COPY

1	REVIEWING EMPLOYMENT OF MINORITIES AND WOMEN
2	IN ENERGY DEVELOPMENT IN UTAH
3	* * * *
4	Sponsored by
5	THE UTAH ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE
6	U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
7	* * * *
8	A Forum
9	* * * *
10	Held at:
11	The Federal Building
12	Room 3421
	125 South State Street
13	Salt Lake City, Utah 84138
14	* * * *
15	August 25, 1982
16	* * * *
17	10:00 a.m.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



1	APPEARANCES		
2	·		
3	For the Utah Advisory Committee to the U.S.		
4	Commission on Civil Rights:	Ms. Linda Dupont-Johnson Chairperson	
5	For Rocky Mountain Regional		
6	Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights:	Dr. Shirley Hill Witt	
7	OIVII Imgiloo	Regional Director	
8	Office of Senator Orrin G. Hatch		
9	Office of Governor Scott M. Matheson		
10	For Office of Ted Wilson, Mayor of Salt Lake City,		
11	Utah:	Mr. John Hiskey Executive Assistant	
12	For Utah EEO Committee,		
13	Salt Lake City:	Mr. Louis Caudillo President	
14	For Sperry Univac,		
15	Salt Lake City, Utah:	Mr. Wilfred Bocage Employe Relations	
16		Representative	
17	For the Equal Employment Opportunity, University		
18	of Utah:	Dr. Kaye Coleman Associate Director	
19	For Resources for Change,		
20	Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah:	Dr. Kate Kirkham	
21	,	Co-Director	
22	For Rocky Mountain Regional Office U.S. Commission on		
23	Civil Rights:	Dr. Roger Wade Civil Rights Analyst	

(continued)



APPEARANCES

(continued)

For Utah Technical College: Ms. Faye Jensen

Director of Placement

The Governor's Commission on Employment of the Handicapped, Salt Lake

City, Utah

State Commission on the

Aging, Salt Lake City, Utah: Mr. Bayard Taylor

Director

Beehive

PROCEEDINGS

* * *

MR. BOCAGE: There is a large demand in the private industry for highly technical employees. The thing that we see right now is that we really don't feel like the State is going to be able to have the technical people available when the jobs arise.

In conjunction with that is the fact that we will have to be recruiting outside the State of Utah. There is no doubt from my travels that there are numerous trained professional minority applicants.

When I was recruited into Salt Lake, one of the main problems that I had, and not so much of the job opportunities of the company that I would be working for, some of my main concerns were: What kind of problems will I have with my kids in school; what kind of black social activities that would be available to me.

I think this is still a concern for minority applicants coming into Salt Lake, because we have a unique society here, and because of information and people's ideals about what's going on in Salt Lake is still out there.

I think it's going to have to be a concerted effort from the people of Salt Lake City, from the private industry, from the public industry, to disseminate that



3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

information to minorities in our process of recruiting. to let them know that there are some opportunities, not only from the job standpoint but also from the social standpoint.

My presentation is short, but I will entertain some questions when I get through with my presentation.

This is my presentation, and if any questions come up, I would be more than glad to answer them.

MS. DUPONT: Why don't I mediate just a bit here, since I am the Chairman, and why don't we have questions for these two gentlemen only.

Please limit your questions to the role of the private sector with respect to minorities and women. And why don't we do that for a few minutes, and while we're answering questions, if I could have Dr. Coleman, Dr. Kirkham, Dr. Wade and Ms. Jensen begin to work their way up.

There are no questions for these two gentlemen? Okay, why don't we have those four people come up, then.

Okay, the next segment of our workshop will concern women in non-traditional jobs.

Our first speaker will be Dr. Kaye Coleman, who is the Associate Director of the Equal Opportunity Office at the University of Utah.



Dr. Coleman?

DR. COLEMAN: Thank you.

i

My topic today is upward mobility for women in management. It seems appropriate to begin by sharing the following quote.

"The task of sheltering women
from the fierce storms of life
is the sheerest mockery, for they
blow upon her from every point of
the compass, just as they do on
men, but with far more fatal
results. For he has been trained

This quote seems as appropriate today as it was then. Because of the training and socialization that a female receives as a woman, she has a difficult task in overcoming the barriers to success, for many women managers are caught between fear of failure and fear of success.

to protect himself."

She also has to overcome cultural conditioning that can create internal conflict between her personal life roles, such as woman, wife, mother, and her role as an upward mobile manager, and she will probably have to deal with the stereotypes others have of women, their acceptable roles, their place in business, their traits

as a boss.

Most of the specific problems unique to women managers are rooted in two general elements: the first one, the woman's own image of what her role and behavior should be; and two, the stereotypes others have about women. Finding the appropriate level of femininity, firmness, friendliness, and assertiveness, is directly related to understanding these two elements and how they affect the woman manager.

Now, let's look at some facts:

In 1980, over 42 percent of all paid workers in the United States were women. Most of them were in low-paying jobs. In fact, on the average, women were making less than 60 percent of what men were making. Only one percent of women workers in jobs paying more than \$20,000, while 13 percent of the men workers held such jobs.

About 51 percent of all women over 16 were in the paid labor force in 1980. Although most of them were working because they wanted to, a large percentage were also the sole source of support of themselves or their families.

Also, in many cases, women's salaries raised the family out of the low income level. Women represent only 26 percent of the managers and administrators in the business world, but they are 80 percent of the clerical



workers.

1.1

Most women managers are stuck in the lowest managerial levels with little hope for advancement; for example, first line clerical workers or personnel administrators, although increasing numbers of women are in middle- and upper-management or aspire to top positions, they are still a very small minority.

Women who move up from worker or trainee to supervision and management, often find themselves in a rather lonely position. They are frequently the only women in either small or large meetings of managers. They may have difficulty fitting in with the groups.

At the same time, they can no longer be "one of the girls" among the female workers. It's been interesting as I've done any training that I have had women that have moved up in the management ranks talk to me about how even when they'll walk into the cafeteria with the group they usually sit down to have lunch with, they move somewhere else. They don't include them, and so they really feel very closed out of the old network they were in.

Women managers must deal with preconceived attitudes about the woman boss. Because they are frequently the first women in their positions, they must also deal with their own uncertainties about the most desirable



approach to various situations.

It's important to understand that about 95 percent of the top decision makers in business organizations are men. Therefore, as a woman manager, her first step is to accept the fact that for better or worse she's going to be operating in a male culture where the rules are made by men.

Her second step is to learn the basic rules of the game. Then she can decide if she wants to be there.

In the past, the typical American woman didn't realize how many years she would have to be part of the work force. She thought of work as something she might do for a while until she got married or had children, or her husband's income was larger, or to give her something to do after her children left home. She wanted some kind of marketable skill or knowledge just in case she ever needed to work.

Much like an insurance policy. And I can't tell you how many women I've heard say that "I'm only coming back to school because if something happened to my husband, I might have to work."

And times have really changed now in terms of economics. During childhood she didn't think in terms of career goals as the typical American man does. Therefore, she didn't prepare herself for a satisfying,



challenging career.

Most men have fairly specific long-term career goals. Very few women have thought in these terms. Most of those who did, only did so after working for ten to 15 years. Then suddenly they realized that they liked their jobs and would probably be working for most of their lives. Only then did they get serious about their career goals.

Most women are shocked to find out that the average single woman spends 45 years of their life working in paid positions and the average married woman spends 25 years working.

Isn't it time we started socializing our females to understand these very simple facts so that they can prepare in different ways for their future.

Opportunities for women in management have expanded in recent years, as the following shows:

In all types of management positions, 12 percent were held by women in 1950 and 26 by 1980, 26 percent, that is. In top management positions held by women, it was less than one percent in 1950, and in 1980 has grown to five percent. However, the number of women making it to the highest levels of corporate management is relatively small. The major reason is probably that most women between the ages of 25 and 35 have been busy raising children, and that is the decade in which most men put forth



the greatest energy to establish themselves on the fast track.

A second reason may be that the number of qualified women for high-level positions is relatively low.

Still another reason might be that while companies have been complying with affirmative action guidelines by placing women in positions of working supervisors, first-line supervisors, staff specialists, or even middle manager, they've been excluded from the position on the career paths that lead to top management.

According to Rosabeth Cantor, their opportunities for advancement have been practically non-existent for three major reasons:

One, the conformity pressures on managers to look and act alike; two, management's need for certainty about the attitudes and actions they can expect from people they bring into their inner circle; and three, the fact that secretarial positions in which most women begin are completely outside the corporate hierarchy.

With conformity pressures, Rosabeth Cantor has noted that managers of the typical large corporation must look the part. The similarities in their appearance are striking and reveal the extent of conformity pressures on managers.



The manager of the typical corporation she investigated were usually white and male, and with a "certain shiny, clean-cut look."

But not only is social conformity important in managerial careers, but studies show that leaders in many types of situations are likely to show preference for socially similar subordinates and help them get ahead.

Clark Kerr and his associates found that incumbents in the managerial hierarchy seek as new recruits those who they can rely on and trust. They demand that the newcomers be loyal, that they accept authority, and that they conform to prescribed patterns of behavior.

With uncertainty, the conformity pressures and the development of exclusive management circles closed to outsiders, are closely related to the degree of uncertainty found in all organizations. Managers are searching for all the security they can find. They are reluctant to give up some control and turn over some of their powers that they have held in the organization to people they are uncertain about. Therefore, they tend to produce themselves in kind.

Women are occasionally included in the inner circle when they are part of an organization's ruling family. In most cases, however, this system leaves women out, along with other people who are socially



different.

Some common perceptions of women also lead to exclusion. For many managers, trust means total dedication and complete loyalty. This viewpoint tends to omit female workers who are seen as incapable of such a single-minded attachment.

Many managers believe women generally don't have strong beliefs about their ability to become a manager, and don't have driving aspirations to achieve the position.

Cantor found data to indicate that although this view of women has some basis, the causes lie more in the circumstances of traditional female roles in the organization than in innate feminine traits.

With the secretarial ladder, traditionally women's roles have centered around the secretarial functions, and this has powerfully affected women's self concepts and aspirations.

In nearly all companies, the secretarial ladder is short, and rank is usually determined by the boss's status. In other words, secretaries derive their formal rank and level of reward not from the skills they use and the tasks they perform, but from the formal rank of their boss. It takes an unusual secretary to avoid or escape these traps.

Frequently a secretary manages to move into



management ranks because she has had an unusual boss who encourages her to develop managerial skills.

In addition to dealing with preconceptions about what a manager should be, women must also give belie to several myths about their typical behavior and abilities. In order to utilize the talents of the best and the brightest of the females in the work force, management needs to be aware of the differences in male and female styles and adopt training strategies to build on these differences.

First, the age span for the development of a junior executive female must be extended. Men with potential for management are usually identified in their 20's. In some professions, such as engineering, men are thought to be topped out and on the downhill side after 32 years of age. This simply is different for most women.

The age of the average woman when her last child enters school is 34 years. At this point she begins to turn full attention toward her career. Because of this, management necessarily will need to be willing to invest time and money in women with potential, even though they are older than has been thought to be a worthwhile beginning place.

A woman in her thirties, however, does bring a good deal more of life experience and maturity to the



training positions. Accordingly, her development can be escalated. Often her capacity for intensity is exceeded only by her enthusiasm. Her commitment to work is heightened rather than declining.

If management decides to focus on adding women to their executive ranks in any significant numbers, then in addition to hastening the developmental experiences of able females, the content of the experiences in training need to be examined.

To begin with, the skills most women possess, ability to communicate, collaborate, cooperate, nurture, needs to be affirmed and valued. Upon this foundation, self-concept can be strengthened and an increase in their confidence should allow rapid progress into more demanding situations.

In spite of an egalitarian ideal in which the contributions of each sex are declared equal and complementary, both men and women value masculine qualities and achievements. Women often abandon the most participative behaviors rather readily, because they do not trust them to be effective.

As long as women are defined as non-male, meaning not as good as, they will feel confused about how to deal effectively.

In addition to the affirmation of the skills they



have, women will need to obtain challenging management positions at a much later time, later than is now customary in business and industry.

A study by Dalton & Thompson of 2500 engineers showed that the most complex jobs went to individuals in their late 20's, while those over 40 had jobs in the bottom half of the complexity scale. This is the case in many job situations.

Dalton & Thompson also noted that job placement is the single most important variable in individual development. An analysis of job placement practices probably will show that the initial placement of females is a factor in their success. Females have the most support in jobs requiring people skills, the skills they are most able and most comfortable in applying. By building confidence through experiences in people skills positions, women could be moved into positions requiring the development of skills to deal with power, authority, do long-range planning, and cope with organizational politics.

The importance of a mentor while a woman is acquiring the qualities that make a good manager cannot be overstated. Dalton, Thompson and Price state that the progress through the first career stage is best facilitated by a mentor, and this typically happens to



-

white males when they get into organizations, and seldom happens to females.

Because of sexual taboos, working styles, and just plain inaccessibility, most women do not enjoy the additional help of sponsorship by a mentor.

No effort has been made to offer final solutions, but rather provide the basis for organizations and individuals to take new directions to broaden the managerial abilities of females.

The richest talent bank for business and industry is the most gifted of both sexes. In order to reverse the trend of the underutilization and the inadequate demonstration of managerial abilities of females, management needs to assume a different perspective and pursue different policies in the employment and career development of managers.

A setting must be provided where women can, one, explore and differentiate between personality characteristics, ascribed sex roles. That is, examine why females with high achievement needs and high energy levels are not setting career goals earlier, if at all; two, provide a climate for the existence of discussion groups dealing with differences and similarities in male and female leadership roles. And I think Weyerhaeuser has done this and have found out that it's been most successful in

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

working with both management and taking groups of women and having these discussion groups.

Three, provide some antidote for the intimidation that occurs in an all-male environment.

And four, develop a way to identify the late bloomer and provide channels where planned progression can occur and will allow the full enhancement of the woman who has the full potential and desire for upward mobility.

Thank you.

MS. DUPONT: That was Dr. Kaye Coleman.

At this time we will bring up Dr. Kate Kirkham, who is the Co-Director of Resources for Change at Brigham Young University.

> Good morning. DR.KIRKHAM:

I have been asked to comment on some research that I'm currently involved in on women in the engineering profession. And let me clarify, the Resources for Change is the firm I had in Washington, D.C. I lived there for about ten years.

I am currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Organizational Behavior at Brigham Young, and the Thompson that Kaye referred to is Paul Thompson, who is my colleague there, and it is his research on engineering and my research on racism and sexism.



And we have attempted to confine and take a look at what goes on once women and minorities are in an organization; what are some of their experiences in that organization.

And as we've heard so far this morning, organizations are the major vehicle for a lot of the opportunities and experiences of people in the states we're talking about, the context in the organization.

And so that's what we want to take a look at -not so much the laws, but the actual experience of people
who are different, trying to work together. And we
found a couple of very interesting things.

First of all, let me tell you a little more about what we did. We set out interviewing managers and engineers who work in various organizations, both here and in several other cities nationwide, that we were able to either travel to or be invited to by the companies.

So our findings probably represent more Utah, but are also indicative of what is going on in other engineering locations.

First of all, demographics are changing quite a bit. In 1975, only 1.1 percent of employed engineers were women, and as of, I think, the latest statistic is 1980, between 4.3 and 11.3 percent were women, depending



on the branch of engineering that you were looking at.

And that's expected to increase ever more rapidly, because a number of women are entering in undergraduate and graduate studies, the professions of engineering.

One of the first things we found out was that there's a widely differing view on what is the problem once you're looking inside the organization where people who are different are trying to work together, and that difference in the view is so critical, both in awareness of the issue, as well as in skills to problem solve or address the issues.

And just to give you an example, one of the managers we were interviewing said, with a straight face, "We have no problems dealing with differences in this organization. We have no problems with women working here. In fact, a little girl is one of our best engineers." With a straight face; and Paul and I looked at each other, and said, We've got to talk to some more people in this organization. Because he was serious, and, "We have no problem," only he was using language and he was using assumptions in his expressions that indicated the fact that there were real, serious problems that would affect probably the promotional opportunities, the leadership opportunities of women working in that company.

So that's what our first challenge is: How do



you address such a widely differing range in awareness and skills in an organization.

I

What we have set out to do is apply a framework to that problem of the differing awareness and experience, and the framework we developed looked at three different levels within an organization to address problems and look at potential solutions.

And what I would like to do is just run over those three different levels, talk about the things we want to pay attention to on those three levels, talk about two of the major findings that we have, and a couple of issues in summary.

The three different levels that we think you have to look at if you're going to understand issues of people who are different working together in an organization are: first, interpersonal level; second, intergroup level; and third, the organizational, institutional level.

The reason why these three levels are important is this: At the interpersonal level we are talking about the ability of people who are different to get along on a one-on-one. In other words, can men and women who have not worked together, talk to each other, use appropriate language, have the skills to work together.

At the intergroup level we are talking about the impact of the identity of people in the organization.



For example, some of the early Harvard studies on school segregation found out there is a critical mass phenomenon where a school or an organization will be perceived as white until the critical mass changes in terms of black and white people in the organization, and then the perception changes. So there's a critical mass phenomenon.

If you have one or two women in an organization, they're isolated, often as a token or solo woman. Once you get a critical mass of women, the issues change and the stereotyping changes. So numbers of people is important.

Cantor's term for that was relative numbers as opposed to just numerical aggregation of numbers.

And thirdly, institutional. Institutional is critical because our experience is most organizations haven't found a way yet to monitor the outcome of a policy.

So like if we're talking to people and we say, talk to us about the experience of men and women who are different here, they'll usually say, "We have an EEO policy," or "We have an EEO personnel person," or "We have an EEO organization."

And we'll say, "What is the outcome of those policies?"

And they'll say, "We have an EEO policy."



They're focusing on intent. They worked very hard to get together a policy or statement. And I'm not wanting to make fun of the statement; that's important. But what they've done is kind of stopped there and assumed that the impact of that policy will filter out in the organization.

And they have not prepared managers to integrate it; they have not prepared people to respond to it. They have just worked on the plan or worked on the statement. And so often, what happens is it just aborts right there at the level it was created, and other people in the organization don't experience the outcome of that policy.

So we're trying to get people to move off of intent and look at the actual outcome and experiences of people in the organization.

Now, from some of our interviews, a couple of stories illustrate these three levels. At the interpersonal level, the most frequent issue is language, or references. As I mentioned, that earlier story about "a little girl is one of our best engineeers" — those kind of language references indicate problems of people who are not prepared to work with others who are different as appears in an organization. So that's an interpersonal skill level.

Are people aware of the impact of their own



individual behavior? Do they use offensive remarks? Do they tell jokes that were not appropriate in organizational context? Do they participate in rumor or innuendo that are inappropriate?

At the intergroup level, the biggest problem we're finding is the issue of stereotypes, and Dr. Coleman referred to some of these. But we have found, we've talked to managers who again quite legitimately in terms of their intent say, "I won't give this woman an assignment if I feel it would prevent her from going home at 5:30 or 6:00 o'clock to fix dinner."

Now, the issue here is that assumption going unchecked in the organization and that manager operating on a stereotype about women which he or she is applying to the individual woman and assuming it fits, rather than checking it out; and so that stereotyping blocks effective intergroup relationships.

The other example is -- and this may be a generalization which maybe we'll change -- but one of the women we interviewed said, "Working here is so different from college, because in college I worked with men as co-students who worked a lot with women. Here, most of the men I'm working with haven't had a female colleague in their entire time in the organization."

They literally had never worked with a woman.



Now, some of that is indicative, I said, of changing demographics of engineering. But on the one hand, there is a group of men who had never worked with women, and on the other hand is a group of women who have had a lot of experience with men, want to be peers, want to be leaders in the organization; and that's hard to integrate those two groups who have had really different experiences in the organization.

The other issue about intergroup is one that explains -- at least for us -- some of the emotionality that occurs in organizations about issues of difference or diversity. And that is what I began to call "collective identity," in that a woman in an organization can have a series of experiences that are so repetitive and so frustrating that her emotional energy is greater than a man who does not have that collective impact.

For example, let me use myself as a reference. When I first came back to teach at the University, I was the only full-time female in our department who was teaching, and invariably people thought I was part of the clerical staff in the organization.

I had nothing against clerical personnel, but what I am against is people who do not check out the assumption. And one day, literally five people had stopped me in the course of two hours, thinking I was



the secretary for our department, and asked me the same thing: Would you take this down to Xerox? Would you take this over to the other department? How can I get ahold of the Department Chair?

1.0

So by the time the fifth person asked me, I was really irritated, and I said -- probably inappropriately -- "I'm not the secretary here," and I kind of stormed out. This person looked at me like, Who is this? Why is she so upset? And kind of said that to the department head: Why is this woman so upset?

What happens here is the collective impact that I had during the day is not the experience of that individual man who's the fifth person who confronts me.

So if you can see, the emotional intensity is really different. I have had five men say something, and that man has only experienced himself saying that to me. That difference is really critical in the organization because, as I said, it explains some of the emotional energy.

There are some strategies to address: that and to ready one group of people for dealing with another group that is different. If strategies aren't employed, usually that gets left at the interpersonal level, and people are asked to try and work that out without an understanding of what's going on, and it's a collective impact.



In terms of people of color, the colleagues I worked with in Washington, D.C., and I have had very similar experiences, where if I'm working with a person of color, their experience in the organization and mine are totally different, again based on that same accumulated intensity of experience.

So what I'm trying to say is not a question of the minority person or the woman being "too sensitive."

It's a question of not understanding group dynamics that can occur in the organization when the work force demographics change, when people who are different are trying to work together.

At the third level, the institutional level, the biggest issue we see is the inappropriate use of discretionary power. Now, a lot of the circumstances that Kaye mentioned are affected by the discretion of an individual manager, and that discretionary power is really important, because it's that decision-making process that interprets a policy or provides an experience for an individual.

For example, one of the engineers we interviewed wanted to take his entire project team down to look at the construction of the model they had been working on.

He went to his manager and said, "I want to take the team down to look at the project and actually let them see the

experience that is going on."

And the manager replied, "You can take all the team members but the women."

And he was serious again. That is discretionary power. He had the discretion to say, You can take these people, and not these people, and not be called upon to give a rationale for that decision.

Now fortunately, the team manager who went to them was one of the individuals in the organization who understood some of the issues. And rather than confront the person with, "You're prejudiced," he said, "This is going to have an impact I don't think we want to have in the organization. Here's what I think we ought to do" -- and kind of worked it through.

But that's a rare individual who takes on that kind of working through the issues. Most people allow that exercise of discretion to go unchallenged in the organization.

The other problem besides discretionary power at the institutional level is overreliance on EEO people who are charged with the legal, technical aspects of EEO. Some of the managers we interviewed said, "I don't do anything about diversity unless it's a real severe problem, and then I call the EO (sic) person."

Now, that exercise of discretion prevents

ooray!



into the operation of a team or integrated into a staff meeting and really handled a lot more effectively than waiting 'til it is "bad enough to call the EO person."

What I'm saying is, we found that if you can help people differentiate different levels of the experience of working together, that can be useful in problem solving.

For example, if you want to correct interpersonal skill deficiencies, you have to work in some kind of seminar format, some kind of dialogue. If you want to correct intergroup stereotypes, you have to do that with groups of people in the organization. It cannot be done on one-to-one.

And if you want to monitor policy and practice, you have to look at the institutional dynamics.

One other story about institutional ones, about their somewhat rigidity of policy and practices. The engineer who was hired, who was a woman, by a company — this was in Minnesota — and she was one of the first women who worked there as an engineer. After a year and a half of very good performance in the organization, she wanted to go on a year's leave of absence for maternity leave.

And the manager went up to the upper management



and said, "We would like a year's leave of absence for this person."

They said, "No, we don't have a policy on that.

We cannot grant a leave of absence." They refused to

monitor, to look at the fact that the population was

changing, and that other people would be asking for leaves

of absence for maternity leave that hadn't been in the

work force before.

So they didn't grant it, and they lost that engineer. She went someplace else after her baby, and they lost a really good person because they did not look at the policies or practices.

Now, to me, that's not a question of necessarily personal bias on the part of someone, but a failure to look at the impact of what was going on in the organization.

Two issues that stood out across all three levels where they were talking about personal bias or intergroup stereotypes or organizational policy and practice were: number one, feedback in the organization. The problem with feedback is not only expectations, but access. A number of the men that we talked to who were engineers got a lot of feedback informally from their male colleagues during the course of a project, or during a basket ball game, or during a raque tball game, or during some event.



They actually got a lot of feedback from their male colleagues.

ī

A lot of the women we talked to who were engineers were not exposed to that informal feedback. They had begun to ask their managers for more feedback, and the managers began to feel like the women here are needing more feedback, as if it were a problem with the women, rather than seeing it as a problem, again, of the structure of the organization that provided feedback.

So that has been pretty consistent, having to change structures and change attention to the issue of feedback on performance in the organization.

The second major issue is job assignment. A number of the women engineers we talked to said, "I really don't care what people call me." They were willing to let go of the issued language. "But I do care about the assignments I get." A number of women were denied travel assignments, or assignments in areas that women had not been in before — meaning in the operations side, or plant side — because of assumption on the part of the male managers that they would not be ready or want those experiences.

And again, the issue is that those assumptions were not checked out.

Four things, in summary, about this:



_

•

Number one is to really understand the necessity of changing the structural or organizational arrangements in the organization and not leaving all issues at the interpersonal level, helping people who are different work together by allowing more group-to-group interaction; reviewing policies rather than just asking a man, Do you mind working with a woman? Or, asking the woman, Do you feel okay here?

Not at that level, but moving it to the level of organization policy and practice creating new structures.

Secondly, understanding the culture of the organization. I've learned a lot about the engineering profession by the research we've been doing, and there are ways engineers think about their work that is really different from the way they have to think about this issue of discrimination or sexism, racism. There's a real difference in how you think about those two things.

And our most successful experiences in seminars have been when we've been able to help people move from thinking in the kind of absolute quantifiable way that engineering entails to kind of abstract, reflective, lookeing at one's own behavior that the area of working in managing diversity entails.

And really appreciate that difference in helping people move to a different way of thinking.



One example about culture that came from another experience: I ended up one summer since I've been back from Utah, working for the Department of Labor in Denver to do a seminar on assertiveness, and I imagined that I would have a population of predominantly women employees in the government. And it turned out I had predominantly mine inspectors, people going to the mines and inspecting the mines.

And they got there by all the bureaucratic means that we're probably familiar with. Someone said, "You're going to go to this program." Their definition of assertiveness was a lot different than mine.

And so we spent the first three or four hours learning the cultures, the different cultures we were coming from. And after that, we had a great seminar on assertiveness.

But if I had just started talking about assertiveness as I understood it, and not understand what does
it mean to be a mine inspector, and talk about assertiveness when you're dealing with people who are different
from you, that's a lot different cultural setting.

The third one is the issue of joint and separate work. I think when the populations change in an organization, the majority group, as well as the minority group — whether that's women or people of color — both of those



-

groups need attention. And I think traditionally what we've done in organizations is only look at women and minorities to see if they're prepared, and not look at the majority group to see if they're prepared.

So a lot of what I invest time in is preventative work with the majority group in the organization to get their skills and insights at a place where they can work productively with others who are different.

And the last point is to really do long-range planning as has been mentioned here, because when the demographics change in a profession, as we're seeing in engineering, the planning that will enable effective working relationships when there are one or two people who are different, is different from the planning that will enable effective relationships when there are ten or 20 people who are different.

And it's really important to develop a long-range plan for your company or for people who are going to begin to see numbers change in the work force. We have finished a paper called "Managing Diversity of Women in Engineering, which we've submitted -- and if some of you are interested in that, let me know afterwards -- which we hope will be published.

Thank you.

MS. DUPONT: Dr. Kirkham, Thank you.



3

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

from Denver, from the Rocky Mountain Regional Office, will now talk to us.

Dr. Roger Wade, who is a civil rights analyst

DR. WADE: Thank you.

What I'd like to talk about is a study that was conducted by the Wyoming Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and a report just recently released by that committee which deals with the situation of women in the mining industry or mineral extraction industries.

The study took place in 1980, '81, and was conducted at worksites at eight different locations around the State of Wyoming.

Now, we may say that perhaps the findings of the study would only be relevant to Wyoming, but I don't know if any of you saw the TV movie last night, "The \$5.20 Dream, " but if you did, it was a dramatization of the types of problems and harassment that women encountered when they tried to get a job on an assembly line that had previously been all male.

As I sat and watched that movie, I thought they must have read our study and based the movie on the study, because the problems, the types of things that happened were so similar that it was almost uncanny.

So what I'm saying is that although the study



took place in Wyoming, I think we can say with some assurance that similar, if not almost identical types of problems have occurred in other locales and in different kinds of industries.

The mining industry has only recently taken women employees into blue collar types of occupations. To give you just one example, in 1973, of 190,000 coal miners in this country, none of them were women. So it's only been very recently that women have been included in mining work forces; that is, actually doing the laboring types of jobs.

There have been women in the office. There have been secretaries and so on, and there have been professional engineers here and there. But by and large, no women in the mines, and certainly no women underground.

Some of you may recall the belief that many miners have -- or had, at least -- that a woman underground meant trouble; that there was going to be an accident; that there would be death -- what have you.

I didn't encounter a great deal of that in Wyoming, although one older miner did say he still believed it. I don't know how he dealt with the fact that there were women in his mine, but he still had that belief.

We did talk with some professional women, but



by and large, the female engineers and geologists and so on did not encounter nearly as many difficulties or problems as did the blue collar women. professional women in these corporations in fact stated that they were very happy with their jobs, and that they

had been treated very well.

1

2

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But of all of the blue collar women interviewed, less than ten percent could say that they had not been harassed in one way or another, and most stated that they had been harassed in several different ways.

Many of the

And I want to talk a little bit about some of the forms of the harassment.

First of all, there is the issue of how widespread is harassment, and our study, at which is more than 90 percent of the women; in some national surveys there have been, which are of dubious scientific value, but nonetheless the best we have to go by, figures range from 70 to 90 percent of women saying that they had been harassed at least once at some time in their work career.

It's hard to say in a particular industry just what the extent of harassment is, but we do know that in fields where women are new to the work force, the tendency for harassment is much greater.

I will say that in general, women working underground in mines had more difficulties than women working



in surface mining. The opportunities for harassment just seemed to be greater in an underground working situation.

First of all, most surface mining is done by machinery, and people are pretty much isolated in their truck or in their tractor, or what have you. But in the underground mining situation, people do work in groups, so there is an opportunity there for more interaction, and of course, greater harassment often comes with it.

We also interviewed in our survey the male miners and supervisors, foremen and company officials. One overriding conclusion that we came to was that in many instances companies are not aware that they are having problems, because women quit rather than bring the problems forward, and for anyone here who works for a corporation, we have developed a list of steps or points, if you will, that can be taken to try and determine whether your corporation is having a harassment problem.

The first thing to do is to look at your turnover rates of employees. What we found in Wyoming was that the female turnover rate was about three times higher in the companies we went to than the male turnover rate.

So if a company sees something like that, they might suspect that there are some problems involved. But there are ways of, I guess in a sense, people don't want to find problems, so we find ways of explaining statistics



like that. And many of the corporation officials said,
"Well, I think it's because the women find out that they
can't really do the work. They get this job which pays
\$10 or \$11 an hour, and it sounds great, but once they
get down underground they find out it's hard, it's dirty,
and they can't really hack it."

That is a wide-spread belief. Yet all of the women I interviewed insisted that they could do the work. The vast majority of the white male co-workers believed that the women could do the work. And those who are familiar with modern mining know that the great, over-whelming majority of the work no longer requires the kind of brute strength that perhaps might give small women and small men problems. In fact, most of the work requires very little in the way of muscle. But the belief still persists that women are not capable of doing the work because of strength required.

when women go to apply to companies, mineral extraction companies, very often we've found they have a difficult time getting the company to consider them for a mining position. There is a thing called "steering" that occurs in some instances. Steering amounts to directing women into certain kinds of jobs that are believed to be jobs that women can handle.

So for example, in one situation that I did



interviewing, the women were put into so-called technical jobs. These were sort of semi-scientific laboratory analysis type of positions.

By the way, they paid less, and by the way, there was no clear ladder, and all of these positions were filled by women. They were called women's jobs, as opposed to the mining jobs, which were thought of by some of the women themselves as men's jobs.

So steering, it is hard to say how widespread it is. Some indicate this is less widespread than it used to be, but it still does occur.

I happened on at least one instance where a corporation allegedly was doing this. Even if assigned to a laboring job, women were sometimes given different kinds of work to do. Stereotypes die hard, I guess. And in some mines, women wound up with all the dirty work, sort of, I guess a carryover of being the homemaker, the housekeeper.

The women had to do the sweeping, picking up of tools, cleaning out of the restrooms. One woman told me she was assigned to clean out the men's restroom while it was being used.

You can only guess that that was harassment.

There are no jobs in the mines which are strictly clean-up jobs. Everyone is supposed to do part of that, but in



many instances women wound up with the "dirty work."

When it came to the more technical kinds of work, many
times women were excluded from that. Women told me that
they would request to be trained on a machine, and they
would not get the training, but that men who were hired
at the same time -- or even later than them -- would get
the training on the machines.

To quote one woman: "Men come in the morning, are asked for the types of work they want, and women get whatever is left over." So work assignments were given in the morning. The men would get what kind of work they wanted, and the women in this particular situation would get whatever was left to them.

Another woman told of working alongside a man who was given all the mechanical work, or the work with the machines, to do, while she was just allowed to do actual physical labor. When she complained to her foreman, he said, "Women are only good for the labor work, not the mechanical."

So these kinds of attitudes were encountered.

Aside from the assignment of dirty work and the use of women as menial in the mines, there were also a great deal of avoidance by male workers. Males would not talk to the female workers. One woman told me of going down in the mine every day. She was a minority woman, by the way.



When she was first hired and waiting to be told when she was to work and what she was supposed to do, she waited day after day at the bottom of the mine.

Finally she just attached herself to one work group, which she felt they were not too happy to have her, and began to do what they were doing.

She went to a foreman and tried to get him to tell her what to do, and he ignored her.

Again, in the movie last night, on the breaks and so on, the one woman on the assembly line was off by herself; nobody would talk to her.

The men were kind of frightened to begin talking to her, because then it would be considered to be on her side, and rumors would probably start; and they do start, that she was sleeping with him, that he's sweet on her, etc. etc.

This was common. Women who get good job evaluations were accused of, as one woman put it, hanky-panking with the foreman.

Another woman I talked to was accused of being a prostitute. All sorts of rumors spread about the women in the mining situation.

The wives of some of the workers, some of the male workers, according to some of the women I interviewed, were also very upset about women being in the mine. They



felt that they would get involved with their husbands.

They felt that they posed a threat somehow.

And companies I think should be aware that this can be a potential source of conflict, and can be something that the men, the male employees in the mines, can be concerned about.

Aside from the avoidance and not helping the women figure out what to do on the job, many men will not help women with the actual day-to-day physical work in the mining situation.

There is some lifting required and certain types of, say, putting up pipe for air, and so on, does require some lifting and strength. Typically men will do that work together, or the strongest men will do it. But when the woman was involved in doing it, she would be left on her own in some instances to do it.

One woman told me of heavy boxes being put purposely in the way of where she had to work, as sort of a game to figure out how she would deal with that.

So there's a more subtle form of harassment than some of the others I'll get to.

Much of a mining job has to be learned on the job.

The training that miners typically go through before going into the mine is safety training, a couple of weeks or a week of that. I forgot; is it two weeks or one? I



can't remember exactly, but very little actual how-do-you-do-the-job that's learned on the job.

went to were not helping the female miners. They would help the male miners to learn the job. So the women learned slower, and in some instances received negative evaluations of their work, and in a couple of instances had to go back through a special training program. This also leads to women do have a higher accident rate in some mine situations. And perhaps one of the sources of this -- and we can't say this with assurance -- but perhaps one of the sources of this higher accident rate is that they are not helped to learn how to do the job.

Also, women tend to get blamed for any accident that happened in the mine. One woman I interviewed told me of being switched to another work crew because an accident occurred in which she was involved, and without any investigation, the foreman and supervisor decided to switch her to another work crew, because the work crew she was with said she was unsafe to work with.

And that in an underground mining situation is a very heavy accusation to wage against someone, that they're unsafe. And so she was at that time in the process of trying to bring some legal action against the company because of that.



The most prevalent form of harassment, almost to the point of omnipresence -- according to the women -- was verbal harassment amounting to swearing, which most of the women sort of just shoved aside. They assumed they were going to hear that when they went into the mine, and didn't really bother them all that much, although some said they just plain got sick of it.

But what really began to bother -- or did bother many of the women were the explicit sexual remarks about the women's bodies or about the men's bodies, or about propositions, suggestions and so on. Some women claim these were a daily occurrence. Men would circulate Playboy magazines, talk about their sex lives, talk about their sexual prowess, tell supposed jokes about women, tell jokes about sexual encounters, and so on.

And again, I think the tendency of many people familiar with the mining industry and mining officials of people who work for the corporations is to sort of say, Well, the women shouldn't be so sensitive, because that's just the way men are.

But the women that I've talked with seem to be able to differentiate between men just sort of being the way they are, and what they felt was above and beyond the normal, and most of them were very hesitant to complain

By the way, again, companies don't hear about



the harassment because most women -- at least from our study -- would rather quit or just abide it and try to struggle through again, like the movie last night, rather than go to the company, because their belief, regardless of what the company says, is that if they go to the company they're going to wind up in more trouble than if they keep their mouth shut.

Some companies claim to have an open-door policy. If you have a problem, come to me, the personnel officer says. Meanwhile, the women miners are saying, Sure, go to them. Everybody will know about it, and then the next day I've got to come to work, and everybody's going to say, Who does she think she is, queen bee? And she's going to suffer even more harassment.

And this is one of the difficulties for corporations. How do you find out what is in fact going on in the mining situation. One way that we suggest is to bring people together from time to time to give them a chance to air their problems to people in the corporate structure who they can trust.

There is often no recourse for a person -- for a woman who is having trouble in a mine. She turns to the union, and the union official says, You're taking it too seriously. It's just boys being boys.

She goes to the personnel officer and he says



maybe the same thing.

There's a tendency to downplay the impact of these events on the women involved. And I know from the crying that took place in some of the interviews that I did that the impact is very severe. And from the turnover rates and from the fact that the women told me that they would rather leave the job than go to the company, that many times these problems are just not brought to the floor.

Other forms of harassment in underground mines again are drawings all over the mines, with comments about these women, drawings of women's bodies nude, women miners' names attached to the drawings in some cases. Some get more ingenious than that.

And again, a woman going to work, she's just trying to make a living, but she has to walk into a situation where she's being ridiculed, treated as a sex object or what have you.

Physical touching of a sexual nature also occurs. Women told me that in the lift going up and down in the mine, it was routine for them to be touched by male miners. There is a lot of pinching, patting, etc.

One woman told of a particular miner who bumped into her all the time, and she didn't think it was just accidental, but she would be standing or working someplace,



and he would bump into her.

Some of the physical contact is not sexual; it's hostile. There have been some reported incidents -- not in this area particularly -- but back east, of rapes, of actual beatings, and just very hostile types of behavior on the part of the male miners towards the female miners.

The force of that I think also was brought out in the movie last night. There is a widespread belief among male miners that as women come into the mines, they will see the hourly salary threatened. The women are competition, and that they will cheapen the value of the job.

Also, another dimension of that is one of the things that miners tend to pride themselves on -- the male miners -- is their physical ability, is their strength.

And if women request to come in and do the very same job, then they feel they have nothing to brag about, or nothing to feel good about.

So in some respects, women entering the mine pose a real threat, or a psychological threat -- both -- to the male miners.

As the last part of this study, we presented our findings to corporate executives in the mining industry and then interviewed these executives to find out what their reaction was to our findings.



I was surprised that most of them did not argue, that these things did not occur, but none of them felt that they occurred in their company. It was other companies.

And again, I don't think they're purposely being blind. I think it's because the problems don't percolate up through the organization to their level, and there are all kinds of reasons why these women would not come forward

And you could imagine trying to work in a situation where you have finked by going to the boss, and what kind of response you would get from workers who already weren't too friendly to you in the first place.

For those who might be interested in this report, we do have copies of it here, and we also have copies of the follow-up in our Denver office, and we could send them to you if you are interested.

MS. DUPONT: Let me introduce to you our final panelist on this particular topic, Ms. Faye Jensen, who is Director of Placement at Utah Technical College.

Ms. Jensen?

MS. JENSEN: First of all, I get real nervous behind pulpits, because it reminds me of church, so I'm going to come out here.

I'm Director of Placement at Utah Technical College, and we train in a lot of different areas.



And in reference to what you said, Dr. Wade, you don't have to go underground to find women that get in trouble.

You can find them on the surface, too, because that's been my experience in dealing with employers, especially with women in non-traditional roles.

We do some training classes at Utah Tech. The ones that we became aware of, such as we did a training class which is ongoing for Mountain Bell to train women, especially in basic electricity, because Mountain Bell found that when they went to their training program, they were failing tool handling -- handling of the tools.

So we run a program every quarter with 20 or 30 women and some men, too; to learn the names of the tools, and just how to handle certain tools.

Some other things that we're doing is Math, and we find that women have a problem because they've been conditioned through elementary that they won't need the Math -- which is a bunch of baloney, as far as I'm concerned.

We have the apprenticeship program. The problem with that program is that the money attracts them, but they don't realize what the condition of the job is really going to be when they get into that job condition, because it's dirty and it's heavy in some situations, and



there is harassment.

So our feeling is that we need to work with people like the Phoenix Institute, which we are trying to do, to teach women especially what that job's going to be and what the expectation of that job is going to be when we go out there doing it.

We have a couple of openings out at Utah Tech.

now. One opening in Electronics, and another opening
in Drafting. I asked the Dean of that college if they
had any female applicants, and he said, No, we had zero
applicants in the electronics area to teach and in the
drafting area. So if you can't find them and they don't
apply and you don't know where to recruit, how are you
going to put them in those kinds of positions?

And I think that we need women in non-traditional teaching areas; because they can serve as models for other women who are entering in those fields.

Speaking of models, my sister and I went to the Division of Department of Transportation three weeks ago because they were having trouble with their 13 supervisors. This is the transportation I mean that goes out and work on the roads, and they have one woman who drives a dump truck. And they thought that if my sister and I went in and talked to those 13 supervisors, it might help to get a discussion going.



And the reason that we were chosen, I guess, is because we're both pretty non-traditional. My sister is at the prison. She's been there six years; one-to-twenty on a bum rap.

But anyway, she supervises the dairy, and she works with other dairy officers, and about a dozen inmates which are male inmates, and she's doing a great job. In fact, Matheson gave that dairy the most improved dairy in the state of Utah award just a few weeks ago.

Anyway, so I am pretty non-traditional. I, as a hobby, have my own hay business. I haul hay. So another thing, when you say "small women and small men;" I appreciate that, but some small women are stronger than some larger men and some larger women, just to make that clear.

Anyway, it's not that I think it has to do with the condition of what you've done throughout your life, whether you're male or female, because to me, to go out and haul hay all day is something I've done most of my life, and it's as natural as anything else, and not difficult because I enjoy it, and probably build up the muscles to do that kind of thing.

So it depends on the person -- not just the size or the sex -- just depends on the person across the board, as far as I'm concerned.



By the way, we talked to the 13 supervisors at the new place up on 45th South, and what she said, and some of the things that stood out in my mind as we were talking about women in non-traditional jobs, was that the managers or the supervisors wanted to be protective of the women. They want to protect the women that work with that road crew from the men, so that they won't get harassed or raped or whatever.

So they're being overly protective, even to the point that they worry where the woman is going to go to the bathroom, and we said, That's not your problem; that's the woman's problem. They'll find that.

I remember as a teenager I had a tractor and I worked on the new Beck Štreet overpass, and I had a post. They hired me to dig the post holes, and that was with all men. And I was a teenager, and I don't know, I can't remember where I went to the bathroom. Maybe I didn't go; I don't know.

But now, anyway, through talking to them, with those 13 men, and I mean that's pretty heavy stuff; they said at the end, they said, Well, we'll hire you.

Well, sure, because they knew that we could probably do the job. And one guy said, "Hey, Faye, why don't we get together and you could run my farm?"

And I said, "Why should I run your farm when I



can run my own?"

I mean, you know, that's just how I feel about it.

Anyway, through talking to people like that and going over to the Department of Transportation, I think it helps placing women in non-traditional jobs. Because just yesterday I called over there, and we happened to be doing training with a lot of Indians this summer at Utah Tech in different areas, like automatic transmission overhaul, and it's CETA monies, and truck driving. And in the six people in the truck driving class, we have one female.

And so I said, Hey, I need a job for a female.

And they said, Send her over. Bring her over, because
we're low in that area and we need to hire some females.

So I know that she'll probably get the job, because she
can do the job and she's qualified.

And that's another thing I think that we as women need to realize that first of all, we must qualify ourselves. And the thing that gets me, I teach women in management. I have for five years, and the reason is because one of the companies in the valley was going to be sued because they had 1400 employees, and 1300 of them were women in low-paying jobs, and a hundred were men in management positions. They were getting government funds, and they said, You'd better do something about getting women in management or we're just going to cut off funding.



So they came to Utah Tech with \$5,000, and, Can you do something for women in management. And I don't think Utah Tech didn't want that one, so they said, Faye, can you do something.

So I knew, I don't want to say invented -- that's stupid -- but I started these classes called "Women in Management." There's three of them, and I have been doing it for five years, and they fill up every time. They're titled "Women in Management." There are men taking the class, and now I just finished a couple of classes last night.

In my one class I have 30 people, and 12 of them are men, and we carry on really good discussions, because we have an interaction with each other. Women in work settings, and we can talk about things.

They said the reason they wanted to be in the class was because they may at some point in their life have a woman for their supervisor, or supervising a woman, and want to know how they feel.

I think that's what we have to deal with, is seeing, talking with both sides. You can't have seminars for women separately and seminars for men separately. I think we need to get together and work together and solve these problems.

Anyway, I've taken these classes into places like



Sperry Univac, Deseret, Mountain Bell, O. C. Tanner and Litton. But what I find, too, in those classes is, generally speaking, I walk in and say, "How many of you would like to work for a woman?"

Mostly women in the class; right? And a lot of women will not raise their hands. They don't want to work for another woman. You're women, and it doesn't make sense.

And, well, I worked for one woman, and she was a real you-know-what; I said, Have you ever worked for a man that was a real you-know-what?

Well, yes, but maybe only one woman, and that one woman stands out, and they might have had 12 men.

So I don't know what the answers are. But anyway, I find that in placing people, and especially women, in non-traditional, that concept and self esteem has a lot to do with it. And if you can build your concept and self esteem, tell them that they can do things and explain what the job is, and they can do non-traditional jobs.

Who wouldn't rather work for ten bucks as opposed to a clerical job that starts at \$734 a month. How many of you would like to live on that, especially if you've got three or four kids, not receiving anything else from anyone, then to have to make it work on that kind of



money. But a woman has to know what they're going into when they get to a non-traditional job, because it's not always easy.

So I think that's about all I have to say.

Do you have any questions?

Thank you.

MS. DUPONT: I think if we're really conscientious, we can finish up here.

I will entertain questions for the panelists that are here, and could you limit your questions for women in non-traditional jobs.

Could I have Mr. Gibson and Mr. Taylor to speak to us?

Mr. Bill Gibson is a representative of the Governor's Commission on Employment of the Handicapped here in Salt Lake City, and our topic for discussion now will be employment of the handicapped and aged.

Mr. Gibson?

MR. GIBSON: It's a pleasure to be with you today. I'm glad to be here to represent the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

I currently am legislative chairman on that committee. I also work for Services for Disabled Students at Weber State College in Ogden, where we do a great deal in the area of placement of disabled individuals.



y

i 13

Recently I made a presentation similar to this in San Francisco, and it was kind of one of those rush things where you fly in and fly out when you're finished. And these kinds of experiences always seem to create butterflies, no matter how often you've done them.

Well, I was trying to get my papers out and get ready to get up and speak, and I made the mistake of leaving the briefcase on my lap when I stood up.

I managed to grab and catch everything except for a bottle of Bromo Seltzer, which rolled down the aisle and rolled clear to the back of the room. A kind little old lady picked it up and walked clear to the front of the room as I was speaking and said, "Here's your bottle of Bromo Seltzer. You must have a nervous stomach."

And I told her, Man, if she only knew.

But anyway, today I hope I can provide you with some information which will help you as employers and citizens to enhance the employment opportunities of handicapped or disabled citizens.

I'd like to divide my remarks into six areas; and first of all, deal with legal justification. I'm sure when you talk about legislation and laws and legal justification, people have an automatic resentment towards that.

But as we review the alarming unemployment rate



that occurred back in the '60's among disabled individuals, we can see that some legislation was necessary.

And I'm certain many of you have heard of the Rehabilitation Act 504 which was passed in 1973, and like many acts that are passed, all the executive agencies were mandated to come forth with regulations, and did not do that until 1977.

The Department of HEW, Health, Education and Welfare -- that is now the Department of Education,

Department of Health and Human Services -- was the first to come forth with those regulations, and probably the most important because it was the Department that influenced on the local level most disabled citizens.

It's important to realize in talking about 504 that to comply with that law, one must be a Federal recipient; that means any type of Eederal contract. So if you're in private business but receive some type of Federal contract, you must still comply with the law.

The regulations contain an important section on employment, which states that an individual cannot be discriminated against solely on the basis of handicap.

In 1977, another law was passed to benefit private employers, and it was called the Tax Reduction and Simplification Act. It allows private employers benefits for hiring disabled individuals or making



 necessary architectural modifications. They're allowed up to 25 percent the first year, depending upon the number of employees they've hired, and up to 50 percent the second year.

It's important in making the architectural modifications to check through the IRS, through the Governor's Office on Employment for the Handicapped, to establish just exactly what benefits you allow.

But people in large corporations that I've talked to have found the Act very useful. A gentleman from the DuPont Corporation said that it has been very successful to their organization, and something that he feels all employers should use, and many are unaware of.

So in the future, if you desire in your area to use that Act, and I think it should be used, you can contact the Governor's Office for further information.

Let me move along now to my next area of human considerations. And those of us promoting employment of disabled realize that it is impossible to legislate attitudes among employers. However, as I stated before, some legal guidelines were necessary when you examine the alarming unemployment rate.

A study completed by the Department of Labor exemplifies this fact. They found that currently 32.1 percent of disabled men and 34.2 percent of disabled



women are currently unemployed.

As we examine statistics in the Social Security

Annual Report, it further validates the fact. They found

that only ten percent of the visually handicapped people
in this country are currently employed, which also includes
sheltered workshop employment; that only 17 percent of
those who are mobility impaired.— that is those who are
paraplegics, quadroplegics, multiple sclerosis cases;
muscular dystrophy cases, cystic fibrosis cases, amputees,
and all those areas are included under mobility impairments—
that only 17 percent of those individuals are currently
employed. And it's a little higher among the hearing
impaired, that they have a 25 percent employment rate.

So you can see that the statistics are quite startling, and it validates the fact that I think the employer needs to make some type of humanistic considerations in this whole argument.

Mr. Steven L. Jamison, a management consultant for IBM who has employed many disabled people, explains the humanistic aspect in this way:

He said, It would be regrettable if real progress could only come from adversary relationships between employers and employees based on legal rights.

Least of all, do handicapped people want to make progress on this basis.



Nevertheless, this legislation was necessary to help set priorities for companies whose good will intentions sometimes get deferred or sidetracked by the many other worthwhile activities that compete for attention.

The primary purpose of business is to earn a profit with decency. This means much more than avoiding the illegal or unethical. It means contributing positively in human values to the general welfare. It has become abundantly clear that human considerations must take first priority in any undertaking.

Every institution, be it a college or a corporation, must take affirmative steps to provide the handicapped, for they are part of our society, and deserve that opportunity.

So what Mr. Jamison is telling us is that in employing people, we must take into account the humanistic aspects of the disabled.

There are also business justifications which must be taken into consideration. And I know many employers have approached me and said, Well, yes, we'll employ a few, but really, what's in it for us. And that's a perfect reasonable question.

We at our level, at the college level, all agree that the disabled person must first be qualified, and I think that most disabled individuals agree with that.



 During the '60's there was a great deal of tokenism that went on. You still find much of that. The other day I was talking to a personnel manager for a large business in the Ogden area, and I was explaining to him the values of this student, how he could do the work, that he was hearing impaired, the modifications that we would need to make.

And he immediately noticed by the student's name that he was a minority, and he said, You mean the student's also a minority in this other area?

I said, Yes, he certainly is.

He said, My heck, we can fill two categories with him. That's outstanding.

Well, I think that under business justification it's important to employers to first look at the value that that disabled person can be to their corporation or their organization, and they can be, if they receive the necessary training, and if they're given a chance to be employed.

Let me talk a little bit, then, about ways to contact disabled people. First of all, at the post-secondary level: Most colleges and universities across the country have career placement offices where they place students in part-time jobs, full-time jobs, upon graduation, or have a cooperative education system



 where a student has an off-campus job and receives credit as well as from the department where they're majoring, as well as a salary for that position.

There is usually, in most placement centers now, a person who is in charge of employment of disabled individuals and works specifically in that area.

I think it's important for employers to know who that person is, to contact that individual if they have not already contacted you.

A study done by the Cooperative Education

Association National Committee that we took part in about six years ago, we surveyed 800 colleges and universities. The study demonstrated that only four percent of those 800 in colleges and universities had dealt with disabled people at the placement level.

We now feel that that's much higher because of an awareness campaign that we've gone on, but it is an important resource now for you to use as employers.

Another source is the Job Service representatives in those offices, and usually they have someone assigned specifically to working with disabled people to locate jobs. And so that is also an important contact point to make.

For awareness programs through the Governor's Committee for Employment for the handicapped, we have a



⋝_

speakers bureau. We also have films and literature that are available, so we would be glad to assist you at any time in that area.

Now we come to the point of you saying, Well, we've contacted them, they have applied, we know who they are. How do we go about getting them into the job situation, which falls under the category of job restructuring.

Let me talk a little bit about job restructuring and do that by giving you some personal examples that we've dealt with.

I noticed the gentleman from Sperry Univac spoke earlier this morning, and we just employed a student in the data processing area with Sperry Univac. He is visually impaired, has partial vision, but is able to perform the task well by using a closed circuit TV system, which enlarges the print from the computer terminal onto the screen.

He just graduated, has been there approximately three months now, and is doing an excellent job. But there was this type of job restructuring that the employer had to be open to and work with.

We also have another student working for Associated Pipe:Company in Clearfield who is hearing impaired, and it was necessary to send an interpreter with her for the



first two weeks of her employment so she could become familiar with other employees, and they could in turn become familiar with her.

We sent the interpreter for her training sessions so she could also participate in those. It provided a good outlet for the supervisor, so the supervisor had that communication level that she needed with that employee, and she is still there in the drafting area, doing an excellent job.

Yesterday we worked with the school districts in employing a teacher who is visually handicapped and needed some modifications there. She has to have a magnified lamp to read in the classroom, but it's another situation that works out very well.

Some things they've done at other industries:

The DuPont Corporation has a number of secretaries who are hearing impaired. They have done some job restructuring by reversing the phone responsibilities that are always in the secretarial job descriptions that they have, to another secretary, and giving the hearing impaired ladies additional filing responsibilities.

So it's a job-sharing concept that takes place.

At IBM Corporation in Boulder, Colorado, there is a
gentleman that has dyslexia, and I'm sure with all the
publicity most of you are aware that it's a disability



which impairs reading, the written skills.

He is an inventory worker and is able to accomplish that by putting his orders on cassette tapes. They are later typed up by a secretary.

So there are a number of devices, job restructuring that can take place. Hearing impaired people can use a TT wire, telephone communication system to communicate over the phone.

There are also several FM systems or phonic ears that have just been established that enable the person to communicate quite easily. Visually impaired individuals use the closed circuit TV system that I talked about earlier, a brailler, or a slate and stylus, to take Braille notes, or they're coming out with a number of talking reading machines now, and talking terminals that have been used throughout the country in job situations.

Mobility impaired people usually require architectural modifications. Once they get to the job setting they're usually able to do that. And of course that involves the installation of restroom facilities, water fountains, modifying entrances and doorways at times, installing elevators. And it's important to realize again that under the Tax Reduction and Simplification Act, there are benefits to the employer for making

_

these kinds of modifications. We find that in working with employers, if the employer is usually willing to make the necessary changes, that the disabled individual who is qualified does perform well the tasks involved.

Out of the people we've found jobs for, 92 percent of those people are still employed, and we feel very good about that.

The other eight percent, some of them we've lost contact with; others moved on to areas of the country. But we feel that that illustrates that by cooperative relationship between us and the placement people, the disabled individual, and you as the employers, success can be gained in this area.

In conclusion, I'd like to read a quote of which is given by Henry Viscardi who established a workshop and a training program, and was able to employ many disabled people in the New York area. And I think it speaks well for all disabled individuals.

He states: "We want to stand erect, to think and act for ourselves, to face the world boldly and say, 'This we have done.'"

Thank you.

MS. DUPONT: Okay, and our final speaker today on employment of handicapped and aged will be Mr. Bayard Taylor, who is Director of the State Commission on Aging

here in Salt Lake City.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

I don't know how many of you had breakfast as early as I did this morning, and was wondering about lunch. I had breakfast at 4:00 o'clock this morning, and so with that in mind, I'm anxious to go to lunch also, so I'll try to be brief.

And maybe this is pertinent: I'm not the Director of the Commission on Aging. My boss happens to be a woman, so maybe that's pertinent.

That's an incorrect title. I'm one of her employees in the Division of Aging. My responsibility has to
do with something I'm very excited about. She's more
qualified than I for that job, because she has been with
Aging longer.

But I really appreciate the opportunity to be on the same panel with others involved in EEO in terms of aged. I suppose we're Johnny-come-latelies, even though our business is concerned with the older worker where the legislation for the older worker was more recent in 1967, when the Age Discrimination in Employment Act was enacted.

But I suppose that our attention is getting greater focus, because I understand that the litigations in terms of this aspect are increasing more rapidly than



any other areas of EEO. So maybe the coin of phrase we've come of age in that regard. In fact, I was talking to one of the City Attorneys in Salt Lake City today, and he said, Yes, that's true. They have more litigations regarding age discrimination in employment than in any other area.

And he said, Maybe it's again because we're later on the scene.

I'd like to quote from an elderly gentleman that I talked to down in Castledale, Utah -- and this is a little poem which would introduce what I have to say -- and he said this:

"In ancient times when skulls were thick and primal passions raged, they had a method sure and quick to cure the blight of age. But for when a man got old and grey and weak and lost his vim, they simply knocked him in the head, and that put an end to him. But all we in this enlightened age are built of nobler stuff, and so we look with righteous rage on deeds so harsh and rash. Now when a man gets old and grey, or a woman, and is weak and short of breath, we simply take his job away and let him starve to death."

Now, I was interested in what Kaye Coleman said in regard to engineering — that engineers top out at age 32. I'd like to start from there and move from there onward, and talk about those people.



I'm surprised she said "at 32," because the Age Employment Act only starts at 45, and that's quite a few years after that.

Let me just talk about some realities of the future in terms of where we're going, and this is something we're all involved in, because we're all getting there, and I'd hate to think that we all get out of this life with the only other alternative there is.

But the realities of employment in the future for older people, I am quoting from Robert N. Butler, who is the first Director of the National Institute on Aging.

And he said, There were only three percent of the population over 65 in 1900; only three percent. The average life expectancy was only 47 in 1900. Now it is 73, a 26-year gain in a little over 80 years. And now we have 11.6 percent of the population over age 65.

So one out of every nine people walking down the street is over 65, and in about 40 years from now, one out of about every five. Because the baby boom after World War II is now getting older, families are smaller, our work force is getting — even though we have unemployment now, we know that in the future, as the economy improves, hopefully there will be a need for the skills

of older people.

And so we want to talk about hiring older people. In 1981, there was a Harris poll that said that 79 percent and I think this is incredible -- 79 percent of those over 65 who were retired wanted to continue to work in some way. Not necessarily full-time work, but in some way, part-time, shared work, work at home, whatever.

I'm acquainted with an individual who is 79 years old. He's one of the sharpest, most intelligent people I know. He's 79 years old and he's had a real struggle finding a job. He was an accountant. He was offered two or three jobs because he looks younger. And when they checked out his age, they said, Sorry, I can't take you.

But yet he is a trained accountant. Now he is employed by Salt Lake County, thanks to Salt Lake County, and he's doing just a magnificent job. He says, I'm not any older than anyone else; I just breathe longer. That's his attitude. That's his whole attitude toward life.

What are the advantages of older workers?

There are a lot of myths and stereotypes. We've talked about myths and stereotypes in other sessions this morning from other speakers, but there are a lot of myths.

Let me emphasize the positive in hiring older



workers -- their morale, their loyalty is very strong.

They know they're not going to, generally speaking, they're not going to go to find a job someplace else. They know that they're not going to, especially the older people, are not interested in becoming the president of the company, even though Reagan became the President. That was a slip. We thought he would be a greater supporter than he is, frankly, but there is less turnover.

Absenteeism is usually not the problem. Their

Absenteeism is usually not the problem. Their health is better, if they don't come with any chronic health problems, their health is generally better.

Lane Kirkland, who is head of AFL-CIO, older workers are just as productive as any other worker in our society. Virtually every job in the country can and is being done by older workers. I think you would agree that that is true.

Well, let me just quote another quote from

Joe Batten, who wrote a book entitled "Tough-Minded

Management." He said, In these critical economic times

when every ounce of energy and every scrap of wisdom

could and should be harnessed for the good of the country,

the attributes of our older workers should not be laid

to waste as is happening.

Now let me just mention briefly what some companies are doing. I might say that I have a



publication here that is the Journal of the Western

Geritological Society, and in this Journal there are

articles by 17 representatives of private industry who

are doing things in the area of hiring older workers.

I just extracted from this periodical some of the things that are happening in the area of employing older workers. Levi Strauss has exploited the market, because they are recognizing that younger people are decreasing and older people are increasing in proportion, and they put out a special line of Levi's for older people, and their sales increased 37 percent because of that.

And what Levi's has done is, they have encouraged people who normally retire at age 65. They have encouraged people to stay on at Levi's. They encourage their retired people, based on this Harris poll I mentioned where people have second thoughts about retiring. They encourage their retirees to come back to work and they have an opening.

Xerox, they employ a bid-downward system. It's an equal pay for equal work kind of situation. They encourage older employees where they are in highly stressed jobs to bid for lower-paying jobs and their salaries average between the two as they get older.

Varian Associates out of California, which is

a high technology research development type firm, encourages phased retirement, where they can take a month off here, a month off there, a summer off, or half time -- and these kinds of options are open to them.

Kelly Temporary Services uses temporary workers who are older very extensively. It just works right in very nicely with their organization.

Bankers Life out of New York, just a couple of illustrations: A man started at age 68 after 42 years with the Post Office. He is now 85 and going strong; just a great employee, according to them.

Another person who is an executive secretary to the boss, she was forced out of her employment where she was the executive secretary at another insurance company. Another person started at age 65. He got the 25-year pin, and then he worked every day up until age 89, up until the time before he died, the day before he died.

So employees, older people can perform and will perform, given the opportunity.

Let me just close by quoting from what Maggie Keen says. Maybe you haven't heard of her, but she's quite legendary in the head of the Grey Panthers. She's just a tremendous person, and she really knows how to speak her mind.

She says: "Our great trouble is we suffer from



a Detroit syndrome. We want only the latest models in our society. The old models are undesirable and scrapped, but we're all growing, every one of us."

And I'm sure we'll all agree with that.

Thank you.

MS. DUPONT: All right. I will see if there are any questions for either of these men.

Limit to handicapped and aged.

We have several people here from the private industry. There might be one or two from public industry, but private industry, and I'd like to open up the floor for comments from these people, and if you have anything to say, would you state your name and the company you represent.

One of the things I would like to recommend,
I guess to you, Linda and Cal, is to disseminate the
summaries, either taped this or recorded the entire
proceedings, and I would like to disseminate the information to a lot of those employers, and other organizations
who were not able to attend today for any reason, so
they get the information.

I know the media will cover some of the aspects of this, but brief form. So we could also assist, by that I mean in the Xeroxing, to disseminate, but I think the information should be disseminated. That is something



that we can do, Cal.

If there is anybody that you would like to have it sent to, if you would give the names to Cal, and we will put that on a mailing list.

Any other comments?

Well, I certainly appreciate you coming. I would like to give a special thanks to the staff from Denver, Dr. Shirley Hill Witt and to Cal Rollins, and I'd like to note that any discrepancy in titles I made should be blamed on my male staff, and I meant to open this forum with prayer. Many of you are traveling across the states and out of the state, and so let us close with prayer.

Robby, would you do that for us?

Let's all stand, please.

(Whereupon, the hearing was closed at 12:30 p.m.)

Reporting Bervice

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2 STATE OF UTAH

ss.

COUNTY OF SALT LAKE

5

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

I, JACKIE MAIR, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public within and for the County of Salt Lake, State of Utah, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings of the Forum was taken before me at the time and place set forth herein, and was taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter transcribed into typewriting under my direction and supervision.

That the foregoing 77 pages contain a true and correct transcription of my said shorthand notes so taken.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal this 4th day of Cataber. 1982.

JACKIE MAIR, C'.S.R.

Notary Public in and for the County of Salt Lake,

State of Utah

