

On the Status of Women

Recruitment Division has had few if any specific directives either encouraging or discouraging the recruitment of professional women. Over the years, however, RD, recruiters, and WARO interviewers have developed a "feel" as to which components of the Agency, a) positively encourage the professional woman, b) tend to discourage the professional woman, and c) are apparently indifferent as to whether candidates for their positions are male or female.

The writer recalls that in the mid-50s on some occasion in a public or quasi-public address, the then-Director, Allen W. Dulles, was reported to have replied to a query from the audience concerning the role of women in intelligence that it was his experience that women made "fine spies". Reaction to that comment reached Recruitment Division via the then-Chief, Career Training Program (then JOT),

STAT

[REDACTED] He, in addressing a Recruiter Conference that year, suggested that he was under a mandate to increase the intake of women professionals in the JOT Program. It is recalled that recruiters, during the next year or so, did indeed nominate more women for JOT consideration. However, records of the Career Training Program do not reflect any surge in the intake of women who, since the Program's inception have averaged about 10% of the intake.

From the beginning of the Program through 30 December 1970 the relationship as between men and women has been as follows:

STAT

Women accepted for CTP have tended to have stronger academic backgrounds than many of males accepted. Those women not accepted by CTP were not necessarily lost to the Agency. The very talents that suggested their nomination by the recruiter to CTP have made them equally attractive for direct hire. Thus, many components, especially in the DDI area, have employed numerous professional women who were or might have been considered for CTP. To the degree that the preponderance of the CTP product has been assigned to the Clandestine Service, there has apparently been some resistance by the CS to accept many women on the theory, real or fancied, that they are limited in their operational potential. On the other hand, the Records Integration Division of the CS has never set limits on the number of professional women it employs although they do rather insist that all their new professional employees indicate availability for overseas assignment. To what degree a professional women's career would be impeded, having entered the CS via RID and become immobile by virtue of marriage, we do not know.

In those components concerned with science and technology, (including DDS&T, Communications, TSD and NPIC), we are not aware of specific limitation on the employment of professional women as such. If there are relatively few women scientists or engineers in these areas it is most probably so because relatively few women seek careers in the hard science area. Recruiters and interviewers have never discouraged the application of women in the science and engineering fields. Exceptions are the Office of Computer Services and other computer components of the Agency. Here we have found apparent indifference as to sex if we present candidates with solid credentials in computer science and/or mathematics.

In the Support Services, by and large, little direct hire of professional women has been noted. Security Officers, Logistics Officers, Medical Officers, Communicators, Finance Officers, Auditors and Training Officers have, in the main, been primarily males. Some exceptions are noteworthy. OMS does employ nurses; on field assignments their male medical technicians may well function in that capacity, but that would be "in addition to their other duties" which are basically to run dispensaries. OMS/Psychological Services Staff has women Psychologists and Psychometrists, but that component, over the years, has shifted from Personnel to Training to OMS and the acceptance of professional women has been the policy of PSS though not necessarily that of its parent organization. The Office of Training has offered some opportunity for professional women although the positions so occupied tend to be thought of as "more suitable" for women, i.e. clerical training, course administration and registration, or instructions in administrative procedures. Some few women have advanced to professional levels in Logistics and Finance, but usually by progression from clerical ranks. The Office of Personnel has probably offered more opportunity for professional women than any other Support Service. As the Agency began to grow in the late 40s and early 50s, there were already professional women in Personnel. They had been recruited, by and large, from other Federal agencies because of their technical expertise in certain phases of personnel work. During the mid to late 50s there was developed in the Office of Personnel a so-called Personnel Officer Training Program (members were euphemistically referred to as "POTs"). A substantial number of these Trainees were women, many of whom have

"roadblocks" to prevent the ambitious and able clerical from advancing to "Personnel Assistant" to Personnel Officer. For example, in Recruitment, itself, we have had not less than twelve women in field recruitment, seven of whom rose from clerical ranks. All who left recruitment went on to greater professional opportunities. The first woman GS-16 in the Support Service was in the Office of Personnel.

We find no evidence that professional women hired as such were offered lower grades to start than male professionals. Whether their grade progression was impeded we do not know although it is probably safe to assume that there have been instances wherein males were given preference for supervisory positions.

Attrition rates among female professionals probably has run a little higher than male professionals, although it would be more appropriate to consult the records of OP/Plans Staff on this matter. Attrition Study I and Attrition Study II, completed in November, 1968 and April, 1969, respectively, covered this in detail.

On Educational Bonuses

The Office of Economic Research is the only component which offered the opportunity for advanced study as a recruitment inducement. To those holding a bachelors degree they were able to offer "in-house" courses during the period prior to 1970 when OER staff members held faculty status with George Washington and American Universities. Many employees gained Masters degrees in this fashion and there appears little evidence that by virtue of their new status they then "flew the coop". OER's experience with sponsoring PhD programs was somewhat different, however. According to long-time OER Personnel

Officer, it became apparent over a number of years that there was a direct correlation between a sponsored year of resident doctoral study at a university some distance from Headquarters and the refusal of the employee to return to duty upon completion of the doctorate. He recalled that, on the average, one employee a year was lost in this fashion, usually because the employee was offered an attractive position on the faculty of the university where he was doing his residence. The problem was resolved by confining the universities to which OER would sponsor a doctoral candidate to the immediate Washington area.

On Joint Recruitment Teams

Throughout the 50s and most of the 60s, OER, OSI, OBG, and occasionally OCI, would participate directly with recruiters in campus recruitment. Recruiters were of two minds on the approach. While on the one hand they appreciated the opportunity to learn directly from operating officials up to the minute information on Headquarters activities, there were many instances of administrative confusion, conflicting schedules, and even open competition in the interview booth when officials from two different components vied with one another for the talents of a particular student-interviewee. By mid-60 it reached almost ludicrous proportions and inspired one recruiter to comment that ". . . every time a plane lands in my territory, it disgorges one more man from Headquarters looking for the same sort of candidate as the last one".

By the late 60s, OSI announced that they were satisfied with the quality of the candidates Recruitment was presenting and withdrew from

the field. This was true also of OCI. OBGI took a different tact; they sent representatives to Geography Departments at major universities to discuss substantive geography with their professional peers and, incidentally, to leave literature and materials for interested faculty to make direct referrals to local recruiters. This has proven most satisfactory. At this writing, OER remains the only component which annually dispatches a force of its officers to participate with recruiters in college and university recruiting (see attached 1970-71 schedule).

Another form of joint recruitment has been the professional society convention. Over the years, recruiters have supported OER at the annual meeting of the American Economic Association, CRS at the annual meeting of the American Library Association, OSI and ORD at the American Physical Society Conference, and Psychological Services Staff/OMS at the several regional meetings of the American Psychological Association. Since 1968, however, this recruitment support has only been requested by OER for the AEA meeting, (traditionally held in a major city during the week between Christmas and New Years), and PSS at regional gatherings of the APA. PSS has found this recruitment approach most profitable; virtually all the Psychologists employed by PSS over the past ten years have been as a result of initial contact at APA meetings.

STAT

Approved For Release 2002/07/01 : CIA-RDP78-05939R000200010015-1

Approved For Release 2002/07/01 : CIA-RDP78-05939R000200010015-1