in operational assignments that they thought would help them advance. Many felt very comfortable in administrative leadership positions. Most participants thought they utilized fair and caring leadership styles. All faced obstacles or challenges where gender played a role. The literature on female leadership style and career self-efficacy informed the description of the data within this typology.

Deciding to lead. Although they showed interest in career advancement, most participants reported that, early in their careers, they did not set clear, long-term career goals for themselves. For example, Tonya described her focus on being a “good agent,” and she had no aspirations to become a supervisor. Her management career began when she was promoted unexpectedly. She recalled her first promotion as a reward for hard work:

I never had the five-year plan. I literally never had a plan. I fall into things or opportunities present themselves, and I took advantage. . . . The SAC [Special Agent in Charge] calls me and says, “You’re transferred to Headquarters.” So, I was picked.

That’s right, there was no application.

Tonya, Nicole, and Monica were among a small number of participants who attained very high-level leadership positions in the FBI. Indeed, they were the only participants in the study to be promoted to the FBI’s Senior Executive Service (SES) ranks. They described setting specific career goals only after their management careers began to progress, and they were consistently promoted. Despite not having set goals early in their careers, they, and most participants, reported that the longer they were in management, the more they began to set goals.

Many participants described a pervasive “good old boy” network that permeated the promotional process. After she became a supervisor, Andrea decided it was her goal to become a Special Agent in Charge (SAC) because she thought, “if you’re high enough in management,

then you can make sure that all applicants are treated fairly. And the best is what you hire, despite their color and their gender.” Many examples of the how “good old boy” network functioned were provided among the data.

Participants reported that they perceived gender was a factor in promotions, and their qualifications were often minimized. For example, after being promoted, Ann was told by other agents, “You only got that job because you’re a woman.” Kathleen described that she did not receive equal consideration for promotion to a supervisory position in a field office: “The people who got promoted ahead of me were the ‘good old boys.’ . . . They had been in that office for a while . . . and they had the blessing.” Kathleen had more experience than the men who applied.

In a similar case, Andrea, then a supervisor at FBIHQ, recalled her frustration when she was passed over repeatedly for promotions in favor of lesser-qualified men:

When people get promoted, you generally knew, or learned, what their background had been, or where they had been, or where they were going. . . . The trajectory [for me] changed after the fourth or fifth White, male agent had been given an opportunity ahead of me [and] had less experience than me [and had] less of a reputation.

Andrea’s experience was an example that women were often overlooked for promotions because decisions were not based on performance.

With no women in high-level leadership at that time, participants had to rely on men to promote them. Men promoted women because of merit or because doing so could work to their advantage. Elizabeth recalled that one supervisor asked her to become his Relief Supervisor because, “that guy wanted a feather in his cap. . . . It was good for his benefit and not for

mine. . . . I can't tell you how much I despised him." Later, the Special Agent in Charge (SAC) promoted her to be a Supervisory Special Agent (SSA), and she described how her performance contributed to his support:

The supervisor retired, and I put in for that desk. I certainly was the best qualified for it, although there were people who were also putting in for it . . . who were already supervisors. . . . I know my SAC went to bat for me on that. . . . If I were in his position, I would have wanted me.

As the experiences of Elizabeth and Catherine indicated, merit was considered but gender was also considered.

Female goal-setting behaviors were addressed in the research literature regarding career self-efficacy. Betz and Hackett (1981) reported that career self-efficacy beliefs lead people to decide whether to set or avoid setting goals and whether to seek or avoid certain career outcomes. Career self-efficacy beliefs range from low to high, and women in traditionally male occupations often have lower levels of career self-efficacy beliefs than men (Betz & Hackett, 1981). In addition, Bandura (1997) reported that people with high career self-efficacy beliefs tend to have clear career ambitions and to set goals, and these beliefs contribute to successful job performance.

Data excerpts in this section were clear that female agents did not set clear career goals early in their careers. Further, their promotions were not solely determined by merit and qualifications. A general lack of certainty about the career development process may have contributed to the lack of early goal-setting by participants. For many, career self-efficacy beliefs became stronger later in their careers, as they set specific goals and worked toward certain career outcomes.

Levels of career self-efficacy beliefs for the participants were varied. Some participants described frustration at being passed over for promotions, and these negative experiences may have resulted in them possessing lower career self-efficacy beliefs than other participants. The participants who faced fewer obstacles may have possessed higher career self-efficacy beliefs than others. The experiences of participants like Catherine, who was content as a field supervisor, and senior executives like Monica, Nicole, and Tonya, who were promoted to very high levels, were representative of women with high career self-efficacy beliefs.

Administrative versus operational roles. Based on their knowledge of the FBI's work, participants described a clear distinction between: (a) operational—or more dangerous—investigative assignments, and (b) administrative—or less dangerous—support assignments. Even within operational assignments, some types of work were considered less dangerous than others. For example, white collar crime, foreign counterintelligence (FCI) work, and civil rights investigations were considered operational work, but they were considered less dangerous than violent crime, organized crime, undercover work, and terrorism investigations. Coordinator positions, applicant processing and recruiting positions, and training positions were considered auxiliary, administrative assignments.

Many of the participants gravitated toward administrative positions when they became supervisors. This pattern may have been influenced by their early experiences, as many of them described the tendency of supervisors to assign new female agents to less dangerous positions. Ann believed that the reluctance of supervisors to assign female agents to criminal squads was grounded in concerns about female agents being be hurt on the job. She overheard her supervisor telling others: “God forbid a female agent gets harmed, and she’s on my squad.”

Thus, participants reported that female agents were routinely assigned to foreign counterintelligence (FCI), white collar crime, and applicant work.

As new agents, the manner of assignment to squads varied widely for the participants among the FBI's geographical locations. In some cases, the participants described being rotated from squad to squad. Their assignments also varied widely within the same FBI office. As a new agent, Cynthia was assigned to an FCI squad in New York, along with "90% of the women that were sent [there]." Melissa was also in New York, but she lobbied against being assigned to an FCI squad. In order to get a different operational assignment, she volunteered to work on criminal cases in her spare time:

When you are asked to work with agents in the [New York] Criminal Division, you're working with the best agents with the best cases. . . . You're right there in the middle of everything, so you see how things work. [With] undercover cases, I was constantly asking questions, so I had a wealth of knowledge.

Melissa was not content to have assignments similar to the other female agents in the office, because she felt it was important to work on criminal cases and be in an operational role.

Like Melissa, Monica pushed to work on criminal cases. For Monica, many factors, such as her prior law enforcement experience, her shooting ability, her good attitude, and her work ethic, helped to shape her career path, but she attributed much of her FBI success to her concerted effort to gain criminal, operational experience as a young agent. Monica was one of a small number of participants who gained experience by working on, and supervising, criminal squads. Early in her FBI career, she made a decision to focus on being a good criminal case agent. Her solid operational experience was an advantage as she advanced in management. She described her perception of a good supervisor:

I looked at, “Who is a good supervisor?” They were always good case agents first, and I knew it was important to be a good case agent and to be in operational roles. . . . If you’re going to listen to the Bank Robbery Coordinator, then he has to have solved a whole bunch of bank robberies, or your conversation with him is useless. I just observed what made people successful, and I tried to do those things.

She described how some female agents limited their opportunities for advancement: “Women sometimes do it to themselves. . . . You have to have time in operational roles.” With this comment, Monica acknowledged, yet minimized, the role of gender in her career success.

Catherine and Karen described being administrative supervisors and knowing that their career opportunities might be limited as a result. Notwithstanding, they were content because they did not have personal goals to be promoted beyond the field supervisor level. Catherine described her life as a supervisor:

I was known as the “Queen of the Red Pen.” I thought I wanted an operational squad at first, but, once I settled into my niche, I didn’t want to move. I was really happy doing that. I did not want to go the ASAC [Assistant Special Agent in Charge] track. At that point, my career goal was to be the applicant—the admin—supervisor.

Catherine described feeling content to be a competent, administrative manager where she could make a valuable contribution to the FBI.

Karen had experience working both criminal and FCI cases, but, when she became a supervisor in a large office, she was assigned to supervise an administrative squad. She recalled that two women had supervised the squad before her: “They just thought women ought to do it, I don’t know [why].” She enjoyed her job and considered herself to be very competent. From the

data, it was clear that Catherine and Karen, along with several other participants, reported satisfaction in auxiliary management positions because administrative functions played to their organizational strengths.

Participants described their mid-level management experiences at FBIHQ as distinctly different from FBI field offices. At FBIHQ, they felt greater acceptance and perceived fewer obstacles. Kathleen was an experienced criminal case agent and had already been a supervisor at FBIHQ when she took a voluntary demotion to a field office so that she could be with her family. In that office, she applied, and was rejected for several field supervisory positions. She recalled, “There was still ‘that thing’ about women, they weren’t sure they wanted a female supervisor in the office.” Instead, she was assigned to be the applicant coordinator, which was neither a supervisory nor an operational assignment. She described feeling, “labeled with this ‘applicant business,’ and they didn’t see me as a criminal supervisor.” Thus, Kathleen’s experiences at FBIHQ and in the field were very different. She believed gender played a role in promotions being awarded to lesser-qualified men in the field; because she was a woman, she was relegated to administrative work in the field.

Participants’ descriptions of the different roles and assignments for female agents reflected the research literature’s acknowledgement of typical roles for women in nontraditional occupations, such as in law enforcement and military careers. Martin (2000) noted a clear tendency for policewomen and women in the military to be assigned by male superiors to auxiliary or administrative roles. Kanter (1975) suggested that, when women are relegated to such roles, they become token members of an organization. Whether or not women choose to work in these roles, they become marginalized in organizations that remain dominated by men (Acker, 1990). Heidensohn (1996) suggested that the assignment of women to auxiliary roles

prevent their acceptance as equal to men in the workplace. With the literature in mind, Monica's career was an example of how a female agent and supervisor could succeed and be promoted by focusing career on criminal cases and operations. The experiences of Kathleen, Catherine, and Karen were in contrast to Monica; although they may have excelled at their duties, they may have been perceived by male colleagues as having token status by virtue of their administrative management assignments.

Self-assessment. Participants described various personal qualities that best embodied their leadership styles. The majority of their self-assessments included descriptions, such as fairness, caring, approachability, and communication. The qualities described were supported by a large body of research regarding women as transformational leaders.

For example, Rebecca was a firearms instructor who was responsible for administering periodic, required firearms qualification training for other agents. As training sessions were announced, her sessions would always fill more quickly than those of other male instructors. Many high-ranking FBI officials, who were not particularly good shooters, signed up to attend her sessions, because they appreciated her style of instruction:

I was approachable enough to do whatever they needed. If you're going to carry a gun, you [must] qualify [to continue to carry your firearm]. If you can't qualify, then I'm going to help you until you do. I don't care who you are, and I prefer not to know anybody's rank. . . . I treated [the high level FBI officials] the same as everybody else.

Like Rebecca, Catherine considered herself approachable as a supervisor. She made a concerted effort to be empathic and caring toward the people she supervised. She assessed her management approach:

I was approachable. I was fair, always fair. . . . I was very good at rewarding people. . . . Anytime I had a chance to write up an award and let somebody be encouraged, or rewarded, for something they had done, I did that. There were a lot of people who requested to come to my squad. I was one who would go out and help with their personal situation, their family situations, their financial situations.

Rebecca, Catherine, and other participants emphasized the importance of valuing, encouraging, and recognizing the people whom they supervised. They also made a point to emphasize fairness.

As a supervisor, Andrea described herself as “obsessed” with fairness and explained the reason:

I was obsessed with treating people fairly. . . . Growing up, I had girlfriends who said, “Well, I’m going to have to go to work at such and such hamburger joint because Mom and Dad only have enough money for my brother to go to college, and he’s the boy, so he gets to go to college.” . . . [But] my parents treated us all very fairly. . . . I just had this innate feeling it was wrong.

Andrea attributed her obsession with fairness to her experiences with gender inequity as a girl. Although other participants emphasized fairness, Andrea was the only participant who described her approach in terms of a childhood personal experience.

Rebecca, Catherine, and Andrea attributed their effectiveness as supervisors to qualities that included encouragement, fairness, caring, and communication. These are qualities often associated with transformational leaders. The self-assessments of these and other participants regarding their leadership styles were supported by the research literature (Kabacoff, 2000) that female leadership is different from male leadership.

Research about female leadership has been increasing since the 1970s when scholars began to reject the stance that no differences existed in leadership between men and women (Kanter, 1977). Since then, gender differences have been widely acknowledged. Women leaders have demonstrated they can have a strong impact on individual, group, and organizational performance (Hegelson, 1990). Often, women leaders are better equipped than men to empathize with employees and to motivate them through encouragement (Kabacoff, 2000). Bass and Avolio (1994) determined that effective women leaders often exhibit transformational leadership styles because: (a) women leaders encourage others to participate, (b) they share power and information to reinforce communication, (c) they encourage individuals to value each other, and (d) they energize others with enthusiasm.

Challenges. During their interviews, all participants recalled specific events that represented challenges and obstacles in their careers. Data excerpts relating to challenges and obstacles constituted the largest number of coded entries in the whole set of data. Coding of challenges depended on whether data were related to: (a) general challenges as female agents, (b) obstacles as female leaders, or (c) equal employment opportunity (EEO) issues. This section describes data within only two of the three categories: general challenges as female agents, and obstacles as female leaders. Even though EEO complaints were described as specific challenges faced by participants, they have been discussed later under the typology of bureaucracy because EEO issues relate closely to formal rules, policies, and practices of the FBI.

General challenges as female agents. General challenges that were unique to female agents fell into three main areas. First, women with children or stepchildren faced practical challenges that other women and male agents did not. Second, participants had to develop

mechanisms to deal with sexist behavior from male agents in the workplace. Third, women who were proficient in firearms faced specific challenges from male firearms instructors.

The first set of general challenges faced by female agents involved managing dual roles as FBI agents and as mothers or stepmothers. Participants acknowledged that most female agents resigned when they had children, and this was a common and expected practice among female agents in the 1970s. Therefore, few of the participants had biological children or stepchildren. For those with children, it was not surprising that they would face practical challenges that other participants did not face. Time management and lack of mobility for job transfers were among the biggest practical challenges cited by participants when balancing motherhood with their careers.

Elizabeth was among the few participants with children. She was very interested in entering the management program and volunteered to be a Relief Supervisor. In this role, she found herself struggling with her schedule, a failed marriage, and small children. In the end, she resigned because she could not manage the time demands of both a demanding career and children:

I can't let somebody else raise my children. . . . I've had two babies. I'm going to raise them, and I can't do that and be on call "24-7." . . . There were still not many females at this point. I'm dealing with it totally by myself, totally. . . . I enjoyed my job to the fullest, and I really felt like this was going to be my career, but when you have to compare a career to raising your children, there was no choice.

Elizabeth voiced deep and lifelong regret over her decision to resign. Of those who met the criteria to participate in the study, Elizabeth never progressed beyond the entry level of management as Relief Supervisor.

Managing FBI careers along with children created challenges for participants when they were required to move. Participants knew that they were expected to move as part of career advancement. For example, Kathleen was a supervisor at FBIHQ; after marrying, she left her management position and relocated to be with her husband and stepdaughter. Her husband would not move to join her. She loved her position at FBIHQ but took the voluntary demotion because moving was simply not an option for her new family:

In the end, when a decision was made to get married, I had to make a decision [to move] because he had a daughter. . . . So, it was my decision to step down as a supervisor. I was doing it for the right reason.

Kathleen described no regrets about her decision, but her career never recovered. Because most the participants did not have children, moving was not reported as particularly challenging or difficult for them.

The second set of general challenges faced by female agents involved dealing with sexist behavior in the workplace. Participants often attributed sexist behaviors to the men who were unable, unwilling, or not yet ready to accept women as agents. For example, Catherine worked on a case but was not permitted to participate in the arrest of her main “subject,” so she confronted her supervisor: “When I said [to my supervisor], ‘This is unfair,’ it’s, ‘Oh, I’m sorry that happened, and we’ll take care of it next time,’ but he really didn’t. He was an older guy, scared of women.” In another example, Elizabeth worked on a sensitive case involving a manipulative “informant.” A male agent reported information from the informant in a way that disparaged Elizabeth. She described the agent’s conduct as an example of a sexist atmosphere:

The informant came back and [said to the male agent], “She’s got the fucking U.S. flag shoved up so far in her cunt, there’s no way I’m gonna be able to get anywhere with her.”

. . . [The agent] repeated that to me and all the men in there. . . . The reason he [the male agent] thought he could do that was because I was a woman, and he did not have regard for women. . . . Women were sex objects . . . and that's it. So, I didn't have a brain, and I could be easily influenced. He found out the hard way that I was not an easily influenced person, that I had my set of standards, and I was not going to deviate.

Catherine and Elizabeth recognized sexist behavior and challenged it. All of the participants made personal choices about whether and how to challenge sexist behavior on a case-by-case basis.

The third set of general challenges faced by some of the participants involved their experiences related to firearms. As noted earlier, some of the participants were very proficient in shooting, and this proficiency afforded them early acceptance as agents. Still, specific data related to their experiences with men in the firearms community were reflective of a sexist climate. The participants who were "good shots" faced unique resistance and jealousy from some male firearms instructors.

Monica recalled being deprived of inclusion on the "Possible" list. Inclusion in this prestigious list was earned when an agent shot a perfect score, known as a "Possible," on a standard FBI firearms qualification course. Thereafter, the shooter's name was posted on a large plaque at the FBI Academy. In data described previously, early female agents were at a disadvantage because they were issued revolvers with shorter barrels than men, and using these guns handicapped their shooting accuracy. Thus, shooting a "Possible" was particularly difficult for early female agents.

While at a routine firearms qualification session early in her career, Monica's male partner handed her his revolver and suggested she try to shoot a "Possible." She recalled:

I still hadn't been issued a .38 [caliber of revolver]. My partner handed me his .38 and said, "Fire a Possible with this." And I did. . . . Later, that Possible was taken away from me by [name redacted]. [He was] probably the most sexist man in the entire FBI. . . . I gave it back to them, and I thought, "Now, I can say something. Or, I can say nothing and then someday execute my revenge." I chose the latter because it [challenging him] would have accomplished nothing. . . . Then, I signed up to go to firearms [instructor] school, so I could shoot a Possible in front of everybody, and, then, I would have it for the second time. And so I did.

Monica described that the instructor's denial of her first "Possible" deprived her of the distinction to be the first female agent to earn the distinction.

Rebecca also described sexism in the firearms community. She was one of the first female agents to be named as a firearms instructor in the field. She described being well regarded in the office, and her shooting skill was unquestioned. Before and after she became an instructor, she faced resistance from the male instructors who had supported a lesser-qualified male agent for the position. They spread spurious, false personal rumors about how she got the job:

This is where, probably, the largest stumbling block I ever got in my Bureau career happened. The PFI [Principal Firearms Instructor] at the time had some cronies who were very sexist, and they wanted to be firearms instructors . . . and their skill levels weren't really where they needed to be. . . . Come to find out the PFI had told [another PFI] all kinds of negative things about me, like I was sleeping with the SAC [Special Agent in Charge] and that's how I got the job.

Feeling powerless to fix her reputation, Rebecca described this as one of the darkest times in her career.

Nicole also had experience with men who were resistant to the idea of female agents as firearms instructors. She was the first female instructor at the FBI Academy. On her first day on the job, she joined other instructors for breakfast:

So, I got my cup of coffee, and I walked back to the table, and I sat down. And every one of them, except two, picked up their trays and went to the next table over. . . . I must have looked really shocked, and [one of the ones who did not move] looked at me and he says, “Just ignore the little boys; they’ll come around.” And, so I thought, that’s pretty good advice.

Nicole learned that a group of male instructors had planned a boycott if she was assigned to their unit.

The examples provided by Monica, Rebecca, and Nicole illustrate that, even though their shooting skills helped them gain general acceptance, they were not immune to sexism. In describing resistance from this group of male agents, they believed men wanted to assure that the firearms community would be closed to women.

Leadership obstacles as female leaders. This section includes data excerpts from the participants about obstacles they encountered as female supervisors. To become a supervisor, each of the participants would have been successful, regardless of gender, as an agent in the field for varying number of years. Of the participants, only a small number reached positions well above the first supervisory level of management, or Supervisory Special Agent (SSA).

Several main ideas are discussed in this section. Many participants described encountering unexpected obstacles. Some reported that challenges to their performance as

supervisors were unwarranted. Participants described a disadvantage for female supervisors who did not have strong support networks. Participants described feeling that their careers were hurt by men who did not defend them or who sacrificed them to advance their own careers. Unexpected, negative experiences often changed the career goals of participants. Some leadership challenges even resulted in decisions by participants to resign or retire.

Ann had been in a number of positions at FBIHQ and in the field, and she had earned consistent, exceptional performance ratings. After many years in management, she was an operational supervisor in the field and planned to seek a promotion to the next level, or Assistant Special Agent in Charge (ASAC). Without warning, her performance rating was lowered by her immediate supervisor, an ASAC. Ann believed the ASAC considered Ann to be competition for his wife, who was also a supervisor in the same office. He lowered Ann's ratings, she recalled, "to eliminate me as a impediment . . . and move himself, and his wife, back [to FBIHQ] as quickly as he could." At this point, because of her supervisor's actions to advance his private agenda, Ann felt that her management career was ruined. She told people who had been recruiting her: "You're not going to be able to get me as your ASAC. I am unpromotable at this point." Ann felt devastated, emotional, and betrayed:

When I have given 14 years of my life to an organization that I loved, and had given them all my time, and put in the work, I tear up thinking about it now. That drives me crazy in life that you have such mean-spirited, mean people. . . . I knew it partly had to do with gender, but it was an odd thing. . . . It was a joint package, so he had to make sure that they would get out together.

Ann was later selected for a position back at FBIHQ where she ended her career. Still, she perceived that this gender-related leadership obstacle changed her career trajectory and tainted her overall leadership experience.

Rebecca had been a respected field agent and supervisor at the FBI Academy. She loved her career and had planned to work until she reached the mandatory retirement age of 57. Late in her career, she opted out of management to finish her career as a field agent. Her retirement plan changed when she felt mistreated by male supervisors there. After returning from a dangerous, overseas assignment, Rebecca returned to her office and was treated like a new agent by her supervisors. She was shocked and humiliated to be assigned duties well below her experience:

I had 29 years in the Bureau, I had just come back from a war zone. . . . I had a pretty negative last year. . . . I wanted to make sure I left before I would ever be bitter, but I see now that those negative things that happened to me loosened my roots. I would have stayed until [my] mandatory [retirement age], because that was what I knew and that's what I always wanted to do.

Rebecca opined that her supervisors, who were less experienced than she was, felt they could assign her to undesirable shift work, because she, as a female agent, would be less likely to complain than a male agent. She ended up retiring many years sooner than she had planned.

Karen's entire life revolved around the FBI. As an experienced supervisor, she managed a large group of workers—known as a task force—for a major FBI investigation, and she was responsible for a myriad of administrative functions. She took great pride in her work and consistently worked long hours to coordinate task force activities. At the same time, a non-agent staffer was added to the task force to assist her. Soon thereafter, an upper management decision

was made to relocate the task force to another city, and Karen was shocked when she was not asked to relocate. Instead, the non-agent staffer was asked to relocate and take Karen's job. Karen felt devastated and deprived of the opportunity to be part of the team that earned national attention for solving the major case. She described how she "hit a wall":

I always got the work done, but I was there until midnight most nights, getting the paperwork done. . . . There was discussion about bringing somebody as a support person to take some of that . . . away from me, and I was fine with that. I thought, if I get home at 10:00 rather than midnight, I'll be thrilled. . . . She ended up going to [the new city], and I had to find another squad. . . . All of that was very hurtful. . . . I had worked, spent three years of blood, sweat, and tears, literally. Until you work one of those cases, you cannot begin to understand the pressure cooker that you're in. . . . I was actually thinking, when this was all over, that I would apply for a [promotion]. . . . It seemed like the next, right step, but my heart was not in it. I think you hit a wall at some point.

Karen did not challenge the decision to remove her from the task force. The decision was particularly hurtful because she felt betrayed by her supervisor, who had been a friend and mentor. Thereafter, instead of seeking promotions, she voluntarily removed herself from the management program and focused on retiring as soon as she was eligible.

Nicole's career advanced quickly, and she became one of the first female agents to be promoted to a rank within the FBI's Senior Executive Service (SES). In one assignment at FBIHQ, she assisted in the revamping of the FBI's promotion system. The improvements had been mandated following the class action lawsuit filed by former female agent, Christine Hansen (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986). The Hansen lawsuit has been described in Chapter 2 and is further discussed in the typology relating to bureaucracy. In an effort to improve the system, Nicole

wrote a letter that questioned the promotion of an agent. She had no vested interest in his promotion. She soon learned that he had been promoted because he was a friend of the FBI Director. Writing the letter resulted in an almost instantaneous, unexpected obstacle for her career:

I knew immediately . . . [that] the letter had damaged my career. It certainly held me back. And so, whenever I had to meet with the Director, it was certainly not warm and fuzzy. He was very cold. He surrounded himself by that patriarchy of buddies, you know, good old boys. And nobody could break through that. And then, [when] I started putting in for SAC [Special Agent in Charge] jobs, I kept getting rebuffed and was told I wasn't qualified for the job.

When Nicole questioned why her career had stalled, a senior male official told her she needed "more experience" and said, "We think you have interpersonal skills problems." This feedback was shocking. When she asked him to explain, he just motioned to the FBI Director's office. Devastated, Nicole resigned soon thereafter and accepted a lateral transfer to another federal agency.

Participants reported gender-related challenges that they faced as agents and as supervisors in detail. Data excerpts were supported by research literature about leadership that has focused increasingly on gender in recent decades (Heidensohn, 1992). Sorenson (1984) noted that women in management adapt by emulating the styles of male counterparts, yet men still do not regard them as equals. Acker (1992) characterized the subordination of women in the workplace as the result of gendered power imbalances. In the data excerpts for the present study, all participants described, in varying degrees, being subordinated by the men in positions of higher rank. Participants described the FBI as a hierarchical structure in which women were not

yet in the management pipeline, and all top management positions held by men. Despite the presence of female agents, a continuing power imbalance was in place during the careers of the participants.

Typology 4: Women Negotiating Bureaucracy

The FBI has long been considered a bureaucratic organization governed by a strict hierarchy and rules (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986). When women were first hired as agents, an irrefutable masculine culture was embedded within the FBI's bureaucracy. The research literature on bureaucracy and the gendered nature of bureaucracy informed the descriptions and data excerpts within this typology. Further, the reviewed literature addressed how changes in culture often occur when new rules and policies support such change (Martin, 1990; Mills, 1988). When describing their personal experiences, participants often described their experiences in the context of the FBI's hierarchy, culture, rules, and policies.

When the Special Agent position was opened to women, Acting FBI Director L. Patrick Gray (1972) announced that the "existing requirements for the Special Agent position will remain unchanged." Therefore, because the rules and policies that governed hiring and training did not change, females ostensibly had to meet the same requirements as males. The hiring of female agents happened to coincide with the opening of the FBI Academy in Quantico, VA; thus, the training environment was new for all trainees, both male and female. In training, female trainees had to pass the same periodic academic, firearms, and physical tests, just as male trainees did. Meeting the physical and firearms standards was difficult for many of the participants.

Data within this typology reflected participants' perceptions of the FBI's rules and policies related to hiring, training, promotions, transfers, evaluations, and the equal employment

opportunity (EEO) process. They described how men in authority controlled the success or failure of women. With no women in leadership, the existing system allowed men in positions of authority to control outcomes for women. Thus, the system in place led many participants to believe that women received disparate treatment.

The rules and policies described by participants as having the most disparate impact on women related to hiring, firearms, promotions, evaluations, and the EEO process. Hiring standards were based on a minimum height. Fitness testing standards were not based on validated, work-related activities. Firearms issued to female agents were more difficult to shoot with accuracy than those issued to male agents. Promotion decisions were described as largely subjective. Some participants described the decisions to downgrade their performance evaluations as arbitrary and undeserved. Some described personal instances of discrimination, and most were aware of instances of gender discrimination. Some filed Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) complaints to seek remedies for discrimination. For those who filed EEO complaints, participants described that these actions did little to remediate the underlying issues of their EEO complaints.

Hansen lawsuit. Christine Hansen was hired in 1972 as one of the earliest female agents. As described in Chapter 2, she filed a class action lawsuit against the FBI in 1977 alleging that various personnel practices were based on institutionalized sex discrimination. She resigned before findings were issued. The class action suit is a matter of public record, and Hansen was not among the study participants. Of 2600 women who qualified as class members and were contacted to join the suit, approximately 2000 women were certified to be included in the class. In 1981, the U.S. Justice Department issued a finding in favor of Hansen and the class. Thereafter, many policy changes were made relating to the hiring process, physical and firearms

training, and the promotion process. These changes were ordered to eliminate previous, established patterns of disparate treatment against female agents (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986).

Most study participants chose to opt out of the Hansen lawsuit and described a range of reasons for their decisions. The lawsuit was mentioned by all of them; thus, the lawsuit created a shared backdrop for their experiences. For some, the aura of the lawsuit presented a challenge because it required them to manage perceptions of male agents who believed that women who joined the suit were not “team players.” For others, the lawsuit had minimal impact. Some opted out of the lawsuit but still acknowledged personal and institutional discrimination. Others, like Melissa, thought the lawsuit made life harder for female agents:

For me, it made things worse. It was kind of like, drop the bomb, and leave on her part. We now got stuck doing physical training twice a year, . . . and it gave the males further ammunition regarding females not having to do what the males had to do. Her suit was, “Why do we have to pass these stupid physical requirements, when the agents out in the field don’t have to do any of this?” So, they said, “Oh yeah, to cover our ass, we will now make agents out in the field do this twice a year.”

Regardless of its merits, Melissa thought that the lawsuit made life harder for the female agents who opted out.

Because the study participants were among the female agents who were hired and completed training, their experiences were dissimilar to the women included in the Hansen lawsuit who were screened out during the hiring process or who did not complete training.

Height. Until 1975, the FBI maintained a 5-foot-7 minimum height requirement for agents to be hired (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986). Although their recollections varied, participants recalled the height requirement. The justification for the height requirement corresponded with

the premise that agents needed a physically commanding presence. Director Hoover authored a memorandum in 1971 limiting the FBI agent position to males because, “the more the adversary senses he is overmatched by the . . . physical qualities of the [male] Special Agent, the more effective is our operation” (Hoover, 1971). After the agent position was opened to women in 1972, the minimum height requirement served to reduce the number of women who were eligible to apply.

Study participants were hired both before and after the height minimum was lifted. Andrea remembered that she had to be at least 5-foot-7 to be considered:

I was only 5 - 5½ . . . [and] you had to be 5 - 7. I filled out two applications by hand, and, on one, I put I was 5 - 7, on the other I put I was 5 - 6¾ Next thing I know, I am getting a call, and they’re saying, “If you’re not 5 - 7, you don’t qualify. . . . We’ll have to have you come in so we can measure you.” . . . So, they had never met me. I had long hair, I piled it up on my head, put a wig on, went in, and I was 5 - 7½.

She recalled that the height requirement had a disparate impact on women, but it also discriminated against Asians and Hispanics “because those cultures tend to be smaller.” Andrea believed the height requirement was one way that officials in the FBI could control the number of women and minorities hired.

Andrea’s knowledge about height and hiring rules were shaped by her awareness of a research project that the FBI commissioned to defend against the Hansen lawsuit. The project involved collecting data that would provide evidence that taller people were more effective as agents. Effectiveness was judged by the ability of agents to subdue violent offenders and to make arrests without incident or resistance. Andrea recalled that preliminary data collected by the FBI suggested the opposite. Andrea learned that the FBI “‘deep-sixed’ it [the study], when it

proved the opposite of what they wanted it to prove, [because] what it proved was, the shorter you were, the less problem you had arresting people.” She recalled that perceptions lingered that height was an advantage on the job because the FBI never publicly acknowledged the findings of the study.

As a tall woman herself, Tonya acknowledged a persistent belief by many in the FBI that taller agents were more effective and more impressive than shorter ones. She recalled a shorter female agent who made a concerted effort to offset this perception:

One thing she told me was, “I’m a short person and, as a short person, you have to work harder.” And, I got to thinking about that, and I said, “She’s exactly right, because . . . who are the people in the FBI? They’re tall, they’re slender, and they’re good looking.” She was short, you had to look down [at her]. . . . She had to work harder because she was short, and she had to measure up.

Tonya’s example illustrated the point that female agents had to manage perceptions about whether they, in her words, “looked the part” of an FBI agent.

All of the study participants met the height minimum, but several recalled that the policy seemed arbitrary, and it was not enforced consistently. Elizabeth recalled an exception was made for another female agent in her training class: “The girl that was in my class was nowhere near [the minimum height]. I think she might have been 5 - 4, but they wanted her because of her language skill. So, they must have overlooked that.” Participants gave others examples that demonstrated subjectivity in enforcing the height minimum rule in the hiring process.

The influence of height on job performance, specifically in terms of a perceived need for physical presence, was examined in the research literature. The entry of women into law enforcement and military careers has historically met resistance, and detractors have

used an argument that a strong, physical presence is a job necessity. The argument about physical presence has also fueled many years of debate regarding women in combat roles (Center for Readiness, 2011). Concerns cited have been whether women are able to perform the physical and mental requirements of these roles. Detractors of women in combat have asserted that women lack the physical presence to perform these duties (Center for Readiness, 2011). Researchers have provided evidence that women perform as effectively as men when their duties take them into combat environments (Harrell & Miller, 1997; Harrell, Beckett, Chien, & Sollinger, 2002). Research studies regarding women police officers have also provided evidence that women are just as physically capable as men when conducting themselves on patrol, responding to hazardous situations, and dealing with violent confrontations (Elias, 1984; Grennan, 1987; Townsey, 1982).

Training. In May 1972 the training of FBI agents was relocated to the FBI Academy, located within the Marine Corps training facility in Quantico, Virginia. Coincidentally, the first two female agents happened to be members of the first class at the new FBI Academy facility (FBI, 2015c). All participants completed their training at the FBI Academy.

Kathleen recalled that female agents at the FBI Academy were a “curiosity,” and she compared the training there to life “in a fishbowl.” She recalled that instructors were “as prepared as they could be for us [the women].” Many participants also recalled that the facilities at the FBI Academy were not designed to include female agents. Some described the facility’s design issues as more annoying than challenging. Catherine recalled being segregated from the men:

During the time I was there, the women, we lived on our own, . . . on one end of the hallway, totally away from everybody else. At that time, they hadn’t redone the

bathrooms. They certainly had not redone the gym or locker room situation. We were off in almost like a janitor's closet.

Catherine believed the lack of proper facilities for female agents at the FBI Academy was an indication of the FBI's overall lack of readiness for female agents.

Participants faced a variety of challenges during their basic training at the FBI Academy. The three main components of training were physical training, firearms training, and academic instruction. Ann described the components and the requirements associated with them: "the testing in Quantico were the physical education/physical training, the shooting, and your academics. . . . If you failed any of those three elements, . . . you were out." All components required trainees to pass periodic tests. Academic testing was paper testing on a variety of legal and investigative topics. Physical testing assessed trainees in fitness, fighting, and defensive tactics drills that were scored by an instructor. Firearms testing required trainees to "qualify" and earn passing scores in target shooting and in other practical shooting drills. Participants described the challenges they faced with firearms and physical training. None of them had difficulty passing the academic tests. Data regarding physical, firearms, and academic training is discussed in this section.

Aspects of physical training were challenging for all female agent trainees. Ann described that all trainees were tested and scored on a timed run, an agility test, sit-ups, push-ups, and pull-ups. Physical training also included defensive tactics training that incorporated boxing and fighting, rope climbs, agility tests, restraint tactics, weapon retention, and handcuffing techniques.

Many participants lived active lives prior to being hired by the FBI, but the physical training was very unfamiliar to them. All aspects of physical training were described as

challenging, but complaints about the timed run were the most prevalent in the data.

Kathleen described her struggle with running:

I was active in high school, and I played basketball on the high school basketball team, but I wasn't a runner. So, the hardest thing was the run, to be honest. [I] would just go out and keep at it, and finally [I] made it.

Tonya recalled that most women did not run in the 1970s:

I had a terrible time with the running because back [then] nobody ran, or at least women didn't. I remember, before I went to the Academy, getting out there with sweatpants and a sweatshirt running on the street, and people would stop the car and watch . . . because it was so unusual.

Like Kathleen and Tonya, most of the participants described struggling with the timed run.

Participants were expected to perform the same skills as male trainees, although the scoring for run times and the number of sit-ups and pull-ups were slightly different for women.

Cynthia recalled that the pull-up protocol for women had to be modified because the FBI acknowledged a perceived "difference in the center of gravity in a man and a woman." As a result, a modified pull-up was designed for female agents.

Firearms training also presented challenges for some, but not all, participants. Regardless of their shooting skills, all participants acknowledged a clear disadvantage for female trainees in firearms training. Women were issued revolvers with shorter gun barrels than the revolvers that were issued to male trainees. During training, it became clear to participants that the revolvers issued to female trainees were harder to shoot with accuracy. Elizabeth described the firearms disadvantage as a form of male bias:

The gun that was given to me, as a female, was a special Model 10-6, put out by Smith and Wesson, and that the Bureau ordered specifically for female agents. It was a six-shot .38 [caliber revolver] but it only had a 2½-inch barrel on it. All the guys were given standard Model 10 with a four-inch barrel. Makes a big difference when you're at the 50-yard line and even the 25-yard line, which are two of the posts you had to pass through in order to qualify.

Some of the participants openly questioned the fairness of female agents being issued a revolver with a shorter barrel, but their concerns were ignored. Ann recalled that women in her class addressed the issue with her firearms instructor:

We all said, "Can we not be issued the 4-inch [revolver]? It would put us on full standing with the guys." And our firearms instructor said, "There is no difference." I'm going, "I'm not making a fight, but I can shoot a heck of a lot better with a rifle, so I do think barrel length makes a difference." Was he being stupid, was he being lazy that he doesn't want to bring it up, or was he being sexist?

In answering her own questions, Ann figured that the policy to issuing women handguns with shorter barrels was not intentionally intended to discriminate against female agents. She described it as follows:

I witnessed things that I thought were poor judgment, and I don't know if it was discrimination, although I think the court probably concluded that [in the Hansen lawsuit]. I think it was just stupid. The Bureau had stupid people. . . . For example, . . . at the very end [of training], the instructors let us shoot the men's guns and other weapons, and we were all shooting great with a 4-inch barrel.

Changes in firearms training resulted from the Hansen lawsuit (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986).

Participants recalled that other changes, such as issuing women revolvers with longer barrels, occurred in the years that followed, as female agents became more accepted and when female agents became firearms instructors.

In addition to dealing with the challenges of physical and firearms training, participants described the practice of posting student test scores in training. Ann reported that low scores for physical and firearms testing were posted, and “weak squads” were identified, but low academic scores inferior were not posted. In her class, “all the women were on the ‘weak squad’ in the gym, and we were all on, and some men, on the ‘weak squad’ for shooting.” She described that this process fostered a negative environment for female trainees:

When you were in your training class, and you were in the gym on your first testing, . . . they would put you on the “weak squad,” based on an accumulation of points you would get. . . [that was based on] a run in a certain number of minutes, sit-ups in a certain number of minutes, push-ups in a certain number of minutes, [and] pull-ups in a certain number of minutes.

Like Ann, Kathleen described the academic component of training as “no problem” for most of the female trainees. Kathleen believed that the posting low test scores for male trainees was never even considered, because doing so would have made “the guys look bad.”

Responses varied widely on whether participants felt they had support from the instructors and their classmates, but all participants felt pressure to pass in training. Catherine described a general lack of support and noted the experience of a fellow female trainee as an example:

Did they like us there? Not much. . . . A lot of women didn’t make it through. . . . One woman should have made it; she had worked for the CIA, was wonderful, intelligent,

fantastic in firearms, [but she] missed the run. . . . It was a power struggle between Headquarters and Quantico, because Headquarters said, “We want her to get through.” . . . And Quantico said, “Don’t tell us what to do.” I think it had everything to do with the fact she was female.

All participants acknowledged a high attrition rate for female trainees in the early 1970s, and the rate was much higher for women than men. The only available supporting data for this perception by participants was that, for all women hired as agents between 1972 and 1984, 28 percent had resigned by 1985, compared to four percent of men (McChesney, 1987).

The descriptions of training in the data were supported by the research literature. The literature that was relevant to height and physical presence also applies to the data regarding male-biased physical protocols and firearms training. Again, the entry of women into traditionally male law enforcement and military careers has met with historical resistance, and detractors have argued that women lack the strength and physical presence to perform required duties (Center for Readiness, 2011; Harrell & Miller, 1997). Studies of women in combat settings and in police work have rebutted these claims and have demonstrated that women can perform as effectively as men when they were placed in physical situations (Harrell, Beckett, Chien, & Sollinger, 2002; Townsey, 1982).

In the FBI, many policies related to the hiring and training of female agents were determined to be arbitrary as a result of the Hansen lawsuit. In that ruling, the U.S. Justice Department determined that the FBI had used unvalidated physical and firearms training and testing as a way to screen out disproportionate numbers of female trainees and that testing requirements were not justified by job necessity (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986).

Promotions and performance. Participants described examples of disparate treatment with their promotions and performance evaluations. Decisions on their promotions were made by men and were often subjective. These decisions were often based on connections and the “good old boy” network, and gender was usually a consideration. Participants earned promotions to supervisory positions at FBIHQ more easily than in the field. Some of the participants were promoted as a remedy to settle EEO complaints, but these promotions have not been addressed in this section.

Participants described that the subjective process for promotions could be either an advantage or a disadvantage. Kathleen experienced the process both ways. She recalled her first promotion to a position at FBIHQ as almost automatic: “I don’t think being a female played into it, honestly. . . . In those days, you just got a call from the Bureau, and they would ask if you were interested.” Later, however, when she applied for a field supervisory position, she described a process where “people got promoted ahead of me [because of] . . . the ‘good old boy’ network. . . . They weren’t qualified, but they had been there for a while, and they had the blessing.” Kathleen recalled being passed over several times for promotions in the field despite being more qualified than other candidates.

Cynthia acknowledged the subjective nature of the promotion process. She did not personally experience gender bias when she first applied to be a field supervisor, but she did acknowledge the importance of the “good old boy network.” She actively networked with men to garner support:

I applied. There were lot of people that [also] applied for it, and I knew a lot of them and they were very qualified. . . . I did talk to anybody that I thought could help me. . . . I

asked for every favor I could. So, I got it and at least half the people were as qualified or more than I was.

Well-connected agents, whether male or female, benefitted from informal networking. Cynthia's example illustrated that connections—and the “good old boy” network—could be more important at times than qualifications.

Of the study participants, only three were promoted to senior executive positions over the course of their careers. Although Tonya, Nicole, and Monica faced obstacles in their careers, their career trajectories were steady and upward. Tonya did not have a clear career plan but was presented with many opportunities:

Opportunities present[ed] themselves, and I took advantage. . . . I was skiing, and the SAC [Special Agent in Charge] calls me and says, “You’re transferred to Headquarters.” I said, “Okay, good. Do you mind if I go down to the lodge, I’m on a mountain here.” I was picked and, that’s right, there was no application.

Nicole and Monica also reported similar experiences when they were offered opportunities and promotions.

Participants reported the devastating impact that negative performance ratings had on their careers. Ann described earning high ratings throughout her career until she had a male supervisor who would not listen to her and blamed her for his errors. He downgraded her to the lowest passing rating, and this action halted her career advancement. Ann was devastated:

My tension was so high there because I had to track everything I did for fear he would again lie and put me in a bad light. . . . I got asked [by a colleague] to come back to [FBIHQ]. . . . [And I told my colleague,] nobody, you’re not going to get me, how can I

ever be promotable again? . . . I can't recapture [my career], I am done, my Bureau career is done."

Ann's experience was an example of how early women supervisors felt they had little recourse when male supervisors, who were in positions of power over them, overstepped or abused their authority.

Like Ann, Karen and Sarah also received undeserved, poor performance evaluations from male supervisors, but they successfully challenged them. Karen described being "shell-shocked" when she received the first low rating of her career:

I got called in [to receive my rating], and he was going to give me a "Fully Successful" rating. That [level of rating] was the kiss of death. . . . I fought it, and he changed it. . . .

He couldn't give any good reasons for that. I don't think he liked women.

Sarah's male supervisor gave her a poor evaluation, while, during the same rating period, he gave a good rating to a male agent who had been kicked out of a training class during the rating period. She appealed the rating, and it was reversed. Sarah took the advice of a female mentor who told her:

"If you don't appeal it, then you're saying, 'Yeah, you're right.' If you do appeal it, even if they don't go your way, you're at least saying, 'No, they're wrong, and here's why.'" Based on that, . . . my performance appraisal was ultimately reversed in my favor. [That] showed me that you've got to stand up for yourself.

These participants strongly believed that gender was a consideration when male supervisors gave them poor ratings.

The Hansen lawsuit confirmed that the FBI had engaged in discriminatory treatment of female agents in many of its personnel practices (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986). Data provided

evidence that many participants perceived such treatment in both promotion decisions and performance evaluations. Research literature regarding how women integrate into male-dominated organizations supported the data. Acker (1990) determined that women act as gendering agents within organizations, and their presence serves to shift and balance power within them. However, the gendering process takes time. Gender plays a role in the framing of underlying assumptions and practices within any complex organization, and new structures develop that govern interactions between men and women. For the participants in the present study, the FBI's personnel practices for promotions and evaluations, as they related to women, were among the structures that overdue for change. As female agents integrated into the FBI workforce, existing policies and practices were proven to be inconsistent. As a result, it was not surprising that some participants reported a range of experiences with promotions and performance ratings. Some had positive experiences overall—for example, Cynthia, Tonya, Nicole, and Monica—while others—Kathleen, Andrea, Karen, and Sarah—had mixed, and sometimes negative, experiences. Indeed, several participants were shocked to face unexpected obstacles as supervisors; these obstacles were deeply devastating both personally and professionally.

Masculine culture. Many participants reported instances where male agents acted in sexist ways and engaged in the stereotyping of female agents. These activities in the workplace reinforced a strong masculine culture within the FBI. Participants often overlooked sexist behavior in their effort to be team players. In other sections, data excerpts described the “good old boy” network that persisted in the FBI. In addition, the previous section described inconsistent policies and practices that governed the evaluations and promotions of female agents. As participants worked to establish themselves as competent agents and as they sought

promotions, the FBI was still entrenched in its masculine culture. Many examples in the data supported this point. However, most instances of sexist behavior did not rise to the level that participants responded by filing formal EEO complaints.

At the FBI Academy, many sexist comments served as examples of masculine culture. In training, Cynthia was one of two women in her training class. She described the other female agent as a “great-looking, a tall blonde, a gazelle” who told her that she was asked about her sexual encounters in her interview to be hired. Melissa recalled classmates telling her, “I’d never work with a female; you’re taking the place of a man who can do the job, and women can’t be depended on.” Teresa recalled firearms training when an instructor told her that if she “stuck [her] rear end out, he was going to grab it.”

In the field, participants continued to tolerate a range of sexist behaviors that supported the FBI’s masculine culture. Elizabeth was a single woman and was assigned to work with a married, male agent. She was “ready to explode” when squad members called his wife several times to tell her they were having an affair. Karen recalled that male agents would have the radio dispatcher in the office call their wives and tell them they were working late when she knew “they would go off and do their own thing [having affairs].” Tonya recalled that a supervisor referred to her as a “cunt” because of a decision she made that affected him. Tammy recalled that her Special Agent in Charge (SAC) called her on a weekend to say, “I need you to get back. . . . I need you to babysit [my children] starting Sunday night, and you’ll babysit my kids for a week.” These examples reflect how the language and behavior of male agents toward the early female agents were indicative of a persistent masculine culture.

Kanter (1977) claimed that, when women comprise a small percentage of a total group, their abilities to change group culture are hampered. The research literature on group culture

provided context for participants' experiences within the FBI's masculine group culture.

Masculine cultures are distinguished by competition and aggression (Reinke & Miller, 2011).

Further, masculine cultures promote male advantage and the subordination of women through language and behaviors (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005). Acker (1990) claimed that gender processes play an important role in power relations in the workplace; such processes include assumptions about women and sexist language, and they support hierarchies that depend on dominance and submission. Deal and Kennedy (2000) identified masculine elements that point to the FBI as a "tough-guy" or "macho" organization. This type of organization is comprised of individuals who enjoy rapid feedback, rapid reward, and high risk.

Equal employment opportunity (EEO). This section focuses on the data that related to the role of the formal equal employment opportunity (EEO) process in the participants' careers. Participants described their efforts to acclimate to the FBI's masculine culture and to work within the system. Many participants did report sex discrimination and did file formal EEO complaints. Those who filed EEO complaints did so because of a desire for action or relief, or because they felt they had no choice. Some of them hesitated and filed complaints only as a last resort. Of those who filed complaints, most reported dissatisfaction with how their EEO complaints were resolved.

Some participants expressed negative opinions on the filing of EEO complaints by female agents. They felt that women relied on the EEO process too readily to address workplace issues and thought most female agents should have been able to handle their issues without filing a complaint. Other participants felt they had sufficient cause to file EEO complaints but they did not. Among the reasons these participants did not file complaints were that: (a) they were

unsure if the conduct was discriminatory, (b) they did not want to be considered victims, or (c) they did not want to feel stigmatized for filing a complaint.

Andrea's career was on track until she was forced to accept an extra assignment as the EEO Officer in her office. That assignment changed the trajectory of her career after she raised concerns raised by other female agents who complained that they had been denied opportunities to work on violent crime squads. When her supervisor insisted that she disclose the names of the women who complained to her confidentially, Andrea refused:

I said [to my supervisor], "I'm sorry, I'm not supposed to tell you that. They asked for anonymity, and I've read the rule book, and I'm not supposed to tell." Well, that made a sharp turn in my career . . . because, within two days, I was transferred to the fugitive squad. [On that squad, I told my supervisor that] I don't want anybody to feel that they have to work with me. . . . That was proven, when everybody went out, and nobody asked me to go along. They all told me they didn't want to work with me. . . . That was kind of the downward spiral. It's obvious the SAC [Special Agent in Charge] called my supervisor and said, "Make sure she fails."

Andrea finally decided to file an EEO complaint because she was ostracized in the office. The only justification she had to file the complaint was that she was retaliated against on the basis of sex. In the complaint, she articulated how she had been harmed:

The only harm I could show was that I hadn't gotten a promotion, and there were guys with a lot less experience than me who had gotten promotions to supervisor. . . . So, anyway, in response to the EEO suit, they transferred me to FBI Headquarters.

When Andrea filed her EEO complaint, it had not been her goal to be promoted to FBIHQ, but the promotion was the only remedy available to resolve the EEO complaint in her favor. She and other early female agents sometimes received promotions to FBIHQ as part of EEO settlements.

The post-career reflections of participants about the EEO process yielded a range of emotional responses. Cynthia expressed regret for filing a complaint. When other female agents asked for her advice about filing a complaint, she discouraged them:

Here's what you need to consider because nobody wins. . . . You can say, "I won, I didn't win," [but] what it takes out of you, nobody wins. I would tell any agent, not just female, to consider the consequences, even if you're right. . . . I really discouraged them, because they were young and, you know, the Bureau is unforgiving. . . . Now, I guess, if it was bad enough, I would [file an EEO complaint], but I didn't ever see anything that bad. . . . You don't want to draw attention to yourself, period.

This reflection by Cynthia was indicative of the changing perspectives of many of the participants about the EEO process. Cynthia filed her EEO complaint late in her career and had the support of many colleagues. She had hesitated to file, but she did so after feeling betrayed by the organization to which she had devoted her life. Years later, she deeply regretted the decision to file the complaint.

Conversely, Melissa reflected that she should have been more aggressive to file EEO complaints to remedy discrimination. For most of her career, she resisted filing a complaint, despite encountering what she described as "anti-female" attitudes in an FBI "time warp" in a "garbage dump" of an office. Just before she retired, she decided to file an EEO complaint that

cited sexual harassment and discrimination relating to a promotion. She reflected on the EEO process itself:

I should have taken them [the FBI] to the mat, but, when I was in [my office], there was no such thing as EEO or, if there was, they kept it hidden. And I was a believer that, if you did good work, you would be noticed. . . . I saw early on that EEO was not the way to go. Now, I'd sue the shit out of them. I would be the most litigious bitch in the world. Every time I saw an injustice, I'd let them [the FBI] have it.

Melissa thought her EEO complaint would be taken seriously because she had been a senior, experienced female agent, but her issues were ignored.

Sarah experienced discrimination, but she did not want her career to be defined by filing an EEO complaint. She and the other participants described a stigma that was attached to women who filed EEO complaints. Sarah discouraged other women from filing because "the Bureau grapevine gets out there and, with no knowledge of the facts, [other agents] start casting aspersions . . . and that sort of kept women from filing." Teresa had considered filing an EEO complaint, but remembered telling a friend, "I can't imagine my life could be more hell, unless I filed a complaint." The fear of being stigmatized prevented Teresa from filing.

Ann and Sarah both described many of the male agents who engaged in discriminatory conduct as "stupid." Sarah called them "stupid men, doing stupid things." Ann excused their poor conduct by calling them "uninformed." Ann's views, however, changed over time. Later, when her performance evaluations were lowered to make another female supervisor more promotable, she thought, "I almost quit because I couldn't take it anymore. I would be sitting at dinner . . . and I would break down in tears. . . . The injustice of the way I was treated just makes

me tear up now.” Ann recalled that she did not want to believe that she had been a victim of discrimination. Neither Sarah nor Ann ever filed an EEO complaint.

Participants did not dismiss the importance of the EEO process to address serious allegations, but some, like Sarah and Tonya, thought women often made their situations worse than they needed to be. Like Sarah, Tonya never considered filing an EEO complaint. Sarah acknowledged that the FBI did a poor job of educating male managers about what constituted discriminatory behavior. Men would say to her, “‘Well, I didn’t know that was wrong.’ What do you mean? It’s been wrong for some time. There are rules involved.” Tonya thought some female agents filed frivolous complaints instead of confronting issues and working them out. She remembered the irony of being the supervisor of a female agent who filed an EEO complaint against her. Tonya thought that this female agent projected her performance deficiencies onto Tonya. While the EEO complaint was pending—and before it was dismissed as baseless—Tonya could not be considered for promotion.

Descriptive data for this section provided insight into how rules, specifically related to the EEO process, functioned within the FBI bureaucracy. The importance of rules within bureaucratic organizations was supported in the research literature. As described in Chapter 2, Alvesson and Billing (1997) identified four fundamental organizational positions that explain how women function within organizations. Of these, only two of the positions relate to the operations of the FBI and the necessity of the EEO process. Alvesson and Billing (1997) claimed that, when an organization sets a goal to treat women and men equally, it will adopt either a meritocracy position or an equal opportunities position. Based on the data, these positions can be applied to the FBI.

In the meritocracy position, organizations place equal value on all workers, regardless of gender, in order to be efficient in terms of promoting career advancement. Although the FBI may have resembled a meritocracy before female agents were hired in the 1970s, the organization did not embody a true meritocratic system in the years that followed. A true meritocratic system would result in all promotions being based strictly on merit and without regard for gender.

In the equal opportunities position, women are viewed as victims who have been denied opportunities to advance; EEO policies and programs are designed to promote equal opportunities. In the 1970s, the FBI did have EEO policies and programs to promote fair treatment, but they were lacking in terms of providing adequate remedies for discrimination. The Hansen lawsuit established that the FBI's EEO system was inadequate to provide remedies for discriminatory workplace practices (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986).

Interpretation Dimension and Interpretive Analysis

Interpretive analysis is used to attach meaning to perspectives by linking data and generating explanations for these links within the data (Hatch, 2002). Through identifying patterns and relationships within the data, interpretive analysis promotes the researcher's ability to make inferences, develop insights, attach significance, refine understandings, draw conclusions, and extrapolate lessons (Hatch). Interpretive analysis requires a researcher to "transform particular qualitative features into generic statements" (Eisner, 1998, p. 38).

In the present study, close examination of data within each typology enabled the development of connecting patterns and relationships between and among the categories and topics described during typological analysis. Hatch (2002) described patterns within data as "regularities" that include similarities, differences, frequencies, sequences, and causations of

experiences. He described relationships within data as the connections and reasons that explain such patterns. The coding of data and typological analysis led to the identification of many such patterns and relationships there were supported by examples and descriptions in the data. The Hatch (2002) model for interpretive analysis usually employs themes as integrating concepts between and among patterns and relationships. However, because the overall structure for data analysis—Eisner’s educational criticism—places thematics as the final stage of analysis, the discussion of themes has been reserved until the end of this chapter.

Interpretive analysis included another review of the transcripts and the biographical summaries completed by participants. In addition, I reviewed my research journal, participant summary sheets, and the data excerpt file. The methodical review of these materials helped minimize potential validity concerns because this review served as an additional check for credibility and trustworthiness of the data during interpretive analysis.

In the present study, metaphors were used as a powerful interpretive tool for interpretive analysis. Metaphors were developed to elucidate the data in terms of the main ideas embedded in the research question and the theoretical framework, as discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. The metaphors were paired to three focus areas that directly corresponded with topics in the literature review and that aligned with the theoretical framework. These focus areas were self, career, and organization. The theoretical framework, corresponding focus areas for interpretation, and the metaphors are identified below in Table 6:

Table 6

Metaphors Used for Interpretive Analysis

Theoretical Framework	Focus Area	Metaphor
Feminist Standpoint Theory	Self	Supergirl
Career Self-Efficacy Theory	Career	Target
Organizational Concepts	Organization	Clubhouse

The focus areas also corresponded with three research sub-questions that were explained in Chapter 3. Metaphors that corresponded to these topics were *Supergirl*, a shooting *Target*, and a men's *Clubhouse*.

The use and selection of metaphors, and how they aligned with the theoretical positioning of the study, are explained in the sections that follow. First, the use metaphors as heuristic tools is explained. Second, characteristics of the superhero Supergirl are outlined as a metaphor, and, using feminist standpoint theory, patterns and relationships that pertained to the participants' unique female perspectives are analyzed. Third, the characteristics of a shooting target are described as a metaphor to interpret connections in the data relating to career success and self-efficacy theory. Finally, the characteristics of a men's clubhouse are described as a metaphor to highlight organizational patterns that explained how women functioned as early leaders in the FBI.

Metaphors as Heuristic Tools

Metaphors have been used in a variety of ways for qualitative research. They have been used to describe conceptual frameworks, the role of the interviewer, a research design, or the approach to data analysis (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). For the present study, metaphors were used to frame interpretive data analysis.

A metaphor is defined as a linguistic tool and figure of speech that aids communication;

in common practice, a metaphor is used to replace one idea with another and to suggest an analogous relationship between the two (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). Heuristic tools are defined as learning tools that enable discovery (Carpenter, 2008). Combining both concepts, Carpenter suggested that metaphors can be used in a heuristic way: (a) to provide structure to qualitative data, (b) to understand familiar processes in new lights, (c) to identify situation-specific interventions, and (d) to evoke emotions.

Metaphors make effective use of language to communicate in ways that people can easily comprehend (Patton, 2002). They offer researchers opportunities to examine phenomena using creative perspectives that facilitate understanding (Carpenter, 2008). For researchers and methodologists who specialize in qualitative research, metaphors serve as more than mere linguistic devices. Janesick (1994) described the visceral connections between data in terms of a dance. Oldfather and West (1994) described the ability to understand deep structures through qualitative research in terms of jazz music.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argued that personal experiences are deeply complex and that metaphors are useful as analytical tools to frame the understanding of how people perceive their experiences. The power of metaphors derives from an aesthetic resonance to sensory experiences, or the “blending of cognition and affect,” and this blend can be described as “imaginative rationality” (1980, p. 235). Eisner described this blend within the realm of personal experience as “the bedrock upon which meaning is constructed” (1993, p. 5). When realms of experience are connected through metaphors, unique understandings are made possible.

Metaphors can be used symbolically to represent the full range of human experience. They offer structure and can serve as a bridge from experience to representation. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) described how similar experiences are connected structurally:

There is a similarity induced by the metaphor that goes beyond the mere similarities between the two ranges of experience. The additional similarity is a structural similarity. It involves the way we understand how the . . . experiences fit together in a coherent way. . . . The metaphor, by virtue of giving coherent structure to a range of our experiences, creates similarities of a new kind. (pp. 150-151)

Thus, structural similarities in data can be made accessible and understandable by using metaphors.

Carpenter (2008) warned that decisions to use metaphors must not be self-serving attempts at creativity. Metaphors are intended to illuminate the meanings of experiences, not distort or obscure them. Patton (2002) also warned against manipulating data to fit powerful metaphors. Because metaphors have implicit connotations, researchers sometimes run the risk of attributing more meaning to data than actually exists. I have attempted to be methodical and diligent in using metaphors and to heed these warnings about their in my interpretive analysis.

Supergirl Metaphor and Feminist Standpoint Theory

The unique female perspectives of the participants were analogous to fictional female superhero characters in popular culture. *Supergirl*, as a famous female superhero and as the female counterpart to the *Superman* superhero, was deemed the most appropriate female character to select as a metaphor. A superhero is defined as a fictional person with amazing powers who is exceptionally skillful or heroic (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). This metaphor allowed for connections in the data to be made between a female superhero and the female leaders in the traditionally male FBI.

A symbolic comparison between this fictional, cartoon character and the real early female FBI leaders is not farfetched. The character Supergirl was created in 1959 as the female

counterpart to the iconic Superman character (*Supergirl*, 2015). The 1972 debut of a DC Marvels comic book known as *Supergirl* (*Supergirl*, 2015), directly corresponded to the hiring of the first female FBI agents. By virtue of their exceptional careers in the FBI, the participants could loosely be compared to real-life superheroes.

Supergirl has existed in different versions over the decades. In 1972, she starred in the eponymous comic book series for two years. That series was followed in 1982 by a second, short-lived comic book series entitled, *The Daring New Adventures of Supergirl*. Most recently, she has been revived in a 2015 television series, entitled *Supergirl* (Morgan, 2015).

Heeding Patton's (2002) warning against manipulating data to fit metaphors, an effort was made to avoid attributing more meaning to the data than was appropriate. Indeed, the participants themselves did not assume a superhero stance. As Elizabeth framed advice for future female agents:

Don't forget who you are. . . . [Be] mentally and physically prepared and don't think that having that badge and credential is giving you superpowers. . . . You are a person just like any other person. It's just that you've been given a little bit more authority. . . . You're not heads above somebody else. Keep your wits about you. Keep your eyes open.

Elizabeth's words exemplify the importance of data analysis being aligned with the data collected. Participants may have acknowledged their special qualities, but they would not have considered themselves superheroes.

Theoretical context. The application of the characteristics of Supergirl to the participants was useful in interpreting patterns and relationships with feminist standpoint theory in mind. Supergirl represents a woman of unique experiences who assumes dual roles and who

performs her duties skillfully. She is depicted in pop culture as smart, strong, self-sufficient, independent, and adventurous. Her character, like Superman, possesses superpowers, and both characters personify clear gender identities.

The basic tenets of feminist standpoint theory were considered when examining connections and relationships in the data using this metaphor. These patterns were grouped according to three primary aspects of feminist standpoint theory: (a) women have unique knowledge and standpoints, (b) women as a group are marginalized, and (c) power relations favor men (Smith, 1990).

Unique knowledge and standpoints. A basic tenet of feminist standpoint theory is that female knowledge is socially situated and constructed (Smith, 1987). Women's unique knowledge, and the way they know, are acquired through lived experiences that create *standpoints* (Smith). For the present study, the participants clearly had personal and unique standpoints from which to gain knowledge. Their standpoints were derived through their upbringing, their experiences as trailblazers in the FBI, and their leadership experiences.

Patterns in the data supported the premise that all the participants shared similar lived experiences through which they developed special knowledge and understanding. Although individual standpoints varied, the participants shared perspectives that supported their special knowledge. Data presented in the typological analysis supported an interpretation that the Supergirl metaphor was appropriate to apply to the participants. They needed special skills to perform, they shared a spirit of adventure and independence, and they exhibited self-reliance. Using the metaphor, patterns of unique knowledge are evident in their perspectives about: (a) being trailblazers for other women, (b) the duality of female roles, and (c) gender identity.

Trailblazers. Participants recognized the unique and special nature of their experiences

as the first female agents. Their knowledge was uniquely situated in a time of historical change for the FBI and in their keen pride in being among the first female FBI agents. Although they did not consider themselves trailblazers at the time, they did recognize the significance of being the first female agents, and they knew their success or failure would have an impact on future women. Monica described this awareness: “I would have never had the opportunities in the FBI had laws not changed. . . . [When] the law changes to allow you to do it, then, after that, it’s your responsibility.” Ann recalled making history as one of the first female agents: “I was not naïve to the fact that what was done in the past opened doors for me . . . and some of what I’ve done has opened the doors for or made it easier for other women to move up in organizations.” Catherine recalled, “I always felt I was representing other women. . . . I never tried to minimize it [being a female agent], and I was very proud of trying to help other female agents.” Data described in the previous section using typological analysis also support the identification of this pattern.

Duality of Roles. Just as Supergirl has two identities—one as a girl with special powers and one as a girl pretending not to be special—early female agents also lived dual lives. They juggled their masculine and feminine roles and identities. On the job, they often let their masculine identities dominate. For example, Tammy became aware of her dual identities when she realized that she became separated from her female self at the FBI Academy. She recalled that, during breaks from training on the weekends, “I would wear more perfume than I had ever worn before because I wanted to be a woman. . . . I would go sit in a shopping center just to see other women.” Her need to identify as a woman surprised her, and she described feeling the need to manage “two personas” at the FBI Academy.

For Cynthia, the reality of juggling dual identities on the job only became clear in

hindsight. She recalled making her first arrest at an apartment complex. In the planning of the arrest, her supervisor told her she needed to wear a bikini because the suspect lived in an apartment complex with a pool. Wanting to be a team player and without thinking, she recalled, “I went home and put on my bathing suit and went to the pool with my gun in a towel,” and then she proceeded to make the arrest as her male coworkers watched and laughed. Although she found humor in it at the time, she recalled “shaking” after the arrest and feeling that she had been manipulated so the men could see her in a bathing suit. By late in her career, she guarded herself from manipulation.

Gender Identity. Supergirl manages her dual roles while maintaining a strong female gender identity. This dynamic could be applied to participants in the study. As part of managing their dual roles as women and as female agents, participants met traditional expectations for women. In addition to their professional identities, many had strong gender identities in roles as mothers, wives, friends, sisters, and daughters. Patterns in the data included both biological and structural gender issues.

For participants who were married, perhaps the biggest biological gender issue related to decisions about whether to have children and be mothers. Married or not, many made decisions or were reconciled not to have biological children. Ann was matter-of-fact in this regard: “It was never [my] dream to have kids.” Although participants described their personal decisions in a straightforward manner, they clearly made these decisions quietly.

Catherine faced a unique issue quietly. In her interview, she identified herself as a gay woman in a committed relationship with a long-term partner. She described keeping her private and professional lives separated throughout most of her career. She described that “I kept [my personal life] personal. . . . I didn’t talk about what I did over the weekend. . . . They thought I

was a boring old lady, [but] I had a very active social life.” She did not acknowledge her sexual orientation until the time of her retirement.

Structural issues related to gender identity were more frequently described within the data than biological issues. The most common of these was a pronounced lack of balance between the participants’ personal and professional lives. Some of the balance issues that they faced as women included managing a family, managing personal relationships with men at work, and managing other workplace relationships. For participants with children, finding time to balance career and family seemed impossible. Teresa described a typical day:

I got up at 4:30 in the morning, got the kids dressed . . . and paid more than half my salary for before and after care. I wouldn’t say there was balance to it. The Bureau demanded most of my time, and my supervisor called me in and told me, “Oh, we had one of you before.” I’m like, “One of what?” [He said:] “Single parent, and she thought she was getting special privileges. Don’t think you are.” And thus began the odyssey just panicking around four o’clock, because, if I didn’t make it to the day care center by seven o’clock, they charged me a dollar a minute. And I didn’t have a dollar.

Teresa was divorced, and her description was an indication of how difficult it was for women with children in the 1970s to work as FBI agents.

According to the participants, it was common for female agents to resign when they had children. Elizabeth was one of the few participants who did so, and she described her dilemma: “I ended up resigning. . . . I just said, ‘I can’t let somebody else raise these children . . . and be on call 24-7.’” Whenever female agents resigned to be fulltime mothers, many men questioned whether female agents belonged in the workforce at all. As Tammy put it, men “figured we were only doing it [being FBI agents] to find a husband . . . [and] we were taking a job away from a

man who needed it.” Data supported the identification of a pattern that the FBI was not a supportive environment for women as women.

Melissa recalled the stress of managing gender identity in multiple roles. She described the challenges: “Being in a new place, having a new job, separation from [her] husband, illness in the family. . . . I had all the stress indicators. I felt like I had multiple identities. . . . Everything was compartmentalized.” The examples of Catherine and Melissa suggest that participants were accustomed to being visible in their public lives as female agents but they often led invisible, compartmentalized private lives as women.

Marginalization. Feminist standpoint theory posits that women are marginalized in society and are thus situated in ways that give them special awareness (Smith, 1987). Patterns in the data supported the idea that participants were marginalized—both as women and as agents in the FBI workplace—in ways that yielded special knowledge and informed their female perspectives. First, like Supergirl, they were single-minded in giving most of their attention to work. Many enjoyed positive relationships with friends and colleagues, but, as women leaders sharing similar experiences, many remained isolated from each other and did not identify with other women leaders. Second, having special knowledge did not afford the participants any special treatment. As described within the data, many participants reported receiving little or no encouragement in their leadership positions. Given the research literature that addressed the importance of relationships in how women interpret their experiences ((Belenky, Clinchy, Goldeberger, & Tarule, 1997), the isolated nature of the participants’ work and their general lack of community as a group was surprising and indicated their uniqueness.

Isolation. In the 1970s, women worked around existing female stereotypes in order to gain power, control, and knowledge in their lives (Collins, 1990). For Supergirl, power and

control come at a high personal cost. The fictional character interacted well with people and was highly respected, but she lived a fairly solitary, isolated professional life, with no women peers and mentors. She was expected to rely on herself and was not able to confide her deepest secrets to others; at the same time, she was always expected to perform at an exceptional level when needed. These patterns could be applied to the experiences of the participants.

Participants were extremely self-reliant despite having few women mentors. They performed exceptionally, interacted well in their work settings, and often thrived despite their isolation from other women.

Early in her career, Tonya resisted associating with other female agents. She admitted that she “didn’t extend myself to any of them” in order to distance herself from being part of a perceived “women’s caucus” that male agents viewed as negative. Later in her career, she would stand up for other female agents, but she knew that many of the early, ambitious women leaders did not do the same. One of them even lamented to Tonya, “I am sorry I did not do more for others [women].”

Although approximately 2000 women joined the Hansen class action lawsuit (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986), most study participants made the decision to opt out. Regardless of whether they or others had experienced discrimination, they made a choice to distance themselves from the women in the class. Tonya recalled, “In looking back, I wished I hadn’t [opted out] because Christine was, in fact, discriminated against. No question. I don’t know that I knew it then, or realized the extent, or whether I was just a chicken.” Most participants chose to steer clear of the lawsuit, either because they disagreed with it or they knew that associating with women who were part of the lawsuit could hurt their reputations and career opportunities.

Many participants described that, as female agents and leaders, they lived one-

dimensional lives where work was their whole lives. Karen admitted, “[In one case] I spent three years of blood, sweat, and tears. . . . You can not begin to understand the pressure cooker that you’re in.” Catherine spoke proudly that she was always available. She recalled, “I always felt I had to do it better [than men]. . . . I was the hardest damn worker on the squad. . . . They would call me on Friday night and say, ‘Will you work?’ and I would.” They dedicated their lives to the FBI, often at the expense of having a more well-rounded life.

No preferential treatment. Data supported a pattern that participants did not receive preferential treatment as agents. They understood that the opportunity for women to be agents was not special treatment, but equal treatment. Women met the same standards to be hired. At the FBI Academy, some training practices differed slightly between male and female trainees, but the adjustments for women did not confer advantage. Female agents were not given preference for assignments or promotions. The assignments to squads in field offices did not confer advantage. When women encountered harassment or discrimination, the remedies did not confer advantage. The typological analysis of the data previously discussed support these interpretations. As described, training standards, firearms standards, and promotion processes did not confer advantages on women.

Many female trainees struggled with physical training at the FBI Academy that included running, push-ups, sit-ups, and pull-ups. The running was particularly challenging, and Sarah recalled the timed run as an example of how women were afforded no special treatment in meeting the training protocols. She recalled, “My attitude was . . . just give me a chance. I didn’t ask for special favors. . . . I had to make this run or I was going to get kicked out.” With physical training, female standards and male protocols were slightly different with women’s physiology in mind. For example, in fitness testing, women did a modified pull up, a modified

push-up, and run times were adjusted by gender. However, these adjustments were not considered by participants to be preferential treatment.

Most participants did not describe receiving special treatment when seeking promotions, and some felt they were at a disadvantage. For example, Melissa recalled that a management aptitude test was required for all agents seeking promotion:

I began to see, first hand, that career advancement was rigged. . . . I went to MAP [Management Aptitude Program training] Everybody in my class of 30, except for me and [the only other woman already] had the answers to the MAP questions. . . . It was more to promote the boys.

Describing the promotion process was “rigged,” Melissa concluded that women were not the recipients of preferential treatment but they were, in fact, at a disadvantage in a “corrupt system.”

In firearms training, where women were issued handguns with shorter barrels, female agents were at a disadvantage. For most female agents, the shorter barrel decreased shooting accuracy and made the qualification process more difficult for them. The participants shared their difficulties in shooting with their issued firearms. This disadvantage countered any claim of female agents having received preferential treatment.

Still, the data provided many examples of how women excelled despite the disadvantages. Shooting proficiency was one such area described by some participants. For example, Rebecca recalled shooting a perfect score, known as a “Possible,” on the revolver qualification course. She bragged, “I made it with my issued gun, which was a 2½-inch [barrel] .38 [caliber], not a 4-inch [barrel]. I was the first person in the Bureau to be on the Possible Board with a 2½-inch.” As Rebecca and others described, shooting skill helped some participants gain respect and acceptance.

Power relations. Feminist standpoint theory explains power relations as connected to the lives of the marginalized; groups and individuals who are marginalized have less power (Harding, 2004). For the present study, participants worked in a closed system where men were dominant. Power relations in the FBI were described by the participants in terms of the constant pressure they felt to prove they could be “as good as” the men. Patterns in the data supported the interpretation that their professional, and sometimes personal, lives were often controlled by men in power.

Examining the Supergirl metaphor is helpful in understanding power relations. Power relations can be understood from a simple comparison of names. The female superhero is perceived to have lower status than the male superhero. Supergirl is envisioned as a girl whom many would consider subordinate, less experienced, and less powerful than the Superman who was envisioned as a man. These perceptions of lower status, less experience, and less power, can be applied when using the metaphor to describe the dynamics between female and male agents in the FBI.

Individual standpoints of the participants varied, but participants did describe how men exerted their power in the FBI. Male agents and male superiors exerted power in subjective and arbitrary ways through their words and actions. Participants reported experiences that made it clear to them that they were lacked power or control; sometimes, they even decided they were better off to cede control. Melissa described feeling powerless very early in her career. Excited to be assigned to a criminal squad, she recalled her first day when she joined her new supervisor and other agents after work at a bar. She recalled him talking to the men on the squad, “[He] starts in about how the Bureau doesn’t need female agents. . . . [He said,] ‘Let’s face it. Females won’t be able to do anything.’” Melissa quickly learned that “he was [just] looking for [her to

be] a girlfriend on the side.” She was not interested in being her supervisor’s girlfriend, and their professional relationship soon became strained. He methodically refused to give her meaningful assignments, and he took credit for her work when she succeeded. She described the power relationship this way:

I got the idea for an undercover business and wrote it up. . . . The supervisor comes back and [says] he’s not interested He turned around and said, “Well, we will do the operation, but you can’t be [the] case agent.” . . . He outranked me.

Melissa and other participants had to find ways to manage the power that male supervisors wielded over them.

At times, personal relationships required participants to acknowledge power and control issues and to find ways to deal with them. Sometimes this meant ceding power to others. Monica waited to pursue her career goals until after her husband retired from his own law enforcement career. Melissa divorced her husband when he provided little emotional support to her and her children. Kathleen stepped down in order to relocate to her husband’s office, so she could accommodate his need to be near his children. Tammy chose not to apply for a promotion, after seeking input from her boyfriend, a fellow agent:

He told me I was not qualified. . . . I said I was going to put in for that, and I said, “How would it affect our relationship?” and he said, “It’ll probably be over”. . . . So, I didn’t put in for the desk.

These examples support a pattern that these participants had to managed power relations at times in their personal lives, and sometimes they relinquished control to their male partners.

Target Metaphor and Career Self-Efficacy

Patterns and relationships within the data led to interpreting the participants’ experiences

in terms of career efficacy. This interpretation used a metaphor with a familiar connection to law enforcement—a bull’s eye target. A metaphor related to shooting was appropriate because it could be used to interpret the participants’ career trajectories, just as a target records the paths of bullet trajectories.

Hitting the target. The use of the target metaphor requires explanation and a note of caution. Direct comparisons should not be made between shooting accuracy and career efficacy. When shooting at a real bull’s eye target, success is gauged on how close shots that are fired come to the center of the target. Using this metaphor, some the participants came close to the bull’s eye, meaning they achieved high rank in their careers. All participants, just by being represented within this target, were successful in the sense that they “hit the target” and became agents or had leadership roles.

In examining career patterns and career-efficacy, I compiled information from the interviews and questionnaires completed by participants. This compilation included the levels of management reached by participants; the presence of obstacles faced by participants; and decisions made to retire or resign by participants. This data are shown in Figure 6.




Figure 6. Target depicting Participants' Careers

In the metaphorical sense, each dot in the above figure represents a “shot” taken on a bull’s eye shooting target. In the real sense, each dot represents a woman who applied to be an FBI agent or who was hired in the 1970s. The dots outside of the rings of the target represent the many women who could not have been hired before 1972, those who applied but were not hired, those who were hired but failed in training, or those who resigned. In the Ring, labeled as 0, are the first 100 women to be hired and complete training to be agents. In Ring 1 are the female agents, including most of the participants, who completed a career in the FBI. The participants for the present study were among the women included in the outer two rings.

Each colored dot represents one of the 15 study participants. Career levels and career obstacles are described in the key to the right of the figure. Participants fell between Rings 2 to 9

of the figure. Each ring represents a progressive management level in the FBI's career development program. For example, Ring 2 is the first step in being a manager and involves volunteering as a Relief Supervisor; Ring 3 represents the first official management position as a Supervisory Special Agent (SSA). Each progressive ring toward the center of the target represents a promotion. Many promotions would also have required the participant to move, or transfer, to another location.

In many instances, specific FBI position titles have been excluded as part of data analysis. The majority of participants in the present study were mid-level supervisors assigned to either FBIHQ or FBI field offices, as represented in Rings 3 to 5 of the figure. Of 15 participants, three attained Senior Executive Service (SES) rank in top management positions, as represented in Rings 7, 8 and 9. Such high level positions are closest to the bull's eye.

The presence of obstacles in participants' career advancement have been highlighted in the figure with the color of the dot. Of all participants, four faced no major career obstacles as indicated by the color green, seven faced obstacles that slowed their management careers as indicated by the color yellow, and four described career-ending obstacles as indicated by the color red. Of all participants, 11 of 15 reported meeting unexpected obstacles late in their careers.

In addition to Figure 3, a detailed description of the FBI's management track and positions by title, as well as notations regarding whether transfers would have been required, is included in Appendix H.

Theoretical context. Career self-efficacy theory (Betz & Hackett, 1981) provided the theoretical context to inform interpretive analysis using the target metaphor. The construct of *grit* (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthew, & Kelley, 2007) was also described as a manifestation of

career self-efficacy. Both approaches were described in Chapter 2 and previously in this chapter. Career self efficacy relates to the argument that a woman's belief in her ability to succeed is more important for success than her actual abilities or experiences (Nauta, Epperson, & Waggoner, 1999).

As described in Chapter 2, self-efficacy theory is a learning theory based on the premise that people learn by watching others and that their development is influenced by environmental, personal, and behavioral factors (Bandura, 1986). Bandura developed the concept of self-efficacy as an offshoot to his social cognitive theory. His definition of self-efficacy is "the belief in one's ability to perform a specific task" (Rittmayer & Beier, 2009, p. 1). The terms self-efficacy and self-esteem are often mistakenly used interchangeably. Perceived self-efficacy is concerned with judgments of capabilities, and self-esteem is concerned with judgments of self-worth. Thus, a woman's like or dislike of herself is unrelated to her belief that she can succeed (Bandura, 1997).

Career self-efficacy beliefs are developed and increased through four primary processes. These personal processes include the ability of an individual to: (a) master career experiences successfully, (b) learn vicariously through the experiences of others, (c) become verbally persuasive, and (d) overcome negative physiological reactions (Bandura, 1986).

Career self-efficacy is manifested through the construct of grit. Duckworth, Peterson, Matthew, and Kelley (2007) identified this construct and developed a scale to measure it. As described in Chapter 2, the Duckworth scale includes items that measure the career efficacy of women in terms of two primary factors: (a) consistency of interests, or passion; and (b) dedicated effort, or perseverance. The scale that measured these two factors with questions about these work behaviors: (a) setting goals; (b) being focused; (c) having singular interests;

(d) completing tasks; (e) working hard; and (f) overcoming obstacles.

Behaviors associated with grit were evident in the data as participants shared with experiences. Examples of these behaviors were reported consistently within the data discussed in typological analysis when participants described what it felt like to be among the first female agents and the traits and skills that helped them to succeed.

The concepts of Betz and Hackett's career efficacy theory (1981) and Duckworth's (2007) grit apply to the data analysis in the present study in several ways. These women negotiated a largely unknown career path for promotion where gender was a factor. Participants had support of male peers who sometimes worked against them. They were able to achieve at high levels as the result of experience, hard work, personal sacrifice, and a willingness to move. The target metaphor was useful in making these linkages within the data more clear and accessible. The sections that follow provide further clarification of these points through examples.

Negotiating an unknown career path. Participants acknowledged that, regardless of whether candidates for promotion were male or female, decisions were not solely based on qualifications. They described promotion decisions for most of their careers as subjective. Even though most of the participants minimized the role of gender in their experiences, all acknowledged the high probability that, regardless of their qualifications, gender was a consideration if and when they were promoted. Participants were aware that they needed to negotiate a largely unknown career path and a competitive male-dominated environment if they were to going to advance.

After the Hansen discrimination lawsuit forced the FBI to acknowledge gender bias in its personnel practices, efforts were made to implement a legally defensible career development

program. Still, many participants reported being passed over for promotions in favor of lesser qualified men and described the system as one that perpetuated the “good old boy” network. In addition, some described feeling as though they were in competition with other women for promotions; as Ann described, the promotions of women had a “quota” feel to them in the sense that men were controlling which women and how many would be promoted. For participants who reached higher ranks, decisions regarding promotions seemed even more subjective. For example, before Tonya earned a high-level promotion, she recalled a conversation with the FBI Director: “He says to me, ‘Do you really want to go to [an office]?’ I said, ‘Yeah, I do.’ He said, ‘Okay, fine.’” Tonya’s example was one of many reported when women were promoted to positions without applying in advance.

The data clearly supported the pattern of each woman’s career advancement being unique and different, and of career success involving a myriad of individual factors. In interpreting their experiences as a group, the subjectivity of promotion decisions made it difficult to know or predict why some reached higher levels than others. The wide distribution of career experiences, as depicted in Figure 3, supports the argument that promotions were determined in inconsistent and unclear ways.

Role of men in career efficacy. Promotions were a measure of career efficacy. Because of the absence of female mentors for the participants, the work environment was one where participants either had no support or relied on men for support. Many attributed positive career experiences to the support from male counterparts throughout their careers.

All participants faced gender-related obstacles in their careers, but some of the participants, who had enjoyed very positive experiences early in their careers, were ill-prepared to face late-career obstacles. The presence of obstacles was partly explained by a more

competitive environment as the number of available top positions shrank when reaching higher levels. The women who faced these late-career obstacles—including personal attacks and criticism—described feeling emotionally devastated by their mistreatment. Before being interviewed, some of the participants reported that they had never spoken about their strong, negative feelings about men who mistreated them late in their careers. Referring again to Figure 6, 11 participants described facing major career obstacles late in their careers, and four of them opted to either resign or retire earlier than planned.

Examples of career obstacles in the data included accounts by Nicole, Andrea, and Tonya. As discussed earlier in terms of her leadership, Nicole was already at a high level of management when she served in an advisory capacity on promotion boards. After she had moved on to another assignment, she wrote a letter to report an aberration she had observed in a promotion that was unrelated to her. Writing the letter resulted in backlash that harmed her career advancement. When applying for promotions, she was rebuffed and was told a high-level official, “‘We think you have interpersonal skills problems,’ which was deadly.” Late in her career, Andrea also felt rebuffed. In her case, she faced retaliation because of an EEO suit in which she prevailed. When applying for promotions and “seeing the favored White boys always getting the promotions, based on who knew what,” she decided to resign. In another example, Tonya’s handling of a high-profile matter was questioned, so she was reassigned—in her words, “fired”—by the FBI Director. Soon after her demotion, she was singled out in a national news story that included a personal attack on her qualifications. She recalled:

The negative comments from his inside crew . . . brought me down. . . . The stakes are pretty high at this level. You’re playing in rarified air and, if you so much as look sideways, that can be taken against you if you’re not one of

them. . . . I have always said, “When you play around with the big boys, sometimes you get kicked in the head like the big boys do, by the big boys.”

Like Nicole, Andrea, and Tonya, many participants described feeling betrayed by their peers and by the very institution to which they had dedicated their adult lives.

Complex patterns for high achievement. Participants were high achievers in the sense that they described performing in FBI leadership positions that had never before been held by women. Complex patterns for career success were marked by their successful work achievements, hard work, and personal sacrifice. Participants achieved different levels of success as expressed in through different individual experiences, choices, and goals.

Using the target metaphor, the rings of the target in Figure 4 are a representation of the layers of management that participants negotiated over the course of their careers. This depiction simplifies the result of a very complex set of influences on each participant. For participants, promotions were not only the result of merit, they were also a function of networking and timing. For all of them, it took years of experience to achieve their success.

The willingness of participants to move when promoted was also significant factor, and career success was clearly tied to mobility. The connection between career achievement and mobility is not clear in Figure 4, but participants described the connection. Each of the women represented near the center of the target reached the highest levels of FBI executive management. They held positions such as Special Agent in Charge (SAC) of FBI office, members of the Senior Executive Service (SES), Deputy Director, and Assistant Director. They all moved several times, and they were able and willing to transfer when promoted. For example, Nicole was able to manage her personal life while earning several high level promotions that required her to move. She recalled one transfer where her husband did not move with her:

Our social life was the same as our business life. We were surrounded by FBI people all the time. . . . I remember when movers came to pick up what little stuff I was taking with me, and [my husband] wasn't there. . . . I remember sitting there, looking at this stuff, saying, "Am I crazy? What am I doing?" But once I got there, work just keeps you going, and then he'd fly up on a weekend, or I'd fly down. . . . It worked very good.

For many participants, the issue of mobility was a complex issue to consider when contemplating promotions.

Many participants acknowledged that their attitudes and perceptions changed, sometimes dramatically, over time. In coding data, notations were made to identify data connected to early, middle, or late stages of the participants' careers. Interpretive analysis of data considered the participants' changing perceptions over the course of their careers. For example, Karen and Cynthia reported that they learned to stand up for themselves as supervisors, and they provided examples of how they became be less tolerant of disparate treatment and discrimination as they matured. As an experienced supervisor, Karen recalled successfully challenging her low, undeserved performance rating: "[My supervisor] was going to give me a Fully Successful [the lowest acceptable rating]. . . . That was the kiss of death. . . . I fought him on it and . . . he couldn't give any good reasons. . . . I don't think he liked women." For most of her career, Cynthia prided herself in getting along well with men, and she often used her sense of humor to defuse gender issues. Later in her career, she decided to file an EEO complaint against a superior when he made a derogatory comment about her in a large setting. She recalled thinking, "under any other circumstance, I would have laughed, but I thought, 'you just messed up'." When he later apologized, she asked him, "If you are raped, and you say you are sorry, are you

still raped?” The examples of Karen and Cynthia demonstrated how participants learned to assert themselves as managers.

Clubhouse Metaphor and Organizational Tenets

Participants of the study adapted to the rules of the FBI’s bureaucracy, but they perceived that their presence could be an impetus for rules to be changed. The metaphor of a clubhouse was selected to interpret these data. The clubhouse connotes an exclusive retreat for individuals who have membership as part of a privileged group, and membership in clubs often reinforce a masculine culture of exclusion (Fidler & Velde, 1999). Regardless of the setting, clubhouses are governed by rules, and, for this study, the metaphor is applied in terms of the FBI as a traditionally male organization. In the FBI, the members of the “good old boys,” as described by participants, were mostly male, and a masculine culture was reinforced. Data presented in the typological analysis support the use of the clubhouse metaphor to bring meaning to participants’ experiences within the FBI’s male-dominated bureaucracy.

The practice of males excluding females develops at an early age and is reinforced through life (Fidler & Velde, 1999). A clubhouse could be a crude hut or tree house, reminiscent of the one used by the boys of “Our Gang” who were famously depicted on television and in motion pictures, starting in the 1920s (Our Gang Wiki, 2015). The boys called themselves the “He-Man Woman-Haters Club,” and they recited this pledge to exclude all girls: “I do solemnly swear to be a ‘he-man’ and hate women and not play with them or talk to them unless I have to” (p. 1). For men, the clubhouse might be a well-appointed, private area where men of similar interests play sports, relax, drink, play cards, and smoke, and where strict exclusionary membership rules are in place.

Fidler and Velde (1999) used a golf clubhouse metaphor to illustrate the privilege that

men occupy in American culture. A golf club supports an activity that has long been viewed as the domain of men. It exists to support a place both to compete and to conduct business. Despite golf being considered a sport of order, integrity, and manners, women have historically not been allowed the same access as men to the clubhouse. Fidler and Velde explained how clubs formed to exclude women:

This behavior may have its roots in the era when women stayed home. Men, the argument went, needed exclusive rights to lunch hour and weekend tee times because they were the only hours they didn't work. In addition, men use golf for the serious business of wooing clients and discussing work.

The message was, for women, that they did not belong in the club with men.

The reviewed literature about bureaucracy, the gendered nature of organizations, and characteristics of masculine culture contributed to the use of the clubhouse metaphor to interpret patterns in the data. This portion of interpretive analysis relies on the organizational frameworks of Alvesson and Billing (1997) and Deal and Kennedy (2000) that were discussed in Chapter 2.

Alvesson and Billing (1997) described the influence of gender on leadership in organizations in terms of a balance of equities among: (a) concerns for operational efficiency, (b) concerns for ethics or politics, (c) emphasis on gender similarity, and (d) emphasis on gender differences. The four primary positions, or quadrants, that can be adopted by an organization when considering these complex concerns are: (a) the equal opportunities position, (b) the meritocratic position, (c) the special contribution position, and (d) the alternative values position. Figure 2, reprinted below from Chapter 2, depicts this framework.




Figure 2. Approaches to the Understanding of Women and Leadership

Note. From *Understanding Gender and Organizations*, by M. Alvesson, & Y. D. Billing (1997). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. p. 171. Reprinted with permission.

As female agents joined the FBI workforce, leaders in the FBI argued that women had to meet the same hiring standards as men to be hired as agents (Gray, 1972). Once hired, the emphasis was on comparability between male and female agents and whether women could perform as agents. Applying the Alvesson and Billing (1997) model, objectives of equal opportunity and a high performance in the workforce reflect the equal opportunities and the meritocratic quadrants. The characteristics of the special contributions and alternative values quadrants might be considered desirable in the sense that the unique contributions of women could be of value to organizations. However, when interpreting the data, the positions for special contributions and alternative values did not apply to the participants as a group.

Data analyzed indicate that participants worked to establish their value in a bureaucracy that had previously provided no opportunities for female agents. In the equal opportunities position, women have been traditionally viewed in terms of their lack of opportunities to advance (Alvesson & Billing, 1997). This condition described the FBI environment before women were hired as agents in 1972, and the environment began to change during the careers of the participants. In the meritocratic position, people move up and down within an occupational

hierarchy according to their merit and contributions; meritocratic organizations place value on the qualifications of workers, ideally without regard for gender, class, race, or other factors (Alvesson & Billing). This condition would be considered the ideal in a bureaucracy. Indeed, in the present study, participants in the study sought promotions based on their merit, not gender.

Deal and Kennedy (2000) identified four culture types in organizations, and their model was the second organizational framework used for interpretation of the data. Culture types are based on scales of risk and feedback from the environment. They include: (a) tough-guy macho culture, (b) work hard-play hard culture, (c) process culture, and (d) bet-your-company culture. In the framework, one culture type is always primary. Participant data support the description of the FBI as embodying tough-guy macho culture as primary and process culture type as secondary. The tough-guy macho culture is masculine at its core, with employees who enjoy rapid feedback, rapid reward, and high risk. Data indicated that participants aspired to adapt within the tough-guy macho culture and most of them valued working in the FBI's high risk, high reward environment.

The Alvesson and Billing model (1997) and the Deal and Kennedy framework (2000) were useful to analyze data from an organizational perspective, using the clubhouse metaphor. Data revealed the persistence of a clubhouse culture in the FBI and the presence of both formal and informal rules that were embedded in the FBI bureaucracy. Key patterns in the efforts of participants within this culture were that participants followed rules to achieve career success, and challenged rules to address inequities.

Following rules. The hiring of female agents was a function of legal mandates and changes to policy. All participants were raised with a respect for rules, so, when they became FBI agents, they were already accustomed to following rules. Throughout their careers, they followed rules for hiring, training, transfers, investigations, promotions, and evaluations.

Examples of the FBI's rule-based environment are reflected in the data as part of the typological analysis. Participants had expectations that rules would assure access to opportunities equal with men, but data interpretation suggests that access for female agents was not equal, particularly with assignments and promotions.

Rules worked both to the disadvantage and to the advantage of participants. For example, the rule that women were required to train and shoot revolvers with shorter barrels than the men's revolvers represented a clear disadvantage to female agents. Ann was rebuffed by her firearms instructor when she asked, "Can we not be issued to four-inch [handgun]? . . . It would put us under full standing with the guys." On the other hand, female agents benefitted by rules that dictated that they be paid the same as men. Ann responded to a coworker who asked her, "'Do you make as much money as I do?' [by saying], 'You know I do.' . . . He laughed, and we laughed." Participants accepted and worked within the rules.

In terms of the clubhouse metaphor, participants made good faith efforts to fit into the masculine culture of the FBI. Still, most acknowledged they would never be truly accepted into the club. The participants who reached the top tiers in management were arguably the women closest to being members of the club. Andrea acknowledged that "different people have different experiences," but she described the most successful FBI women as closed to the idea of helping other women. A top female manager once told her, "I know there's some women who think they are not treated equally in the FBI. . . . My experience has proven [it is] women with a chip on their shoulder who have a problem. Everything else is hunky dory." Most participants reported that the female agents who were promoted to high ranks had different experiences and opportunities than they did.

Challenging rules. Participants did not embark on FBI careers with expectations that

they would be fully and immediately accepted as equals to men. At the same time, they did not join the FBI with the intention of attracting public attention to change it. As noted previously, participants were largely willing to work within whatever rules the FBI imposed. Excerpts from the data supported participants' perspectives that the FBI status quo was challenged as a result of the Hansen discrimination lawsuit and other equal employment opportunity (EEO) complaints. It was clear that, although a change process was underway, the process would be slow.

As described in the EEO section of the typological analysis, the Hansen lawsuit was a catalyst for changes in the FBI's rules and policies about hiring, training, and promotions. The court action resulted in the development of legally defensible training protocols for physical and firearms training at the FBI Academy that would assure fair treatment for women. Even though most participants did not join the Hansen suit, they acknowledged awareness that the FBI was forced to adapt to the inclusion of female agents and other minority groups. Indeed, discrimination lawsuits were also filed by Black and Hispanic agents.

Most of the participants opted out of the suit. Most opted out because their careers had not been hampered by discrimination at the time, and they did not want to get involved. Many were not supportive of the suit. Thus, it was significant and ironic that the participants, as leaders, were not the women who first challenged the FBI's masculine culture and rules.

Karen and Melissa shared perspectives that the Hansen lawsuit might result in potential backlash against all female agents. Karen recalled:

I remember thinking at one point, I feel bad for her if what she is saying was the truth, but, at the same time, I didn't want her to mess it up for the rest of us kind of thing.

Melissa recalled that the suit “made things worse. It was kind of like ‘drop the bomb and leave’ on her [Hansen’s] part.” Many participants like Karen and Melissa took steps to distance themselves from the Hansen lawsuit.

Ironically, although many participants opted out of the Hansen lawsuit, they still played a role in promoting gender equity in the FBI. An argument could be made that participants facilitated change as strategic insiders, rather than as members of the lawsuit. In this respect, the role of participants as insiders was different from the role of the class members in the Hansen lawsuit who assumed a more direct role in advocating for change.

Within FBI management, many of the participants advocated for gender equity within the FBI system, but they often met resistance. For example, Melissa was asked to be part of a review group formed to study issues faced by female agents, and she was initially optimistic that the airing of issues would result in positive change:

[An FBI official] put together a Female Advisory Group. . . . I [was] a member of the group and instrumental in starting the ball rolling. . . . Females started to speak out about the Hispanics getting ahead now, the males, the Blacks are getting ahead, the females are getting stomped on. Females were having problems out in offices, and they were being swept under the rug. . . . [The official] comes along and goes, “There is no problem with female agents.” And I’m looking at him, going, “You’re dumb as a brick if you think that.”

Melissa was surprised to learn that the FBI official in charge was not receptive.

Some participants filed individual EEO complaints rather than joining the Hansen lawsuit. For them, the EEO process provided little satisfaction to address their specific complaints. Cynthia was once asked by colleagues whether they should file a complaint. She

replied to them:

“Nobody wins. . . . Consider the consequences, even if you’re right.”. . . I really

discouraged them because they were young, and the Bureau is unforgiving. . . .

You don’t want to draw attention to yourself, period, because if you’re good, it’s

[good things] going to come anyway.

Like Cynthia, Melissa started her career thinking, “I was a believer. If you did good work, you would be noticed.” At the end of her career, she filed an EEO complaint that she believed was not taken seriously. In hindsight, she said, if she had the chance to start over, “I’d sue the shit out of them.” Her viewpoint was one of many examples that the expectations of the participants regarding the EEO process changed over the course of their careers.

Introduction to Evaluation and Thematics

The first two of Eisner’s (1998) four dimensions of educational criticism—description and interpretation—were aligned with typological analysis and interpretive analyses to present data in the preceding sections of this chapter. Analysis using these dimensions presented a significant amount of data according to major typologies, patterns, and relationships.

Eisner’s (1998) dimensions of evaluation and thematics were used to expand the analysis from particular data to a larger landscape. His third dimension of educational criticism—evaluation—reflects the responsibility of the connoisseur or researcher to acknowledge how the research addresses important human values. The purpose of evaluation is to attach value to data as they reflect concerns for how participants contributed to the development of the FBI as an organization. The fourth dimension—thematics—focused on the process of identifying recurring messages that are pervasive within situations. The purpose of thematics analysis was to focus on

recurring messages within the data that could be pertinent to other women working in highly gendered organizations.

Evaluation Dimension

Meaningful data analysis includes a responsibility for a researcher to identify the connections between data and important social and human values. The perspectives and experiences of female FBI leaders in the present study were largely educative, not just for FBI women who followed them, but also—as analysis within this dimension of educational criticism suggests—for other women working within male-dominated bureaucratic organizations. Data analysis led to two categories of significance: personal and organizational values. In terms of personal values, women who have experiences of value should accept a moral obligation to share their knowledge with other women. In terms of values that transcend the individual, women who have experiences of value should serve as catalysts for positive organizational change, with an emphasis on the need for diversity in organizations.

Moral Obligation as Female Leaders

Because participants were successful both as agents and leaders, the idea that women belonged in the FBI gained greater acceptance. Participants took advantage of an historic opportunity when they became the first female FBI agents, but their experiences had value beyond their private accomplishments. Participants knew that their presence in the FBI challenged the status quo and that they were part of an important process to redefine traditional thinking about women in nontraditional careers. The participants sent a powerful, positive message that women could perform as agents and do the same work as male agents.

A major contribution of the early trailblazers was that they created a “foothold” for future female agents and leaders. During their careers, most participants minimized their gender

identity, despite knowing that most of their male colleagues viewed them in terms of gender.

Given the small number of female agents at the time, they were understandably focused on personal job security. As discussed in the data, participants managed complex issues related to gender. One of the significant issues they faced was the decision to opt in or opt out of the Hansen lawsuit. This decision required them to take a stand for or against other female agents. Most participants opted out, and this decision may have reflected a desire to avoid negative responses from male agents. In hindsight, the actions of these participants might be viewed as reasonable because, in the midst of polarizing litigation, they attracted positive attention for being successful female agents. Data analysis can support the argument that the contributions of both the women in the lawsuit and the participants combined together to advance the cause of all women in the FBI.

Beyond individual behavior, John Dewey (1903) claimed that those in service have an obligation to represent goodness and to serve as moral agents for others. He further accentuated the essential nature of moral obligation to leadership and decision-making (Dewey, 1903). Feminist research that began in the 1970s expanded on previous models of moral development to consider gender. Gilligan's (1982) feminist model for moral thinking, and Noddings' (2003) moral theory of care provide support for the premise that women have a moral obligation to others, and they emphasize the importance of relationships and caring in the lives of women.

Data were evaluated to connect participants' experiences to social and human values on a larger scale than their individual lives. Although their experiences varied, the data as a whole could be tied to a shift of values related to gender equity. Simply stated, women who have experiences of value have a moral obligation to other women. When the participants in the present study began their careers, few were ready to reflect on their moral obligations to other

women. Understandably, their focus was on being successful at the time. In their success, they proved, to themselves and others, that women could be more than just competent female agents. By creating a foothold for female agents and by their actions as leaders, they contributed to a shift in thinking by men that women could be competent without consideration of gender, and that female agents could add value to the FBI.

Through their efforts, the participants represented the special human capacity of all women. Female agent leaders who followed the participants had a different starting point. Their successors were able to begin their careers with more male colleagues who accepted female agents. They were able to benefit from the knowledge of their predecessors, and this knowledge would increase the likelihood for them to succeed. They were in a much better position to reflect on their moral obligations and to act on them on behalf of other women ((Belenky, Clinchy, Goldeberger, & Tarule, 1997).

Need for Organizational Diversity

The present study was designed in recognition of a gap in scholarly research about hidden gender inequality and a lack of diversity in male-centric organizations (Calas & Smircich, 1992). As scholars share knowledge about how women adapt within highly gendered organizations, leaders in those organizations may learn to be more accepting of gender equity and the need for organizational diversity.

Diversity has been broadly defined as a condition of acceptance of all characteristics and experiences, beyond race and gender, that define people as individuals (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2000). Commitment to diversity can result in individual productivity, organizational effectiveness, and sustained competitiveness (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2000). Occupational improvements are facilitated when leaders and managers focus on: (a) the need for

equitable gender practices in the workforce, and (b) the positive impact of female leaders in increasingly diverse organizations (White House Project, 2010).

With the hiring of female agents, the 1970s represented a period of organizational and structural change for the FBI. As discussed in Chapter 2, disruptions to bureaucratic organizations can result in changes to underlying order, or deep structure (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985). For the FBI, the entry of female agents to the workforce represented such a disruption. Female agents served as gendering agents to create a platform that would push the FBI toward a more diverse bureaucracy (Acker, 1990; Bartlett, 1990). The punctuated equilibrium paradigm described by Tushman and Romanelli was useful in making this evaluation. In this paradigm, the interrelationships between the two states, revolution and equilibrium, are explained in terms of disruption and order. Once a revolution takes place, the organization seeks a new state of equilibrium (Tushman & Romanelli). In the 1970s, the number of female agents was relatively small, but, by virtue of their very presence, participants and other female agents challenged existing stereotypes and created conditions to disrupt the FBI's durable order. This process resulted in organizational change.

Table 7 depicts a sequence of some of the actions related to the integration of female agents in the FBI. These actions took place during a period of punctuated equilibrium, when the FBI's deep structures were challenged.

Table 7

<i>Sequence of Events Impacting Early Female Agents in the FBI</i>	
Order of Event	Event
1	The FBI began to hire female agents in 1972.
2	Many of the first female agents failed to complete training.
3	Existing EEO systems were utilized to rectify gender inequity in hiring and assignments.
4	Christine Hansen filed a class action discrimination lawsuit against the FBI.
5	Groups of minority (Black and Hispanic) agents filed class action discrimination lawsuits.
6	Female Advisory Group was formed by FBI management.
7	FBI Director Webster made the hiring of female and minority agents a priority.
8	Increasing numbers of women were hired and completed training.
9	Increasing numbers of women entered management ranks.
10	Reexamination of FBI personnel practices took place following Hansen ruling.
11	Legally defensible personnel practices were implemented.
12	Number of female agents and female supervisors increased.

By the time participants had completed their careers, change was well underway in the FBI. Greater numbers of female agents were being hired and were moving into management. The FBI's progress toward greater inclusion of women is reflected today, with 19 percent of all agents being women, and 20 percent of Special Agents in Charge (SAC) of FBI offices being women (FBI, 2015c).

Important values are represented in the data as a whole that relate to positive

organizational growth. Through their meaningful experiences, participants contributed, not only as trailblazers for other women, but as catalysts for organizational change. In a real sense, they started the FBI on a path to recognize the importance of organizational diversity. The perspectives and experiences of female FBI leaders are educative, not just for other women working in nontraditional occupations, but for the organizations they serve.

Thematics Dimension

Thematics reflect recurring messages (Eisner, 1998) grounded in interview data and notes collected during research. Thematics permits a researcher to identify recurring messages within data from a study in order to make “naturalistic generalizations” and to transfer those generalizations to other situations (Eisner, 1998). Themes are useful to distill major conclusions as a part of educational criticism.

For the present study, thematics were conducted in conjunction with the other three dimensions of educational criticism. Based on the data, four main themes were developed in relation to female leadership in nontraditional occupations: (a) occupational pride as women, (b) challenge to manage multiple roles, (c) inadequate support through relationships, and (d) range in feminist views.

The use of thematics in the present study allowed for open expression of feminist perspectives expressed in the data. As explained earlier in this chapter, interview data regarding feminist perspectives was bracketed during typological analysis. With interpretive analysis, the Supergirl metaphor limited analysis to patterns in the data that were related to gender. Thematics allowed an opportunity to consider this bracketed data as well as patterns, and the data as a whole, in terms of modern feminist perspectives. Thematics went beyond previous analyses and draws strongly from the reviewed feminist literature in Chapter 2.

Theme 1: Occupational Pride as Women

Until the 1970s, perspectives of working women had been overlooked, and faulty assumptions were made about women's capabilities based on male-dominated culture (Kanter, 1977). Participants in the present study challenged these assumptions that women were not capable of working in dangerous, nontraditional occupations. As data indicated, participants desired lives of independence and adventure. They chose nontraditional careers in the FBI and dedicated themselves completely to their careers. A pervasive message within the data was that participants proved—convincingly—that women could in fact perform on an equal footing with men. Although few participants had clear career plans when they became FBI agents, they learned that they could contribute to the FBI in a myriad of roles. Throughout their careers, they embodied qualities of grit—perseverance and passion—that enabled them to prove themselves, not only as agents, but as leaders in a job that was previously closed to women (Duckworth et al., 2007).

As participants found varying degrees of success in their careers, many other women in the 1970s and 1980s did not have similar opportunities for success. Many women failed to be hired, failed to complete training, and failed to stay in the FBI (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986). Although participants acknowledged concerns that they might fail, and some did experience failures on the job, they, as a group, were resilient under pressure and averse to failure.

Participants navigated complex challenges along their nontraditional career paths. Despite facing obstacles, persistent messages in the data were that participants were extremely proud of their careers and contributions as FBI agents and that they were very proud to be among the FBI's first female leaders. Their shared sense of occupational pride as women, along with the knowledge that their experiences would help others, was a keen motivator for them to work

hard and to be successful as leaders.

Theme 2: Challenge to Manage Multiple Roles

Reality is socially constructed, and gender is a complex, social construction (Berger & Luckman, 1966). For the participants, managing the realities and demands of complex lives as women was not easy. Despite different personal paths, career routes, and varying levels of success, they were determined to manage the challenges of myriad roles. Among the pervasive messages expressed by participants in the data was that women are challenged to manage complex experiences in both their personal and professional lives.

In their personal lives, participants had a wide range of experiences and roles in a variety of careers before becoming FBI agents. As young women, they shared desires for adventure and self-sufficiency, they exemplified fitness and intellect, and they were eager to have nontraditional lives. During their careers, they learned to manage their personal identities as women while working in a demanding male-oriented job. Successful careers meant that the participants often had to make personal sacrifices, and they described that their lives lacked balance. For many, they described having little to no personal life. Other described the difficulty of balancing roles as mother, child, spouse, or friend. Participants were often forced to make difficult personal decisions about whether to seek promotions; the requirement for relocate for new positions had a negative impact on the careers of some participants.

In their professional lives, participants described managing a wide variety of work and leadership experiences, and they demonstrated the ability to effectively manage multiple roles. In training, they had to prove themselves as intellectually and physically capable. As agents, they succeeded in a wide variety of assignments. Participants described feeling that their successes were temporal so they felt they needed to prove themselves over and over and in every

new assignment. Many described the pressure of being continually tested. In the effort to prove themselves, many participants described working longer hours and working harder than men. They did, however, describe that they worked well with their male counterparts. As leaders, they demonstrated abilities to be adaptable. They also were able to address, defuse, or confront sexist behavior.

Theme 3: Inadequate Support through Relationships

Increased understanding of female leadership can lead to greater opportunities for female occupational empowerment (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). A pervasive message within the data was that participants lacked adequate support through their professional relationships. While some participants described friendships with female agents, the absence of formal, professional support was clear. Participants described working largely on their own without formal mentoring. Informal role models were, for the most part, men. Without the benefit of connections or a supportive network, many willingly gravitated toward those administrative leadership roles.

Many participants described feeling isolated and facing career obstacles alone. The absence of relationships with other women may have contributed to distance between women; as a result, participants often did not share their concerns with other female agents. Some participants even described feeling that they were in competition with each other.

Research literature supports the theme that participants lacked support in their professional relationships. Their general lack of connectedness suggests a lack of occupational empowerment. This theme emphasizes the importance of professional relationships—with both male and female colleagues—for female career empowerment.

The importance of female empowerment through relationships was expressed in the

feminist literature. The importance of relationships is clear in Gilligan's (1982) model for moral care, as discussed in Chapter 2. Gilligan identified three different moral levels that women pass through to attain moral maturity. In the first level, women focus on the individual. In the second, they establish and participate in relationships. In the third and most advanced level, they are able to recognize the needs of others in addition to their own and to act on them. The lack of supportive relationships in the present study suggests that participants had not reached the third level and that they were not yet ready to attend fully to both their needs and the needs of others.

The research of Belenky, Clinchy, Goldeberger, and Tarule (1997) regarding women's ways of knowing underscores the importance of relationships. They claimed that relationships and connectedness are key to understanding how women experience reality and interpret experiences. The ability to use personal power to transform commitments into action is essential to female empowerment and advanced knowledge. Belenky et al. identified five epistemological and progressive positions of knowledge that apply to women. The positions range from women being silent and powerless with others to women being connected and empowered. The positions are: (a) silent knowledge, (b) received knowledge, (c) subjective knowledge, (d) procedural knowledge, and (e) constructed knowledge. The positions are further explained in Chapter 2 (see pp. 31-32).

The procedural knowledge position is applicable to the participants in the present study when considering the data as a whole. This way of knowing is characterized by women with confidence and personal power. These women use objective procedures to access knowledge, and they are systematic thinkers whose knowledge is accessed through being connected with others. Women in this position rely on objective, concrete procedures. They support equal

opportunity for women but do not question the structure of institutions.

The data reflect that participants operated in this position, as evidenced by their career choices and perspectives. Positive relationships and reinforcement were necessary to be in this position, but many participants lacked the connectedness they needed to move to the next transformative level of knowledge. In the absence of female colleagues and mentors, participants gained knowledge and career support from relationships with male colleagues. Their knowledge, as received mostly from men, supported the existing FBI institution. As a result, participants worked within the rules of the institution.

The ideal and most advanced position for women is constructed knowledge, which is characterized by connectedness and the ability to use personal power to transform personal and moral commitments into action ((Belenky, Clinchy, Goldeberger, & Tarule, 1997). In this position, women would be able to challenge systems and act out of empathy toward other women. They would be able to feel close, trusting connections with other people—men and women—despite large differences.

The theme that participants lacked supportive relationships suggests that participants did not operate in the constructed knowledge position. Participants accepted the status quo but, as a group, they and other female agents were not yet empowered to use their personal power to challenge the system in meaningful ways. Based on the data, a few participants actively supported gender equity for women and were well connected with others, but these descriptions were not prevalent in the data.

Theme 4. Range in Feminist Views

Feminist research has often been inadequate to explain fully the complexities of women's thoughts because women's perspectives are not fixed, universal, or linear (Belenky, Clinchy,

Goldeberger, & Tarule, 1997). Feminism thus includes a wide range of movements and ideologies that share common goals to define, establish, and achieve equal political, economic, cultural, personal, and social rights for women (Beasley, 1999).

The complexity of participants' views about feminism was a clear theme in the data. Any expectation that participants might perceive issues of importance to women in the same way is not supported by the data or the research literature. Of the participants, only a few acknowledged themselves in feminist terms, either during their careers or afterward. The participants' FBI careers began between 1972 and 1978, and this time frame was considered when identifying this theme. Participants were able to have careers in the FBI only after laws had changed to allow equal opportunities for women and FBI Director Hoover had died. Although most participants distanced themselves from the politically charged feminist agenda of the 1970s, their experiences during this period in history were groundbreaking for women in nontraditional occupations.

Spanning the three waves of feminism described in Chapter 2, four primary approaches are commonly used by modern feminist today to describe women in terms of their oppression: liberal, radical, Marxist, and socialist (Grana, 2010). Liberal feminism is based on the idea that women are oppressed due to lack of equal opportunity in education and employment. Radical feminism suggests women are oppressed by patriarchy and are considered subordinate to men. Marxist feminism suggests that women are oppressed because of a capitalist system. Socialist feminism is based on the belief that women are oppressed because of both patriarchy and capitalism.

The careers of study participants corresponded with the second feminist wave that took place between the 1960s and the 1980s. Although participants embraced equal opportunities

created by law, the 1970s was a decade marked by second wave radical feminists who were considered by many to be aggressive and who were critical of patriarchal society (Collins, 2009). These feminists were very outspoken about women's subordination in terms of patriarchy, misogyny, sexuality, and power relationships (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldeberger, & Tarule, 1997). Women's roles and norms in society were changing quickly during that period. As participants ended their careers, the third wave had been ushered in, and the voices of feminists had softened to be more accepting of a wide range of views (Collins). Participants described having mixed and complex feelings about the feminist movement as a whole, but they acknowledged supporting some of its goals. They described agreeing that women deserved equal work opportunities; thus, participants were aligned with the liberal feminist approach that considers subordination of women in terms of their lack of opportunities.

The use of the word “feminist” became synonymous with hostile sexual politics in the 1970s, and its use to describe women often created barriers between women and men (Berkowitz, 2014). Few other words in the English language evoked—and still evoke—the immediate, powerful, and negative response that the word feminist does. Berkowitz described the connotations of this feminist label:

Folks have come to associate negative—and often untrue—things with feminism.

Perhaps it is because of this that the word is so rarely used accurately. Sure, I'll concede that some women can be a little intimidating in their quest for equality.

I'm not sure I blame them, though. We have come a long way in the last 100 years, with women moving mountains of social change. (p. 1)

Many women in the 1970s rejected the debate about feminism, and the feminist label, for a variety of reasons.

The feminist label may have had negative connotations to some participants, supporting the research decision to use a constructivist paradigm for data analysis instead of a political, feminist paradigm (Hatch, 2002). Adopting an openly feminist approach might have suggested an agenda to participants, and my goal was to allow participants to identify the issues of importance to them. At the end of each interview, however, I asked each participant to state her personal views on the feminist movement. Beyond agreeing that women deserved an equal opportunity to be FBI agents, participants did not agree on whether they supported feminism or whether they were feminists.

The choice for women to acknowledge themselves as feminists—either in the 1970s or today—was, and is, deeply personal. However, for the participants of the present study, as career FBI women, these decisions may have been practical ones as well. Being known as feminists at that time may not have helped these women assimilate into the FBI. Choosing to ignore, or being silent to, sexism and discrimination in the workplace could well be regarded as reasonable decisions for working women trying to protect their interests.

Tonya was one of the few participants who openly embraced being a feminist during her FBI career. In describing herself as a “fuzzy-haired liberal,” Tonya recalled:

Of course I am [a feminist], yes, very much so, in the very good sense of the word, in the very good sense of the word. . . . I don't understand how people can't be, frankly. . . . I [supported the feminist movement] by virtue of my speaking out on behalf of women and the just treatment of women. . . . I felt that I went further in a time when no one was doing that.

Unlike Tonya, most participants rejected the label feminist for themselves, but they did so in varying degrees. Kathleen did not describe herself as a feminist, but she was in favor of equal

opportunities for women. She described her position:

I never considered myself a feminist, okay? I know I was very privileged to become a part of the FBI as one of the first females, but I never felt that I was part of any feminist movement. . . . If women feel they have the abilities and want to do it, they should be given the opportunity.

Sarah's response was similar, except that her view on the label feminist changed over time:

I would be feminist in that I believe that women should have equal access, equal opportunity, and equal pay. That doesn't mean that all women want all jobs. . . . I'm not a bra-burning, card-carrying . . . feminist, but I do think that, in this day and age, women are as capable as men to do pretty much any job. Other than childbirth.

Kathleen and Sarah were typical of many participants who, in looking back on their lives, reevaluated their positions on feminism.

A small number of participants, like Rebecca, criticized the actions of women who labeled themselves as feminists. Although she favored equal opportunities for women, Rebecca did not believe the leaders in the feminist movement served women well. She described them:

I didn't think much of them. . . . They were making a big cause. . . . It seemed negative. . . . Some of them seemed a lot "butchy," and they were making a big noise. I just figured, if you want, just go [do things men do]. Quit making a big deal out of it, because people think of you negatively if you make a big noise.

Regardless of how they characterized themselves, the majority of participants avoided being vocal about the feminist movement during their careers. Many referred to feminists as overly aggressive. Among the participants, some could not relate to the women leading the feminist movement, some felt the movement would hurt their careers, and some did not even give much

thought to the role of the movement in their lives.

The terrain for negotiating feminism was—and is—a complicated one. It is ironic that participants benefitted from the efforts of women from whom they distanced themselves. They, and their successors, benefitted from the efforts of the outspoken feminists of the 1970s and from the women who joined the Hansen lawsuit to demand equitable treatment for female FBI agents. Being an avowed feminist was not necessary to be part of changes that were taking place in the FBI. It was enough for the participants to believe in gender equity in the workplace and to contribute their own unique talents and perspectives. Whether feminists or not, participants contributed to gender equality in the American workplace through their positive actions.

Summary of Chapter 4

In this chapter, data supported the claim that early female FBI agents had unique and complex experiences during a time when women's roles were dramatically evolving in America. Throughout their careers, they followed many paths to achieve various career outcomes. The FBI played a significant role in transforming their own lives, but they themselves contributed to a more diverse, more representative FBI. Through their presence and their actions, they were catalysts for positive change in the FBI.

This chapter presented a layered approach to data analysis. It offered detailed explanation of the processes used in data analysis and justification for the decisions made. Data analysis strategies incorporated the four dimensions of educational criticism: description, interpretation, evaluation, and thematics (Eisner, 1998). Analysis included: (a) typological analysis for description (Hatch, 2002), (b) interpretive analysis for interpretation (Hatch, 2002), and (c) educational criticism for evaluation and thematics. The strategies were integrated as part of a comprehensive and open approach that was not overly prescriptive.

Typological, descriptive analysis comprised the largest section of the data analysis discussion. Despite a large volume of data, this approach was fairly straightforward, as interview data were linked to data categories generated from the conceptual framework and the literature review. The categories were grouped in terms of how participants: (a) chose non-traditional careers, (b) achieved career self-efficacy, (c) performed as leaders, and (d) negotiated bureaucracy.

Interpretive analysis employed metaphors to interpret patterns and relationships between and among the data categories. The use of metaphors made these connections within complex data more accessible and understandable. Selected metaphors corresponded to the theoretical framework. A *Supergirl* metaphor connected feminist standpoint theory to participants' unique experiences. A *Target* metaphor connected career self-efficacy theory to the participants' career and leadership decisions. A *Clubhouse* metaphor connected principles of organizational theory to the impact that women had on the FBI's bureaucracy.

The four dimensions of educational criticism were integral to all aspects of data analysis. Following the typological and interpretive data analysis, educational criticism provided a unique lens in data analysis to address Eisner's (1998) dimensions of evaluation and thematics. Using the relevant literature and my own connoisseurship, the evaluation dimension of educational criticism permitted an examination of the data as a whole in order to connect it to important social and human values. Finally, the thematics dimension discussed pervasive messages in the data as a whole that might apply as well to women leaders in nontraditional occupations.

CHAPTER FIVE—SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

“Life is not easy for any of us [women]. But what of that?

We must have perseverance and above all confidence in ourselves.

We must believe that we are gifted for something and that this thing must be attained.”

Marie Curie (1938)

Women in nontraditional occupations, such as in law enforcement, the military, and the FBI, have historically faced pervasive hidden agendas of hegemonic masculinity (Prokos & Padavic, 2002). Until the 1970s, little scholarly research examined persistent gender inequality in organizations and in leadership. This lack of research created a gap in organizational research and allowed a tacit adoption of male-centric positions regarding how organizations function (Calas & Smircich, 1992; Martin, 2000). The 1970s was a decade marked by the women’s movement, legal mandates to provide women with equal opportunities, and a focus on feminist research about organizational theory and leadership. This decade was also marked by the entry of women into the modern FBI as Special Agents. The present study was designed to gain knowledge about the experiences of these trailblazers as workers and as leaders in nontraditional careers and within a highly gendered bureaucracy. The participants’ perspectives have been considered within an historical context, but knowledge gained from the present study extends beyond the experiences of one generation and is relevant today.

The 1970s ushered in great change for American women. The Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1974 were mandates that were designed to close gender gaps in schools and workplaces and to make discrimination illegal on the basis of sex. Efforts to pass

and ratify the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) were unsuccessful, but, during this time, women were making their voices heard about gender equity (Alice Paul Institute, 2013).

The purpose of the present study was to gain knowledge about women trailblazers who helped contribute to historic change in the FBI. Prior to 1972, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover perpetuated the belief that women were unable to perform the dangerous work of male FBI agents. At the time, FBI agents were nicknamed “G-Men.” The beginning of structural and cultural change in the FBI began just days after Hoover’s death in 1972, when women were hired to be agents and they became the first “G-Women” (FBI, 2015c). As soon as this occurred, the FBI’s exclusive, gendered culture was disrupted.

The research question for the study was: “How do the early women leaders in the FBI describe their experiences in a gendered organization?” Several main ideas were embedded in this question: their personal and professional perspectives as women, their career experiences working in man’s world, and their potential impact as female leaders on the FBI bureaucracy. These ideas reflected a three-pronged theoretical framework that included feminist standpoint theory, career self-efficacy theory, and principles from organizational theories. Subsequently, three additional sub-questions were added to organize the research literature and to develop the interview guide that was used in data collection. The sub-questions were:

1. How do these women describe their decision-making?
2. How do these women describe their career self-efficacy?
3. How do these women describe the role that gender played in the FBI?

These additional questions were designed to elicit perspectives from the participants regarding female leadership.

Of the first FBI female agents who were also supervisors, 15 agreed to be interviewed for the present study. Participants recalled that many of their male colleagues described the hiring and training of the first female agents as “the Female Experiment” and most male agents they thought women would fail. The unique perspectives of the participants were shared through in-depth, semi-structured interviews. A research decision was made to refrain from using a critical, feminist approach for data collection or analysis; the study was designed to promote openness in interviews and to discourage a political agenda in engaging with participants or in reporting the data.

This final chapter contains seven sections. The first section summarizes the reviewed literature. The second section summarizes the research methodology for data collection. The third section provides a description of data analysis procedures, how these procedures were followed, and the results of data analysis. The fourth section acknowledges the limitations and delimitations of the study. The fifth section suggests implications from this study for educational leadership. The sixth section offers recommendations for future studies. The final section presents conclusions.

Summary of the Literature

The review of the literature corresponded to the theoretical framework for the study and the main ideas embedded in the research question: being female, working in a man’s world, and female leaders in the FBI. The literature was organized under three headings: the feminist perspective, nontraditional occupations, and bureaucracy.

The Feminist Perspective

The first section in the literature outlined the historical and legal framework for gender equity in the American workforce and the evolution of various feminist approaches over the last

century. The literature was organized into the following categories: (a) three major waves of feminism in America, (b) a discussion various feminist frameworks, (c) an overview of feminist theory, and (d) a discussion of feminist standpoint theory.

Three major feminist waves in American history were outlined. The first wave, from 1848 through the 1920s, was driven by women's fight for formal equality, including the right to vote (Krolokke, 2005). Times of war were dormant periods in terms of female activism, although women entered the workforce in large numbers during World War II, and employment opportunities for women increased dramatically during that time. The second wave of feminist activism spanned the 1960s to the 1980s, with this period known for radical feminism and the women's liberation movement (Krolokke, 2005). Primary emphases during this wave were workplace equity, equal rights, and reproductive rights. The third wave, which began in the 1990s and still continues, emphasizes substantive equality, and today's feminists are far more accepting of the multitude of ways that women deal with gender, sexuality, race, class, and age (Krolokke, 2005).

Feminist frameworks were explained within an historical context. Early scholars have debated the root of female subordination (Grana, 2010). The earliest framework incorporated the conservative approach of Sigmund Freud, in which the subordination of women was viewed through the singular lens of biology (Krolokke, 2005). Early frameworks were considered narrow and male-centric, and later frameworks considered subordination more in social and structural terms (Krolokke, 2005). Modern feminists view the early debates about gender primacy and subordination as outdated (Jaggar & Rothenberg, 1993).

Four frameworks are most often associated with the modern feminist perspective: liberal, radical, Marxist, and socialist (Grana, 2010). Of these, the liberal and radical frameworks were most relevant to the present study. Liberal feminism is based on the idea that women lack equal opportunity in education and employment (Grana, 2010). Radical feminism is based on patriarchal views and suggests that women are viewed as inferior to men (Grana, 2010).

Generally, feminist theory is based on social theory that highlights the social arrangement inherent in society between men and women (Acker, 2006). Despite disagreements within various schools of thought, feminist scholars agree on three basic feminist tenets: the rejection of dualism, the belief in social construction of knowledge, and a commitment to the empowerment of women (Sprague & Zimmerman, 2004).

The first tenet of feminist theory is the rejection of the dualistic premise that women are inferior to men (Nelson, 1997). Dualism is a view that creates order in the world by dividing entities and concepts into opposed pairs where one in the pair is superior to the other (Nelson, 1997). Western patriarchal thinking is based on the central, absolute theme of dualism, where the concept of man is the superior to the concept of woman. Feminists patently reject this view (Nelson, 1997).

The second tenet of feminist theory concerns the social construction of knowledge by women. Mainstream scholars have debated whether the primary locus of knowledge is constructed within individuals or within relationships, when individuals work with each other (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldeberger, & Tarule, 1997). Like other feminist scholars, Belenky et al. (1997) have argued that female social construction of knowledge is based more on relationships and that women develop *ways of knowing* through several, sequential epistemological positions. In the Belenky model, the positions of procedural knowledge and constructed knowledge were

relevant to data analysis. Procedural knowledge relates to how women can use connectedness, empathy, and systematic thinking in their daily lives. Women in this position typically support equal opportunity for women but they do not question the structure of systems or institutions. Constructed knowledge is the most advanced position where, in addition to using procedural knowledge, women are able to challenge systems and to feel closely connected with other people in spite of large differences.

The third tenet of feminist theory relates to women's empowerment through morality and the ethics of caring. Proponents of traditional ethics have suggested a male-centric, legalistic, self-centered approach to morality, but feminists have disputed this view (Gilligan, 1982). Feminist scholars, most notably Gilligan and Noddings, have criticized the Piaget and Kohlberg early models of moral development, arguing that these models fail to account for the differences between women and men. Gilligan claimed that morality does not center on rights and rules but, rather, on interpersonal relationships and ethics of compassion and care. Men speak and act in terms of justice and rights, while women speak and act in terms of caring and responsibility. Women's morality is contextualized because it is tied to real, ongoing relationships rather than to abstract, hypothetical situations (Gilligan, 1982).

Finally, the literature included feminist standpoint theory as the first component within the study's theoretical framework. Dorothy Smith (1987/1990) and Nancy Hartsock (1983) were among the early pioneers of this theory that advocates using women's lived experiences, or *standpoints*, as the basis for their research. Feminist standpoint theory is based on the following beliefs about women's complex, unique experiences: (a) knowledge is socially situated; (b) marginalized groups are socially situated in ways that make it possible for them to be aware of things and to ask questions; and (c) research, focused on power relations, should begin with the

lives of the marginalized (Harding, 2004). The theory is based on the view that, because the lives and roles of women are significantly different from men, women possess a different type of knowledge than men (Hartsock, 1983). Central to this approach are the connections between experience and power and between power and the production of knowledge.

Nontraditional Women

The second section in the literature review included references to gender-specific leadership research, along with the historical background and statistical data about women working in nontraditional careers. The literature was organized into the following categories:

(a) gender and leadership, (b) nontraditional occupations, (c) women trailblazers, (d) choosing a career, (e) career self-efficacy theory, and (f) grit.

Leadership scholars did not mention gender until the latter part of the 20th century (Stogdill, 1948/1974). Classical leadership approaches took the position that leadership in organizations was gender-neutral and that there was no significant difference between male and female leaders. This stance held that women and men could be equally effective as managers, but that women would be successful only if they adopted masculine styles of management (Powell, 2010). In the 1970s, research began to advance beyond this assumption and to focus on the qualities associated with good leadership and the differences in how women and men lead (White, 1995). In many studies, researchers determined that women gravitated toward a transformational leadership style more than men; they rated more highly than men on empathy, communication, and interpersonal skills; and they scored higher than men in the areas of production and the attainment of results (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Eagly et al., 2003; Hegelson, 1990). In the same studies, men gravitated toward a transactional leadership style and tended to score higher than women in the areas of strategic planning and organizational vision.

Nontraditional occupations for women have been defined as those jobs in which women comprise less than 25 percent of the workforce (U. S. Department of Labor, 2015c). Traditionally female occupations, like nursing and teaching, have been afforded less status, lower pay, and fewer benefits than comparable traditionally male occupations (Foss & Slaney, 1986). Occupational segregation and wage discrimination have a negative impact on women, with women in a narrow range of traditionally female occupations earning two-thirds the salaries of men in comparable occupations (Forret & Dougherty, 2004).

Trailblazers have been defined in this study as women who break new ground and use “skills of innovation or brave constitutions to conduct their lives off the beaten path” (Chase, 2013, p. 1). Women working in dangerous, nontraditional careers, such as in the military, law enforcement, and the FBI, fit this definition. Because no research on the experiences of female FBI agents was located, the literature review focused on research about women trailblazers in other masculine and potentially dangerous nontraditional occupations. Thus, research about female military members and police officers was reviewed and discussed.

A review of the literature revealed four shared characteristics that pertain to women who work in the military, law enforcement, and the FBI. In these occupations:

- Women comprise less than 25 percent of the organization’s employees.
- Organizations are governed by policies and laws mandating gender equity.
- Positions require the capacity to face danger and use deadly force.
- Minimum physical standards for entry and retention must be met.

Military Women. In December 2015, after years of study and debate, Defense Secretary Ash Carter announced that women would be allowed to serve in all combat assignments, and all military positions were opened to women in 2016 (Kamarck, 2015). Under the previous policy of

combat exclusion, women in the military had been excluded from certain assignments solely due to gender (Manning, 2010). With the majority of male military officers having previous combat assignments, a gender gap in military leadership was clear (McSally, 2007). Detractors have cited many reasons why they oppose allowing women in combat. However, several research studies determined that the presence of women had no impact on unit cohesion and morale in combat settings, that women performed as effectively as men in these settings, and that women could perform their duties during deployments (Manning, 2010).

Policewomen. Over the last century, gender integration into police organizations has met strong resistance with early women police officers facing many obstacles (Heidensohn, 2006; Horne, 2012; Martin, 2006). Until the 1970s, women were not permitted to perform basic patrol duties that would have helped them to earn promotions (Price, 1996). Over the last 40 years, researchers have studied the capabilities of women to perform police work. Studies have consistently provided evidence that women are physically and mentally capable to conduct patrol work, respond to hazardous situations, perform well in academic and physical tasks, and handle violent confrontations (Elias, 1984; Grennan, 1987; Townsey, 1982).

G-Women. During his tenure as FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover refused to allow women to be hired as FBI Special Agents. Just days after his death in 1972, the FBI announced that women would be considered as agents (Gray, 1972). The attrition rate of the early G-Women was high because many of them were unable to complete the rigorous physical, defensive tactics, and firearms training at the FBI Academy (McChesney, 1987). One of the first female agents was Christine Hansen, who later became the lead plaintiff in an administrative class action lawsuit against the FBI that alleged institutional sex discrimination in hiring, training, and assignments (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986). The finding in that case was that the FBI had

systematically discriminated against women in all areas except transfers. As a result, many new policies relating to job interviews, physical and firearms training, and promotions were adopted in order to reduce and correct the FBI's disparate personnel practices (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986).

Research about how and why women choose nontraditional careers provided knowledge regarding how women succeed in these careers (Graham, 1997). This knowledge can be useful as today's working women continue to grapple with double standards and discrimination in the workplace, and as they work to break through the *glass ceiling* (Collins, 2009) to assume leadership positions. Factors in making career decisions include family, individual, and environmental variables (Graham, 1997). Many studies were cited regarding how these variables influence career decision-making (Letarte, 1992). Authority figures impose different sets of expectations and limitations on girls and boys that generate different gender-specific patterns of behavior (AAUW, 1992). Different socialization experiences of males and females result in complex patterns of career development for women (Fitzgerald & Crites, 1980). Disproving the once-held belief that girls are genetically not as smart as boys, particularly in science and mathematics, numerous research studies have determined that innate intellectual gender differences simply do not exist (Hyde, Lindberg, Linn, Ellis, & Williams, 2008; Monastersky, 2005). Further, women are motivated by occupational mentors who emphasize group interaction and collaboration (Gilligan, 1982).

Career self-efficacy theory (Betz & Hackett, 1981) was described as the second component in the study's theoretical framework. Using social learning theory, Bandura (1997) developed the concept of self-efficacy as "the belief in one's ability to perform a specific task" (Rittmayer & Beier, 2009, p. 1). Such beliefs are developed through successful mastery

experiences, vicarious learning experiences, verbal persuasions, and the management of negative physiological states. Betz and Hackett (1981) later developed a theory of career self-efficacy by applying the concept of self-efficacy to career-related behaviors. Career self-efficacy is defined as people's judgments of their abilities to perform career behaviors in relation to career development, choice, and adjustment (Betz & Taylor, 2001). People with low career self-efficacy beliefs tend to procrastinate when making career decisions and to lack follow-through with tasks (Betz & Taylor, 2001). People with high career self-efficacy beliefs tend to visualize success for themselves and to seek positive support (Bandura, 1993). People with high career self-efficacy beliefs tend to challenge themselves more and set higher career goals than people with low self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997). Applying career self-efficacy theory to gender, Betz and Hackett (1981) found that women's self-efficacy in many traditionally male occupations is typically lower and weaker than men's self-efficacy in these occupations.

Finally, the construct of *grit* (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthew, & Kelley, 2007) was introduced as a manifestation of career self-efficacy. Duckworth et al. defined grit as the combination of perseverance, measured in terms of hard work, and passion, measured in terms of dedicated effort, to achieve long-term goals. Using a scale to collect data from professional men and women across a wide range of occupations, Duckworth et al. provided evidence that grit, more than personality traits or mental ability, contributed to high achievement.

Bureaucracy

The third section in the literature review related to several elements of organizational theory and practice that combined to form the third component of the study's theoretical framework. The literature helped to frame data collection in terms of a variety of tenets and was divided into the following categories: (a) the gendered nature of organizations and *feminist*

practice, (b) *tipping points* and tokenism, (c) masculine culture in bureaucracy, and (d) shifts in equilibrium.

When discussing organizational theories, scholars routinely refer to gender-neutral organizational models, such as Weber's (1946) model of bureaucracy and Mintzberg's (1979) structural configurations for organizations. Both approaches were useful in the assessment of the FBI's bureaucratic structure as it applied to the present study. The FBI operates as a rigid Weberian hierarchy that is slow to change. The FBI's structure resembles Mintzberg's divisionalized structure and professional bureaucracy models.

Questions about the influence of gender in organizations have generated an increasing body of both mainstream and feminist research (Ferguson, 1984). Ferguson (1984) described bureaucracy as the primary source of the oppression of women. Structure and process are part of a system of rules that is controlled by those in power. As a result, rules that govern bureaucracy act to normalize women's behavior as subordinate (Arendt, 1958). The use of feminist methods to challenge the standing of women in organizations is referred to as *feminist practice* (Bartlett, 1990). This practice promotes core female values, such as mutuality, interdependence, inclusion, cooperation, nurturance, participation, empowerment, and personal and collective transformation (Ferguson, 1984). Bartlett (1990) argued that women in the workforce can and do act as *gendering agents* who can shift power within their organizations.

The most powerful organizations have historically been occupied by men with the exception of the "occasional biological female," described by Sorenson as a "social man" (1984, p. 1). Ironically, as many women have minimized their gender and worked hard to integrate into male-dominated workplaces, they still have been viewed and treated differently by men; in effect,

they have become social men. Thus, women often have become token members within powerful, male organizations (Kanter, 1977).

Kanter introduced the concept of the *tipping point* to signify how the compositional proportion of women in an organization can be related to power. Strength in numbers can counteract the token phenomenon. Kanter posited that, when women number more than 15 percent of any workforce, they are able to form powerful alliances and affect group culture.

Alvesson and Billing (1997) identified organizing principles that explain how women function as leaders in organizations. In their framework, described in detail in Chapter 2, four positions—or quadrants—are aligned that are based on whether leaders place greater value on gender similarities or differences, and whether they place greater value on ethics or efficiency. The four positions are: (a) equal opportunities, (b) alternative values, (c) meritocracy, and (d) special contributions. The organizational approach of the FBI was assessed using this model. The assessment determined female leaders in the FBI would tend to be understood within the equal opportunities and the meritocratic positions of the Alvesson and Billing model. The basis for the equal opportunities position is primarily moral, and its premise is that women and men are entitled to equal opportunity and equal treatment in the workplace (Alvesson & Billing, 1997). In this position, women are often viewed as victims of discrimination. The other applicable position is the meritocratic position in which people can move up and down the occupational hierarchy based on personal merit. In a meritocratic society, organizations place value on the qualifications of their workers, presumably without regard for gender, class, race, or other factors (Alvesson & Billings, 1997).

The literature review also examined characteristics of organizational cultures. A well-aligned corporate culture is considered essential to an organization's success. Deal and Kennedy

(2000) outlined a framework to describe various types of organizational culture. Law enforcement and military organizations are generally regarded as tough-guy/macho cultures, in which employees seek excitement and recognition and workers focus on the present rather than the future. In process cultures, excellence is valued, and employees focus on getting details right without necessarily measuring the actual outcome. Typically, one culture type has primacy in a given organization. When using this framework, my assessment is that the appropriate primary culture in the FBI is the tough-guy/macho culture, where agents assume high risks and earn high rewards. Although this culture type would have primacy, the FBI also embodies a process culture as a secondary culture type because the FBI's investigative work is methodical, orderly, and precise.

Because stability is a characteristic of bureaucratic organizations, change in these settings can result only when significant pressure is exerted. Tushman and Romanelli (1985) suggested a paradigm of punctuated equilibrium in which disruptive forces prompt broad organizational change. Gersick (1991) outlined how organizations can evolve when long periods of stability, or equilibrium, are punctuated by compact periods of metamorphic change, or revolution. In the present study, the integration of female agents into the FBI workforce represented a disruption that prompted organizational and culture change.

Summary of Research Methodology

Qualitative research is designed to understand people and the social and cultural contexts within which they live (Creswell, 2003). In order to understand the lived experiences of female FBI agents during a period of change in the FBI, a phenomenological approach to qualitative research informed the design for this interview study (Patton, 2002).

As discussed in Chapter 3, a phenomenon is “anything that presents itself to consciousness” that is of interest and is the result of lived experiences rather than second-hand experiences (Patton, 2002, p. 104), and phenomenological inquiry explores the meaning, structure, and essence lived experiences (Patton, 2002, p. 104). Phenomenological research is committed to understanding a social phenomenon from the research participants’ unique perspectives (Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

The theoretical framework and the literature review supported the research question and contributed to the conceptual framework of the study. Research sub-questions were developed during the literature review that contributed to the conceptual framework. Sub-questions focused on participants’ perceptions in three areas: self, career, and organization. Thus, sub-questions were designed to elicit knowledge about the participants’ perspectives as women, their experiences in a nontraditional occupation, and their perceptions as the first women leaders in the FBI. The sub-questions contributed to structuring the interview guide that was used in data collection.

Although a critical or feminist paradigm is often used in feminist studies, such an approach was not used as part of the research methodology for the present study. Instead, a qualitative interview study, using a constructivist paradigm, was selected as appropriate in order to place value on knowledge as a human construction and the belief that multiple realities exist (Hatch, 2002). This paradigm worked well with feminist standpoint theory. The decision was explained in Chapter 3. This paradigm allowed for participants to identify the areas, issues, and situations where gender was a factor in their careers.

My role as researcher and my personal *connoisseurship*, based on my experiences as a female FBI agent supervisor and as a woman, were described to provide context for the research

processes used (Eisner, 1998). In a self-audit, I disclosed my personal assumptions and how they needed to be transparent throughout the research study (Eisner, 1998).

Given my background as a retired female FBI agent and my continuing association with many former agents, I had unique access to lists of the first female agents and their contact information. The study sample was drawn from the group of the first 100 women who were hired and completed training as agents between 1972 and 1978. All of the participants met the required training, fitness, and firearms qualifications to complete training, they all worked as agents, and they all held supervisory positions during their careers. From among the first 100 female agents, 23 women met the study criteria, and 15 agreed to participate. Although two of the women invited to participate were Black, all who agreed to participate were White women. Because of our shared backgrounds, participants were very receptive to my invitations to be interviewed as part of the study. Of those contacted, four women never responded to my initial request to be interviewed, three agreed to participate but could not be scheduled within the data collection timeframe, and one declined to be interviewed.

The group of 15 participants constituted a purposive sample. Borrowing from an approach often used in feminist research, the methodology included an elite interview approach. This approach is often used to interview persons who are well informed in their particular community (Kezar, 2009; Tansey, 2007). Using semi-structured, open-ended interviews, the 15 participants were able to tell their stories from personal viewpoints, thus enabling others to relate to their lived experiences. Each interview lasted approximately 2 to 2½ hours. Participants shared their perspectives on being trailblazers in their roles as agents and as supervisors. Many shared their perspectives about gender and the FBI for the first time. The effort to build rapport in the interviews, through a process known as *phronesis*, was explained. This process is used by

an interviewer to recognize and respond to descriptions having importance in a given situation (Brickmann & Kvale, 2009).

Data were collected between December 2013 and April 2014. I travelled to the home cities of 13 participants to conduct interviews in person. I organized interview sessions into trips that corresponded to four geographic regions in the United States: the Northeast, the Northwest, the Southeast, and the Southwest. At their request, two participants were interviewed using a web-based, audio and video link. Skype and Face Time connections were used for those interviews.

The identities of all participants remained confidential. Each participant selected a pseudonym to be used for the interview from a list that was provided of the most popular female baby names in the year 1972. If a participant identified individuals by name in her interview, this information and other identifiers were removed from the first draft of the transcript. Each participant approved her own final transcript. Combined, the transcripts totaled 1100 pages of data.

Summary of Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using Eisner's (1998) educational criticism as the overarching framework for review. The four dimensions of educational criticism—description, interpretation, thematics, and evaluation—included other data analysis strategies that were compatible within this framework.

Hatch's (2002) typological analysis was used along with Eisner's (1998) description dimension of educational criticism. Typological analysis provided detailed description according to predetermined categories that were generated from the conceptual framework and the literature review. Data were coded to correspond with these categories. Additional codes

were created to correspond with whether experiences were reported early or late in the participants' careers; these data were valuable when analyzing participant's descriptions in leadership positions or when facing obstacles.

Hatch's (2002) interpretive analysis was used along with Eisner's (1998) interpretive dimension of educational criticism. The decision to use metaphors as a heuristic tool to aid in data analysis was explained. Metaphors facilitated the identification of patterns within the data and relationships among the data.

The final two dimensions of educational criticism—evaluation and thematics—were used as the final stages of analysis (Eisner, 1998). In the evaluation dimension, values were associated with the perceptions and experiences of participants as they related to other women and to organizations. In the thematics dimension, pervasive messages with the data, based on situations described by participants, were analyzed to identify themes; data that related specifically to the participants' female perspectives had been bracketed in earlier stages of data analysis to be used for thematics analysis.

Typological Analysis

Descriptive analysis was laborious, yet straightforward, in linking predetermined data categories from the conceptual framework to the data. The coding of data according to these categories allowed for retrieval of data excerpts from among the large volume of data in the transcripts. A summary of typological analysis follows in this section.

Typology 1—Women in nontraditional careers. Participants who chose nontraditional careers had early family support, particularly from their fathers. They grew up with a strong work ethic and felt confident working around men. They desired less traditional lives than other women around them. They wanted to be independent and self-sufficient in their careers. The

pay and benefits of the FBI were significant considerations when they decided to become agents.

Typology 2—Women achieving career self-efficacy. Participants recognized their place in history as the first female FBI agents. They were physically fit, self-confident, and hard working, and they took great pride in being agents. They felt scrutinized and often labeled, and they were highly averse to failure. Most had the support of some men. No formal mentoring was available. Shooting skills were helpful for some to earn early acceptance by men. Women were often assigned to less dangerous assignments.

Typology 3—Women as leaders. Most participants did not start with clear career objectives. The process for promotions was subjective, and women relied on men to promote them. They described a pervasive “good old boy” network that existed. Participants were often assigned to administrative leadership roles where many of them were relatively content. They described their strongest leadership characteristics as fairness, caring, approachability, and communication. They faced unique personal challenges as women that ranged from managing child care at home to sexism in the workplace. Many faced unexpected obstacles to career advancement at the end of their careers.

Typology 4—Women negotiating bureaucracy. Working within a bureaucracy, employees are expected to follow rules. In this study, women described the disparate effect of rules on them. Rules governed their height, the type of firearm they were issued, certain physical standards in training, the promotion process, evaluations of their performance, and the equal employment opportunity (EEO) process.

Participants worked for the FBI at the time a class action discrimination lawsuit was filed on behalf of many women; most participants did not join the class (*Hansen v. Webster*,

1986). In that matter, a federal court ruled that the FBI systematically discriminated against female agents in hiring, training, and assignments. Participants who filed individual EEO complaints did not feel the process worked well.

Interpretive Analysis

Interpretive analysis employed metaphors as linguistic tools to identify and facilitate the interpretation of patterns and relationships among the data related to “self,” “career,” and “organization,” as consistent with the primary research question. After outlining their heuristic value and the decision to use them to make connections among the data more accessible, the selection of metaphors to correspond to my theoretical framework were explained.

Supergirl metaphor. A *Supergirl* metaphor—to compare female agents to a female superhero—was used to interpret patterns in the data. Patterns with a focus on “self” were analyzed by applying feminist standpoint theory to the participants’ unique experiences (Smith, 1987).

Patterns were evident within participants’ unique perspectives as trailblazers. This knowledge was situated in a time of historical change for the FBI, and participants knew their success or failure would have an impact on future women. The duality of women’s roles was a clear pattern, as participants compartmentalized their masculine and feminine identities and let their masculine identities dominate on the job. In addition to their professional identities, many had strong gender identities in roles as mothers, wives, friends, sisters, and daughters. Patterns in the data included both biological and structural gender issues. The biggest biological issue related to decisions about having children. Structural issues included feelings of isolation and a pronounced lack of balance between the participants’ personal and professional lives.

Patterns about marginalization supported a claim that participants had positive

relationships with friends and colleagues, but women did not identify as a group with other women. Participants reported that, as women, they did not receive preferential treatment. The data indicated that early female agents were perceived by men to have lower status and to be less experienced than male agents, and thus they had less power than men in the organization.

Target metaphor. A *Target* metaphor—to compare the career trajectories of female agents to a bull’s eye target—was used to interpret patterns in the data by applying career self-efficacy theory to career and leadership decisions. These data had a primary focus on “career.” Participants described having to negotiate a largely unknown career path within a competitive male-dominated environment in order to advance. They described promotion decisions as largely subjective. Participants described the support of male counterparts as helpful to their success. Connections among hard work and perseverance, personal sacrifice, and career efficacy were supported by the data. Promotions, or changes in status, were a function of career success, networking, willingness to relocate, and timing. Participants described learning and maturing over time; their confidence levels were generally high but not always consistent.

Participants who faced career obstacles—and even personal attacks and criticism—late in their careers were emotionally devastated. The absence of female mentors fostered an environment where participants described feeling that they had minimal support from other female agents; thus, they relied on men for support.

Clubhouse metaphor. A *Clubhouse* metaphor—to compare the male-centric FBI bureaucracy to a men’s clubhouse—was used to interpret patterns in the data that primarily focused on “organization” and the gendering impact of women on the FBI.

Consistent with the reviewed literature regarding organizational culture, the FBI’s clubhouse primarily embodied a tough-guy/macho culture (Deal & Kennedy, 2000) that is

masculine at its core, with workers seeking rapid feedback, rapid reward, and high risk. Also consistent with the reviewed literature regarding female leadership in organizations, both the equal opportunities position and the meritocratic positions (Alvesson & Billings, 1997) were applicable to the data analyzed. Data revealed a pattern that participants worked to earn promotions, based on merit, in a bureaucracy that had previously provided no opportunities, much less equal opportunities, for women.

Key patterns among the data were that participants followed rules to be hired, to be trained, and to achieve career success, but rules often worked to their disadvantage. Gender disparities relating to hiring, training, and promotions were discussed in the context of litigation in the case of the Hansen discrimination lawsuit (*Hansen v. Webster*, 1986), and participants' lack of participation in that lawsuit. Other patterns reflected how participants adapted within the FBI to its masculine bureaucracy. Many participants were not aggressive in pushing for organizational change and increased gender equity.

Evaluation

The experiences of these early female FBI leaders supported the conclusion that women can make important contributions within highly gendered organizations. Data were evaluated as they reflected personal and organizational values. First, as women leaders, participants created a foothold for women and charted a path that enabled other women to follow; in doing so, their personal values were reflected; they served as moral agents for the next generation of women leaders. Second, these women were catalysts for organizational change, with an emphasis on diversity.

Moral obligation as female leaders. Regardless of their individual motivations and experiences, participants, as the first female leaders in the FBI, represented a moral obligation

that women have between and among themselves. The essential nature of social and moral values was supported by the research literature. In mainstream literature, John Dewey (1934) asserted the essential nature of moral understanding in decision-making and articulated an obligation for those in service to serve as moral agents for others. In feminist literature, Gilligan (1982) and Noddings (2003) presented the argument that women in leadership have an obligation to serve as moral agents for others.

Even though participants may not have shared the same experiences, they were representative of a special human capacity within women that resonated beyond their lives and their generation. When participants began their careers, few would have been in a position to reflect on their moral obligations as leaders for other women. Still, through their actions as leaders, they contributed to a shift in thinking such that, in their careers and in future generations, gender might be viewed as an asset and not as a liability.

Need for organizational diversity. Diversity has been broadly defined as a condition of acceptance of all characteristics and experiences, beyond issues of race and gender, by people as individuals (U. S. Department of Commerce, 2000). Further, this concept includes a commitment to diversity that can result in individual productivity, organizational effectiveness, and sustained competitiveness. This commitment is illustrated when attention is focused on creating equitable gender practices in the workforce and valuing the positive impact that female leaders can play in diverse organizations (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

Disruptions to organizations can result in changes to deep structure. The 1970s represented a period of change for the FBI when female agents disrupted the status quo. They served as *gendering agents* (Bartlett, 1990) who were contributed to the transition of the FBI bureaucracy into a more diverse workforce. As a group, the total number of female agents was

relatively small during the careers of the participants. Still, by virtue of their very presence, participants and other female agents challenged existing stereotypes and created conditions for organizational change. Tushman and Romanelli's (1985) model of punctuated equilibrium was used to describe how the inclusion of female agents into the FBI was instrumental to creating conditions for change in the deep structures of the bureaucracy.

Thematics

Thematics allow a researcher or connoisseur to identify themes in order to make naturalistic generalizations about situations (Eisner, 1998). In the present study, thematic analysis allowed for open expression of feminist themes based on pervasive messages contained in the data. Although the study did not have an overt feminist orientation or political agenda, thematic analysis allowed for the data to be considered as a whole in terms of modern feminist perspectives and ideologies. Based on the data, four themes were identified that relate to female leadership in nontraditional occupations within highly gendered bureaucracies.

Theme 1—Occupational pride as women. Among the most pervasive messages in the data was the occupational pride felt by participants regarding their careers as FBI agents. Until the 1970s, perspectives of working women had been overlooked, and faulty assumptions were made about women's true capabilities (Kanter, 1977). Participants in the present study challenged the traditional assumptions that women were not capable of working in dangerous, nontraditional occupations like the FBI. Although participants acknowledged concerns about failure, they were consistently loyal to the FBI and their coworkers, they were resilient to pressure, and they were unaccepting of failure. Despite facing obstacles, participants were extremely proud of their accomplishments as the FBI's first female agents and first female leaders. This shared sense of occupational pride by the women was accompanied by their keen

knowledge that their experiences would help generations of women to follow.

Theme 2—Challenge to manage multiple roles. Another pervasive message in the data was that these women were challenged to successfully manage complex experiences. Reality is socially constructed, and gender is a complex, social construction (Berger & Luckman, 1966). For the participants, managing the roles and demands of complex lives as female agents, as supervisors, and as women was not easy. As agents, they succeeded in a wide variety of assignments, and they were able to work well with their male colleagues. In their efforts to prove themselves, they described feeling that their successes were temporal and that they worked harder than many of the men. As leaders, they demonstrated abilities as effective, caring, and even transformational leaders. At times, participants had to address sexist behavior from coworkers and supervisors. As women, their careers meant that they often had to make personal sacrifices, and their lives lacked balance. Many described having little to no personal life or having difficulty balancing roles as mother, child, spouse, or friend. Participants were often forced to make difficult personal decisions about whether to seek promotions. Despite different personal paths, career routes, and varying levels of success, they were determined to overcome these challenges.

Theme 3—Inadequate support through relationships. Another pervasive theme within the data was that participants did not have adequate support in their professional relationships with both women and men. Many participants described being assigned to administrative roles as supervisors; many acknowledged that they willingly gravitated toward those roles without the benefit of connections or a network to support them. Formal mentoring was nonexistent. Informal role models were mostly men. The absence of relationships with other women promoted separation and silence on issues of importance to women. Women

sometimes felt they were in competition with each other. The lack of relationship support was particularly clear when many women faced late career obstacles and they felt isolated from coworkers. This theme emphasizes the importance of personal and professional relationships — with both men and other women—for women to be empowered as leaders in nontraditional occupations.

Theme 4—Inconsistency in feminist views. The choice by any woman to acknowledge herself as a feminist in the 1970s was a deeply personal one, but it may also have been a practical decision. Today, this choice is still difficult for many modern women. Participants described having mixed feelings about feminism, but they acknowledged supporting many of its goals. For example, they agreed that women deserved equal work opportunities. Thus, they were aligned with the liberal feminist approach that considers subordination of women to be related to lack of opportunities (Grana, 2010).

Being known as a feminist in the 1970s may not have helped participants and other female agents assimilate into the FBI. Choosing to ignore, or being silent to, sexism and discrimination in the workplace could be regarded as a reasonable decision that a woman would have made in order to protect and advance her individual interests.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of research studies center on study considerations that cannot be controlled and they typically relate to the process of drawing appropriate generalizations based on data analysis (Patton, 2002). They arise as a consequence of the deliberate design of a study. Limitations are dependent upon the type of data collection strategies used.

Like all research, the present study had unique boundaries and limitations. Several limitations could relate to the design of the study and were outside my control. The study was

framed within a particular time in FBI and American history. The study focused on women in only one law enforcement organization. The purposive sample included only White women because the few potential Black participants did not participate. Limitations could relate to other external pressures on the FBI at the time that had nothing to do with gender; these pressures might include political pressures on the FBI or changes in leadership after Director Hoover's death. Limitations could also relate to the consideration that some male agents may have had career experiences similar to female agents.

With the research itself, limitations could relate to validity and reliability because this research would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to replicate (Simon & Goes, 2013). Limitations could relate to the collection and analysis of data in several ways. Data could have been skewed if women were guarded in their responses or if their memories were not clear or accurate. Participants could have been guarded when asked about their feminist perspectives, or they could have been concerned that former colleagues might be able to identify them through their stories. Participants could have become uncomfortable during the interviews, or they could have proceeded hesitantly without acknowledging discomfort. Data could have been skewed if participants did not voice the full range of their experiences, whether positive or negative. Finally, data could have been skewed in the web-based interviews, where nonverbal cues were less apparent than in in-person interviews. Every effort was made to assure that data were not skewed or misinterpreted and that generalizations are plausible (Simon & Goes, 2013). The data collected were an accurate representation of the perceptions of participants at a moment in time and to the degree that they were willing to share them.

Delimitations are research considerations that can be controlled but it may not be possible to do so. Unlike limitations, which flow from implicit characteristics of method and design,

delimitations result from specific choices by the researcher (Simon & Goes, 2013). Three delimitations for the present study have been acknowledged that could not be reasonably constrained.

First, this study focused on experiences of past FBI female leaders, and, therefore, study data may not be directly compared to today's FBI female leaders. Indeed, the context of hiring, training, promotions, and evaluations in the FBI is different today than it was 40 years ago. Second, research literature about women in nontraditional careers is abundant, but research literature about FBI women is not. Female FBI agents have been mentioned in studies, and some have written biographies, but no scholarly research focused solely on female FBI agents could be located. Third, the study design and data analysis strategies used may have overlooked other approaches that could have provided insight into the experiences of early FBI women related to race, sexual orientation, or family issues.

Implications for Educational Leadership

Despite progress over the last 40 years, the growing number and presence of women in masculine leadership roles still evokes strong, negative responses from men (Center for Military Readiness, 2011). Until the 1970s, most scholars adopted a male perspective to explain how organizations functioned; thus, they tacitly contributed to the perpetuation of gender inequities in society (Calas & Smircich, 1992; Martin, 2000). Since then, gender-specific research has helped to slow the perpetuation of gender stereotypes and male-centric research bias. The present study was rooted in the beliefs that gender-specific research can highlight the occupational challenges faced by women, add awareness to issues related to gender equality in the workplace, and promote additional scholarship about female leadership (Calas & Smircich, 1992).

Bush, Bell, and Middlewood (2010) promoted a broad perspective on educational leadership that emphasizes moral and ethical leadership, leadership for diversity, and professional development for leaders. Based on data analyzed in the present study, these concepts of educational leadership can be applied to the experiences of female leaders in highly gendered bureaucratic institutions. Learning how women adapt and lead within such organizations enhances feminist scholarship and the field of educational leadership (Martin, 2000).

The connection between the present study and educational leadership as a profession is found in the knowledge that women can effectively navigate bureaucracy. As a result of this research, three implications for educational leadership were identified that can influence educational and institutional practices.

1. Institutions that support equal opportunity should regularly review performance practices to assure gender equity. It was not enough for the FBI to simply open its doors to women. Leaders in bureaucratic, male-centric organizations like the FBI must examine personnel practices related to hiring, training, assignments, evaluations, and promotions to assure they are mission-oriented, legally defensible, and gender-equitable. Government and institution leaders must strive to improve any policies and personnel practices that have a disparate impact on recruitment, retention, and promotion of women, and these practices must be reviewed periodically to assess progress and to evaluate strategies. Removing barriers to advancement will send a powerful message to young women that their career potential is unlimited.

2. Institutions that support equal opportunity should promote meaningful mentoring and professional development programs that will enhance leadership pathways. In order to recruit and retain the best possible leaders, institutions must implement formal and informal mentoring

programs that will encourage and prepare future leaders and will assure organizational continuity. The results from this study indicate that institutions can and should offer professional development and mentoring programs for law enforcement personnel, both male and female, at the local, state, and federal levels. As part of these programs, mentors must identify and assist potential female leaders so that they can broaden their experiences beyond administrative assignments.

3. Institutions that support equal opportunity should promote organizational cultures that embrace diversity. Greater institutional diversity is needed both in the representation of women in assignments and the representation of women in numbers. In other words, simply having women represented in institutions is not enough. In order for organizations to effectively serve broad, public constituencies, today's leaders—male and female—must recognize, create, and support organizational cultures that embrace diversity.

Recommendations for Future Studies

Based on the present study, several recommendations for further research could inform scholars, executives, leaders, and students at educational and other institutions. This study supports four recommendations for future research.

First, research to examine the impact of greater numbers of women in law enforcement organizations is necessary. Prior to 1972, all FBI agents were male, and, today, 19 percent of the all FBI agents are female (FBI, 2015c). The percentage of women in the American workforce has increased from 38 percent in 1970, to 47 percent in 2014 (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015). As almost half of the Americans in the workforce are now women (Department of Labor, 2015) and, as more young women embark on careers in nontraditional occupations, the number of women in

law enforcement careers will increase in future decades. These trends, and the reasons why many young women gravitate toward nontraditional occupations, are worth examining.

Second, further research to better understand the differences in leadership between men and women is necessary. Over the last 40 years, women have overcome structural, societal, and individual obstacles in order to ascend to leadership positions in the American workforce (White House Project, 2010). At the same time, gender-specific leadership studies have determined that women and men lead differently. Women leaders often demonstrate different values than men, characterized by interdependence, cooperation, receptivity, and acceptance (Marshall, 1984). Women leaders are often better equipped than men to build inclusive, collaborative, and rewarding organizations where employees on every level can perform optimally (Kabacoff, 2000; Heidensohn, 1996). Additional gender-specific research that explores how women lead, specifically in nontraditional organizations, can add to female scholarship.

Third, further research is necessary in order to understand the connection between operational assignments in some nontraditional careers and promotions for women. For example, in the military and in law enforcement, research has pointed to a clear gender gap in the promotion pathways that are available to men who have served in operational environments (McSally, 2007). Data in the present study suggested the possibility of a similar gap related to operational experience in the FBI. Research to determine connections among operational assignments, gender, and promotion would add to scholarship about female leadership.

Finally, qualitative and quantitative research about women in nontraditional careers should continue and should also include issues of race, sexual orientation, and family. For example, most of the early female agents were White women, and all participants in the present study were White. Further study on the unique perspectives of Black female leaders would add

to existing knowledge regarding female leadership. In addition, data excerpts did suggest that personal factors, such as sexual orientation, marriage, and motherhood, played a role in some of the participants' career decisions; these data were reported in data analysis but were not the focus of the study; thus, these issues warrant additional research.

Conclusions

This qualitative research study was an important step in understanding the perspectives of the first female leaders in the FBI regarding their work experiences in a masculine bureaucracy. Participants played an historic role as trailblazers and leaders during a period of change in the FBI. Using the processes of educational criticism, themes were identified to distill the following conclusions from the data (Eisner, 1998).

1. *Women can effectively navigate bureaucracy.* Participants in this study were among a very small number of women to be successful as the first female agents and supervisors in the previously male-dominated FBI bureaucracy. Many other women never had the opportunity to do so, and many others failed while trying. When the FBI started to hire female agents, participants accepted the challenge to be agents without hesitation. During their careers, they willingly overcame challenge after challenge. In 1972, when their male colleagues referred to participants as part of "the Female Experiment," they knew that many men believed they would not succeed at work tasks or be able to function within the FBI's bureaucracy. The career success of the participants, as supported by the data, provided evidence that they could do both.
2. *Career satisfaction can occur despite obstacles.* Most participants were satisfied with their careers despite facing unforeseen obstacles. When reflecting on their lives, it was evident that participants had achieved their stated, early life objectives by having careers as FBI agents. They described being eager to have careers in the FBI. They described their wishes, as young

women, to lead interesting lives, to find adventure, and to be self-sufficient. They described wanting alternatives to traditional careers, such as in teaching and nursing. In terms of their careers, they described pride and contentment in their experiences. They led their lives on their own terms and were in control of their choices and decision-making.

3. *Potential exists among female leaders.* Although participants could not have predicted the challenges they would face, they described feeling competent and confident as agents and as supervisors. Many described themselves as the hardest working agents they knew. They demonstrated perseverance and passion, in terms of grit, and many possessed high career self-efficacy beliefs. Most never questioned their ability to perform well as supervisors. Where many in the FBI questioned whether women could even be successful as agents, participants demonstrated the potential of women, not only to excel as agents, but also to excel as leaders.
4. *Empowerment can occur through mentoring and relationships.* Participants described having some support through relationships, but most of them charted their careers without the benefit of formal mentoring. Many described feeling isolated and alone. Because their supervisors were men, informal career support for participants typically came from men. With access to formal mentoring and support through relationships with men and women, female leaders can be empowered to achieve greater success.
5. *Women can be feminists through action.* In their descriptions, participants did not decide to become FBI agents to further feminist agendas. In fact, most of them did not describe themselves as feminists, and many rejected the feminist label. Still, all of the participants recognized the exciting opportunity that was created for them when legal mandates opened the doors of the FBI to women. Though their hard work and success as agents and leaders, participants demonstrated the importance of gender equity. Although their efforts may not have

always been purposeful or conscious, the trailblazers interviewed for the present study acted as gendering agents within the FBI's bureaucracy, and they were feminists through their collective action.

6. *Gender matters.* Although it is not always clear to what degree gender matters, it is clear that gender does play a key role in the work experiences of both men and women. For women in the workplace, disparate personnel practices, along with perceptions of isolation, tokenism, and sexism, are underlying issues that impact the recruitment and retention of women both as workers and as leaders. However, the present study offers evidence that female leaders can overcome these disparate practices, and they can add value to their organizations *because* they are capable and caring women. Gender matters because of the transformational ways that women interact with others and because of women's ethics of caring for others.

7. *Organizational diversity matters.* Data in the present study were clear and compelling that participants personally encountered gender inequity, and they reported on similar experiences of other women in this regard. Institutions in government and education must accept responsibility in countering gender and other forms of institutional inequity, and they can do so by promoting and supporting diversity. Through shifts in their deep cultures and structures, traditionally male organizations are making progress, but they need to do more to promote diverse work environments that are free of institutional inequity. Thus, diverse organizations can build unified workforces that are better equipped to serve their constituencies and the general public.

Summary of Chapter 5

This final chapter summarized the problem statement, the central research question and sub-questions, the related literature, and the methodology for the study. It then presented a summary discussion of data analysis, major themes that were developed, limitations and

delimitations of the study, implications for educational leadership, recommendations for further research, and final conclusions.

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4(2), 139-158.
- Acker, J. (2006). *Class questions: Feminist answers*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Alice Paul Institute (2013). The Equal Rights Amendment. Retrieved from <http://www.equalrightsamendment.org/overview.htm>
- Allmendinger, J., & Hackman, R. J. (1995). The more the better: A four-nation study of the inclusion of women. *Social Forces*, 74, 423-460.
- Alvesson, M., & Billing, Y. D. (1997). *Understanding gender and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- American Association of University Women (AAUW). (1992). *How schools shortchange girls*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Appelrouth, S., & Edles, L. D. (2007). *Sociological theory in the contemporary era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Aspin, L. (1994, January 13). *Direct ground combat definition and assignment rule* (Memorandum). Washington, DC: Secretary of Defense. Retrieved from <http://www.govexec.com/pdfs/031910d1.pdf>
- Baier, A. (1985). *Postures of the mind: Essays on mind and morals*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.
- Bartlett, K. T. (1990). Feminist legal methods. *Harvard Law Review*, 103(4), 829-888.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Shatter the glass ceiling: Women may make better managers. *Human Resource Management*, 33(4), 549-560.
- Beasley, C. (1999). *What is feminism?* New York, NY: Sage.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1997). *Women's ways of knowing; Development of self, voice and mind*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Belknap, J. (2007). *The invisible woman: Gender crime and justice* (3rd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Wadsworth.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Berkowitz, A. (2014, July 24). The "F Word." *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/allison-berkowitz/feminism-an-f-word-for-all_b_5615295.html
- Bern, S. L. (1981). *Bern sex role inventory professional manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Betz, N. E., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1987). *The career psychology of women*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Betz, N. E., & Hackett, G. (1981). The relationship of career-related self-efficacy expectations to perceived career options in college women and men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28(5), 399-410.

- Betz, N. E., & Taylor, K. M. (2001). *Manual for the career decision self-efficacy scale and CDMSE-Short Form*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Blickenstaff, J. C. (2005). Women and science careers: Leaky pipeline or gender filter? *Gender and Education*, 17(4), 369-386.
- Bloch, P. B., & Anderson, D. (1974). *Policewomen on patrol: Final report*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Brandser, G. C. (1996). Women—The new heroes of the business world? *Women in Management Review*, 11(2), 3-17.
- Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Brooks, A. B. (2007). Feminist standpoint epistemology. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & A. B. Brooks (Eds.), *Feminist research practice* (pp. 53-82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bryson, J. M. (2004). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bumiller, E., & Shanker, T. (2013, January 23). Pentagon is set to lift combat ban for women. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/24/us/pentagon-says-it-is-lifting-ban-on-women-in-combat.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
- Burton, R. M., deSanctis, G., & Obel, B. (2011). *Organizational design: A step-by-step approach* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Burton, B. K., & Dunn, C. P. (1996). Feminist ethics as moral grounding for stakeholder theory. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 6, 133-147.

- Bush, D., & Simmons, R. (1987). Gender and coping with the entry into early adolescence. In R. Barnett, L. Biener, & G. Baruch (Eds.), *Gender and stress* (pp. 185-211). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bush, T., Bell, L., & Middlewood, D. (Eds.). (2010). *The principles of educational leadership and management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Carlson, A. C. (2003). *The family in America: Searching for social harmony in the industrial age*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Carpenter, J. (2008). Metaphors in qualitative research: Shedding light or casting shadows? *Research in Nursing and Health*, 31, 274-282.
- Cassidy, M., Nicholl, C. G., & Ross, C. R. (2001). *Results of a survey conducted by the Metropolitan Police Department of victims who reported violence against women*. (Executive Summary). Washington, DC: Metropolitan Police Department
- Center for Military Readiness. (2011). Women in Combat. Retrieved from <http://www.cmrlink.org/content/women-in-combat>
- Chesler, N. C., & Chesler, M. A. (2002). Gender-informed mentoring strategies for women engineering scholars: On establishing a caring community. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 91(1), 49-55.
- Clement, S. (1987). The self-efficacy expectations and occupational preferences of females and males. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60(3), 257-265.
- Clopton, N. A., & Sorell, G. T. (1993). Gender differences in moral reasoning: Stable or situational? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 17(1), 85-101.

- Colley, A., Mulhern, G., Maltby, J., & Wood, A. M. (2009). The short form BSRI: Instrumentality, expressiveness and gender associations among a United Kingdom sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 384-387.
- Collins, G. (2009). *When everything changed: The amazing journey of American women from 1960 to the present*. New York, NY: Back Bay Books.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society*, 19(6), 829-859.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI): Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resource.
- Cott, N. F. (1997). *The grounding of modern feminism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Crotty, M. J. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Curie, E. (1938). *Madame Curie: A biography by Eve Curie* (1938). Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, Doran, & Company.
- Danner, M. (1989). Socialist feminism: A brief introduction. *The Critical Criminologist*, 1(3), 1-2.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (2000). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.
- D'Agostino, M. J. & Levine, H. (2011). *Women in public administration: Theory and practice*. Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett.

- de Beauvoir, S. (1949). *The second sex*. (C. Borde & S. Malovany-Chevallier, Trans.) New York, NY: Random House.
- De Lair, H. A., & Erwin, E. (2000). Working perspectives within feminism and early childhood education. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 1(2), 153-170.
- Dervin, B. (1983, May). *An overview of sense-making research: Concepts, methods, and results*. Paper presented at meeting of the International Communication Association, Dallas, TX.
- Dewey, J. (1903). *Ethical principles underlying education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelley, D. R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9, 1087-1101.
- Dorn, E., & Graves, H. D. (2000, February). *American military culture in the 21st century*. Retrieved from Center for Strategic and International Studies website: <http://www.csis.org/pubs/am21exec.html>.
- Duska, R., & Whelan, M. (1975). *Moral development: A guide to Piaget and Kohlberg*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(4), 569-591. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569
- Eagly, A. H., & Sczesny, S. (2009). Stereotypes about women, men, and leaders: Have times changed? In M. Barreto, M. K. Ryan, & M. T. Schmitt (Eds.), *The glass ceiling in the 21st century: Understanding barriers to gender equality* (pp. 21–47). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Books. doi:10.1037/11863-002

- Eccles, J. S. (1994). Understanding women's educational and occupational choices: Applying the Eccles et al. models of achievement related choices. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18(4), 585-609.
- Eisner, E. W. (1998). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Ericsson, K. A. (2005). Recent advances in expertise research: A commentary on the contributions to the special issue. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 19(2), 233-241.
- Farganis, S. (1994). *Situating feminism: From thought to action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2015a). *A byte out of history: "Machine Gun" Kelley and the legend of the G-Men*. Retrieved from <http://www.fbi.gov/news/stories/2003/september/kelly092603>
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2015b). *Celebrating women Special Agents: How a former nun became an FBI agent*. Retrieved from <http://www.fbi.gov/news/stories/2012/july/celebrating-women-special-agents-part-2-the-pioneers/joanne-pierce-misko-how-a-former-nun-became-an-fbi-agent>
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2015c). *Celebrating women Special Agents. Part 1: May 12, 1972—A new chapter is opened*. Retrieved from http://www.fbi.gov/news/stories/2012/may/women-agents_051612
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2015d). *FBI jobs*. Retrieved from <http://www.fbi.gov>
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2015e). *Short history of the FBI*. Retrieved from <http://www.fbi.gov>

- Felder, R. M., Felder G. N., Mauney, M., Hamrin, C. E., & Dietz E. J. (1995). A longitudinal study of engineering student performance and retention: Gender differences in student performance and attitudes. *Journal of Engineering Education* 84(2), 151-163.
- Ferguson, K. E. (1984). *The feminist case against bureaucracy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Fidler, G. S., & Velde, B. P. (1999). *Activities: Reality and symbol*. Thorofare, NJ: Slack.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., & Crites, J. O. (1980). Toward a career psychology of women: What do we know? What do we need to know? *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 27, 44-62.
- Fondas, N. (1997). Feminism unveiled: Management qualities in contemporary writings. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 257-282.
- Forret, M. L., & Dougherty, T. W. (2004). Networking behaviors and career outcomes: Differences for men and women? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 419-437.
- Foss, C. J., & Slaney, R. B. (1986). Increasing nontraditional career choices in women: Relation of attitudes toward women and responses to a career intervention. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 28, 191-202.
- Friedan, B. (1963). *The feminine mystique*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- G-Man. (n.d). In *Merriam-Webster's online dictionary* (11th ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/g-man>
- Galton, F. (1892/2000). *Hereditary genius: An inquiry into its laws and consequences*. London, England: Macmillan.
- Garrison, C. G., Grant, N., & McCormick, K. (1998). Utilization of policewomen. *The Police Chief*, 32(7), 4.
- Gergen, K. J. (1994). *Toward transformation in social knowledge*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Gergen, M. (2000). *Feminist reconstructions in psychology: Narrative, gender, and performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gersick, C.J.G. (1991). Revolutionary change theories: A multilevel exploration of the punctuated equilibrium paradigm. *The Academy of Management Review*, 16(1), 10–36.
- Giles, M., & Rea, A. (1999). Career self-efficacy: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(3), 393-398.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Physiological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glaser, D. F., & Saxe, S. (1982). Psychological preparation of female police recruits. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 51(1), 5-7.
- Graham, L. P. (1997). *Profiles of persistence: A qualitative study of undergraduate women in engineering* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 304372437)
- Graglia, F. C. (1998). *Domestic tranquility: A brief against feminism*. Dallas, TX: Spence.
- Grana, S. J. (2010). *Women and justice* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gray, L. P. (1972, May 12). *L. Patrick Gray, III, Acting Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, today announced that women applicants will now be considered for the FBI Special Agent position* (Press Release). Retrieved from the Federal Bureau of Investigation website: https://www.fbi.gov/news/stories/2012/may/women-agents_051612/women-agents_051612
- Grennan, S. A. (1987). Findings on the role of officer gender in violent encounters with citizens. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 15(1), 78-85.

- Hannah, J. A. S., & Kahn, S. E. (1989). The relationship of socioeconomic status and gender to the occupational choices of grade 12 students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 34(2), 161-178.
- Hansen v. Webster, 41 Fair Empl. Prac. Cas. (BNA) 214, Civ. A. No. 84-3026 (D. D.C. 1986)
- Harding, S. (1987). *Feminism and methodology*. Bloomington, IN: University Press.
- Harding, S. (1992). Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is “strong objectivity”? *Centennial Review*, 36(3), 437-470.
- Harding, S. (2004). How standpoint methodology informs philosophy of social methodology. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Approaches to qualitative research: A reader on theory and practice* (pp. 62-80). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Harrell, M. C., & Miller, L. L. (1997). *New opportunities for military women: Effects upon readiness, cohesion, and morale* (Research Report No. MR-896-OSD). Retrieved from Rand Corporation website: http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR896.html
- Harrell, M. C., Beckett, M. K., Chien, C. S., & Sollinger, J. M. (2002). *The status of gender integration in the military: Analysis of selected occupations* (Research Report No. MR-1380-OSD). Retrieved from Rand Corporation website: http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1380.html
- Hart, J. L. (2001, June). *Mobilization among women academics: The interplay between feminism and professionalism*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Richmond, VA.
- Hartsock, N. (1983). The feminist standpoint. In S. Harding & M. B. Hintikka (Eds.), *Discovering reality: Feminist perspectives in epistemology, metaphysics, methodology, and philosophy of science* (pp. 283-310), Dordrecht, Netherlands: D. Riedel Publishing.

- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hegewisch, A., & Liepmann, H. (2010, March). *The gender wage gap by occupation* (Fact Sheet C350a). Retrieved from Institute for Women's Policy Research website:
<http://www.iwpr.org/publications/pubs/the-gender-wage-gap-by-occupation>
- Helms Mills, J. C., & Mills, A. J. (2000). Rules, sensemaking, formative contexts, and discourse in the gendering of organizational culture. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. M. Wildrom, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate* (pp. 55-70), Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Heidensohn, F. (1996). *Women in control: The role of women in law enforcement*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hoover, J. E. (1971, March 11). *Justification for limiting the position of Special Agent of the FBI to males* (Memorandum). Washington, DC: Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- Horne, P. (1980). *Women in law enforcement*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Howe, K., & Eisenhart, M. (1990). Standards for qualitative (and quantitative) research: A prolegomenon. *Educational Researcher*, 19(4), 2-9.
- Hunt, J. C. (1990). The logic of sexism among police. *Women & criminal justice*, 1(2), 3-30.
- Huntington, S. P. (1957). *The soldier and the state: The theory and politics of civil-military relations*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Hyde, J. S., Lindberg, S. M., Linn, M. C., Ellis, A. B., & Williams, C. C. (2008). Gender similarities characterize math performance. *Science*, 321(5888), 494-495.
- Jacobs, J. (1995). Gender and academic specialties: Trends among recipients of college degrees in the 1980s. *Sociology of Education*, 68, 81-98.

- Jaggar, A. M., & Bordo, S. R. (Eds.). (1990). *Gender/body/knowledge: Feminist reconstructions of being and knowing*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers State University.
- Jaggar, A. M., & Rothenberg, P. S. (1993). *Feminist frameworks: Alternative theoretical accounts of the relations between women and men*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Janesick, V. (1994). The dance of qualitative research design: Metaphor, methodolatry, and meaning. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 209-219). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kabacoff, R. I. (2000). *Gender and leadership in the corporate boardroom*. Portland, ME: Management Research Group.
- Kamarck, K. (2015). *Women in combat: Issues for Congress*. (CRS Report No. 7-5700). Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.
- Kanter, R. M. (1975). *Women and the structure of organizations: Explorations in theory and behavior*. New York, NY: Doubleday Anchor.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Women and men of the corporation*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kellerman, B., & Rhode, D. L. (2007). *Women and leadership: The state of play and strategies for change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kezar, A. (2009). Change in higher education: Not enough, or too much?. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 41(6), 18-23.
- Keohane, N. O., Rosaldo, M. Z., & Gelpi, B. C. (1982). *Feminist theory: A critique of ideology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Klenke, K. (1996). *Women and leadership: A contextual perspective*. New York, NY: Springer.

- Koertge, N. (2006). Critical perspectives on feminist epistemology. *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kohlberg, L. (1958/1985). Kohlberg's moral stages. In W. C. Crain (Ed.), *Theories of development*. (pp. 118-136). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Krauss, S. E. (2005). Research paradigms and meaning making: A primer. *The Qualitative Report*, 10(4), 758-770.
- Krolokke, C. (2005). Three waves of feminism: From suffragettes to grrls. In C. Krolokke, A. S. Sorenson, & A. S. Sorensen (Eds.), *Gender communication theories and analyses: From silence to performance* (pp. 1-24). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (with Tesch, R.). (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (2nd ed.). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Leder, D. (1990). *The absent body*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Leech, B. L. (2002). Interview methods in political science. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35(4), 663-688.
- Letarte, D. C. (1992). *An expression of femininity: The delimiting role of female socialization in the career choice process* (Unpublished master's thesis). Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL.
- Lichtblau, E. (2001, May 1). FBI settles Black agents' discrimination lawsuit. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://articles.latimes.com/2001/may/01/news/mn-57894>
- Levin, J., Wyckoff, J., & Hussey, R. (1994). What students should know about engineering. *The Science Teacher*, 61, 26-29.

- LaFollette, M. C. (1988). Eyes on the stars: Images of women scientists in popular magazines. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 13(4), 262-275.
- Longino, H. E. (1993). Feminist standpoint theory and the problems of knowledge. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society*, 19(1), 201-212.
- Lonsway, K., Aguirre, P., Gilliams, N., Lukens, A., Tejani, S., Moore, M., . . . Spillar, K. (2003a). *Under scrutiny: The effect of consent decrees on the representation of women in sworn law enforcement* (Report). Retrieved from National Center for Women and Policing website: <http://womenandpolicing.com/pdf/Fullconsentdecreestudy.pdf>
- Lonsway, K., Moore, M., Harrington, P., Smeal, E., & Spillar, K. (2003b). *Hiring & retaining more women: The advantages to law enforcement agencies* (Research Report, Spring 2003). Retrieved from National Center for Women and Policing website: <http://womenandpolicing.com>
- Macionis, J. J., & Gerber, L. M. (2011). *Sociology*. Toronto, Ontario: Pearson.
- Macionis, J. J. (2004). *Society: The basics*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1989). *Toward a feminist theory of the state*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Manning, L. (2010). *Women in the military: Where they stand* (7th ed.). Washington, DC: Women's Research and Education Institute.
- Marshall, J. (1984). *Women managers: Travellers in a male world*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Martin, J. (2000). Hidden gendered assumptions in mainstream organizational theory and research. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9, 207-216.

- Martin, S. E., (1982). *Breaking and entering: Policewomen on patrol*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Martin, S. E. (1990). *On the move: The status of women in policing*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Martin, S. E., & Jurik, N. C. (2006). *Doing justice, doing gender: Women in law and criminal justice occupations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McChesney, K. (1987). *Organizational and vocational characteristics of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Special Agent position that motivate men and women to select careers as FBI Special Agents* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 8807212)
- McCracken, G. (1988). *The long interview: Qualitative research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McDaniels, C., & Gysbers, N. C. (1992). *Counseling for career development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McSally, M. (2007). Women in combat: Is the current policy obsolete? *Duke Journal of Gender Law and Policy*, 14, 1011-1058.
- Melchionne, T. M. (1974). Changing role of policewomen, *Police Journal*, 47(4), 340-358.
- Merriam, S. B. (Ed.). (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merton, R. K., Fiske, M., & Kendall, P. L. (1990). *The focused interview: A manual of problems and procedures*. London, England: Collier McMillan.
- Metaphor (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster's online dictionary* (11th ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/metaphor>

- Miegs, C. D. (1859). *Woman: Her diseases and remedies: A series of letters to his class*. Philadelphia, PA: Blanchard & Lea.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC). (2010, November). *Women in combat: Legislation and policy, perceptions, and the current operational environment*. Arlington, VA: Author.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC). (2011, March). *From representation to inclusion: Diversity leadership for the 21st century military*. Arlington, VA: Author.
- Mills, A. J. (1988). Organization, gender and culture. *Organization Studies*, 9(3), 351-369.
- Minogue, K. (2001). How civilizations fall. *New Criterion—New York*, 19(8), 4-14.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations: Synthesis of the research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Monastersky, R. (2005). The number that's devouring science. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(8), A12.
- Mooney, R. L. (1975). The researcher himself. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (pp. 173-207). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Morgan, D. L. (1988). *Focus groups as qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Morgan, E. (2015, May 13). CBS announces Fall 2015 schedule: Supergirl flies into action on Mondays and established dramas usher in new additions. *Headlines and Global News*. Retrieved from <http://www.hngn.com/articles/91714/20150513/cbs-announces-fall-2015-schedule-supergirl-life-pieces-code-black-limitless-angel-hell.htm>

- Morrison, A. (1992). *The new leaders: Guidelines on leadership diversity in America*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mroz, J. (2008, April 6). Female police chiefs, a novelty no more. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/06/nyregion/nyregionspecial2/06Rpolice.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
- Myers, D. G. (1992). *Psychology* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Worth.
- Nauta, M. M., & Epperson, D. L. (2003). A longitudinal examination of the social cognitive model applied to high school girls' choice of non-traditional college majors and aspirations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 448-457.
- Nauta, M. M., Epperson, D. L., & Waggoner, K. M. (1999). Perceived causes of success and failure: Are women's attributions related to persistence in engineering majors? *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 36(6), 663-676.
- Nelson, J. A., (1997). Feminism, ecology, and the philosophy of economics. *Ecological Economics*, 20, 155-162.
- Nesdale, D., & Pinter, K. (2000). Self-efficacy and job-seeking activities in unemployed ethnic youth. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(5), 608-614.
- Nevill, D. D., & Schlecker, D. I. (1988). The relation of self-efficacy and assertiveness to willingness to engage in traditional/nontraditional career activities. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 12(1), 91-98.
- Niles, S. G., & Sowa, C. J. (1992). Mapping the nomological network of career self-efficacy. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 41(1), 13-21.

- Noddings, N. (1990). Feminist critiques in the professions. *Review of Research in Education*, 16, 393-424.
- Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- O'Brien, K. M., & Fassinger, R. E. (1993). A causal model of the career orientation and career choice of adolescent women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 40, 456-469.
- Odendahl, T., & Shaw, A. M. (2002). Interviewing elites. In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and methodology* (pp. 299-316). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Oldfather, P., & West, J. (1994). Qualitative research as jazz. *Educational Researcher*, 23(8), 22-26.
- Oliver, P. (2006). Purposive sampling. In V. Jupp (Ed.), *The Sage dictionary of social research methods* (p. 245). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Osborn, S. M., & Harris, G. G. (1975). *Assertive training for women*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Our Gang Wiki (2016). He-Man Woman-Haters Club. Retrieved January 1, 2016, from http://ourgang.wikia.com/wiki/He-Man_Woman-Haters_Club
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perry, W. G. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Peshkin, A. (1988). In search of subjectivity—One's own. *Educational Researcher*, 17(7), 17-21.

- Pfeffer, J., & Davis-Blake, A. (1987). The effect of the proportion of women on salaries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29(32), 1-24.
- Piaget, J. (1981). *Intelligence and affectivity: Their relationship during child development*. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Pinnick, C. L. (2008). Science education for women: Situated cognition, feminist standpoint theory, and the status of women in science. *Science & Education*, 17(10), 1055-1063.
- Plumwood, V. (1993). *Feminism and the mastery of nature*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Powell, G. N. (2010). *Women and men in management*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Price, B. F. (1996). Female police officers in the United States. In M. Pagon (Ed.), *Policing in Central and Eastern Europe: Comparing firsthand knowledge with experience from the west*. Ljubljana, Slovenia: College of Police & Security Studies.
- Prokos, A., & Padavic, I. (2002). "There oughtta be a law against bitches": Masculinity lessons in police academy training. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 9(4), 439-459.
- Reinke, S., & Miller, R. D. (2011). *Women in public administration: Theory and practice*. Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett.
- Rittmayer, A. D., & Beier, M. E. (2009). Overview: Self-efficacy in STEM. In B. Bogue & E. Cady (Eds.). *Applying Research to Practice (ARP) Resources*. Retrieved from http://www.engr.psu.edu/awe/misc/ARPs/ARP_SelfEfficacy_Overview_122208.pdf
- Rogers, A., & Gilligan, C. (1988). *Translating girls' voices: Two languages of development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education, Harvard Project on the Psychology of Women and the Development of Girls.

- Rosener, J. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(6), 119-127.
- Rosow, I. (1978). What is a cohort and why? *Human Development*, 21(2), 65-75.
- Ruddick, S. (2001). Making connections between parenting and peace. *Journal of the Association for Research on Mothering*, 3(2), 7-20.
- Smircich, L. (1985, August). *Toward a woman centered organization theory*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, San Diego, CA.
- Schulz, D. M. (1995). From social worker to crime fighter: Women in United States municipal policing. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 23(6), 571-572.
- Schulz, D. M. (2003). Women police chiefs: A statistical profile. *Police Quarterly*, 6(3), 330-345.
- Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2002). The development of academic self-efficacy. In A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 15-31). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Sellers, P. (2007, June). The power of women. *Fortune Magazine*, 155(8). Retrieved from http://archive.fortune.com/2007/05/31/magazines/fortune/sellers_women.fortune
- Shafritz, J. M., Ott, J. S., & Jang, Y. S. (2005). *Classics of organizational theory*. Boston, MA: Thompson Wadsworth.
- Sherman, L. J. (1975). An evaluation of policewomen on patrol in a suburban police department. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*. 3(4), 434-438.
- Silvestri, M. (2003). *Women in charge*. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.
- Sismondo, S. (1995). The scientific domains of feminist standpoints. *Perspectives on Science*, 3(1), 49-65.

- Simon, M. K., & Goes, J. (2013). *Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success*. Seattle, WA: Dissertation Success LLC.
- Skowronek, S. (1982). *Building a new American state: The expansion of national administrative capacities, 1877-1920*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Smith, D. E. (1990). *The conceptual practices of power: A feminist sociology of knowledge*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Smyth, R. (2004). Exploring the usefulness of a conceptual framework as a research tool: A researcher's reflections. *Issues in Educational Research*, 14, 167-180.
- Solano, E. (2006). *Women in the line of fire: What you should know about women in the military*. Emeryville, CA: Seal Press.
- Sorenson, B. A. (1984). The organizational woman and the Trojan horse effect. In H. Holter (Ed.), *Patriarchy in a welfare society* (pp. 88-104). Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Spradley, J. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Sprague J., & Zimmerman, M. (2004). Overcoming dualisms: A feminist agenda for sociological methodology. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Approaches to qualitative research: A reader on theory and practice* (pp. 39-61). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Stichman, A. J., Hassell, K. D., & Archbold, C. A. (2010). Strength in numbers? A test of Kanter's theory of tokenism. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 633-639.
- Stivers, C. (1995). Settlement women and bureau men: Constructing a usable past for public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 55(6), 522-529.

- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 34-71.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Sullivan, S. (2001). *Living across and through skins: Transactional bodies, pragmatism, and feminism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Summers, A. (1993). *Official and confidential: The secret life of J. Edgar Hoover*. Hingham, MA: Wheeler.
- Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 16, 282-298.
- Supergirl. (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved October 3, 2015, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supergirl>
- Superhero. (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster's online dictionary* (11th ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/superhero>
- Taeuber, C. (1991). *Statistical handbook on women in America*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Tansey, O. (2007). Process tracing and elite interviewing: A case for non-probability sampling. *Political Science & Politics*, 40(4), 765-772.
- Thaves, R. (Writer) (1982, May 3). Frank and Ernest [Cartoon]. Retrieved from Frank & Ernest website:
http://www.frankandernest.com/search/index.php?kw=grace+kelly&property=Frank+and+Ernest&id=13&opt=jqvxcldneswf&css=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.frankandernest.com%2Fincludes%2Fiframe&fb_ref=888&submit=Search

- Thomas, R. R. (1991). *Beyond race and gender: Unleashing the power of your total work force by managing diversity*. New York, NY: American Management Association.
- Tierney, H. (2005). *Women's studies encyclopedia*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Townsey, R. D. (1982). *Female patrol officers: A review of the physical capability issue*. New York, NY: Clark Boardman.
- Trailblazer (n.d). In *Merriam-Webster's online dictionary* (11th ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/trailblazer>
- Trochim, W. (2000). *The research methods knowledge base* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog.
- Tushman, M., & Romanelli, E. (1985). Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and reorientation. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7, 171-222.
- Turner, W. (1972). Mr. Hoover's Loyal Legion. *The Nation*, 214(6), 167–170.
- U. S. Bureau of Labor. (2015). *Data & statistics*. Retrieved from http://www.dol.gov/wb/stats/stats_data.htm
- U. S. Census. (2015). *Profile of general population and housing characteristics: 2010 demographic profile data*. Retrieved from <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk>
- U. S. Department of Commerce. (2000). *Best practices in achieving workforce diversity*. Report prepared by the National Partnership for Reinventing Government. Retrieved from <http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/npr/library/workforce-diversity.pdf>
- U. S. Department of Labor. (2015). *Nontraditional occupations of employed women in 2010*. Retrieved from http://www.dol.gov/wb/stats/NontraJobs_2010.htm

- U. S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2015). *The 1970s: The “toothless tiger” gets its teeth— A new era of enforcement*. Retrieved from <http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/history/35th/1970s/index.html>
- Washburn, M. H., & Miller, S. G. (2007). Keeping women students in technology: Preliminary evaluation of an intervention. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 9(2), 205-219.
- Weber, M. (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology* (H. Gerth & C. W. Mills, Trans.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- White, B. (1995). The career development of successful women. *Women in Management Review*, 10(3), 4-15.
- White House Project. (2010). *Public comfort with women leaders*. Retrieved from White House Project website: <http://benchmarks.thewhitehouseproject.org/>
- Willis, E. (1984). Radical feminism and feminist radicalism. *Social Text*, 9/10, 91-118.
- Manning, L. (2010). *Women in the military: Where they stand* (7th ed.). Washington, DC: Women’s Research and Education Institute.
- Worden, A. (1993). The attitudes of women and men in policing: Testing conventional and contemporary wisdom, *Criminology*, 31(2), 203-241.
- Zeldin, A. L., & Pajares, F. (2000). Against the odds: Self-efficacy beliefs of women in mathematical, scientific, and technological careers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(1), 215-246.

Appendix A: Archived FBI Memoranda

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover Memorandum, March 11, 1971

FBI Director L. Patrick Gray Announcement, May 12, 1972

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover Memorandum, March 11, 1971

 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20535 March 11, 1971 JUSTIFICATION FOR LIMITING THE POSITION OF SPECIAL AGENT IN THE FBI TO MALES The FBI applies a long-standing policy of limiting the Special Agent position to males. It is based on a careful, objective evaluation of all pertinent factors germane to the operations and effectiveness of the FBI, particularly those inherent in the broad range of challenges which Special Agents must satisfactorily meet to enable this Bureau to properly discharge the responsibilities entrusted to it and do so with optimum return to the public trust. It is not the intent of the FBI to confine this position to males without there being every good reason to do so. Current reconsideration of the Bureau's position has resulted in the conclusion there are no grounds for change. The Bureau's policy is in concert with Civil Service Commission regulations on this subject appearing in the Federal Personnel Manual, Chapter 332, Subchapter 4, Item 5, which state that law enforcement positions requiring the bearing of firearms are exceptions to the basic policy that consideration of applicants for appointment shall not be restricted to one sex. The FBI is in full accord with the Commission's regulations. The FBI is responsible for investigations in upwards of 175 classifications in a nation of over 206 million persons in the 50 states and Puerto Rico. Accordingly, our force of Special Agents is comparatively small considering the sparse deployment of it throughout the United States and Puerto Rico, the magnitude and diversity of the population, and the wide variety of investigations our Special Agents are called upon to undertake. Therefore, the very basic tenet of our operations is flexibility, meaning flexibility in terms of the maintenance of a Special Agent staff of superbly trained, experienced, and conditioned men we may deploy from FBI Headquarters to meet changing emphasis and needs on a broad or national level, which Special Agents in Charge
--

may deploy on a day-to-day or minute-to-minute basis in fast-breaking cases, and the deployment and flexibility dictated by Special Agents themselves singly or together during sensitive and critical situations. It is significant to mention that a substantial portion of our Special Agent force is assigned to Resident Agencies out of our 59 field offices.

In view of the need for flexibility and mobility it is important to understand that we hire only one breed of Special Agent, the one who will be equipped and able to perform all duties of the Special Agent position. We do not need nor do we hire specialists or anyone with the understanding that assignments will be in any way short of the full range of duties specified in the Special Agent position. To do otherwise would handicap management and impair overall efficiency. We insist that each Special Agent be capable of performing all duties of his position whenever and wherever necessary and our whole recruiting process is geared toward selecting those men best qualified to measure up to this standard and then training them and affording the necessary experience to accomplish this. It is our responsibility to the nation to do so.

All of this means it is imperative that each Special Agent be qualified for the strenuous physical exertion required to effectively participate in arrests and raids which involve the use of firearms, physically subduing dangerous criminals, and self-defense. Performance of these duties frequently requires work during any time of day or night and exposure to all kinds of adverse environmental conditions. It is doubly important that those Special Agents in Resident Agencies, many of which are one or two-man assignments, be equipped to fully represent the FBI and acquit themselves properly under any contingency.

Most significantly, there are very real, pressing, and paramount factors bearing heavily on the role of the FBI and its effectiveness which substantially transcend bearing of firearms, physical subduing of dangerous criminals, and self-defense as factors per se. The hallmark of the FBI's law enforcement concept is that our Special Agents use their weapons only in self-defense and that arrests, raids, and other dangerous, sensitive undertakings are accomplished without resort to use of firearms or physical force, but with overpowering strength of this sort ready to be appropriately and assuredly unleashed to the degree needed as any situation demands. Effective application of this basic and long-standing policy protects the public as a whole but most specifically the innocent man on

the street in proximity to a crime scene. It assures fullest protection under the law to those who would defy and resist the law. Effective overall application of this policy also best protects our own Special Agents who may be working alone or as a team. Application of this policy has been quite successful. The public must have the confidence that the FBI is equipped personnelwise to continue it. Lurking in the minds of those bent on defying the law must be the ever-present concern for the prowess and ability of the FBI Special Agent. Each Special Agent must have the confidence in himself and in each fellow Agent that each is able to dissuade against violence but prepared to act swiftly and surely should defense of one's self or fellow Special Agents be necessary. Dangerous assignments often develop spontaneously. The response by our Special Agents must be quick and is frequently military in nature with one man, supported by others, making the initial move, such as bounding into a room. He must have supreme confidence in his associates and inherently greater confidence will be associated with well-trained men.

In professional law enforcement, to effectively persuade, dissuade, influence, convince, and secure cooperation, our force of Special Agents to the man must be formidable. The Special Agent in his appearance, approach, and conduct must create the impression to his adversary that among other qualities he is intrepid, forceful, aggressive, dominant, and resolute. The more the adversary senses he is overmatched by the personal and physical qualities of the Special Agent the more effective is our operation. The Special Agent must often dominate the crime scene, marshaling and directing forces of other law enforcement agencies. Our work involves basically man against man and is a body-contact profession where in the interest of good law enforcement we endeavor to minimize the use of firearms and violence by an aura of invincibility and by the presence of superior force.

5 Let us face reality. If the credibility of the FBI is to be maintained in the eyes of the public, the lawbreaker, fugitive, deserter, et cetera, and if we are to continue a flexible, mobile, ready-for-anything force of Special Agents, we must continue to limit the position to males. At a time when there is growing disrespect for the law and contempt for and abuse of law enforcement officers, including FBI Special Agents, such as increased senseless, unprovoked attacks on such personnel, we must put up the best front possible throughout our service.

FBI Director L. Patrick Gray Announcement with Enclosure, May 12, 1972

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20535

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
MAY 12, 1972

L. Patrick Gray, III, Acting Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, today announced that women applicants will now be considered for the FBI Special Agent position.

Mr. Gray pointed out that this action is required by President Nixon's Executive Order 11478 dated August 9, 1969, relating to nondiscrimination and is further required by the recently enacted Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 which was signed into law by President Nixon on March 24, 1972.

According to Mr. Gray the Special Agent applicant position before today has been limited to male citizens of the United States. All additional existing requirements for the Special Agent position will remain unchanged. The attached background sets forth in detail the Special Agent position requirements.

Acting FBI Director Gray said that the intensive 14-week Special Agent training course would remain unchanged. This course includes firearms training requiring the applicant to become qualified in the use of .38 caliber revolver, shotgun and rifle. The training period

also includes a comprehensive physical fitness program and requires the Special Agent applicant to become proficient in defensive tactics. The Special Agent training program is conducted at the FBI's newly completed Academy which is located at the Marine Base at Quantico, Virginia.

Enclosure

INFORMATION CONCERNING THE POSITION OF SPECIAL AGENT IN THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is the primary investigative arm of the United States Department of Justice and as such has jurisdiction over some 185 Federal investigative matters, which include general investigations of a criminal and civil nature and domestic intelligence operations dealing with the internal security of our country. An additional responsibility is the correlation of information concerning the internal security of the United States and dissemination of such data to interested agencies in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government.

Applicants Must Possess the Following Qualifications:

1. They must be ~~male~~ citizens of the United States.
2. They must be willing and available to serve in any part of the United States or Puerto Rico in which it is determined that their services are required.
3. Education and experience. Applicants must be:
 - (a) Graduates from state-accredited resident law schools.

Note: Graduates of law schools must have successfully completed at least two years of resident, undergraduate college work. A resident college is one requiring personal attendance.

 - (b) Graduates from a resident four-year college with a major in accounting with at least one year of practical accounting and/or auditing experience.
 - (c) In addition, the Bureau is presently considering for the Special Agent position applicants possessing a 4-year resident college degree with a major in a physical science, fluency in a language for which the Bureau has a need, or 3 years of specialized experience of a professional, executive, or complex investigative nature. No assurance can be given, however, that these requirements will remain in effect.
4. Age: They must have reached their twenty-third but not their forty-first birthday on the date that the application is filed.
5. Physical ability:
 - (a) Height - Must be at least five feet seven inches without shoes.
 - (b) Vision - All applicants for the Agent position must have uncorrected vision of not less than 20/40 (Snellen) in one eye and at least 20/50 (Snellen) in the weaker eye without glasses and at least 20/20 (Snellen) in each eye corrected. No applicant can be considered who has been found to be color blind.
 - (c) Hearing - No applicant will be accepted if found by audiometer test to have a hearing loss exceeding a 15 decibel average in either ear in the conversational speech range (500, 1000, 2000 cycles).

All Applicants must be in excellent physical condition and can have no defects which would interfere with their use of firearms or with their participation in raids, dangerous assignments, or defensive tactics. An applicant's physical and visual condition will be ascertained through a rigid physical examination conducted at a Government examining facility.
6. All applicants must have a valid license to drive an automobile.

Examinations

Applicants who meet the basic requirements are afforded a detailed interview as well as written examinations. The latter are of a practical nature designed to test knowledge of law or accountancy. Any necessary travel expense incident to these tests must be borne by the applicant, and at no time should it be assumed that an appointment will be made because the opportunity for examination is offered. Prior to any appointment being made, applicants possessing the basic qualifications and who have successfully passed the necessary examinations are thoroughly investigated for the purpose of securing additional evidence of their qualifications and fitness for the position.

Training and Salary

The Special Agent position is not under Civil Service appointment regulations. All appointments in this service are made on a probationary basis and become permanent upon the satisfactory completion of a one-year period. Applicants receiving an appointment must satisfactorily complete a course of training at FBI Headquarters in Washington, D. C., and the FBI Academy located at Quantico, Virginia, which is approximately 14 weeks in duration. Following this training, the appointee is assigned to a field office. The entrance salary for Special Agents is \$12,151 per annum and they are paid their regular salary while attending the New Agents' Training School. Following assignment to a field office, additional compensation in the amount of \$3,035.80 per year may be earned for overtime performance as required in connection with official duties and provided the performance of the Agent in this regard meets certain necessary official requirements. Since all promotions are based on demonstrated merit rather than seniority, excellent opportunities for advancement exist. While engaged in investigative work, Special Agents can earn as much as \$24,982 yearly, exclusive of overtime, and many Agents promoted to supervisory positions receive even higher salaries.

Benefits of FBI Employment

Among the other benefits which accrue to Special Agents are comprehensive life insurance programs offered under the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Program, the Special Agents Insurance Fund, and the Special Agents Mutual Benefit Association. Also, under the Special Accident and Travel Insurance Program, a long-term disability income plan, an accidental death and dismemberment plan, and an accident indemnification plan are available. Under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, health insurance covering hospitalization, surgery, and major medical benefits is also available to Special Agents and their families. The majority of the above programs continue following retirement. All Special Agents are covered by provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act, which permits consideration for retirement at age 60 after 20 years of investigative service under its liberalized provisions relating to the nature of Special Agent duties.

Any applicant possessing the necessary qualifications may obtain an application by addressing a communication to the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. 20535 or by contacting any of the divisional offices located in the following cities:

Albany, New York	Houston, Texas	Norfolk, Virginia
Albuquerque, New Mexico	Indianapolis, Indiana	Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Alexandria, Virginia	Jackson, Mississippi	Omaha, Nebraska
Anchorage, Alaska	Jacksonville, Florida	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Atlanta, Georgia	Kansas City, Missouri	Phoenix, Arizona
Baltimore, Maryland	Knoxville, Tennessee	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Birmingham, Alabama	Las Vegas, Nevada	Portland, Oregon
Boston, Massachusetts	Little Rock, Arkansas	Richmond, Virginia
Buffalo, New York	Los Angeles, California	Sacramento, California
Butte, Montana	Louisville, Kentucky	St. Louis, Missouri
Charlotte, North Carolina	Memphis, Tennessee	Salt Lake City, Utah
Chicago, Illinois	Miami, Florida	San Antonio, Texas
Cincinnati, Ohio	Milwaukee, Wisconsin	San Diego, California
Cleveland, Ohio	Minneapolis, Minnesota	San Francisco, California
Columbia, South Carolina	Mobile, Alabama	San Juan, Puerto Rico
Dallas, Texas	Newark, New Jersey	Savannah, Georgia
Denver, Colorado	New Haven, Connecticut	Seattle, Washington
Detroit, Michigan	New Orleans, Louisiana	Springfield, Illinois
El Paso, Texas	New York, New York	Tampa, Florida
Honolulu, Hawaii		Washington, D. C.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is an equal opportunity employer.

Appendix B: Factors and Items on Grit Scale

Factor 1: Consistency of Interests/Passion

Items:

- I often set a goal but later choose to pursue a different one.
 - New ideas and projects sometimes distract me from previous ones.
 - I become interested in new pursuits every few months.
 - My interests change from year to year.
 - I have been obsessed with a certain idea or project for a short time but later lost interest.
 - I have difficulty maintaining my focus on projects that take more than a few months to complete.
-

Factor 2: Perseverance of Effort

Items:

- I have achieved a goal that took years of work.
 - I have overcome setbacks to conquer an important challenge.
 - I finish whatever I begin.
 - Setbacks don't discourage me.
 - I am a hard worker.
 - I am diligent.
-

From Duckworth, Peterson, Matthew, & Kelley, 2007

Appendix C: Developing the Conceptual Framework

<u>Main Ideas of Research Question</u>	<u>Theoretical Positioning</u>	<u>Topics in the Literature</u>	<u>Additional Concepts</u>
Being Female	Feminist Standpoint Theory	Feminist Perspective	Personal Stance Feminism in the U.S. Women's Knowledge Caring & Moral Development Feminist Standpoint Theory
Working in a Man's Job	Career Self-Efficacy	Nontraditional Occupations	Women's Careers Female Leadership NTOs: Police & Military Career Choice Career Self-Efficacy Theory Grit
Female Leaders in the FBI	Organizational Theories	Bureaucracy	Organizational Theory Gendered Organizations Tipping Points Understanding Gender & Leadership Organizational Culture

Appendix D: Sample Interview Guide

Research Question:

“How do the early women leaders in the FBI describe their experiences in a gendered organization?”

Sub-questions:

“How do these women describe their career decision-making?”

“How do these women describe their career self-efficacy?”

“How do these women describe the role of gender in their careers?”

D. Possible Questions about Self

- D1. Describe what led you to an FBI career.
- D2. Describe the influence of personal relationships in your early life.
- D3. What motivates you to make the choices you make?
- D4. How do you set and achieve goals?
- D5. What advice would you give to a new female agent?
- D6. How would you describe your views on feminism?
- D7. Have your views on gender changed?

E. Possible Questions about Career

- E1. How did you deal with challenging situations?
- E2. How did you assess your emotional and physical well-being?
- E3. Describe the influences of relationships in your career.
- E4. Describe how you achieved successful career outcomes.
- E5. What hindered you as a leader?
- E6. How important was feedback and encouragement in your career?
- E7. How did gender play a role in your career?

F. Possible Questions about Bureaucracy

- F1. What was the impact of hiring and training standards on women?
- F2. Describe both productive and nonproductive work settings you were in.
- F3. Describe what it was like to be one of the first women agents.
- F4. Did personnel practices, related to gender, have a disparate impact on you?
- F5. Describe any workplace discrimination/harassment you experienced.
- F6. Did you have equal opportunities to your male counterparts?
- F7. Did your presence in the FBI result in any policy changes?

G. Other

- G1. What would you do differently in your career, if you had the chance?
- G2. Is there anything you would like to add?

Appendix E: Sample Questionnaire

Questionnaire

(To be completed after the interview. Use the back of form if necessary)

Pseudonym:

Career Questions:

- A1. Entry on Duty (EOD) Date:
- A2. Place Hired:
- A3. Age when hired:
- A4. Job before being hired:
- A5. Years of FBI Service as Agent:
- A6. Resigned or Retired Agent:
- A7. FBI Offices Assigned & Years:
- A8. Program Hired Under:
- A9. Specialized Skills:
- A10. Self-Assessment of Firearms Proficiency (poor, average, excellent):
- A11. Number of transfers:
- A11. Supervisory Positions in order (type/length/location):
- A12. Highest Position:
- A13. Duties in Highest Position:
- A14. Reason for Separation:
- A15. Number of Personnel Actions Initiated:
- A16. Number of Personnel Actions Subject of:
- A17. Overall Evaluations (not successful, fully successful, exceptional

Demographic Questions:

- B1. Year of Birth:
- B2. Place of Birth:
- B3. Primary Ethnic Identity:
- B5. City, State where Raised:
- B6. Religious Affiliation, if any:

Biographical Questions:

- C1. Current Marital Status:
- C2. Year Married:
- C3. Changes in Marital Status during FBI Career:
- C4. Children/Stepchildren during FBI Career:
- C5. Height:
- C6. Body Frame during Career (Small, Medium, Large):
- C7. College Major:
- C8. Type of Graduate Degree, if applicable:
- C10. Approximate Grade Point Average:
- C11. Mother Education:
- C12. Father Education:
- C13. Father Primary Occupation:
- C14. Mother Primary Occupation:
- C14. Post-FBI Work or Activities:

Appendix F: Key to Data Coding

Key:**Typology (First Letter)****Topic (Second Letter)****Time Frame (Early Career -1, Mid Career – 2, Late Career - 3)**


1. (N) Women in Nontraditional Careers			
S – Readiness	NS1	NS2	NS3
C - Choice of FBI Career	NC1	NC2	NC3
F - Family Influence	NF1	NF2	NF3
O - Previous Occupation	NO1	NO2	NO3
H- Hoover	NH1	NH2	NH3
2. (C) Women Achieving Career Self-Efficacy			
I - Experiences Being First	CI1	CI2	CI3
S- Personal Qualities (Humor, Confidence, Caring)	CS1	CS2	CS3
J- Job Skills (Shooting, Organization, Intellect)	CJ1	CJ2	CJ3
R- Relationships/Friends			
M- Mentors/Training Agents/Supervisors			
C- Challenges			
3. (L) Women as Leaders			
G- Setting Goals	LG1	LG2	LG3
S- Selection	LS1	LS2	LS3
R -Auxiliary vs. Operational Roles	LR1	LR2	LR3
E- Work Ethic	LE1	LE2	LE3
A- Self-Assessment	LA1	LA2	LA3
O - Obstacles/Surprises	LO1	LO2	LO3
4. (B) Women Negotiating Bureaucracy			
F- Top Management	BF1	BF2	BF3
R- Recruiting/Experiment	BR1	BR2	BR3
T- Training (Height, Guns, Fitness, Intellect)	BT1	BT2	BT3
P- Promotions	BP1	BP2	BP3
E –Evaluations	BE1	BE2	BE3
C- Masculine Culture	BC1	BC2	BC3
S –Transfers	BS1	BS2	BS3
E- Equal Opportunity (Suits, EEO)	BE1	BE2	BE3
5.* (F) Perspectives on Being Female			
S- Sameness vs. Difference	FS1	FS2	FS3
G- Gender/Body Identity	FG1	FG2	FG3
B- Balance	FB1	FB2	FB3
O- Failure	FO1	FO2	FO3
M-Marriage/Children	FM1	FM2	FM3
F- Feminism	FF1	FF2	FF3

* This set of coded data was bracketed for inclusion in later sections of data analysis.

Appendix G: Key to FBI Terminology

Term	Meaning
10-7:	Out of service, or off duty.
10-8:	In service, or on duty.
24-7:	24 hours a day, 7 days a week.
ADIC:	Assistant Director in Charge.
Agent:	Special Agent in the FBI.
ASAC:	Assistant Special Agent in Charge. Works as #2 to SAC in a field office.
Brick Agent:	A field agent, also called a "street agent".
Bucar:	Short for "Bureau car," or vehicle.
Bureau:	The FBI
Case Agent:	FBI agent in charge of a particular case.
CI:	Criminal Investigation.
Creds:	Credentials.
Director:	Director of the FBI.
EEO:	Equal Employment Opportunity.
FBI Academy:	Training Center for FBI agents in Quantico, VA.
FBIHQ:	FBI Headquarters in Washington, DC.
Field:	Assignments to FBI Field Offices.
Field Offices:	FBI offices, not Headquarters.
FIT Test:	Fitness qualification test in the field
FCI:	Foreign Counterintelligence work.
G-Man:	Slang for Government Man
G-Woman:	Slang for Government Woman
Informant:	Person who provides information to the FBI confidentially
Keeping Book:	Monitoring a coworker's actions to find problems.
KMA:	Kiss My Ass. Refers to agents who are eligible to retire.
MAP:	Management Aptitude Program
New Agent:	An FBI agent trainee, at the FBI Academy or in the field.
OC:	Organized Crime.
OPR:	Office of Professional Responsibility (FBI internal inspection office).
PFI:	Principal Firearms Instructor.
Possible:	Shooting the FBI firearms qualification course and getting a perfect score.
Possible Board:	Group of agents, listed on a plaque, who shot a Possible.
Quantico:	Location of New Agent training in Northern Virginia.
Relief Supervisor:	Volunteer position as supervisor trainee.
Resident Agency:	Resident Agency, or a small satellite location of a field office.
SAC:	Special Agent in Charge of a field office.
Special Agent:	Formal title for an FBI agent.
SSA:	Supervisory Special Agent.
SSRA:	Supervisory Senior Resident Agent. Field supervisor in a resident agency.
Squad:	Group of agents assigned together.
Subject:	Person who is the focus of an FBI investigation.
SWAT:	Special Weapons and Tactics.
Task Force:	Multi-agency group of investigators working on a case.
Training Agent:	A senior, experienced agent who is assigned to train a new agent.
UACB:	Unless Advised to the Contrary.
Unsub:	Unknown Subject of an investigation.

Appendix H: Key to FBI Promotions

Key to 10 Rings in Target:

Each dot represents a female applicant or agent

Outside the Rings - All women who applied but were not hired

Ring 0 - Represents first 100 women hired who completed training

Ring 1 - Represents women who successfully completed FBI careers as agents

Ring 2 - Pre-management level (voluntary) - Relief Supervisor (no move required)

Ring 3 - Entry level management (in field or FBIHQ) - Supervisory Special Agent (SSA) (may require a move)

Ring 4 - Management I. Second supervisor position (SSA) (may require a move)

Ring 5 - Management II. Mid-level positions such as Unit Chief (may require a move)

Ring 6 - Management III. Higher, mid-level positions, such as Unit Chief or Assistant Special Agent in Charge (ASAC) (may require a move)

Ring 7 - Management IV. Special Agent in Charge (SAC) of an office, Section Chief, or Senior Executive Service (SES) position (may require a move)

Ring 8 - Management V. Higher or second SAC, or SES position (may require a move)

Ring 9 - Management VI. Additional SAC, Assistant Director (AD) or SES position (may require a move)

Ring 10 (Black, center of target) - Bull's eye, or highest possible position in the FBI (may require a move)

Key to Shade

Green - Reported no obstacles that hindered career progression

Yellow - Reported obstacle that halted upward career progression

Red - Reported career-ending obstacle

Permission to Reprint Letters

March 17, 2015

Terrence E. Deal

Dear Dr. Deal:

I am completing a doctoral dissertation at the University of North Florida entitled "G-Women Since 1972." My research is focused on the earliest women special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I would like your permission to reprint an excerpt from the following citation:

Deal, T. E. and Kennedy, A. A. (1982, 2000) *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1982; reissue Perseus Books, 2000

The excerpt to be reproduced is the table on page 171, entitled "Culture Types."

The requested permission extends to any future revisions and editions of my dissertation, including non-exclusive world rights in all languages, to the electronic publication of my dissertation by the University of North Florida, and to the prospective publication of my dissertation by ProQuest. ProQuest may supply copies of my dissertation on demand. These rights in no way restrict republication of the material in any other form by you or by others authorized by you. Your signing of this letter will also confirm that you own the copyright to the above-described material.

If these arrangements meet with your approval, please sign this letter where indicated below and return it to me in the enclosed return envelope. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Signature Deleted

Ellen Glasser

PERMISSION GRANTED FOR THE USE REQUESTED ABOVE:

Signature Deleted

Terrence E. Deal

Date: 3/24/15

March 17, 2015

J. Amos Hatch

Dear Dr. Hatch:

I am completing a doctoral dissertation at the University of North Florida entitled "G-Women Since 1972." My research is focused on the earliest women special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I would like your permission, on behalf of you and Professor Billing, to reprint an excerpt from the following citation:

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

The excerpt to be reproduced is Figure 1.1 on page 13, entitled "Research Paradigms."

The requested permission extends to any future revisions and editions of my dissertation, including non-exclusive world rights in all languages, to the electronic publication of my dissertation by the University of North Florida, and to the prospective publication of my dissertation by ProQuest. ProQuest may supply copies of my dissertation on demand. These rights in no way restrict republication of the material in any other form by you or by others authorized by you. Your signing of this letter will also confirm that you own the copyright to the above-described material.

If these arrangements meet with your approval, please sign this letter where indicated below and return it to me in the enclosed return envelope. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Signature Deleted

Ellen Glasser

PERMISSION GRANTED FOR THE USE REQUESTED ABOVE:

Signature Deleted

J. Amos Hatch

Date: 3-23-15

March 19, 2015

Mats Alvesson
Professor, Department of Business Administration
Lund University

Dear Dr. Alvesson:

I am completing a doctoral dissertation at the University of North Florida entitled "G-Women Since 1972." My research is focused on the earliest women special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I would like your permission, on behalf of you and Dr. Billing, to reprint an excerpt from the following citation:

Alvesson, M. & Billing, Y.D. (1997). Understanding gender and organizations.
Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

The excerpt to be reproduced is Figure 7.1, a table on page 171, entitled "Approaches to the understanding of women and leadership."

The requested permission extends to any future revisions and editions of my dissertation, including non-exclusive world rights in all languages, to the electronic publication of my dissertation by the University of North Florida, and to the prospective publication of my dissertation by ProQuest. ProQuest may supply copies of my dissertation on demand. These rights in no way restrict republication of the material in any other form by you or by others authorized by you. Your signing of this letter will also confirm that you own the copyright to the above-described material.

If these arrangements meet with your approval, please sign this letter where indicated below and return it to me in the enclosed return envelope. If it is more convenient, you may scan and email it to me at glassere@comcast.net. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Signature Deleted

Ellen Glasser

PERMISSION GRANTED FOR THE USE REQUESTED ABOVE:

Signature Deleted

Mats Alvesson

Date: 21.4.2015

ELLEN GLASSER
Criminology and Criminal Justice Department
Building 51, Room 2305
University of North Florida

Professional Profile

- Instructor, University of North Florida (UNF).
- Retired FBI Special Agent and Supervisory Special Agent.
- Past President, Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI.

Education

- M.Ed., Criminal Justice Counseling, Duke University, 1980.
- A.B., Psychology, Duke University, 1977.
- Nonprofit Certificate, UNF, 2012.
- Second Career as a Teacher Program, Jacksonville University, 2009.

Recognition & Awards

- Sigma Alpha Pi Teaching Award, 2016
- Spirit of Rosie Award, 2011.
- FBI Files Episode, Terror in Disguise, 2001.
- Subject of Ann Rule book, *The End of the Dream*, 1998.
- Julie Y. Cross Award Finalist, 1997.
- Numerous FBI and U.S. Attorney Awards, 1982-2006.

Law Enforcement Experience

- FBI Special Agent & Supervisory Special Agent, with assignments in North Carolina; California; Washington, DC; Washington; Florida; Louisiana; and Saudi Arabia, 1982-2006.
- Joint Terrorism Task Force Coordinator, Northeast Florida, 2001-2005.
- Case Agent, Iran-Contra Public Corruption Investigation, 1986-1990.
- Congressional Liaison, FBIHQ, 1990-1993.
- National Press Spokesperson, FBIHQ, 1990-1993.
- Numerous high-profile FBI criminal investigations.
- North Carolina Probation-Parole Officer, 1977-1982.

Academic Experience

- Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, & Instructor, UNF, 2012-2015.
- Courses Taught:
 - White Collar Crime, UNF, CCJ 4664: 2012-2016.
 - Crime in America, UNF, CJ 2002: 2016.
 - Serial Killers, UNF, CCJ 4935: 2016
 - Terrorism, UNF, CCJ 4938: 2015
 - Elite Crime, UNF, CCJ 5668: 2012-2014.
 - Women and the Legal System, UNF, CCE 3281 & CCJ 5934: 2013-2015.
 - Homeland Security, UNF, CCJ 4938 & CCJ 5934: 2013-2015.
- Doctoral Steering Committee, University of North Florida, 2010-2011.

- Researcher, Florida Institute of Education, 2010.
- Substitute Teacher, Episcopal High School, 2007-2009.
- General Police Instructor, FBI, 1982-2006.

Community Involvement

- President, Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI, 2012-2015.
- Trustee, Former Agents of the FBI Foundation, 2012-2015.
- National Secretary, Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI, 2010-2012.
- Participant, Big Ride Across America, American Lung Association, Seattle, WA, 2006.
- Board Member, Community Development Board, Atlantic Beach, FL, 2007-2012.
- Family Selection Committee, Beaches Habitat, Atlantic Beach, FL, 2008-2013.
- Resource Allocation Committee, United Way, Jacksonville, FL, 2009-2013.
- Commissioner, Mayor's Commission on the Status of Women, Jacksonville, FL, 2010-2013.
- Regional Political Leadership Institute Graduate, Jacksonville, FL, 2010.