Spring 2018

Moving Beyond the "Old Boys' Club" in Environmental Organizations: Investigating the Behaviors, Attitudes and Perspectives of Men and Women

Kat Pardoe
Bucknell University, kep016@bucknell.edu

Moving Beyond the "Old Boys' Club" in Environmental Organizations: Investigating the Behaviors, Attitudes and Perspectives of Men and Women

Submitted for Honors in Environmental Studies

Kat Pardoe

Approved by:

Advisor: Ben Marsh

Department Chairperson: Peter Wilshusen

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Professor Ben Marsh, for his support, patience and wisdom. Without his encouragement, I would not have pursued this opportunity to begin with. He has pushed me to become a better writer, researcher and thinker, and for that, I am forever thankful. I would like to thank the other members of my Honors Committee, Professor Gaalaas-Mullaney and Professor Smith, for being a part of this process and providing valued insight along the way.

Equally as supportive of this project was Sabrina Kirby, without whom I would have been utterly lost. Sabrina's guidance has been invaluable throughout every step of this process, from practicing interviews to editing the final paper. I am thankful for her thoughtfulness, kind words of encouragement, and calming presence.

Of course, I cannot submit this thesis without acknowledging the woman who first inspired me to explore undergraduate research, Professor Amy McCready. Professor McCready has been a cherished mentor for many years and has supported many of my greatest academic endeavors, giving me the confidence to delve deeper and deeper into world of research. I would like to thank all of the aforementioned individuals for their commitment to undergraduate research; I have grown immensely, both academically and personally, as a result of my involvement with undergraduate research during my time at Bucknell, and there is no way to adequately express my gratitude.

I owe a huge thanks to the thirteen individuals that participated in interviews with me. Without their involvement, this project would not be possible. I appreciated everyone's openness, sincerity, and reflection throughout the interviews. It was truly an honor to learn from each of you.

And finally, I give a special thanks to my family and friends who have shown me nothing but love and support throughout every step of this process.

Preface

Historical Acknowledgements

> "*Vanity Fair's* 'oversight' in highlighting hardly any African Americans or other people of color in their 'Green Issue' speaks volumes about *how* Americans think, see, and talk about the 'environment' in the United States." (Finney 2014, 2)

The quote that opens this section was drawn from Carolynn Finney's *Black Faces, White Spaces: Reimagining the Relationship of African Americans to the Great Outdoors.* Finney calls attention to the apparent whitewashing of environmental engagement as portrayed by *Vanity Fair,* and the implications of the way this magazine attempted to frame environmentalism. Her book explores the exclusionary construction of environmentalism in the United States, with specific interest in the implicit disenfranchisement of African Americans, and the consequences of the prevailing, whitewashed narratives that have shaped environmental discourse, practice, and organizing. She asserts that "The dominant environmental narrative in the United States is primarily constructed and informed by white, Western European, or Euro-American voices" (Finney 2014, 3). Finney explains that, from the environmental movement's nascent stages in the early twentieth century, involvement has been largely been limited to the white middle class – from employment in organizations, to use of recreational spaces, to engagement with volunteerism(Finney 2014, 25-26). For example, she found that "there is a lack of diversity both in [national] park visitation and park hiring practices" (Ibid.). The implications of Finney's research can be extrapolated to inform this research. "By excluding the African American environmental experience (implicitly or explicitly), corporate, academic and environmental institutions legitimate the invisibility of the African American in the Great Outdoors and in all spaces that inform, shape, and control the way we know and interact with the environment in the United States" (Finney 2014, 5).

I cannot do justice to this research on gender-based exclusion from the environmental realm without acknowledging the historical developments that have underpinned said exclusion. There is a much broader picture to consider. The exclusionary culture of environmental organizations stems from oppressive race relations dating back long before

the rise of the environmental movement[1]. Indeed, the exploitation of African natural knowledge, particularly female African natural knowledge, set the framework for the exclusion of minorities (in the context of the United States, anyone who is not a white, property-owning male) from environmental matters, and the particular devaluation of women's knowledge and contributions to this field.

Histories have been manipulated to repackage environmental knowledge and management as white, male contributions to society. Mart Stewart, in his chapter *Slavery and the Origins of African American Environmentalism*, explains the historical contributions of African Americans to environmental and agricultural knowledge, and the development of African American environmentalism in response to the lack of inclusion in mainstream environmentalism. This narrative dates back to the earliest days of slavery.

> The history of slavery in North America was from beginning to end deeply rooted in the environment in which it developed… [Slaves] girdled and fired trees, removed stumps and cultivated land, herded cattle on the open range in South Carolina and Georgia, erected the hydraulic systems of banks, canals, and drains for tidewater rice plantations in the southeastern Atlantic tidewater, and planted, tended, harvested and processed plantation crops throughout the colonies. (Stewart 2006, 10)

The land cleared to develop colonizers' towns and estates "was lifted from the forests and swamps literally on the backs of slaves" (Ibid.). Thus, enslaved Africans established a relationship with and knowledge of American land unparalleled by their masters.

The knowledge brought and created by Africans was exploited by their captor-oppressors and has since been assimilated into a conceptualization of environmentalism that makes invisible the contributions of minorities and marginalized groups. Female Africans brought with them a unique library of knowledge on medicinal uses of flora, and enhanced this knowledge within the context of the American landscape. Stewart writes, "slave women, especially, went out into the woods and wetlands to find supplies for household manufacturing and healing. They also cultivated common medicinal herbs in their garden patches. In turn, they taught others what they learned, both by practice and by storytelling" (Stewart 2006, 15). Evidently, the ways in which these "stories" have

[1] Race was not a variable that was accounted for in this study, yet it still came up in conversation, unprompted. For this reason, it is all the more pertinent to discuss the issue of race, albeit briefly, in this paper.

been told throughout American history have not preserved the racially specific aspects of the development of environmentalism. By understanding the history, we can begin to understand the repercussions of this skewed narrative. Carolynn Finney rightly states that "The representation of environmental issues and the narrative supporting the visual images provides insight into *who* Americans think actually cares about and actively participates in environmental concerns. In addition, how the environmental narrative is portrayed will be an indicator of who is actually being engaged in the larger conversation" (Finney 2014, 2).

Finney's review of the racial representation in *Vanity Fair's* "Green Issue" prompted my own gender-based investigation of the same issue. A cursory look at the magazine revealed asymmetrical gender representation as well; thirty-eight men were mentioned in the issue, whereas only twenty-two female figures made the cut. To use Finney's words, this gender gap in representation in the media serves as "an indicator of who is actually being engaged" in environmental affairs. Gender affects environmental knowledge and engagement in much the same way that race does. I am in no way suggesting that racial exclusion and gender exclusion are occurring at the same scale in environmental organizations and the environmental movement at large. Certainly, there is more even gender representation in the environmental realm than racial representation. Despite that, there are persistent gendered barriers that exist to marginalize and undermine non-male genders. These barriers are important to identify, explore and address. Research is emerging on the consequences of exclusivity with respect to gender in the environmental realm, but the impacts are not yet fully understood. This thesis is intended to contribute to the scholarly discussion of gendered disparities in the environmental realm.

Personal Significance

This research is inspired by observations and frustrations related to gender, similar to those described by Carolynn Finney in regard to racial exclusion from the environmental arena. I am not suggesting that sexism and racism are the same; of course, they are very different phenomena with unique manifestations and impacts. I am not attempting to value one "ism" over the other – they are both significant and should be addressed and combatted in all arenas. I am choosing to speak on gender because it is a

matter of personal identity; my identity does not fall within that of a racial minority group, therefore it is not my place to speak on such issues.

This research was inspired by my observations as a private individual and as a member of an environmental organization. I am arguing that gender is an important factor to critically analyze and consider in environmental organizing and environmental affairs at large. I feel as though my experience as a female member of an environmental organization gives me a relevant perspective to investigate and speak on these issues. I noticed patterns of environmental behavior, attitudes, and dialogue through everyday situations and interactions that appeared to be generally gender-specific. Within my organization, I noticed dynamics that seemed to have gendered impacts; privileging of the masculine became apparent, and I felt and heard the struggles of my female colleagues. I wanted to learn whether my experiences were isolated or in common with others' experiences, and to understand the deeper significance of what I had witnessed.

Abstract

This study interrogates the exclusionary culture of environmentalism with respect to gender, and in doing so, illuminates elements of function and dysfunction with respect to gender dynamics in environmental organizations. I utilize social science-based quantitative and qualitative methods as a foundation for my analysis. My research investigates the role of gender both at the micro level, with individuals, and the macro level, by evaluating the persistence of the "Old Boys' Club" culture in environmental organizations. Thirteen people participated in interviews, and forty people responded to an online survey. Personal reflections gathered from the survey reveal gendered trends in environmental problem perception, attitudes, behaviors, values and engagement, while professional reflections collected during interviews provide insight into the operations of gender in an organizational context. In some ways, current gender dynamics in environmental organizations signify a departure from the "Old Boys' Club" culture, as indicated by female leadership of environmental organizations and a burgeoning interest amongst females in environmental work. However, a deeper analysis reveals the residual effects of the masculine-privileging "Old Boys' Club" culture, as women express sentiments of feeling dismissed as professionals, and report working harder than their male counterparts to achieve the same level of respect. I explicate the importance of considering gender in matters of organizational structure, management and participation through this perspective of analysis.

Part I: Introduction

In this chapter, I present my research question and the important terms and concepts that have informed my understanding and approach to the research. I introduce the methods and purpose of my research. All that is presented in this chapter is elaborated in more detail in later sections.

Introduction

This research uses the narratives of thirteen interviewees and the responses of forty survey participants to assess the degree to which gender influences an individual's environmentalism and his or her effectiveness within his or her environmental organization. The present study is a report on men and women's experiences in environmental organizations and of their engagement with environmentalism based on personal variables such as behavior, attitude, perception, values and access to resources. This study focuses on organizations in the public sector – nonprofit, governmental, and informal organizations (i.e. clubs, university departments). The research was initiated by the question: **How do the distinct ways in which men and women identify, understand and engage with environmental problems complement or complicate their roles and behavior within environmental organizations?**

Inherent in this query is the assumption that men and women do, in fact, have distinct ways of identifying, understanding and engaging with the natural world. This assumption is based on emerging research that highlights the varying experiences of men and women with respect to the environment. *The Organization for Security and Co-Operation in Europe* recognized such gendered disparities, stating that "The differentiated socio-cultural construction of men and women's roles means that the linkages between people and the physical environment impact differently on both sexes" (Organization for Security and Co-Operation in Europe 2009). The "differentiated socio-cultural" roles that produce disparate, gender-specific environmental impacts also generate gender-specific experiences and understandings of the environment. The interplay of impact and experience creates understandings; as human beings engage with the natural world and experience (positive or negative) impacts, they construct personal understandings of environmental problems, their causes and solutions. Moreover, these

"socio-cultural roles" provide men and women with different opportunities to protect the environment, including differentiated power over resources that aid in environmental protection (OSCE 2009). Empirical research has found that that the effects of environmental degradation are "invariably" more severe for women (Shiva 1993, 75), and that the "socio-cultural construction" of women's roles has positioned them to have less influence in environmental affairs (Connell 1995; Hennessy 1993; Lazar 2005; Plumwood 1991; Shiva 1993). Thus, women's disproportionate vulnerability to environmental hazards and asymmetrical participation in matters of environmental decision-making and protection can be regarded as a kind of environmental injustice. The project of increasing women's participation in environmental affairs through research such as my own constitutes a step towards creating and sustaining a more equitable environmentalism.

In their report, the Organization considers disparate environmental impacts and engagement with a focus on the circumstances in the developing world. The present study seeks to expand this perspective by chronicling the experiences of members of environmental organizations in the United States (more specifically, in Maryland and Pennsylvania). My research inquires about the "socio-cultural construction of men and women's roles" in environmental organizations, with an interest in gendered impacts such as access to resources, agency, and influence.

Systems theory is a foundational reference point for my argument; *systems theory* is an interdisciplinary theory about the nature of complex systems (whether in the natural world, society or science). It is a framework by which one can investigate groups of actors that work together to produce some result, and "has given ontological primacy to relations rather than individual entities" (Bruni and Gherardi 2002, 24). I apply this theory to my research at the micro and macro level. At the micro level, I am interested in how relations between employees impact an organization's functionality. In this case, each employee is one component in the system: the organization. The produced result is the organization's ability to adequately provide environmental services to its constituents. Similarly, I am also interested in the board of directors' ability to influence the organizational system. At the macro level, each organization can be thought of as a piece of the larger (inter)national environmental movement. I am interested in optimizing

system functionality beginning at the micro level with individuals in organizations, then organizations themselves, for the betterment of the larger system, the environmental movement.

This research focuses on gender dynamics in the context of environmental organizations for a few reasons. Sources cited in the literature review section and conversations with participants from this study indicate that environmental organizations have long been conceived of as "Old Boys' Clubs" and have privileged masculine priorities, perspectives and participation. The impacts of this masculine construction are relatively unexplored. At a time in human history where the environment is desperately in need of protection and stewardship, it is counterproductive to disempower half of the world's population. This research shows that the masculine culture developed in the days of the "Old Boys' Clubs" still persists in many aspects of the environmental organization experience, and operates against women in many contexts. Women's uninhibited participation is necessary to optimize the efficacy of their organization, but beyond that, their right to participate in the same way as their male counterparts is a matter of dignity, equity and justice. Any barriers to women's total inclusion in environmental decision-making, often determined by holding a certain role in an organization, should be considered a justice issue.

Through this research, I hope to encourage a discussion of what I will call *gendered environmentalism*. Gendered environmentalism encompasses the different attitudes, values, behaviors, goals and roles that men and women take on in the environmental realm, as well as their ability to access resources and influence processes of environmental decision-making. I believe that this gendered perspective of environmentalism may illuminate pathways to create more equitable gender dynamics in environmental organizations, to the benefit of individuals, communities, and environments. However, this research is not just a critical exposition; I also highlight the ways in which environmental organizations are moving beyond the paradigm of the "Old Boys' Club", and for the most part, they are. Women's incorporation and full participation in the highest levels of leadership in environmental organizations is evident. Indeed, there are barriers yet to break down, but some have already been shattered.

Important Terms and Concepts

In this section, I explain several terms and concepts that are relevant to this research. Some terms are used throughout the paper, while others are mentioned for their role in framing the significance, understanding and interpretation of this research.

Gendered Environmentalism

The idea that attitudes, behaviors, perceptions, values and access to resources with respect to the environment are impacted by gender is summarized by the concept of gendered environmentalism. Gendered environmentalism recognizes the specific gendered histories, ideologies, theories and realities that have shaped environmental organizing and management. It is not meant to be an essentialist concept that is invariably recognizable; rather, it is a reference point from which to complicate our understandings of environmentalism while preserving space for individual expressions and nuances. The significance of this term is elaborated below.

Hegemonic Masculinity, White Malestream Environmentalism and the Old Boys' Club

A critical analysis of the underpinnings of mainstream environmentalism reveals the operations of hegemonic masculinity – "a pattern of practice that maintains men's dominant social position in relation to women" (Chan and Curnow 2017, 79) – that fundamentally shape and structure environmentalist ideology and practice. In addition to the gendered domination of environmentalism, there is also racial asymmetry – almost all representation in environmental organizations, and thus the environmental movement at large, is white. Therefore, I argue that white 'malestream' environmentalism is the dominant paradigm of American environmentalism. Malestream is a frequently used term in feminist critiques of male-dominated systems of knowledge and power (Youngs 2004). Viewing environmentalism from this perspective acknowledges that environmental organizing has largely been coordinated by and for white, middle-class males since the inaugural days of the environmental movement. Thus, by naming the dominant paradigm of American environmentalism as white malestream environmentalism, I assert that the organizations, attitudes, perspectives and values that have shaped environmental stewardship and engagement have largely been constructed by white males. Indeed, "Research has found that these mainstream environmental organizations reflect and reinforce the social privilege of White people, and particularly White men, through

insular recruitment practices, implicit bias, and low levels of engagement with diversity and environmental justice concerns" (Chan and Curnow 2017, 77). This is an important concept to this research because it has framed my understanding of the problems at hand. The critique of white malestream environmentalism calls attention to systemic exclusion of minorities and marginalized groups from important arenas of environmental engagement, from leadership, to volunteerism, to recreational enjoyment.

Further, *gendered environmentalism* recognizes that the construction of environmental knowledge and power distribution has been shaped by mechanisms of hegemonic masculinity. "To be recognized as an expert, a person needs to establish their place in a hierarchy and demonstrate both their own qualifications and ability to judge the qualifications of others – and other people must agree" (Chan and Curnow 2017, 79). The mannerisms that garner acceptance of the expertise and legitimacy someone endeavors to assert are "behaviors of dominance" that are stereotypically masculine – projection of voice, authoritative engagement in conversation, professed knowledge (Chan and Curnow 2017). Men retain almost exclusive rights to exhibiting such behavior; "patterns of masculine behavior become hegemonic when they are widely accepted, expected and idealized in a culture (Chan and Curnow 2017, 79). In this way, women have been excluded from the discourse that shapes environmental expertise (and subsequent power distribution based on that expertise) by the operations of hegemonic masculinity.

"Old Boys' Clubs" or "Old Boy Networks" (terms used interchangeably throughout this paper) are "informal social networks" in which "men are to share information in a less formal setting, learn to trust each other, and establish personal relationships" (Morgan, Quesenberry and Trauth 2004, 1313). These networks breed a culture of hegemonic masculinity. They are an important, albeit tangential, facet of organizational life because such networks "reinforce gender inequalities in the organizational distribution of power" via the "tendency to form same-sex network relationships" (Ibarra 1992, 422). This is explained in more detail in the literature review.

Exclusion and Inclusion

I wish to clarify what I mean by inclusion and exclusion in the context of this research; exclusionary attitudes and practices can still operate under the guise of equality and inclusion. In the context of men and women's experiences in environmental

organizations, inclusion defines a person's experience of relative ease in terms of building relationships, gaining respect, having influence in organizational decision-making, and performing one's job. Exclusion, then, defines a person's experience of barriers to building relationships, difficulty winning the respect of colleagues or constituents, frequent feelings of being dismissed, overlooked, or otherwise undermined, having relatively little influence in organizational decision-making, and encountering obstacles that impede the performance of one's job.

Resource

The definition of this term may seem obvious, but in the context of this research its meaning is enhanced. Beyond the material realm, power and influence are also considered resources in this study. These resources are limited, exchangeable, and attached to positions within organizations. Therefore, access to resources becomes intertwined with ideas of inclusion and exclusion. If systemic paradigms and practices consistently privilege one group in the occupation of certain roles with greater access to resources, the other groups are being excluded from the same level of participation.

Supportive Roles

Supportive roles are defined as any role in which the primary function is to increase the ease or productivity of another person or people. The roles that fall under this category are numerous, and vary based on organization. Some titles of supportive roles include: office manager, administrative assistant, volunteer coordinator, and liaison. Resources allotted to these positions are comparably minimal than higher positions in the organizational hierarchy. Supportive roles are important to this study because they are predominately occupied by women, due at least in part to the fact that supportive roles are often part-time positions. A study from 1990 reported that women held two thirds of part-time positions in the United States (Feldman 1990); today, that number remains almost the same, with women representing 64 percent of the part-time workforce in the United States (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2018).

Significance of the Present Research to Environmental Affairs

"Gender and environmental concerns come across in certain aspects of policy-making, particularly in participatory decision-making and stakeholder involvement, which are important both from the gender perspective but also from a broader environmental perspective. Gender equity is also essential in major sustainable development challenges, namely use and management of natural resources and the prevention of environmental degradation and pollution." (Organization for Security and Co-Operation in Europe 2009)

An understanding of the ways in which gender influences environmentalism, both at the micro, individual level and the macro, systemic level is significant to the study of environmental management and engagement for many reasons. Narratives and responses collected from participants reveal gendered patterns with respect to environmental engagement and elements of function and dysfunction related to gender dynamics in environmental organizations, and expose the areas that are perpetuating the culture of an "Old Boys' Club," which implicitly marginalizes women.

Environmental organizations are key actors in the environmental movement; they embody significant hope for the sustainable future of our planet. Environmental organizations work in research, advocacy, stewardship, conservation, prosecution, and education, among other arenas. Environmental organizations' successes and failures have global implications; environmental problems are not confined by human borders, thus the circumstances in any given locale will surely have consequences in other places. Consider the presence of litter in an urban neighborhood, for example. Though this litter may, at first glance, appear to be a small-scale, community-specific problem, its impacts extend far beyond the immediate area. Urban litter can be swept away into storm drains where it causes infrastructural damage that affects entire cities, and can wash into nearby waterways where it becomes part of a larger pollution problem affecting major bodies of water such as bays and oceans. Thus, the piecemeal contributions of environmental organizations working in their respective niches to promote environmental and human sustainability are vital to the overall success of the environmental movement. The ability of men and women to participate fully within their organization in a way that complements their personal (and perhaps gender-specific) values, beliefs and priorities only serves to augment the success of these organizations.

Not only is this research theoretically important, it also maintains a practical significance. With a better understanding of the gender-specific barriers to total inclusion

in environmental organizations, those in leadership positions can begin to rethink the structure of their organization, their hiring processes, their modes of decision-making, and more. The total integration of women can assist environmental organizations as they endeavor to reach new constituencies, develop new strategies and prioritize their goals. We can begin to look at gender not only as an influential factor in construction environmentalism, but as an asset to optimized environmental engagement.

Methods

The research for this thesis was carried out through three methods: literature review, surveying, and interviewing. By employing this particular set of research methods, understandings of key theories in the fields this thesis brings together were expanded, and both qualitative and quantitative data were obtained. The literature review serves as the conceptual and practical foundation for my own research. Stories collected from interviews serve as the empirical framework of this research, complemented by the data collected from the survey.

The research methods that informed this thesis can be thought of as a three-legged stool, each "leg" serving a crucial purpose and adding a unique value to the research. The literature review provided theoretical, conceptual knowledge; the interviews grounded this theoretical framework through empirical data; the surveys added a quantifiable dimension to the otherwise largely ethnographic approach to this research, expanding the theoretical and empirical findings with patterns and trends.

a. Literature Review

The literature reviewed for this thesis came from a variety of disciplines. To broaden my understanding of organizations and their functionality, I read books and articles on organizational culture, women in the professional world, managerial styles, board structure and influence, and organizational research theory. I was able to source a few articles relating gender to environmental values, behavior, and risk perception, which informed much of the material that composed the survey. I also sought out material focused on ecofeminism, and women's relationship with the natural world. I strived to create a well-rounded conceptual framework for the thesis through the diverse assortment of literature I chose to review. The knowledge gleaned from this process augmented my

ability to interpret and critically evaluate the data collected from the interviews and survey.

b. Interviews

Interviews were an integral component of my research as I set out to explore gender dynamics in environmental organizations. I interviewed thirteen subjects from eight different organizations over the course of six weeks. Conducting the interviews was undoubtedly the most time-intensive aspect of my research, with each conversation lasting one to two hours. Subjects were selected through association, recommendation and/or outreach. Rather than constructing selection criteria for individual subjects, I chose to focus my selection criteria on the organizations for which my subjects worked. The thirteen individuals I interviewed were all members of either a nonprofit or quasigovernmental environmental organization governed by a board of directors; all were employed by such organizations, aside from one subject who was a member of the board of directors. The demographics of the interviewees are described in Table 1. Two demographic categories stand out in this table, ethnicity and highest education level. Eighty five percent of subjects are white; although race was not a consideration of this specific study, this is noteworthy. The implications of this ethnic distribution will be explored in the Discussion section. Additionally, over fifty percent of respondents were educated at the Master's level or above. This suggests that careers in the environmental field are demanding a high level of expertise. The gendered distribution of Master's level education or higher is as follows: one woman attained her PhD, four women attained their Master's degree, and three men attained their Master's degree. The implications of these findings will be dissected in detail in chapters two and three.

Table 1: Subject Demographics		
Total Count	Nonprofit	6
	Quasigovernmental	7
Gender Distribution	Male	4
	Female	9
Location	Maryland	7
	Pennsylvania	6
Ethnicity	White	11
	Black	1
	Hispanic	1
Highest Education Level	High School Diploma	1
	Bachelor's	4
	Master's	7
	PhD	1
Position Title	Administrative Assistant	1
	Manager	2
	Director	1
	Executive Director	4
	Board Member	1
	Other[2]	4

Table 2: Organization Characteristics		
Total Count	Nonprofit	5
	Quasigovernmental	3
Gender Distribution	Nonprofit (F) - Interviewed	4
	Nonprofit (M) - Interviewed	2
	Nonprofit (F) – Total*[3]	109
	Nonprofit (M) – Total*	89
	Quasigovernmental (F) - Interviewed	5
	Quasigovernmental (M) - Interviewed	2
	Quasigovernmental (F) - Total	13
	Quasigovernmental (M) - Total	13
Location	Maryland	3
	Pennsylvania	5

[2] Other position titles include: Planner, Coordinator, and Conservationist

[3] The numbers marked with * are not an exact numbers. Two individuals from the same large nonprofit organization (150 employees) were interviewed. When asked to provide an estimate of the gender composition of their organization, the subjects offered different responses; one estimated the ratio was 7F:3M, the other estimated 5F:5M. Their estimates were averaged (6F: 4M), as reflected in the table.

Interview Technique The thirteen interviewees were selected and recruited by several means. Some subjects were recruited via my own professional network, others were contacted via email after researching their organization on the Internet, and others were recommended or directed to me by other interviewees (i.e. the "snowball method"). Prior to beginning the interview, each participant was provided a consent form, which informed them of the purpose of the thesis and their rights as a participant. On the form, participants had the option of consenting to have the interview recorded; all interviewees consented. The interviews delved into various aspects of the subject's professional life, including their relationships with coworkers, the obstacles they have faced, their relationship with the Board, and more. There was a personal dimension to the interviews as well, which inquired about the participant's values, aspirations, and perspectives.

There was a deliberate sequencing of types of questions in order to ease participants into the tougher, more critical topics interrogated in the interview. I began by asking the participant to share their gender identity, and proceeded by gauging participant's conceptualization of masculinity and femininity. I followed with questions about the participant's personal background, such as level of education, involvement with environmental activism, and attraction to the environmental cause. Next, I asked participants to think about the demographic structure of their organization with particular interest in gendered patterns of employment. I followed with questions that asked participants to think about their personal involvement and satisfaction with the organization. Included in this section were questions about job title, description, and responsibilities; satisfaction with the mission; relationships with colleagues; and perception of gender relations in the workplace. Then, I asked subjects to be self-evaluative. I inquired about their motivations for joining the organization they were with, their rationale for staying with the organization, the greatest obstacles they have faced professionally, and the proudest moments of their career. After encouraging my participants to think in critical, gendered terms, I then read a series of quotes to them and asked them to tell me whether they agree or disagree, and explain their rationale. Finally, I concluded the interview with a set of broader questions about gender and environmentalism, presented the participants with my hypothesis and conversed about their opinion and/or experience of it. It was important to me to maintain a casual,

conversational atmosphere for these interviews to take place. I provided space for participants to contextualize their responses with stories and often strayed from the questions I laid out for myself in order to understand a respondent's experience in greater depth. This produced a set of thirteen interviews that were completely distinct. I wanted to understand how people experience their gender within their environmental organization, and the best way to do so was to approach the interviews without expectations, assumptions or rigidity. Some of the questions posed to interviewees include:

- What are some characteristics or qualities you associate with masculinity?
- What are some characteristics or qualities you associate with femininity?
- What attracts you to the environmental field? Why?
- What were your environmental aspirations before joining the organization you are currently with? What are they now?
- Is there an observable gender pattern in positions of authority within your organization?
- What is your role in realizing the mission of the organization?
- Are there roles or functions that you have assumed besides those assigned to you in your job description?
- In your opinion, what is the most important function/service your organization provides to the greater public? Why do you think this is the most important?
- How would you describe the culture of your organization?
- How are your relationships with your fellow employees/volunteers/members? Could you tell me about the people you work well with? Could you tell me about the people you struggle to work with?
- What is your relationship to the Board? How often do you interact with them and what are those interactions like?
- Do you feel as though men and women tend to gravitate towards certain roles in your organization?
- Are gender dynamics different in this organization than in past organizations you have worked for?
- What does your job represent to you?
- In the context of your organization, have you ever encountered advantages or disadvantages (or both) related to your gender?
- "Environmental degradation impacts men and women differently." Do you agree or disagree? Why?
- What do you think men bring to the field of environmentalism?
- What do you think women bring to the field of environmentalism?

In order to encourage authentic interaction and conversation, these questions were used as guidance rather than as law; if there was an opportunity to explore a story with

spontaneous questions, it was taken. Time only became a limitation when other obligations required my attention; on average, interviews lasted about ninety minutes.

Interview Mechanics All subjects consented to have their interview recorded. A recording application on my computer was used to collect these audio files. They were saved and stored anonymously by assigned each participant a number with which all of their information corresponded (consent forms, interview notes, interview recordings, data storage, etc.). Throughout the interview, I took notes. The written notes complemented the recorded interviews well, because I could visually identify trends in participants' responses and refer back to recordings if specific information or quotes were needed. I did not transcribe the interviews.

Interpretation of Interviews Each interview represents one piece of a larger narrative about gender dynamics in environmental organizations. To create my version of this narrative, I chose to interpret and organize the data from the interviews thematically. These themes will be discussed in more detail in the discussion section.

Data collected from the interviews were interpreted first and foremost with consideration for the role of gender in producing the responses. Importantly, not all interview questions explicitly asked about gender. Thorough and nuanced analysis of the interview data revealed the subtle influences of gender in various realms of subjects' experiences. Interview data was also analyzed with consideration for the type of organization the respondent was involved with. This is significant for the study because nonprofit organizations and quasigovernmental organizations operate through two different approaches; the former more generally employs a bottom-up approach to problem solving, whereas the latter typically employs a top-down approach. The character of the organization has an impact on the types of people who are attracted to work there, and therefore has an impact on the structure of the organization. Furthermore, the type of organization certainly has an impact on the organizational culture, which shapes members' daily experiences.

c. Surveys

The survey distributed as part of this research represents the third and final leg of the stool. The purpose of the survey was to understand how gender relates to a person's

environmental perception, attitude and behavior, and their professional values. The two methods were intended to complement one another.

Surveys were distributed electronically via the platform SurveyMonkey to an unnumbered and largely unknown sample group. Through my professional and academic network, and with the help of previous interviewees and other supporters, the survey was disseminated to members of environmental organizations via email. Certain restrictive criteria still applied, however. Individuals working in for-profit organizations were not selected to participate in the survey. Board members were also not selected. The sample pool was expanded, however, to include individuals involved in informal environmental organizations, such as clubs or academic major programs.

Survey Technique The survey (see appendix) was developed with inspiration from several of the scholars mentioned in the literature review, including: Dietz, Kalof and Stern; Markle; and Wehrmeyer and McNiel (Dietz et. al. 2002; Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000). Each of these studies proposed certain values and methods of surveying for said values. Drawing on the work of these scholars, I created a survey in which participants were asked to rank values and topics by degree of personal importance. In this way, I was able to evaluate the sample groups' priorities and measure their values. Responses were collected ten days after the survey was opened; forty people had participated. The responses were extracted and recorded individually and collectively (that is, a text copy of each participant's individual response was made, as well as a spreadsheet containing all of their individual responses, and a final report containing collective data). This way, I was able to evaluate trends within the group as a whole, while still maintaining the ability to sort through individual responses.

Survey Mechanics All subjects consented to participate in the survey. The option was given to provide a name on the survey, but otherwise subjects remained anonymous. Respondents could access the survey at any time via the shareable link, and were able to work through the survey at their own pace. Ten days after the survey was initially distributed, responses were collected. SurveyMonkey has a feature that collects the responses and then exports them in various file formats. Most of the interpretation was done by reviewing the data from the Excel spreadsheet and data summaries. Each of these files was kept secure on a computer protected by password.

Interpretation of Survey As stated, most of the survey interpretation was done by reviewing all of the data collected in the Excel sheet in conjunction with the collective data summaries. The data summaries illuminated general trends in the responses, but were not gender-specific. In order to analyze the responses through a gendered lens, I had to work with the data in the Excel spreadsheet. The questions asked in the survey comprised the column headers in the spreadsheet, and individual responses comprised the rows. I differentiated male and female responses through color code. Then, I sorted the data column by column, and began to record the responses to questions based on gender. Tables were created to summarize the data in gendered terms. These tables are included and discussed in the Discussion section of this paper. The results from the survey were used to support or challenge theories and empirical evidence found in the literature review and interviews.

Part II: Foundations

In this chapter, I present the underpinnings of my research and subsequent discussion. The literature review serves as the conceptual foundation of my research. It presents key theories, concepts, ideas and studies that have enhanced my understanding of my data. The literature review contextualizes the research and situates it within converging scholarly conversations. Furthermore, it justifies the significance of the research.

The results serve as the foundation for the discussion of men and women's experiences in environmental organizations in the next chapter. I identified five recurring themes in participants' responses: *Gender Roles and Patterns, The Board of Directors, Gender Consciousness, Job Representation* and *Valuation of Services.* Participants' stories and experiences are relayed in these sections and analyzed in detail to unveil the operations of the "Old Boys' Club," and aspects of function and/or dysfunction of gender dynamics in environmental organizations.

Literature Review

This literature review serves as the conceptual foundation for the research that follows. This section draws from scholarly works that have examined the intersections of gender and the environment, gender and organization, and organization and environment, the three converging spheres of knowledge I explore in my work.

Gender and Theory

At the heart of this thesis the question of gender: how does it affect an individual's environmentalism both professionally and personally? Before addressing this central question, let us first clarify the important differences between "sex" and "gender." Sex is biological – it is identified and defined by an individual's reproductive organs. While there are a few sex identifications, generally, two are used: male and female. The term gender was coined by psychologists in order to "distinguish biological differences [between males and females] from social/psychological ones" (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy 2017). Though I recognize that gender is a spectrum, I have chosen to focus specifically on men and women in this research.

The origins of the gender concept are themselves gendered. In the late 1960s, a male psychologist (Robert Stoller) was the first to use the term in this way, "based on the

amount of femininity and masculinity a person exhibited" (Ibid.). In other words, the masculine and feminine behaviors that in create gender were interpreted and defined by a man. Around the same time, second-wave feminists adopted the gender concept after the women's movement exposed the deep "disadvantage and oppression" faced by females in almost every arena of society; the gender concept served to support the feminist position that differences between men and women were socially defined and produced (Bradley 2012; Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy 2017). Feminists argued that gender was a "socially imposed division of the sexes" stemming from the "oppressive results of social interventions that dictate how men and women should behave" (Ibid.). Gender has since developed into a socio-culturally constructed idea, which both generalizes and imposes the characteristics, behavior, attitudes and morphology of men and women.

Feminist scholar Michelle Lazar explains that "gender is a social relation that enters into and partially constitutes all other social relations and activities. Based on the specific, asymmetric meanings of 'male' and 'female', and the consequences of being assigned to one or the other within concrete social practices, such an allocation becomes a constraint on further practices" (Lazar 2005, 5). In this sense, gender is not just a matter of personal identity, it is an indicator of how an individual will be imagined by and interacted with by other people; in this way, when manipulated by an oppressive 'other', gender can become "a constraint on" personal expression and development. From an ideological perspective, gender serves as a means of separating humans into "classes", primarily male and female (Lazar 2005). It is no surprise, then, that in a patriarchal society that benefits from the subordination of marginal groups, that women have been socially constructed as beings of lesser voice, agency and importance and justified their exclusion from major societal arenas. The privileging of men in gendered orders of hierarchy gives them a "'patriarchal dividend', in terms of access to symbolic, social, political and economic capital (Connell 1995 in Lazar 2005, 7).

Feminist theory brings to light and critiques these gendered systems of power, and therefore is very relevant to this research. The breadth of literature on feminist theory and critical analysis is diverse; I am focusing in particular on feminist theory about discourses and standpoints. These are important facets of feminist theory to consider in this research

because they situate social power and influence within systems of hegemonic masculinity.

Discourses are "historically specific world-views" that are framed by "all that is said, written or thought" in any given field (Teymur 1982 in Brulle 1996, 60). They are important because they are the foundation upon which (academic, social, political, economic, etc.) understandings are built. Feminist critical discourse analysis employs "A critical perspective on unequal social arrangements sustained through language use" (Lazar 2005, 1). In doing so, feminists "aim to describe the ways in which power and dominance are produced and reproduced in social practice through the discourse structures of everyday interactions" (Holmes 2005). Feminist critical discourse analysts are concerned with exposing "relations of power that systematically privilege men as a social group and disadvantage, exclude and disempower women as a social group" that are perpetuated through the everyday politics of language and interaction (Lazar 2005, 5). Discourse not only reinforces social structures, it impacts upon ideology, and processes of knowledge creation and legitimation (Holmes 2005; Shiva 1993; Miles 1993; Hennessy 2013). Analyzing paradigms of discourse in various arenas promotes a "nuanced understanding of the complex workings of power and ideology in discourse in sustaining a (hierarchically) gendered social order" more broadly (Lazar 2005, 1). Germane to this research are feminist critiques of scientific discourse, rational knowledge, and expertise. Scientific discourse, the politics of science, and what is accepted as rational knowledge have impacted greatly upon understandings of environmentalism and environmental challenges.

Vandana Shiva writes, "Third World and feminist scholarship has begun to recognize that [modern science] emerged as a liberating force not for humanity as a whole (though it legitimized itself in terms of universal benefit for all), but as a Western, male-oriented and patriarchal projection which necessarily entailed the subjugation of both nature and women" (Shiva 1993, 22). She argues that "an arbitrary barrier between 'knowledge' (the specialist) and 'ignorance' (the non-specialist)" has legitimated the dual subjugation of women and nature (Ibid.). Forms of knowledge that do not conform to the (masculinist) rational epistemology favored by scientific "experts" are devalued at best, or ignored at

worst. This barrier, in turn, operates to exclude forms of "non-specialist knowledge," such as emotion, compassion and sensuality from the scientific domain (Shiva 1993, 22).

Modern science is critiqued as reductionist from a feminist perspective, because it constitutes a system of knowledge that literally reduces the integration of diverse perspectives and assets through oppressive means. "Rational knowledge has been constructed as a transcending, transformation or control of natural forces; and the feminine has been associated with what rational knowledge transcends, dominates or simply leaves behind." (Lloyd 1993 in Phillips 2014, 444) Additionally, the modern scientific framework serves a limited pool of constituents, namely (white) males. Shiva's critique of the reductionist nature of modern science reflects this. She argues that "Western patriarchy's epistemological tradition of the 'scientific revolution'" is reductionist because "it reduced the capacity of humans to know nature by excluding other knowers and other ways of knowing" (Shiva 1993, 23).

Feminists and ecofeminists alike have critiqued the harsh division that constitutes relevant and irrelevant knowledge in the scientific realm. According to ecofeminist philosophers, the "combination of rationality and scientism constitutes a 'logic of patriarcy'" (Phillips 2014, 444). This logic of patriarchy serves to maintain systems of male privilege and dominance. Under this sort of masculinist epistemology, "what is categorized as authentically human conforms to ideas around idealized, hegemonic masculinity and is defined in opposition to what is taken to be natural, nature, or the physical or biological realm. The feminine, women and nature are rendered as abject; 'othered' to confirm and justify their subordination" (Ibid.). Feminist and ecofeminist scholars have proposed alternatives that challenge these 'taken-for-granted' epistemologies and paradigms.

Feminist scholar Maria Miles, for example, argues that sensuality should be considered a legitimate source of knowledge in scientific discourse (Miles 1993). She says "Ideas about a different science should be based on different ethical and methodological principles" and should be constructed "in such a way that our senses can still be our guide through reality and not just organs rendered obsolete because they have been replaced by machines (Miles 1993, 52). Addressing the discourses that have legitimated a reductionist scientific framework is paramount. Shiva argues that

"Reductionist science is a source of violence against nature and women, in so far as it subjugates and dispossesses them of their full productivity, power and potential" (Shiva 1993, 24). This is an important insight in the context of this paper; similar discourses to those that have operated to shape scientific thought are at work in the environmental domain. The extent to which environmental discourses have effected the devaluation of women's knowledge, priorities and contributions and limited the exercise of "their full productivity, power and potential" within the environmental movement merits investigation.

In the environmental realm, masculinist discourse that has framed nature in instrumentalist terms has had profound, global effects. Robert Brulle, in his exploration of the development of American environmental discourses, compiled a table of discursive frameworks, defining actors and events that codified these discourses (Brulle 1996). Of the six dominant environmental discourses, women are only depicted as contributing to two of them: ecocentrism and ecofeminism. The vast majority of actors, literature, and events that have framed contemporary understandings of environmentalism through environmental discourse are, according to Brulle's table, almost entirely men. Men contributed to the discursive frame "Manifest Destiny" that has promoted an instrumental, commodified view of the natural world, asserted that "human welfare is based on development of the natural environment," and promoted the idea that nature is "valueless without human development" (Brulle 1996, 64). Men crafted "Conservation" discourse, which propogated the view of nature as a "machine," underpinned societies' reliance on natural resources, and laid the framework for technocentric approaches to addressing environmental problems. The "Preservation" discourse, influenced by Thoreau's *Walden*, produced the environmentalist fixation on protecting "wilderness" – a concept of nature that implies no human interference – for the benefit of humans. Manifest Destiny, Conservation and Preservation were the first discursive frameworks – and then, discourses – that drove the environmental movement in the United States, and continue to influence environmental discourse today.

> In investigating the roots of our current environmental dilemma and its connections to science, technology and the economy, we must re-examine the formation of a world-view and a science that, reconceptualising reality as a machine, rather than a living organism, sanctioned the domination of both nature and women. (Merchant 1980 in Shiva 1993, 23)

Women do not appear to have an effect on these discourses until the 1960s, beginnig with Rachel Carson's contributions to ecocentrism with *Silent Spring*. In Bruelle's analysis, women are not mentioned as contributors to the development of Political Ecology, which calls attention to the dual subjugation of nature and marginalized peoples. Nor are they noted as contributors to the formulation of Deep Ecology, which calls attention to the intrinsic value of nature and natural systems. Ecofeminist scholars would dispute this, arguing that women were the first to bring such perspectives to environmental discourse. The fact remains, though, that the majority of discourses that have shaped understandings and implementation of environmentalism in the United States were developed by and for men, through masculinist frameworks of ethics that have instrumentalized and exploited nature.

Vandana Shiva argues that the pitfalls of environmentalism can be mended through the incorporation of feminist perspectives, which implicitly employ a different set of ethics.

> Mainstream environmentalists… divorced from feminism, continue to use the model of the world designed by capitalist patriarchy. Instead of rebuilding ecological cycles, it focuses on technological fixes… the feminist perspective is able to go *beyond* the categories of patriarchy that structure power and meaning in nature and society. It is broader and deeper… ecological feminism creates the possibility of viewing the world as an active subject, not merely as a resource to be manipulated and appropriated. (Shiva 1993, 33-34)

The ethics implicitly referenced by Shiva in this passage are seen through the ecofeminist ideological orientation that views the world with agency and intrinsic value (i.e. "an active subject, not merely as a resource to be manipulated and appropriated). Integrating feminist perspectives to the environmental domain would, in turn, integrate feminine-oriented ethics into discourse and practice.

John Dobson and Judith White, in their research on the impacts of masculinist business value systems on organizations, generally characterized dominant, gendered ethical orientations as "the autonomous self" and "the connected self" (Dobson and White 1995). Their findings indicate that men tend to embody the attitude of the autonomous self, where they self-perceive as "separated from others in a hierarchical world" (Dobson and White 1995, 464). Operating under this ethical framework, men self-perceive as separate from others and their relations with other individuals are hierarchically defined; they constantly vie for higher positions on this perceived

hierarchy and interact competitively with others; this breeds an individualistic culture characterized by "tendencies for self-sufficiency," aversion to vulnerability and caution with others, and competitive behaviors (Dobson and White 1995, 465 - 466). Women, on the other hand, align with "the connected self, joined to others in a web of relationships" (Ibid.). The ethical orientation of the connected self recognizes that others have similar or different thoughts, perspectives and experiences; acknowledges interpersonal connections and the importance of maintaining relationships; knows through "emotions, sense experiences, intuition, logic," and interpersonal relations (Dobson and White 1995, 465). At the macro-level, ethical orientations inform value systems, which in turn inform practice and implementation, and thereby have a material effect in the world. In most contexts, masculine-oriented systems of ethics prevail, because they are framed as "rational" (Dobson and White 1995). Like female-based knowledge, feminine-oriented ethical systems are devalued for their purported lack of rational grounding.

Gender-specific ethical orientations are important to this research because they enhance our understanding of the development of environmental discourse and environmentalism. Ecofeminist scholar Val Plumwood defames the allegiance to rationalism in dominant scientific and ethical discourses that have shaped environmentalism as "the key to the connected oppressions of women and nature" (Plumwood 1991, 3). She argues that "a relational account of self," much like the connected self defined by Dobson and White, "enables us to reject an instrumental view of nature and develop an alternative based on respect without denying that nature is distinct from the self" (Dobson and White 1995; Plumwood 1991, 1). Plumwood recognizes that masculine ethics systems are at least somewhat responsible for the current state of the environment. She argues that masculine environmental ethics have constructed environmental care as a matter of obligation, and maintain some element of self-interest. "Concern for nature, then, should not be viewed as the completion of a process of (masculine) universalization, moral abstraction and disconnection, discarding the self, emotions and special ties (all, of course, associated with… femininity). Environmental ethics has for the most part placed itself uncritically in such a framework" (Plumwood 1991, 7). Plumwood posits that the masculinist

framework of environmental ethics "fails to capture the most important elements of respect, which are not reducible to or based on duty or obligation… but which are rather an expression of a certain kind of selfhood and a certain kind of relation between self and other" (Ibid.).

In the bid for reimagined forms of discourse, epistemologies and ethical orientations, feminists and ecofeminists have offered alternative theories as guidance. Standpoint theory has emerged from feminist discourse analysis as a means of rendering the discourses that shape our world more objective. An individual's "standpoint" refers to their "'position' in society which is shaped by and in turn helps shape ways of knowing, structures of power, and resource distribution " (Hennessy 1993, 67). Standpoint theorists have argued that 'position' can be conceptualized as an "objective condition of *people's lives*" and "as *discursive"* (Hennessy 1993). Standpoint theory recognizes that individuals occupy different standpoints in their communities and the world at large based on factors such as gender, race, class, and geography, among others. Feminist standpoint theory reaffirms the systemic subjugation of women and other minorities in this respect. This theory simultaneously asserts that standpoints generate unique perspectives that have discursive value; standpoint theorists argue that, by formulating major discourses with consideration for a range of perspectives, we are able to create a more objective, holistic, and accurate depiction of our world.

The critiques and theories discussed in this section have impacted this research in the following ways: 1) feminist theory of gender as a social construction that can impact upon a person's development and access to capital serves as the foundation for our understanding of the immediate gender-based disparities between men and women; 2) feminist discourse analysis reveals how women have been excluded from these spaces that construct our understandings and interpretations of the world; 3) scientific discourse and its fixation on the idea of rationality – a perceived masculine characteristic – has dismissed other forms of knowing, such as emotion and experience – forms of knowledge that are common in women – and thereby excluded other knowers; 4) ideas of rationality that constitute legitimate scientific knowledge and discourse infiltrated environmental discourse, which, from the very beginning, has

been dominated and shaped by men; 5) there are embedded ethical orientations within the environmental discourses men have created, and these ethics and discourses have had profound impacts; 6) feminine ethics, perspectives and theories are an alternative to 'taken-for-granted' masculine epistemologies. In the next section, I explore the intersections of gender and the environment through continued discussion of male-dominated origins of American environmentalism, ecofeminist theory, and gendered disparities in humans' experience with the environment.

Gender and Environment

Dorceta Taylor writes, "The history of American environmentalism presented by most authors is really a history of middle class white male environmental activism. The tendency to view all environmental activism through this lens has deprived us of a deeper understanding of the way in which class, race and gender relations structured environmental experiences and responses over time" (Taylor 1997, 16).

Indeed, from the outset, the environmental movement has been dominated and shaped by males. Figures such as Theodore Roosevelt, John Muir, Henry David Thoreau, and Aldo Leopold are frequently conceived of as pioneers of environmentalism. In *The Columbian Guide to American Environmental History,* Carolyn Merchant provides readers with a comprehensive list of major actors and developments in the environmental movement in the United States. She names forty three influential men who have helped shape the course of environmentalism in America in some way; by contrast, she names only seventeen females (Merchant 2002). The male representation is over twice that of female representation, illustrating the historical privileging of men and the male voice in matters of environmental planning, management, and discourse.

In its nascent stage, the environmental movement was characterized by an agenda focused on wilderness and wildlife preservation to ensure the sustained viability of recreational activities such as hunting, fishing and mountaineering (Taylor 1997). The focus on preservation of natural spaces for continued human use at this stage was largely a male construction; as men noticed the spaces men appreciated for their hunting, fishing, and exploratory purposes were being encroached upon by civilization, they began advocating for the protection of these spaces – often at the expense of marginalized, native tribes that were subsequently evicted from their indigenous lands as they were

converted into national parks (Corry 2015). The majority of the men noted in Merchant's *Guide to American Environmental History* contributed to the field by promoting conservation in some form (Edward Abbey and desert preservation, particularly in national parks; Hugh Hammond Bennett and soil conservation; George Washington Carver and conservation techniques; the list could go on and on). These men, among others, shaped ideas of American environmentalism, conservation and land use and acquisition at a national scale.

In addition to ideas of environmentalism, many major environmental policies were also brought about and decided upon by men, such as The National Park Service Act (1916) (Merchant 2002; National Geographic 2010), the National Environmental Policy Act (1969) (Merchant 2002; Layzer 2012) and the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (1973) (Merchant 2002). Each of these policies attempts to balance environmental interests with (male) human interests, but have been critiqued for their failures to adequately address environmental issues (Antolini 2009; Mandelker 2010; Huffaker 2013). Male-privileged forms of networking (such as interacting with government, policy groups and industries) helped legitimize and strengthen the environmental movement (Ibid.) These early, male-dominated manifestations of environmental prioritizing and organizing laid the framework for the United States' approach to tackling environmental problems; "a brand of environmentalism that sought to make small incremental changes or reforms in the existing system by working with both government and industry" was created, and has become ingrained in the American political system (Taylor 1997, 32).

One can only speculate what the goals and outcomes of the environmental movement would have been had women been equally represented in the formative stages of the movement. Figures such as Jane Addams, Rachel Carson, Lois Gibbs, Alice Hamilton and Cora Tucker suggest that an intersectional, community and health-based approach to addressing environmental concerns may have been more prevalent had women been incorporated as equal partners. Though gender was not an explicit consideration in the developmental stages of American environmentalism, it can be incorporated as a key concern now. Questioning the role of gender in shaping environmentalism is crucial as the global community teeters perilously on the brink of environmental catastrophe (i.e.

climate change, natural resource shortages or extinctions, rampant pollution and intensifying natural disasters). By undertaking efforts to increase the integration and participation of women in environmental organizations, opportunities to incorporate feminist and ecofeminist perspectives to environmental discourse are expanded, to the benefit of the masses; the inclusion of the female voice may well encourage a more community-based moral framework by which to craft proactive environmental policy, juxtaposed with [male-constructed] reactive, regulatory environmental policy aimed at serving male interests, industries and corporations, for example.

Ecofeminism There is a growing body of literature that explores relationships between gender and the environment. Ecofeminist literature is the most prominent subdivision of this realm. Ecofeminism emerged simultaneously in environmentalist and feminist discourse in the 1980s (Seager 2003). Pioneering ecofeminists recognized the "mutually reinforcing" goals and ideals of women's and ecology movements of this time, and capitalized on this unique relationship (Warren 1996, ix). "[Feminists and environmentalists] must unite the demands of the women's movement with those of the ecological movement to envision a radical reshaping of the basic socioeconomic relations and the underlying values of this society" (Ruether 1975 in Warren 1996, ix). And so, ecofeminism was created. The term itself evokes a multiplicity of meanings and associations; ecofeminism exists as an ideology imbued with spirituality and essentialism, a secular political philosophy, a grassroots movement, a reclamation of female-earth wisdom, a feminist theory, among other conceptualizations (Seager 2003).

There are unique iterations of ecofeminism that embody these meanings. *Cultural ecofeminism*, for example, propagates the belief that women's biology and reproductive capacity correlates to a greater identification with nature and natural processes. This, in turn, produces a set of values in women that are distinct from men's; these values focus on caring and nurturing, rather than domination (Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000).

Critical ecofeminism, on the other hand, rejects the essentialism enmeshed in the cultural ecofeminism, opting instead to promote a more rational, resistance-based ideology. Critical ecofeminists explore systems of oppression as they arise from common dualisms such as nature/culture, reason/emotion and male/female (Ibid.) Furthermore, critical ecofeminists reject the spiritual connotations of ecofeminism; the image of the

Earth Mother and inherent connection between women and the environment are seen as notions that legitimize the oppression of women and the natural world (Ibid.).

Social ecofeminism echoes the *critical ecofeminist* perspective, with special attention paid to women's unique position as subordinates in society. Social ecofeminists recognize a power within this disempowerment: women are "better placed to see the way in which social relations have an adverse impact on the natural world than men in their superordinate position" (Mellor 1997 in Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000, 212).

Despite the plasticity of the term, there is one fundamental aspect of ecofeminism which, according to Karen Warren, all ecofeminist philosophers hold in common: "the view that there are important connections between the domination of women (and other human subordinates) and the domination of nature *and* that a failure to recognize these connections results in inadequate feminisms, environmentalism, and environmental philosophy" (Warren 1996, x). Warren's words resonate with the purpose of this study; just as an environmental philosophy which is blind to the nuances of gender produces an inadequate environmentalism, so too does an environmental organization with imbalanced gender dynamics.

Ecofeminist theory is observed empirically via the socio-cultural roles of women, particularly in the developing world, and the disproportionate distribution of environmental agency, costs and benefits. Vandana Shiva notes the disparate gendered impacts of development in these parts of the world, where men are reaping the benefits of modernization as women continue to struggle. She argues that "women's increasing under-development" in these nations is a result of "their enforced but asymmetric participation whereby they bore the costs [of development] but were excluded from the benefits" (Shiva 1993, 73 - 74). Costs borne from development take a great toll on the environment. Shiva argues that the burdens of ecological devastation are "hidden costs" and that they are "invariably heavier for women" (Shiva 1993, 75). Because women are typically charged with maintaining the household in these nations, they are interacting with the environment on a daily basis in ways that men are not; they collect water, forage, tend to gardens and raise livestock, among other crucial tasks. Environmental degradation often serves to make these duties more difficult; Susan Buckingham-Hatfield explains, for example, "as forests are decimated and sources of groundwater are depleted, women

have to make longer, more time-consuming journeys to collect water and firewood" (Buckingham-Hatfield 2000, 1).

"In both the North and South," the "hidden costs" of environmental degradation weight more heavily on women, although circumstances in these two regions are distinct (Shiva 1993, 75). In the developed world, the relationships between women and the environment are constructed and experienced differently than those in the developing world; women's societal roles in the global North are (generally) more fluid than those in the global South, and men tend to take on professions that require frequent exposure to the environment (mining, construction, monitoring, etc.). Certain stereotypically female roles such as child rearing are, however, linked to frequent interactions with the natural environment and used as justification for female subordination. "Women are devalued, first, because their work co-operates with nature's processes, and second, because work that satisfies needs and ensures sustenance is devalued in general (Shiva 1993, 75).

This devaluation of women's work and voice has relegated women to the margins of environmental engagement (whether through decision-making, planning, management or organizing) and diminished their perceived and possessed agency. In its guide to incorporating gender considerations into environmental projects, the Organization for Security and Co-Operation in Europe notes that "[women's] often restricted access to public participation and political participation" creates a barrier to incorporating women's priorities and concerns with regards to environmental planning and decision-making (OSCE 2009, 18). Thus, women, especially in developing countries[4], are assuming a considerable amount of environmental risk via exposure and interaction, yet have significantly less influence over matters of environmental planning and decision-making. The work women do with and for the land compared to their ownership and ability to make decisions about land use reflects a deeply unequal, gendered power dynamic (Buckingham-Hatfield 2000). The consequences of such inequality have yet to be

[4] Development projects in the global South have created gendered effects – not all of which are expressly related to the environment – that positions them to be more vulnerable than women in the global North. As a result of development in the global South, "The almost uniform conclusion of the [UN Decade for Women]'s research is that with a few exceptions, women's relative access to economic resources, incomes and employment has worsened, their burden of work has increased, and their relative and even absolute health, nutritional and educational status has declined" (DAWN 1985 in Shiva 1993, 74). One commonality between this research and the present research is increasing "burden of work" that women experience. This is discussed in more detail in later sections.

thoroughly investigated, important questions to attend to include: How does male-dominated leadership of environmental strategizing and planning impact women's livelihoods? How does male leadership of environmental organizations affect the services that are made accessible to women? What do communities and/or organizations stand to gain from incorporating equal consideration for gendered perspectives into the realm of environmental planning and decision-making? My research strives to answer this final query, at least in part.

Related Research In addition to ecofeminist literature, many studies have also explored the relationship between gender and the environment. Thomas Dietz, Linda Kalof and Paul C. Stern published their research, *Gender, Values and Environmentalism*, which related gender to a set of key psychological values thought to be closely associated with pro-environmental behavior and environmental concern (Dietz, Kalof and Stern 2002). The researchers identified two broad "value clusters" that are thought to influence pro-environmental behavior and environmental concern: altruism and self-interest (Ibid.). Altruists tend to display more pro-environmental behavior, whereas highly self-interested individuals are less likely to exhibit these behaviors (Ibid.). Deitz, Kalof and Stern found that men and women prioritize these value clusters differently; women value altruism more than men do (Ibid.). Since altruism is the value most closely associated with pro-environmental behavior, this finding is of particular importance to understanding the ways in which gender influences environmentalism.

Another study constructed by Walter Wehrmeyer and Margaret McNeil investigated the intersections of gender and environmental engagement (Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000). The researchers constructed four broad "value factors" that encompassed various attitudes and perspectives related to pro-environmental behavior and ecological concern: *Conscientious Activism* ("individuals' actions in support of environmental protection"), *Corporate Environmentalism* ("sharing of information about the firm's choices and actions on matters involving the environment", *Deep Green* ("a personal value system which recognizes nature in its own right") and *Technological Omnipotence* (confidence that "human ingenuity, when coupled with technology, will provide the answers to all the difficult environmental challenges) (Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000, 214-215). Their research illuminated gendered patterns of environmental conceptualization. Valuation of

the *Technological Omnipotence* and *Conscientious Activism* factors both varied along gendered lines; men scored more highly on the *Technological Omnipotence* value factor than did women, and women scored higher on *Conscientious Activism* (Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000). The researchers note that "this finding is consistent with many previous studies" which report that women are more likely to engage with pro-environmental behavior (Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000, 220). Interestingly, however, there was little distinction between men and women regarding the *Deep Green* value factor. "The similarity in ratings on *Deep Green* orientation between the men and the women surveyed suggests a challenge to the cultural feminist notion of women's essential nature being radically different from men's" (Ibid.).

Conceptualizations of the interplay between gender and environment clearly vary. Ecofeminism is the prevailing theoretical approach to understanding the relationship between gender and the environment. This framework is strengthened by other theoretical approaches to relating gender and environment, such as the study of gendered value systems and ethics. There are also conceptualizations based in empirical research that has explained the interplay between gender and the environment primarily by noting the gendered impacts of environmental degradation. These conceptualizations guide this research and assert the importance of incorporating gender in the study and implementation of environmental affairs.

Gender and Organization

There is a lot to be said about the interaction between gender and organizations. The literature is extensive. Much of what this literature examines is now a matter of widespread public awareness: sexism and harassment in the workplace, the gender pay gap, women's impaired professional advancement, etc. It is clear that women are still vying for legitimacy and respect in the in virtually every sector of the professional world. I argue that, in the context of environmental organizations, the implications of imbalanced gender dynamics that disenfranchise women are especially important and of universal significance.

Organizations are gendered spaces. Business theory and practice has long been imbued with underlying gender bias. Jeff Hearn writes, "The apparent or presumed degendering of organizational cultures and identities remains a powerful form of men's

power" (Hearn 2002, 41). He posits that men's domination of organizations has been "taken for granted" both in the organizational and academic realms, such that it is overlooked (i.e. "taken for granted"), unnamed, and generally unquestioned; when these dynamics go unchallenged, gendered organizational spaces continue to act as a mechanism of male power and dominance. "The majority of debates on identities in organizations and organizational culture – that is, the patterns of behavior, beliefs, symbols and identity reproduced by organizational participants – have taken their ungenderedness as given" (Hearn 2002, 42). Hearn argues that to ignore the "gender question" while cultivating understandings and studies of organizational cultures, identities and functionality, is to do a disservice to the professional and academic world.

Hearn notes that predominately female and predominately male organizations have been observed to be quite distinct in terms of the ways in which they define, conceptualize and experience different aspects of the world (Ibid.) Women's organizations have different concerns and priorities than men's organizations; the "recognition of the different social locations and social experiences of women and men" may explain this (Hearn 2002, 43). Furthermore, they are often structurally distinct, with each being managed and staffed differently; this is empirically observed by the female population in the nonprofit sector (approximately 75% of the nonprofit workforce (Outon 2015)) and the male population in the military (approximately 85% of the defense force (Department of Defense 2015)), for example. "Bringing these taken-for-granted men's organizational cultures and identities to the fore illustrates the need to develop macro/societal conceptualizations that locate organizations, cultures and identities in the context of patriarchy and patriarchal social relations." (Ibid.)

Hearn is not alone in this assertion. John Dobson and Judith White investigated the moral rationalities of men and women, and used their findings to propose a revised version of business ethics to reflect a more feminine value based system (Dobson and White 1995). They challenge the implicit gender bias of organizations by "drawing on the concept of substantive rationality inherent in virtue-ethics theory" (Dobson and White 1995, 474). In other words, the researchers endeavor to change the ways organizations function by expanding the rationality under which organizations operate; they envision a transformation of the role of the organization to something beyond that of a "contractual

nexus," a stop on a journey to accumulate wealth (Dobson and White 1995). Rather, they argue that a feminized business ethic allows the organization to operate as "a nexus of relationships between stakeholders," and a cultivator of "moral excellence" (Dobson and White 1995, 474).

Dobson and White identify two general camps that moral individuals fall into: the "autonomous self" and the "connected self" (Dobson and White 1995, 464). The autonomous self approaches ethical dilemmas from a position of stark rationality, with consideration for rules and rights; the connected self approaches ethical dilemmas from a relational position, with consideration for context and compassion. Their research posits that men tend to embody the autonomous self in their modes of rationality, whereas women tend to align with the connected self (Ibid.). "Women tend to conceptualize moral questions as problems of care involving empathy and compassion, while men conceptualize them as problems of rights" (Dobson and White 1995, 465). Bearing this in mind, Dobson and White relate men and women's rationality not only to the moral competency of the organization, but also to its financial success. In their own words: "Given the essential nature of the firm as a nexus of communal relations, the exclusion of the feminine firm levies both a moral and economic cost on our corporate culture. By establishing a sound logical conceptualization and justification for the feminine firm within the business disciplines, extensions of this work will help disseminate this broadened value orientation throughout business education and practice" (Dobson and White 1995, 473).

Other literature (Morgan et. al. 2004; Ibarra 1992; Granovetter 1973; Lin, Ensel and Vaughn 1981) explores the importance of social networks within organizations. Social networks have been observed to "reinforce gender inequalities in the organizational distribution of power" through *homophily*, the "tendency to form same-sex network relationships" (Ibarra 1992, 422). This affects "the ability to convert individual attributes and positional resources into network advantages" (Ibid.). These networks serve as mechanisms of socialization, mentoring, information acquisition and information sharing (Morgan et. al. 2004). The "Old Boys' Club" embodies the homophily referenced by Ibarra and has been observed to operate as described by Morgan et. al. From the female perspective, such networks have been experienced as "an empowered force that provided

a barrier to and devalued the contributions of women" (Morgan, Quesenberry and Trauth 2004, 1316). The persistence of "Old Boys' Networks in organizations is significant because their perpetuation simultaneously perpetuates inequality in the workplace; furthermore, their status as an informal social group makes them difficult to address and dismantle from an organizational standpoint.

Organization and Environment

Studies reveal that organizations have an impact on their employees' behavior and environmental attitudes. Wehrmeyer and McNeil's study inquired beyond gendered differences in environmental attitudes to investigate organizational influence on employees' ethical stances. Their research was conducted in a large pharmaceutical company in the United Kingdom (Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000). The researchers assert that "personal environmental attitudes often correlate and interact with organizationally held environment beliefs," and explore this relationship with an eye to variables such as age, organizational status (the employees' rank and department) and gender (Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000, 212). Several important conclusions are drawn from this study.

Firstly, an organization's priorities influence its employees' attitudes. Wehrmeyer and McNeil identified a set of variables such as "encouraging others to protect nature," "trying to do my bit to protect the environment," and "being active and interested in the environment" that comprised a value factor called *Conscientious Activism* (Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000, 214). They found that "conscientious activism, whilst a personal choice and orientation, is linked to the choices of the firm" and argue that organizations should "seek a good environmental reputation" if they wish to promote values in accordance with *Conscientious Activism* in their staff (Ibid.).

The researchers also found that value prioritization was susceptible to variance based on individuals' position and/or department within the organization. For men, variation in orientation towards *Conscientious Activism* was linked to their position in the organizational hierarchy, as was their affinity for values relating to the *Deep Green* factor (i.e. a value system which recognizes the intrinsic importance of nature) (Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000, 217). Those in senior-level positions scored lower on each of these factors than their male colleagues who occupied lower positions in the organizational hierarchy. "For men there was a very real sense in which their environmental attitudes were

mediated by their level in the organizational hierarchy" (Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000, 221). Additionally, both women and men showed variance regarding notions of *Technological Omnipotence* based on their departmental position in the organization (Ibid.). Women working in sales and marketing reported more confidence in technology's ability to "provide the answers to all ecological challenges," whereas women working in research departments were less confident (Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000, 215-217). Similarly, male employees in the field of manufacturing scored this factor higher than male their colleagues in research, development and regulatory departments (Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000, 220). Evidently, an individual's role within their organization (whether that role is defined by department or position in the organizational hierarchy) has an effect on their conceptualization of environmental issues.

Conclusion: Gender, Environment and Organization

Wehrymeyer and McNeil's research captures the intersections of gender, organization, and environment. Their results identified "both gender differences and role-based differences at play with varying impact across key environmental attitude dimensions" (Wehrmeyer and McNeil 2000, 221). Their research both supports and challenges previous studies that link gender with environmental engagement. Their findings do suggest that women are more likely to practice positive environmental behaviors, but challenge the cultural ecofeminist notion that there are fundamental differences between men and women that influence environmental values. They caution against this sort of essentialism, and instead suggest that future studies employ a critical ecofeminist perspective with an interest in deconstructing the dualisms (i.e. nature/culture, emotion/reason) that have shaped our world and legitimated the domination of the environment.

A survey of hundreds of conservation and other environmental organizations conducted by Donald Snow in the 1990s revealed that the "average" leader in these spaces was a "forty-five-year-old white male who serves as the chief executive officer of his organization" (Snow 1992, 42). 79 percent of environmental organization leaders who responded to Snow's questionnaire were male (Snow 1992, 47). His study illustrates that environmental organizations are (or were) highly gendered spaces. Theory on masculine ethics and organizations calls attention to the problems embedded within this masculine

construction. By converging these three spheres of knowledge – gender, environment, and organization – together, it becomes easier to identify, discuss and understand the consequences of male-dominance in environmental organizations.

Results

The results of this study suggest that the exclusivity in environmental organizations persists through remnants of the "Old Boys' Network" that created early American environmentalism. In some aspects, progress is visible. Female leadership in these organizations is certainly apparent. Women feel deeply fulfilled by their jobs. They are active participants within their organization and the environmental movement at large. Yet, remnants of the exclusive "Old Boys' Club" culture continue to shape their experiences. Masculine privilege set in place by this culture eases men's ability to form relationships with colleagues and cull respect; their access to resources is greater than that of their female colleagues. Additionally, it perpetuates a culture of implicit bias towards women that impacts upon their professional experience.

These results are organized and discussed thematically. The *Organizational Observations* discuss what structural, interpersonal gender dynamics subjects have witnessed specifically within the context of their organization. The *Personal Reflections* takes a more nuanced approach, analyzing the discrete influence of gender on perceptions, values and attitudes. Each section employs the conceptual framework of *moving beyond* the "Old Boys' Club" culture, beginning with stories that indicate strong presence of such a culture and/or its effects, followed by stories of perceived and actualized success transcending the confines of the "Old Boys' Club."

A Brief Description of Subjects[5]

For the reader's reference, I am providing a short description of each subject to help contextualize his or her perspectives. The parenthetical numbers that are seen throughout these sections correspond with specific subjects. Subjects **1**, **3, 4, 8, and 9** are female subjects working in quasigovernmental organizations. Subjects **2 and 10** are male subjects working for quasigovernmental organizations. Subject **5** is a board member of a

[5] **Distinguishing details of individuals and their organizations have been altered throughout the following sections to preserve confidentiality. Bracketed statements and asterisks denote phrases and other details that have been modified for clarity and/or confidentiality.**

nonprofit organization. Subject **6** is a male working for a nonprofit organization. Subjects **7, 11, 12 and 13** are female subjects working for nonprofits. Not all subjects grouped as such belong to the same individual organization.

Organizational Observations

The following sections report on structural realities, perceived patterns and interactions, and lived experience of the thirteen subjects. They reveal both overt and covert operations of the "Old Boys' Club" culture, and the factors that perpetuate this culture. Responses from subjects also convey that progress towards gender equality is being made in these organizations.

Gender Roles and Patterns

I inquired about gendered patterns in hierarchical position and formal and informal roles within the organization to support my understanding of the types of resources accessible to men and women within their organization, and to assess the degree to which leadership of these organizations remains male-dominated. Responses revealed gender-specific perceptions of a person's skills and competency, which were incorporated into the following discussions. Women's leadership is apparent, but their access to resources is distinct from men's.

A group interview with two female participants revealed the construction of their shared organization's employee base through a gendered lens. When prompted about gendered patterns in positions of authority and support, they exchanged: "When we first started, the staff was majority male." (4) "And now, majority female." (3) "Higher positions are male." (3) "[Supportive positions are] always female." (3 and 4) The observations of these women of their conservation-based organization reveal that, historically, this organization has been male-dominated. However, women have been incorporated into the organization over time, yet remain underrepresented at higher levels of leadership, despite currently holding the majority of positions within the organization.

Another female subject reported similar observations within her organization. "Yes, the male [occupies positions of authority]." (8) In this particular organization, males occupied the vast majority of positions within the organization; positions dealt with environmental education, technical assistance, engineering, directing, equipment

handling, and specialized assistance. Only two positions were reserved for females, one of them a broad specialist position and the other an administrative assistant.

Subjects note gendered patterns in positions of authority and support not only within the immediate organization, but also in the board of directors. The female subjects interviewed as a pair reflected: "Currently, on the board it's typically males, especially [those] that command the power." (3) One woman expressed the view that "the board's influence" explains male domination of authoritative positions, because the organization is governed by a "male dominated board." (4) Yet, there was also an element of assumed skillset and capacity in their conversation. One mentioned that "Who applies for those jobs" explains female pattern in supportive positions. (4) Whether this was a measure of assumed skillset of females, their gravitation towards these roles out of compatibility with their personal life, or their capacity to perform a role was unsaid. Subject 7 expressed similar views, but was more direct in her analysis; she attributes female patterns in positions of support to many of those positions being part time, a good transition for women with children coming back into the workforce as they regain independence.

Dialogue with a male subject revealed similar perspectives, with interesting nuance. The subject recognized that his organization skewed heavily male, and said that "[The unequal distribution of male and female employment in my organization] comes down to the hiring process, very much lends itself to picking out the best person for the job. For the candidates we had in front of us at the time, that's how it panned out… We don't get as many females that apply, that's part of the equation" (10). He went on to speak of an individual's capacity to fulfill a role in gendered terms. In his response, capacity is discussed in terms of interest, skills and compatibility with perceived societal roles. "What I see is, it seems like the female contingency is more involved in what I would say are more of the service areas, and it seems like male contingencies are more involved in the compliance side of the equation… The administrative assistants are almost all female, I don't think I know of one that's not [female]. That, I think – yes, it's stereotypical – but it's also how males and females look at their career possibilities. Those positions tend to pay less and often times, if the male is going to be the breadwinner in a household, that position wouldn't pay enough" (10). This subject

understands the gendering of positions and minimal female involvement as a natural phenomenon, but offers support that is socially constructed: women's societal roles as the secondary supporters of the household. Such a response is imbued with implicit biases. These masculinist biases aren't necessarily specific to the "Old Boys' Club" culture, but they are biases of social construction that, intentionally or not, marginalize women and impact their ability to access resources within their organization.

Another male subject identified that, within his organization as well, the hiring process is focused on selecting the best individual, regardless of gender. When prompted about gendered patterns in positions of authority within his nonprofit organization, he responded "No, whoever we feel can and wants to step up to that position, it doesn't matter." (6) Although there may not be gendered patterns in positions of authority or support within this organization, there were certainly gendered patterns ."[My organization has] three standing committees, and I'd say two of them are female-dominated. The chairs are female, and when I go to those meetings and sit around the table, it's mostly women. The one that's *not* is our site-stewardship committee, that's the group that started going out in the field looking at properties and making recommendations to the board [regarding whether the organization] should pursue this [project]. That one is our only [committee] that I would say is really male-dominated. The [female-dominated] committees are education and [public relations], and the other one is membership development. [Based on that] it sort of seems like [genders] gravitate towards certain roles." (6) What's interesting to note here is that this subject said this in defense of female participation and leadership in his organization. That is surely apparent here with two female-dominated committees. According to this subject, one committee is predominately male, but the role of this committee is arguably of most consequence. The "site-stewardship" committee first and foremost interacts directly with the land. In the context of this organization, the committee is working to assess environmental quality and viability of projects. They are the most involved in influencing the direction and priorities of the organization, and they are mostly, if not all males, according to this individual's account. The perceived equality in his organization based on female leadership in some areas of the organizational structure is masking the perpetuation of an

insider male group wielding the most agency. Certainly, the dynamics here are reminiscent of the "Old Boys' Club," whether intentionally constructed or not.

Similar dynamics were reported in other organizations. While there may be relatively equal numbers of male and female employees and no obvious gendered patterns in positions of leadership or authority, a deeper look at the departmental structure of the organization challenges the perceived balance. A female leader of a nonprofit stated that "[The gender distribution of this organization] is roughly half and half, it looks like… There's definitely an imbalance when you look at our teams, I'm looking at this [organizational] chart, and our development team, it's only three people, but they're all women. Our operations team is three women and a man. Our advocacy team is all women. Then, when you get into implementation, we have a crew that does tree planting and storm water projects – so the guys that are really digging in the earth – that whole team is men." (12) This is a repeating narrative – the men are more typically the members of environmental organizations that are actually engaging in the environmental work. This research can only speculate on the consequences of male-dominated environmental fieldwork; what is sure, though, is that the incorporation of women into roles that require more fieldwork would certainly impact the problems identified and prioritized by the organization, and perhaps the organization's approach to addressing such problems.

This subject also spoke about leadership within her organization. "At our top level [of leadership], we have more women than men. Three of four directors are women. Just below that, we have senior managers, and three of the four are men." After she pondered the tendency of men and women to occupy certain roles within her organization, she said "No, [men and women don't tend to gravitate towards certain roles in this organization] and that hasn't necessarily been my experience in each of the places that I've worked, so I feel as though [this organization] is a little bit different. We have women who are just as ready to roll up their sleeves and get dirty as we have men. We have men who are good managers and men that are not so good managers, and we probably have women that are good and not so good." (12) Her response departs from the reality of the structure of her organization slightly.

Circumstances in some organizations are indicative of a move beyond the confines of the "Old Boys' Club." A female subject spoke of progress she had witnessed

at one level of leadership in her organization. “There used to be a lot of men in power, and they still run the organization as VPs and board members, but the executive level has changed. That has been trending towards more female executives and managers. But at the VP, President and board level, they’re mostly men.” (11) Despite the integration of females into higher levels of leadership (i.e. positions with greater access to resources and influence), men still seem to maintain the most control in this organization, according to this account. She went on to say that “[supportive roles] are all women, the assistants, the office managers, the secretaries, they’re all women.” (11) She observed that men and women gravitate towards certain roles within her organization, explaining that “a lot of the field positions – doing work outside – are mostly men, the water or boating jobs are mostly men, and for the most part the women are – they gravitate towards leadership positions and positions that are more desk-jobs.” (11) So, while there is an emergence of more female leadership within this organization, the privileging of men is clear. Men remain at the pinnacle positions of leadership hierarchy, they are out in the field identifying environmental problems and setting priorities for this water-focused organization, and women are more often seen working at a desk in the office. Women’s engagement is no less valuable in this sense, but it certainly is different, and therefore produces a different, arguably diminished, impact on organizational functionality.

One female subject from a quasigovernmental organization discussed the current and historical gender composition of her organization. Currently, there is a gendered balance in positions occupied within her organization, and women hold several leadership positions. But, the subject argued, “If you had conducted this interview twenty years ago [the equal distribution of males and females in this organization] wouldn’t have been that way.” (9) I asked her what she attributed the equilibrium of gender representation in her organization to, to which she responded “A lot of the younger groups that are graduating, I think there’s a lot more interest in the environmental field from women, men too, but a lot of our newer employees are females. I think there’s more graduating females in environmental fields. Our older employees – if you look at age demographics – the men are the older ones.” (9) This subject’s observation of gender distribution of employees with respect to age is noteworthy. It suggests that, while environmental organizations have historically been male-dominated, the tides may be shifting in favor of increased

female involvement. Indeed, this has witnessed a great deal of female leadership in her career, including being in a leadership position herself. “My team and my area is dominated by women. I’m the supervisor for the four counties. My direct supervisor who is in charge of twenty-six counties in [my state] is also female. The [uppermost position] that is in charge of the entire state is also [held by a] female. So, I come from a line of women leaders.” (9) This sort of female leadership representation is important for females entering the environmental field. The subject attributes female leadership to low competition for jobs, however, which weakens the argument that female leadership in this organization is indicative of a cultural move beyond that of the “Old Boys’ Club”; it may just be a product of happenstance. Additionally, the subject noted that affiliation with government and the diversity initiatives the government promotes may be a factor in the equal gender distribution of employees and instances of female leadership.

Gendered patterns of roles are observable in the structure of organizations, as these anecdotes have described. However, subjects of this study indicated that there are also gendered patterns in informal roles; these informal roles are less visible than established organizational roles. “Old Boys’ Networks” have been created informally, adjacent to organizations yet still having an effect within them, highlighting the significance of investigating and attempting to understand informal roles men and women take on within their organization.

Subject 7 notes the informal roles that she has witnessed women gravitate towards in her experience with her organization. “When we have our annual membership meeting, which is always a dinner, I feel like the women tend to act more like a hostess, talking to a lot of different people and moving through the groups of people, and I feel like a lot of the guys, and it’s not necessarily that they just talk to a buddy, but they find one person and they tend to have a conversation with them for the whole social hour, whereas I feel like the women take on the responsibility of checking in with a lot of people and making sure they’re having a good time.” (7) Elements of the “Old Boys’ Network” are unveiled in this anecdote, specifically by the subject’s description of the way men are interacting at these social events. While women are working to connect with multiple people, perhaps motivated by concern that everyone in attendance is “having a good time,” men are behaving differently. The observation that men tend to talk with one person at such

events is significant because this is a behavior that reinforces the "Old Boys' Network." Exclusive insider groups are created and fortified through such behavior. Furthermore, the depth of conversation men are having at these social events compared to their female colleagues is significantly greater. Depth of conversation can aid in the formation of stronger relationships and networks. While women take on the labor of being "the hostess," caring for others and ensuring the satisfaction of those in attendance, men are enhancing their own relationships and networks.

A male subject responded similarly based on his observations within the workplace. "Socialization occurs more readily through female prompting, and that's somewhat of the culture [of this organization]." To illustrate his point, he spoke of women's efforts to prompt social "coffee breaks" in his office. Women appear to be trying to form relationships and inclusive culture within their organization, but are unable to do so without the equal effort and engagement of their male colleagues.

Discussions with participants on gendered patterns of leadership, support, formal and informal roles suggest that, structurally, environmental organizations are moving beyond the "Old Boys' Network" in terms of involving more women, especially in leadership positions. Yet, organizational structures simultaneously reveal women occupying supportive positions, positions with less direct engagement with the purpose of the organization and the physical environment. In most cases, the most influential positions of leadership are still held by men. This finding is extremely significant because it relates position occupation to resource access. Because men hold the most influential formal leadership roles, they have greater ability to exercise agency in decision-making processes, strategic planning, and other important activities within the organization. Women are exhibiting a desire to assimilate into these cultures and spaces, as evident by their informal roles that tend towards socialization. Participants' observations of dynamics in the board of directors both complement and complicate the findings of this particular inquiry.

The Board of Directors

Any given organization's board of directors can be thought to serve three primary functions: institutional, governance and strategic (Goodstein, Gautam and Boeker 1994). Institutional functions include linking the organization with external resources and

communities; governance functions include ensuring cohesion between organizational actions and stakeholder interests; finally, the strategic role of the board encompasses institutional and governance functions, as well as decision-making responsibilities that help the organization adapt to changing circumstances, both within and beyond the organization itself (Ibid.). The strategic function of boards has "historically been neglected," yet is arguably the most important aspect of board function to explore, as the strategic role of the board shapes the direction of the organization (Goodstein et. al. 1994, 242). "With institutional pressures for greater corporate accountability, the strategic function of the board is expanding from a caretaker function to one of dominant participation" (Goodstein et. al. 1994, 249).

Though not an initial query of this research, gender diversity in boards has proven to have very palpable impacts on the environmental organizations surveyed in this study, in terms of structure and functionality. This finding is supported by prior research, which suggests that board diversity "appears to have significant effects on strategic changes" (Goodstein et. al. 1994, 246). These effects are not necessarily all positive. The obvious benefits to increasing diversity in boards of directors, (i.e. integrating unique perspectives, goals and priorities; enhancing services provided; representing an assortment of communities and interests) constitute one side of a double-edged sword. With a diversity of perspectives and priorities comes an increased risk of disagreement and conflict between individuals; within a board of directors, this dynamic may hinder the ability to reach agreements and make important strategic planning decisions. Goodstein and his colleagues "found that organizations with diverse boards are less likely to initiate strategic changes than those with homogeneous boards" (Ibid.). My own research both supports and challenges this finding. Some stories from these environmental organizations highlight that, although a homogenous board may be able to reach agreement on organizational decisions quickly, this is not necessarily to the benefit of the organization or its constituents; further, these results illustrate that increasing board diversity and integrating new perspective may inspire other board members to begin acting differently and can enhance the organization's functionality.

Certain interviews revealed a negative perspective of board influence on organization functionality, based on perceptions of the gendered structure of the board,

the way the board is constructed, and the culture and behaviors amongst members. A female subject, working in a predominately-male quasigovernmental organization governed by an entirely male board of directors, noted the multidimensional detriments of such a homogenous board. This subject maintained two official roles: administrative assistant for her office, and assistant to the board. This dual presence in the organization gave the subject a unique perspective; she has been able to observe the inner-workings of the board and directly experiences the impact of their governance as an employee of the organization.

By her account, board members are strategically "hand-picked" for their positions, and the manager of her organization has substantial influence in this process. The board is constructed by "nominating organizations that pick the members." (8) These partner organizations include workers' alliances and economic, business-oriented organizations, among others. Organizations such as these are typically male-dominated, and the subject attests to this in her reflections. "[board membership] is dependent on who [these organizations] nominate… a lot of people in them are male." (8) One "nominating organization" even had the word "men" in its name (i.e. Fishermen's Association*), highlighting that men are the intended constituency of this particular organization. Here, the "Old Boys' Club" or "Network" becomes strikingly apparent; a predominately-male organization is being governed by an entirely male board of directors who are nominated to their positions by a network of male-dominated organizations. During her thirteen years with the organization, the subject reflected that "I don't know of any time a woman's name has been introduced to be on our board." (8) Matters are further complicated as the subject explicates the managers' role in influencing board structure.

As a quasigovernmental organization, certain initiatives need to be approved by governmental officials; selecting new board members is one such task. The subject explained that she perceived a certain relationship between the manager of her organization and the governmental officials to which the organization reports. "I feel that our manager has a lot of pull with our [governmental officials], so he helps to pick these names [i.e. select or nominate new board members], even as far as getting these nominating organizations to give names, so that the board is kind of who he wants it to

be, and then they go along with whatever he proposes." (8) Again, the privileging of the "Boys' Network" is made clear; men have created these sorts of insider groups and connections within the nexus of such organizations, and they reap the benefits of these relationships. The subject went on to share that, within the monthly board meetings, board members are not contributing much; rather, the manager largely controls the floor and board members tend to go along with his suggestions and ideas unquestioningly. His network has afforded him increased influence over the organization vis-à-vis his construction of the board.

The consequences of such homogeneity on this board are multifaceted. This subject's experience as assistant for the board has exposed her to patterns of conversation and prioritization amongst members. Aside from her observation of the leadership of the board being usurped by the manager, she also notes that members tend to focus their attention on their own agendas. Her experience is that board members tend to push for projects that align with their own interests or priorities, at the expense of addressing matters of greater consequence or diversity. "It feels like sometimes we will talk forever on those topics, and then topics where you think there should be a real conversation are glazed over. They won't even ask questions half the time. [The manager] gives the 'I think we should…' and [board members] just go with it." (8)

Most importantly, however, this subject notes the limitations to advancement, services and constituencies that are perpetuated by low board diversity. Within the organization itself, and the constituency it serves, this subject notes that "men are given more opportunities than women." (8) This disproportionate opportunity is observable in the predominately male structure of the organization, which employs six males and two females. The board of directors assists in the selection of an organization manager, who in turn is charged with selecting employees. It is perhaps not surprising then, that in the context of this organization, an all-male board selected a male manager who has constructed a largely male employee base. It is worth considering that implicit biases have privileged male involvement in this organization at all levels. These biases influence the structure of the organization to become predominately male. By virtue of their greater numbers, men have more opportunity to exercise their agency within an organization context, illustrating the sentiment expressed by the subject. But gendered access to

opportunity is not confined to the members of the organization, it extends to its constituents.

The subject posits that female constituents are ignored and disadvantaged by her organization. Projects proposed by or for female constituents are "overlooked" in this subject's experience; this oversight directly impacts the access to opportunity of the organization's constituents. Citing an example of a project to assist a female constituent, the subject explains that the attitude surrounding said project was apathetic; statements were made amongst the board to the effect of "I don't even know why [the organization is] doing [this project]," she said. She elaborated that the specific issues addressed in this project were brought to the organization's attention by a larger state environmental organization, which underscored the importance of the project and the severity of the problems it addressed. Yet the board remained unreceptive. "But, we have another project that we're doing… and it's been said straight-out that [the constituent's] management style is a big part of their problem, but [the organization] is going over and beyond what [the organization] should be doing [for this project]. I don't think that it's [i.e. the valuation of projects] being treated fairly in these two circumstances" (8). This anecdote reveals a privileging of male constituents, an effect that is inseparable from the male dominance of the organization at all levels. It is important to question how board diversity, whether in terms of gender, race, age, or other variable, affects constituencies reached and served.

Other subjects echoed similar observations relating to board diversity and organizational service. From the perspective of one female subject from a large nonprofit, "[The organization is] striving for diversity [on the board], but frankly, there's still a lot of old, white men." (13) This subject also noted the perceived controlling attitude of a male executive with respect to the board. "The board is highly controlled, at least from my perspective, access to the board is highly controlled by the president [of the organization]… there isn't a whole lot of opportunity to interact with them… which I think they would benefit from. Every time I interact with them and every time I've heard other people speak about it they seem to want more of staff, but they're not getting it… the president [is the barrier]… I think it's a control thing." (13) This is the second case in this study that depicts a male leader exercising a significant amount of control over the

board and its activities. The motivations of such behavior were not accounted for in this study, but should certainly be pondered. It is reasonable question whether this behavior is a matter of protecting and enhancing male power within the organization, indicative of a devaluation of the knowledge and contributions of those employees lower in the organizational hierarchy, or a mechanism of something else entirely.

Another female subject from the same organization spoke of the authority of the board. "We have very strong board members that direct our overall practices. When they make suggestions, you listen." (11) She lamented that creativity of staff members feels stifled in this environment. "I think that's the culture of them getting what they want for so long and not being challenged." (11) As it stands, this organization's board is 35 percent female. Males are clearly privileged. The unequal gender distribution of this particular board could be a factor in its highly directive approach to organizational governance. Other subjects shared similar experiences.

A number of subjects, both male and female, from the same quasigovernmental organization spoke to me about their board's overbearing presence. Within this particular organization, the interaction between staff and board members shifted. Staff members, especially those charged with coordinating special projects or programs, once regularly attended staff meetings to share their work and ideas. This collaborative dynamic has disintegrated over time, however, and now staff members rarely attend board meetings, and have very little interaction with board members. "Partially, that's just because of how we've structured committees and how they report to the board." (3) The restricted professional interactions between staff and board members within this particular organization have given way for problematic relations to develop between the two personnel groups.

From the female perspective, interactions with board members are particularly strained. "It's hard to be a woman that has your opinion listened to on the board. There have been a few really good female board members, but I have seen them express views that just weren't taken seriously or given much consideration." (3) "There's an element of dismissiveness. I think women know [what it's like to be subject to dismissiveness], but I'm not sure men are aware they're being dismissive because they've never been dismissed… my professional opinion [on projects or programs] had no weight at all…

there was no acknowledgement of the experience or education that I would bring to the table [in board meetings]." (4) Beyond dismissive attitudes towards women, board members of this organization have been observed to treat women in rather demeaning ways.

"I've witnessed board members refer to staff in a way that's condescending, like referring to someone as a 'young lady' when she's a woman." (4) Such language belittles women, and undermines their status as legitimate members of and contributors to the organization. It evokes a paternalistic dynamic in which the board member assumes a position of authority imbued with influence and decision-making powers, and relegates the woman to the subordinate status of "young lady," with diminished power. Furthermore, the title "young lady" certainly does not demand the same respect as "woman"; "young ladies" are perceived as needing direction, guidance, support, and further development, whereas "women" are perceived to be independent, mature, fully developed individuals. In addition to such language, this informant also reported that board members request tasks from women that are inherently demeaning. "There is a definite element of service" expected from female staff by board members. (4) She noted the consistent requests by a few board members for female staffers to make and bring them a cup of coffee during meetings. "I can't imagine these four or five board members ever going to a male employee and asking for a cup of coffee. That would not occur. But it would occur to us [women] regularly." (4)

A male from the same organization had observed similar dynamics between staff and board members. "The staff are treated like servant-workers, versus partners with the board, which disturbs me. It upsets me that the board sees the staff as an interchangeable cog in the system, rather than valued, experienced, skillful, unique contributors that you need on the bus to make it all go." (2) This subject has extensive experience in his particular niche of environmental work, including involvement with several other similar organizations throughout the United States, and said of his observations at his current location, "To the extent that that story is not unique… I would suggest that the story I just described – the patriarchal board – is something that [organizations such as mine] across the country are struggling with. It's a huge challenge for them. Some of them don't care about it and are fine with it, but I think many are starting to understand that that's the

problem." (2) He reflected on his own interactions with the board, saying "I struggle with [a patriarchal, "Old English Common Law" culture] every day with our board and board leadership." He comments that instead of "encouraging open dialogue" between members during board meetings, they are more typically "run like a business." (2) The subject stated that some of his most trying professional relationships have been with board members, especially when their values do not align with his own.

This particular subject interacts with board members quite regularly, as attending board meetings is a provision of his job description. His observations of board dynamics in meetings reveal a clear affinity for directive influence amongst members. "[Exercising their power is] like a hobby for them, they love the ability to weigh in on whether [a decision] is [a good decision], or whether [a constituent's] request for [amendments to contracts or developments to projects] should be allowed. [They enjoy the ability] to have a say in that, and the staff is just sort of there to make sure the paperwork [is done] and the trains are running on time, which is kind of discouraging, to have a staff person in that role." (2) Yet, the subject also said that the power of the board is overstated, and has been dwindling over time. "Right now, I don't think they have a lot of power. My view on that though is… we need to have the board *feel* empowered, and strong, and important at this point in time – it doesn't serve [the organization] to have them feel disenfranchised or weakened in any way." (2) This subject illustrates the strained relationship between the organization and its board well. At one level there is a perceived power and negative impact of the board as expressed by female employees; the male manager shares similar perspectives and has had his share of frustrations with the board as well, but doesn't perceive the same power dynamic – he seems to suggest that the board's power needs to be reaffirmed to keep its members engaged with serving the organization. Regardless of the imagined or actual power the board holds, board members' behaviors have negatively impacted upon the experiences of employees of the organization significantly.

Though experiences with patriarchal, dominating boards of directors were recurrent during the course of my research, other stories also emerged that highlighted the potential for positive impact by the board on organization functionality. In instances where the board appears to be working well with (or for) the organization, deliberate steps have been taken to overcome the obstacles of the "Old Boys' Network." One

woman (7) reflected on the positive impacts of board diversity that she has witnessed during her twenty-four year tenure with her nonprofit. When she began with the organization, gender diversity on the board was low, with only one female serving. "She and I realized that needed to change for a lot of reasons." (7) The sole woman on the board held the Chair position, and made it "her personal mission to get more women on the board." (7) The subject went on to explain this woman's background. A military wife who had lived many years on military bases, the board Chair had extensive experience with gendered roles and expectations in terms of work. "In her experience, men tend to talk about what needs to be done, but women were the ones actually implementing it on the base." (7) This dynamic was not just confined to military bases; as board Chair, this woman noticed that "men were serving on the boards, but most of the men were used to having support staff [because of their higher positions within their own, separate companies]… that made stuff happen. They could just say 'this is what needs to be done,' and people would go and do it… We're a small enough organization that we don't have those people to go and do it, so we needed people that *could* do things and were *willing* to do things and understood that they *had to* do things. " (7) This dynamic was part of the rationale for the board Chair's initiative to integrate more women into the board for this nonprofit organization.

The subject also noted that the endeavor to diversify the gendered homogeneity of the board was in part motivated by the long-term, strategic goals of the organization and this particular board Chair. "She felt that with guys… you can talk about the hunting and fishing aspects of land conservation and environmental improvement projects… she felt that longer-term, [the organization is] going to have to tie this into community health, and health of people. [She felt that] moms spend more time thinking about the health of their family than dad thinks about it. So if we get women involved now, we can start formulating and getting those messages out there about community health and a healthy landscape." (7)

Since bringing more women to the board, the subject interviewed has noticed changes in the way her organization interacts with their constituents. "The board is more involved in the membership renewal process than they used to be. I think part of that has to do with the fact that there are six women on the board… I think women view

relationships a little bit differently than men. So, getting the women on board to make 'Thank You' calls for members that had renewed [their membership] wasn't a big deal – the guys, I got all kinds of excuses from. But then as the women started to do it, the guys became willing to do it." (7) This anecdote highlights the benefits of increasing board diversity on organization functionality. The institutional and strategic functions of the board have been expanded as female inclusion has been prioritized. In this case, gender diversity on the board has forged stronger relationships between the organization and its constituents. The overall functionality of the organization has been enhanced in this way, as more attention has been paid to fundraising with an increase of women on the board as well. The subject attributes each of these developments to women's level of comfort communicating gratitude to constituents, whether for their continued membership to the organization or for their supportive donations. In other words, she recognizes a characteristic of women that has a very specific manifestation and affect on the way her organization functions.

These anecdotes reveal the many ways in which boards influence the experience of individuals within the organization they govern and the overall direction and functionality of the organization. Through these stories, the positive impacts of increased gender diversity are revealed, as well as the consequences of low board diversity. Mechanisms of exercising and maintaining power within the board are also evident, and these tactics are directed primarily towards women. This narrative crafted from this study suggests that "The Old Boys' Club" culture is still pervasive in the board of directors of environmental organizations. In order to fully move past the confines of this framework, boards must increase their diversity initiatives, and create inclusive spaces where different ideas can be shared, discussed and implemented.

Personal Reflections

The subjects' personal reflections described in this section touch on abstract topics. The role of gender is analyzed at a more discrete, nuanced level. To inform these sections, participants were asked questions regarding their perception of certain gendered issues, the personal significance of their job, and their opinion of the services provided by their organization.

Gender Consciousness

At the end of each interview[6], I presented respondents with a set of five quotes: 1) "Environmental degradation impacts men and women differently"; 2) "Men and women prioritize environmental concerns differently"; 3) "The different socio-cultural roles of men and women create different opportunities to engage with environmental organizing and protection"; 4) "Gender influences an individual's values, priorities, goals and worldview"; and, 5) "There are certain roles within an organization that are better suited for certain genders". I asked participants to tell me whether they agree or disagree with each statement, and to explain their rationale.

One statement that produced the least variance between respondents was: Men and women prioritize environmental concerns differently. 92% of respondents indicated that they agree with this statement, and, interestingly, many of their rationales were similarly focused. 45% of respondents noted women's nurturing character, particularly in their roles as caretakers of children, as the principal factor distinguishing women's environmental priorities from men. In their own words: "I think women, because they raise children, are more concerned with environmental things, for the children" (5). "I think, perhaps women, when they think of the environment, they think of it closer to home – the health and well-being of their children in the space they're in [wherever that may be], and men will tend to think of [environmental problems] more globally" (2). "Men might prioritize activities like hunting and fishing, whereas women might prioritize outdoor activities that they can do with their children… and use it as an educational tool, or for family outings" (6). "In my experience, women tend to, more often than men, be the nurturers, whether it's in their family or their relationships with others. So, care for the environment, for me, is sort of akin to nurturing. I think often, that role (or that action or that importance) is often prioritized by women" (12).

One respondent noted the Mother Nature narrative as an influencer of men and women's different environmental priorities. "It's Mother Nature, not Father Nature… I think if you polled women that they would have a greater concern for the environment than men." (13) The cultural ecofeminist undertones of this particular response are intriguing. The respondent insinuates an innate, spiritual/mythological connection

[6] Twelve out of thirteen interviewees were asked to respond to these questions. One interviewee was not able to complete the interview, and so did not respond to these questions.

between women and the natural world, therefore producing a heightened concern for the environment in women. In line with this rationale are other respondents who argued that women view and engage with the environment on a more personal level than men. One respondent (11) began her defense by stating, "I think it's more personal for women, more of a feeling, it's more emotional for women. And for men, it's more of a duty." When prompted to consider whether this gendered difference in prioritization affected men and women's approach to understanding and resolving environmental problems, the respondent unequivocally agreed. "Men are more solution-driven and practical… I feel like women prioritize [environmental concerns] because of our connections and emotions." (11)

Another statement elicited very uniform responses from interviewees: There are certain roles within an organization that are better suited for certain genders. 92% of subjects disagreed with this notion. Most argued that an individual's experience and/or skills qualify them for the role they are assigned, rather than their gender. In other words, most subjects did not seem to see gender as a powerful influencer of individual aptitude. However, one subject responded to the statement in the affirmative, and this is worth dissecting.

There are certain roles within an organization that are better suited for certain genders; the sexist undertones of this statement were deliberate. Just as the statement was intentionally crafted with organizational sexism in mind, the responses were interpreted from a critical perspective with an eye for nuanced expositions of sexism[7]. The subject that affirmed the above statement was a male leader in a quasigovernmental organization (10). He identified "the administrative assistant world" as a realm well suited for women. "Women tend towards those roles… they seem to fulfill that role very well or else there would be a lot more male folks in that role." The subject went on to say that women seem to be "more broadly service-based" and alluded to the idea that men may be more self-interested. He notes the "nurturing and service-based capacity [of women] that tends to lend itself towards certain roles." The subject also conceptualized the social roles of women as distinct from men's. "Women think through nuances of socialization that men don't think through sometimes… [like] being sensitive about how someone might

[7] This is not to suggest that those who agree with this statement are sexist.

perceive something." (10) He did not explicitly discuss what roles he felt that men were better suited for.

Discriminatory sexism does not seem to be apparent in this subject's explanation; it is important to refrain from overly scrutinizing the responses, as the prompts do lead subjects to generalize. In his response, the subject notes characteristics he believes to be uniquely related to females (i.e. service-based mentalities, nurturing characters, social knowledge). There is no apparent devaluation (or privileging) of these attributes in his response. This subject attaches skills, values and competencies to gender identity; this association is problematic when it becomes essentialist and/or justifies discrimination, but can be seen as a tool that helps guide the placement of individuals in roles where they are best positioned to succeed. Of course, the individual nuances of skills, values and competencies should always be accounted for, but recognizing general characteristics that relate to a person's "standpoint" (Hennessy 1993) in the world with respect to gender can serve as a starting point from which to begin a deeper assessment of an individual's assets.

Job Representation

Job attitude (i.e. job satisfaction, organizational commitment (Riketta 2008)) is an important indicator of an individual's engagement with their organization. Studies indicate "positive job attitudes, such as commitment and satisfaction, are accompanied by better work outcomes" (Riketta 2008, 472). Previous studies investigate two major aspects of job attitude: job satisfaction and "attitudinal or affective organizational commitment" (Ibid.). Job satisfaction describes "a cognitive and/or affective evaluation of one's job as more or less positive or negative (Ibid.). Organizational commitment is defined as "'the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization.'" (Mowday et. al. 1979, 226 in Riketta 2008, 472). The present study adds to this discussion by inquiring about what jobs *represent* to individuals. Job representation can be related to satisfaction and organizational commitment, depending on the individual. For example, if an individual views their job simply as a means of earning a paycheck, their zeal for their role and the duties inscribed within it may falter. This representation may lead to lower levels of satisfaction with their job, as well as lesser personal commitment to the organization's priorities and mission. Conversely, if an

individual finds personal fulfillment within their job, they are more likely to passionately engage with their role and produce better work. Their reported job satisfaction would certainly be higher than a colleague who maintains their job solely as a means of earning a paycheck, and their organizational commitment would likely be strong as well. I set out to discover whether gendered patterns of job representation are present in environmental organizations; does one gender regard their participation in environmental organizing more highly than another?

Data from the interviews does not reveal gendered patterns of job representation between men and women of environmental organizations. All subjects indicated that their job represented something far greater than a source of income. In fact, only one respondent noted the importance of her job as a means to provide for her family.

> "Well, [my job is] a big part of my life, I'm here forty hours a week. I'll tell you what, though, if I could be a stay-at-home mom, I would be – I'd rather be with my kids than at work any day, I just can't financially do that. So, I guess it represents a career, a means to provide for my family, but also a way to leave a lasting impact on the environment. And it's not just about the environment – that's why I got started, because I cared about the environment, but as I've worked here for this many years [fifteen years], I've come to appreciate working with the people just as well, like the [our clients]. I've gotten to know quite a few of them, and I enjoy helping them, relating with them, working with them." (9)

Her response reveals a complicated interplay between her role within her environmental organization and her role within her family. While she clearly states a concern for the environment that she can act upon within her role in her organization, she favors her role and duties as a mother. This is someone who, perhaps, would not be working to create environmental change, were her circumstances different.

Other recurring responses to the question of job representation included: identity, the chance to make a difference or change, and an expression of values and/or passions. It would be worth investigating a correlational relationship between these representations and job attitude, but this study did not account for such questions. My query was focused on understanding the ways in which men and women conceive of their job.

Three women responded that their job represented at least "some part of [their] identity." Two of the women, executive directors of their respective nonprofits, said that their jobs represented their self-identification; the jobs are an integral component of their sense of self. One woman reflected, "Fortunately or unfortunately, a large portion of my identity is tied into my job and what I do. In some ways that's probably not a good thing,

but for the most part it doesn't bother me." (7) She spoke of her job being "personal" to her, and "doing what [she has] to do in order to be successful" (such as working "bizarre" hours or driving long distances frequently) as a result of that personal connection. When asked if her role within the organization complemented her personal values and beliefs, the subject unequivocally responded "yes"; "Personally, I feel like people should… figure out a way to improve their community, whether that's the small community that they live in or a larger community… regardless of what that person is doing as their vocation in life... So I feel like what I'm doing is contributing to the betterment of my larger regional community." (7) In this way, this person is expressing her job not only as a representation of identity, but a manifestation of personal values in action.

Another female subject said that "more than anything," her job is a part of her identity, and that she "really couldn't think of a better fit, both professionally and personally" to fulfill her passions. "Maybe it's because I'm not a parent, or because I'm not an avid skier, I am the Executive Director of [her organization]. It's a huge part of who I am… I think a lot of my self-identity is… the impact I can make on the world around me." (12) The subject also said that she felt her role complemented her personal values and beliefs. "I really feel like this job allows me to do what I'm most passionate about… [it allows me] to be a leader in that space, doing that in the environmental arena, which is the arena about which I'm most passionate." (12)

Such associations between job and identity suggest that these women are not just doing their jobs, they are *being* their jobs; they are engaging with their roles and responsibilities in deep, personal, meaningful ways. They are living their values and passions through their roles within the organization. In this way, women may be exercising greater organizational commitment. Certainly, those that identify with their jobs on such a personal level would model greater relative strength of identification and involvement with the organization as a whole (Mowday et. al. 1979, 226 in Riketta 2008). This is worth interrogating further; more supportive evidence would be needed to accurately craft an argument on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. That being said, however, it is worth reiterating that both women who stated that their job was entirely representative of their identity were Executive Directors of dynamic organizations; both women are at the top of their

respective fields, and achievement certainly *not* won by low involvement and identification with their respective organizations. Interestingly, no males mentioned identity when speaking of job representation. Even males in comparable positions (including Executive Director and Manager titles) did not indicate that their job was representative of any facet of personal identity. Why are women actively living out their jobs and roles through self-identification, while men are not? One might argue that women are working harder to achieve the same success as their male colleagues in the environmental arena; they are working so hard, in fact, that they are *becoming* their roles and actively *living* their jobs. Their work is their self.

Male participants tended to respond that their job represented something more interactive. Whether as representative of the chance to make a difference in the world, to be a voice for the environment, to give back, or to create community, men's jobs seem to be viewed as a mechanism of interaction with others, and are imbued with the sense of a need to leave their personal mark on the world. Like their female colleagues, male respondents invariably reported that their role within the organization complemented their personal values and beliefs. One subject said "My mantra in life is to love, be loved and be in service, to make the world a better place… so the extent to which my job fulfills that is important to me… it's more than just making money… it's more than just keeping me busy." (2) With that, however, a few also responded that they were feeling "burnt out" by their work. Men appear to be interacting with their jobs in dynamic, demanding ways; a great deal of investment is required to leave a personal legacy, which could explain the professional fatigue some male respondents seem to be exhibiting. High personal investment in the job removed from self-identification with the role creates a gap between the personal and professional self, which could also contribute to this professional fatigue.

Valuation of Services

Environmental organizations are dynamic institutions that provide a wide range of services to their communities and constituents. When considering the how gender influences an individuals' environmentalism, attention to the prioritization of such services becomes relevant. Interviewees were asked to identify what they considered to be the most important service or function their organization provided to the greater

public. Subjects evaluated importance with respect to three major aspects of environmental organizations' function: system-based services, education-based services, and community-based services. Each of these categorizations was imbued with other nuances. Some subjects evaluated their organizations' services from an anthropocentric perspective, i.e. "it is important to protect land for future generations." Others expressed a more ecocentric view, valuing the services for natures' sake.

There were no significant gendered trends in the participants' evaluations of services. Five females argued that systems-based services were the most important; three argued that community and education-based services were the most important; one argued that policy-based services were the most important. The five females that advocated system-based services justified their argument with respect to the services ecosystems provide to humans, a respect for ecosystems themselves, and personal values. In other words, their rationales stemmed from an anthropocentric perspective. One subject explains, "Our conservation easement program [is the most important]… because right now we're really the only organization in this geographic region doing that, and… a conservation easement allows a landowner to have a say in the future of that property, and understanding the role their property can play in the larger landscape, and confirms their recognition that there is value in having open space in a landscape." (7) Anthropocentric and ecocentric perspectives are evident in this response. Another subject stated that working to provide "clean water and clean air" to the public was the most important function of her organization. (9) "Everyone needs clean water and clean air. The [Chesapeake] Bay is polluted, we need to do our part to not contribute to that problem." (9) Again, this subject evaluates the importance of a service her organization provides with respect to the benefits it delivers to humans, but she also seems to have a concern for the state of the Chesapeake Bay in its own right. Another subject framed her response through personal values. "Keeping land open for agriculture and out of the hands of developers is incredibly important, it's just a value that I have." (4) The service this subject regards as the most important has human and environmental benefits, but the root of her perspective on this service as the most important stems from her own values.

Other female subjects expressed that community and education-based services provided by their organization were the most important. One subject recognized that

knowledge is able to connect and spread through communities, expanding its impact indefinitely as people continue to share knowledge with others. This is summarized in her response: "I would say that environmental education [is the most important service] because thousands of students are educated and end up sharing those experiences with their families." (11) Another subject advocated for the importance of educational services for the safety of the public, and also as a reaffirmation of the intrinsic importance of our environments.

> "I think information is probably one of the most important things that we provide, and we provide it in a variety of ways… we put information on our website about pollution threats, or we provide information to decision-makers about the impact of a bill, or to homeowners. I think it's [the most important] because water is so fundamentally important for life on this planet… but it's probably one of the things we take most for granted… most people do not have an understanding or an appreciation of where that water comes from, whether or not it's clean, how it gets clean, how it gets polluted… somewhere along the way we stopped actively recognizing the importance of water." (12)

One woman, in her explanation of the importance of education and community-based services, lamented that such services seemed to be fading from her organization's repertoire. "I would say the most important [service] that we did, I don't see [the organization] doing it as much anymore, is helping the public with [their projects]… we used to hold workshops educating them, we had meetings… whether it was a farmer or a homeowner, we did things to target them and get them information." (8)

Taking a different angle on related ideas, one female participant from a large nonprofit organization highlighted information and governance-based services as the most important within the context of her organization.

> "We are known for taking well-informed, science-based policy decisions, so I think what we bring to the table, whether it's at the federal level or the state level… we can be relied upon to be very thoughtful in our decisions and we also try to get the word out, the rationale for our decisions and why we would want people to take a certain position on a law or regulation." (13)

Policy as the most important service provided by the organization reveals an affinity for governance, top-down approaches to problem solving. The subject cites the expertise of the organization. "We have the luxury… of having scientists on staff… many of our smaller environmental partners don't have that luxury. We can often bring to the table a level of expertise that our partners don't have the capacity to. [This service is the most important] especially in this day and age, when there is a lot of misinformation out there." (13) Unlike any other subject, this woman situates her argument within the

context of current events that propagate "misinformation". This is significant because it shows a perceived relationship between the services her organization provides and the discourses that shape environmentalism.

Male subjects' opinions of the most important services their organization provides generally mirrored those of women. Two men posited that systems-based services were the most important; one said that community-based services were the most important; and one argued that "The most important thing is that we are a voice for the environment… because it can't speak for itself. And it's important for future generations to have clean water, clean air and productive soils." (10) This is a difficult perspective to characterize; it is not a systems-based service, nor a community or education-based service. Rather, this service appears to be symbolic, but with presumed material effects.

An interesting trend in men's defense of the most important services was their relation of the service to personal experiences and observations. As explained by one subject, "Protecting what we've got here, the land and waterways [is the most important]… Because the human population is getting out of control, has been out of control for some time, the sprawl you see is sort of an environmental crime, that we spread ourselves out so thin and stretch our resources… you don't know what you've lost until you've lost it… I grew up here, so I know what the places were like where I played, I know what they're like now… I hate to see the farmland disappear… I see so much fragmentation" (6). This subject's observations of the changes to his hometown and county brought him to the realization that protecting land is paramount, and the most important service his organization provides to the public.

Men also conceptualized the services of their organizations as having impacts beyond the immediate location. "Drawing people's attention to the environmental problems in the watershed [is most important]… connecting it with the Chesapeake Bay, alerting folks to the fact that our obligations don't end here, we've got a sick Bay." (5) One subject's explanation, in his defense of the importance of land conservation, revealed dynamism in his understanding of the impacts of this service:

> "Everybody is connected to the land one way or another, wherever they are, in some way, and they have a relationship with it even if it's completely damaged land and it's not providing the sustenance – emotional, physical, spiritual and otherwise – that it does for a lot of folks… wherever you go, there is that common connection that I think conservation has an opportunity to (in a good way) exploit and use to drive towards a

> whole community's future where we're working together on a common mission, under a common set of values, which is a healthy landscape that supports all of us. That's one of the things I've become much more – and I probably was drawn to innately without realizing in the beginning – but now see much more fully that land conservation is one path for really healing the world. I don't say that flippantly, I really do believe that. That to me is what is and should be what we're about." (2)

This subject holds land conservation in high regards for its perceived multidimensional impacts. This service, to him, is less important for its environmental contributions; rather, its significance derives from the ability to augment the quality of life for individuals, communities, and ultimately, the world.

Concluding Remarks on the Results

The results of this study described above set the foundation for a discussion of men and women's experiences in environmental organizations, and what those experiences reveal about the state of gender dynamics in environmental organizations. The structure of organizations has been discussed here in gendered terms. Relations between colleagues and other relevant actors have been analyzed through a gendered lens. Men and women's perception of certain gendered issues, their relationships with their jobs, and their opinions regarding the services provided by their organization have also been discussed. The results have indicated that there are areas in which gender dynamics are working well, and others in which they are not. The following chapter builds from these results to generate a more comprehensive discussion.

Part III: Discussion

In this chapter, I present two narratives: The Male Experience and Female Experience. Included in this conception of "experience" are the expressions of environmentalism (including perception, behavior, attitude and values) and individuals' experience within their organization. To culminate this chapter, I discuss the limitations to this research.

Narratives

The following narratives discuss the experiences of men and women more broadly, integrating new concepts and drawing from the previous results. Within the Male and Female experience, there are two realms of discussion: *Expressions of Environmentalism* and *Organization Experience*. *Expressions of Environmentalism* chronicles the perceptions, attitudes, behaviors and values of men and women. The responses that inform these sections were drawn primarily from the survey. *Organization Experience* summarizes much of what was discussed in the previous chapter.

The Male Experience

The male experience of environmentalism and as members of environmental organizations is complex, but in many ways reminiscent of "The Old Boys' Club." With some exceptions, men find ease creating and sustaining relationships with colleagues and constituents. For the most part, the men surveyed in this study report satisfaction and fulfillment with their jobs, though some did express negative feelings towards their job or role. In general, I suggest that the males continue to be an advantaged group within environmental organizations, thus men are less inhibited in their experience as members of environmental organizations.

Expressions of Environmentalism

Environmentalism is experienced and expressed through perception (the identification and prioritization of environmental problems), attitude (opinions about environmentalism and environmental solutions), behaviors and values. With regards to matters of perception, men indicated that they are most concerned about environmental issues at the global scale, yet the majority indicated that they were equally informed about environmental issues and the local and global scale. This finding supports previous research and opinions shared in interviews. Additionally, men were more concerned

about the loss of arable farmland than their female counterparts. This supports ideas of men's concern for the environment stemming from a place of obligation or duty (as suggested in (Plumwood 1991)), because food production that takes place on farmland is a matter of human survival. Yet this simultaneously challenges the notion that work involving sustenance is devalued (Shiva 1993).

With respect to environmental attitude, men and women both overwhelmingly affirmed that "stewardship of the environment is primarily a collective responsibility." This is an interesting finding in light of the research that suggests men's ethical orientations are more individualistic (Dobson and White 1995). Such ethical orientations would suggest that men would not support ideas of collective responsibility, but individual responsibility. Interestingly, zero men agreed with the statement "Human ingenuity and technology can solve any environmental problem." This challenges the findings of Wehrmeyer and McNiel, who posit that men tend more towards "techno-centrism" (Wehrmeyer and McNiel 2000).

Responses from the survey suggest that there may be a relationship between male environmental values and male environmental behavior. Men value "doing the work [themselves]" more highly than women. This appeared in conjunction with data that suggests males are slightly more likely to engage in behaviors that would be considered "doing the work yourself," such as picking up litter. Men hold this form of environmental engagement (doing the work themselves) in higher regard, and therefore more often engage in this way.

Other data regarding men's values is more difficult to decipher. Interestingly, in contrast to the findings of Dietz, Kalof and Stern, men value altruism more so than women. In the workplace, men value formal and informal leadership considerably more than women, as well as competition. However, men also value democratic culture (equal influence amongst colleagues) within the organization more than women do. These results seem almost contradictory; men value altruism and democratic culture, both rooted in selflessness and community, yet simultaneously value individualistic elements of the organizational experience like leadership and competition. Clearly, an essentialist construction of men as wholly (or even mostly) individualistic and self-interested does not hold here.

The Organization Experience

Men seem to be aware, to a certain extent, of some of the same problems that women brought to the fore during their interviews, but they remain significantly less impacted than their female counterparts. The responses collected throughout this study suggest that the male experience in environmental organizations is characterized by strong social networks and overall amicable relations with staff and board members. In the male experience, regular increases in workplace responsibilities are considerably less frequent than in their female colleagues' experience; yet the male experience is bogged down by a feeling of being "burned out" (6 & 10) by the involvement with the organization. A few males reported frequent frustration situated around their involvement with the organization, whether centered on relationships with colleagues (2, 10) or the confines of their role (2). Indeed, male members of environmental organizations face hardships that are gender-specific, including being on the receiving end of sexual harassment allegations, as well as navigating particularly hostile situations brought about by their professions.

Remnants of the "Old Boys' Club": Male Networks and Relationships Most insight into the persistence of (white) "Old Boys' Club" culture in environmental organizations has stemmed from the observations and experiences of women. Women have shared their stories of male-dominated boards tainting their professional experience through general dismissal, and limiting (at best, impeding at worst) organizational functionality; they have spoken of their exclusion from social circles forming beyond the organization; they have observed their male leaders reaping the benefits of an exclusive, power-laden, male network. Yet, the narratives gathered from male subjects did not reflect such dynamics. A single male subject stands out by his perception of (or perhaps, willingness to disclose) the residual effects of (white) "Old Boys' Club" culture in his tenure in the environmental sector.

"If I look at the leadership of [major environmental organizations], I don't think there's hardly been any women in the CEO jobs, let alone next-level management. It's clearly dominated by males…. You could say the same thing about cultural diversity. There is not a lot of [racial representation]." (2) "One of the assumptions that has been made and definitely colors peoples' hiring and decisions on who's going to be put in a

position in the field and so on, is that it's easier for a male to go work with a rancher patriarch, who in [this state] is the head of the ranch, not the matriarch – at least that's the assumption – and that if you're going to go ask them to do a land deal or work with them, you've got to send a man to do it." He went on to contextualize this claim with a story of a female colleague working in one of the most difficult areas of the state in terms of constituent culture. While working there, she was excluded from male "in-group" meetings between land-owning ranchers, but was welcomed into the ranch wives' social group. "Her access to the fellas that were calling the shots on the ranch was limited." (2) Yet, the subject posits that, through her relationships with the wives, his colleague was able to eventually forge relationships and establish trust with the male ranchers, which ultimately allowed her to "get work done". (2) "The pathway was different for her than it would have been for me, maybe it was more effective. I couldn't tell you… Particularly in a rural context, I think [assumptions about men and women's ability to form relationships with constituents] has definitely influenced hiring decisions, in terms of who's going to go out and work in the field with what's presumably a male-dominated culture of ranching or farming." (2)

Fatigue, Frustration and Difficult Situations The majority of male participants reported that, despite feeling fulfilled by their work, they were feeling "burned out" (6 & 10) or otherwise frustrated with their current jobs. This fatigue appeared to stem from external circumstances (ever-encroaching environmental challenges), the limitations of their role, tension between colleagues, and the burden of navigating precarious circumstances, including allegations of sexual harassment. In this sense, this weariness that men report can be interpreted as a response to the changing world men see themselves in; compounded upon mounting environmental problems are transitions occurring within environmental organizations – and the world at large – that challenge (but do not defeat) men's long-held power in these spaces.

One man explains, "I find [my job], rewarding and fulfilling. Sometimes I do feel somewhat trapped by it… it keeps me feeling more 'pinned down' than I'd like to be. You know, I've been doing this coordinator job for ten years or so, I might be feeling a little burned out, and may be feeling like there's a need for some fresh blood." (6) His

long tenure with the organization and frustration with the confines of his role that keep him 'pinned down' have led him to feel 'burned out.'

Sexual harassment, while popularly conceived of as a male advantage in terms of asserting and maintaining power, has been observed to be both a female and male obstacle through the course of this study. A male subject, who will be kept anonymous in the following discussion, shared his experience on the receiving end of sexual harassment allegations.

> "I was part of something that I want to describe as being very painful relationship issue, and it was officially determined to not qualify as anything for action by the leadership, but the end result of that was that it has strained relationships greatly… For one reason or another, I had a good relationship [with someone in the office] that slowly eroded… As some of the things that were happening about questioning my management came to light, there was a very negative reaction by this person in a public way. It had to do with my management, not anything to do with her. And she was disciplined for that, and as a result of that discipline, she made a sexual harassment complaint against me."

The informant contextualized the situation by explaining that he had once had a friendship with this person in which they both felt comfortable exchanging banter that, in hindsight, was probably not appropriate for two colleagues to engage in. "I think because of that history, perhaps there was a bit of foundation laid that she felt she could use against me [in sexual harassment charges], and she chose to." The incidents brought to light in the allegations included an inappropriate joke that was made in the context of their banter-filled relationship, and a later, emotional interaction that toed the line of professional appropriateness. In this instance, this subject offered what he thought was an empathetic, human reaction to a person who was "broken down and crying" in front of him. When confronted with the allegations, the subject said "I didn't deny that I did the things that she said that I did. What was inaccurate was the context that she painted them into. It was totally errant." As a result, the appropriate officials conducted an investigation, but no charges were made nor discipline given. In this scenario, there was an absence of formal consequences, but impacts were definitely felt by this subject and others in the workplace. "What I would say is, it has scarred me deeply… What I feel so hurt about that was, I can't even be a human being. If I can't be a human being in [this line of work], I don't want to be in [this line of work], that's where it's left me… the hostility [of this individual] is toxic [to other employees and workplace atmosphere]… It affects tone in the office, it affects demeanor, all those things." After being investigated

and undergoing what appears to be a great deal of emotional trauma, this subject was confronted with another challenge: how to proceed with the complainant. "I was told to let her and another person go by my superiors. I was told to let them go. I chose to keep them." This is a meaningful decision; the aftermath of the situation could have been simplified by the removal of the individual who filed the allegations. According to the subject, the person who accused him "would have liked to see [him] fired," but his feelings towards her clearly were not the same. One can certainly reason that the atmosphere in the workplace would have been much less hostile and "toxic" had this subject chosen to follow the advice of his superiors. Yet he didn't. His motivations for refusing to fire this person were not discussed, but it is important to note that this subject did not exercise a power he could have, and was told to.

Emerging from the other end of the ordeal, this reported that he was "drained" of energy, fatigued by the strain of navigating such a precarious situation. He also shared his perspective on addressing sexual harassment in the workplace. "I *do* fully, fully support [women] where there's been inappropriateness. At the same time, we have to be very cautious here moving forward. I just think, men need to behave – that's the bottom line, men need to behave themselves – and we also need to move forward in ways that do not men feel like they can't be [themselves]… We need to move forward in ways that protect women and men, both equally, but also allow for there to be normal human interaction. If people don't know when they're crossing a line than we need to better educate about what the lines are." Shedding light on the male experience of such a contentious issue broadens our understandings of the effect sexual harassment in the workplace has on individuals and the organization itself.

Men are presented with other challenges that are more specific to the context of environmental organizations. One subject, a seasoned veteran of the environmental sector, recalls the precarious situations he had to navigate as part of his profession. "From an 'on-the-ground' standpoint, the resistance of the community [was an obstacle], particularly the conservative community… that honestly were outright hostile to land conservations and land trusts… I was spat on in a community meeting; I had a chair thrown at me at one, literally. I was a personification of evil to somebody, which was quite a shock." (2) I asked the subject to consider whether he thought these sorts of

experiences and the outrage directed towards him were at all related to his gender. He responded, "The way it was presented to me, yes. Would that pushback have been there for a woman? Yes. Would [the public] have thrown the chair and spat [at her]? No, they would have done something else, I think. But, [a woman] would not have been spared the public outrage. It just would have been presented differently, I believe." (2) He noted that, due to the traditional gender roles of men in the context of his line of work (male landowners, male organizational representatives and governmental officials) he couldn't conjure up "an instance where a woman would be in my shoes" (2); this suggests that such experiences as a member of an environmental organizations may be gender-specific, and the subject recognized that. "I'd be shocked, knowing the folks that were being hostile – because I got to know them more and was able to achieve some level of mutual respect with them[8] – they would not have spat on a woman, I don't think. Hopefully. That would be just because of old-school, this-is-how-I-was-raised kind of stuff. 'You don't spit on women!'" (2)

The violent hostility that this subject experienced is likely a gender-specific risk of involvement in an environmental organization; to be sure, women worry for their personal safety when they are in the field as well, but, based on the responses collected in this study, this apprehension stems from precautionary tendencies rather than lived experience.

This narrative is just a snapshot of men's experiences in environmental organizations, but it is valuable. Through the narrative of The Male Experience, I have exposed and explained persistent advantages relating to the "Old Boys' Club" that are part of men's experience in environmental organizations. I have noted the patterns of male perception, attitude, behavior and values that guide their engagement with environmentalism. This section has explored the gender-specific obstacles men face within the context of their organization, and the impacts these obstacles have had on the subjects as individuals and their organizations. Feelings of professional fatigue among

[8] Though not followed up with during the interview, it is worth considering that this feat is also gender-specific. As we have seen through this study, men find more ease forming relationships within their organization and with constituents than their female colleagues. Though initially met with resistance, this male subject was able to overcome the opposition and form a working relationship; a woman who is already positioned as an outsider within the traditional realm of (patriarchal) environmental thought would conceivably face many more challenges trying to forge the same relationship.

men were also discussed; I suggested that this weariness could be a response to the changing world men see themselves in. Understanding the male experience in environmental organizations, noting where they are privileged and hindered, aids the project of rendering gender dynamics more equitable.

The Female Experience

The female experience of environmentalism and as members of environmental organizations is distinct from men's. They are concerned with local issues and actively express their environmentalism as consumers. As members of organizations, they are met with frequent obstacles including difficulties forming relationships (which includes other obstacles such as devaluation and dismissive attitudes towards them), and ever-increasing workloads. The experiences of the female subjects in this study as members of their respective organizations demonstrate that "The Old Boys' Network" has a residual impact that maintains its exclusive character.

Expressions of Environmentalism

Women's expressions of environmentalism through their perceptions, attitudes, behaviors and values manifest differently than men's. Women far outnumber their male counterparts in their concern for local environmental issues by a ratio of ten to one. More women also indicted that they were most informed about environmental issues within their community than males. These two data points support one another; women perceive environmental issues in local contexts in greater proportion than men, and thus would similarly be more informed about these issues than men as well. Women expressed significantly more concern for natural disasters than men, as well as for the rate of use of natural resources (though, the number of men and women who expressed at least moderate concern for the rate of use of natural resources is relatively balanced). There is an argument to be made that women's heightened concern for natural disasters is an effect of feminine ethical orientations being (presumably) more community and connection-focused (Dobson and White 1995). Women do not have to experience the natural disasters to witness their devastating impacts on distant communities and people.

Regarding matters of environmental attitude, women indicated that they more frequently engage with voluntary lifestyle changes (such as picking up a workout routine or altering diet), suggesting that they align closely with an attitude that is open to change,

reflecting one of the key environmental values described in Dietz, Kalof and Stern. Relatedly, all female participants in the survey save for one indicated that they agreed with the statement "I need to alter my way of living to better serve the environment." Women responded to this idea more affirmatively than their male counterparts, suggesting an environmental attitude that is oriented towards acknowledging and assuming personal responsibility for environmental problems.

Women's environmental behaviors suggest that they tend to exercise their environmentalism primarily in the consumer sphere, both in what they choose to buy and what they choose *not* to buy. Women more often reduce their consumption of meat than men. Seven women reported that they always reduce their consumption of meat (which implies that these women are all vegetarians), and six responded that they often reduce their consumption of meat, compared to six men split evenly between the respective indications. By choosing *not* to purchase and consume meat, women are decreasing their ecological footprint[9]. In this example, women are refusing to participate in a certain niche of the consumer market, but their environmentalism is also expressed through their active participation in other market areas. Significantly more women reported using a reusable water bottle consistently than did men. This behavior captures both active participation and refusal; women are supporting the reusable bottle industry while refusing to support the disposable bottle industry. Similarly, women engage more with purchasing ecofriendly products and using reusable bags when shopping. They are choosing to spend their money on products that reduce harmful impacts on the environment (i.e. organic produce is grown without the use of pesticides or other additives that are polluting, reusable bags eliminate the need for disposable bags on every shopping venture; by regularly choosing to purchase goods such as these, women are reducing their individual impact on the environment). All of these behaviors encapsulate women's environmentally conscious participation in the consumer realm. Excerpts from the interviews capture the attitudes that underlie such behaviors:

> "I am a vegetarian by choice, for about eighteen years, and that was because of the environment. I truly believe that one of the most important ways that we can 'vote' is with our pocketbooks. For me, that is one of my most firmly held beliefs. It's not an animal rights kind of

[9] Whether this behavior is motivated by environmental concern or other factors, it is still important to note that women are exhibiting a behavior with proven pro-environmental repercussions in greater numbers than their male counterparts.

> thing, it is truly that most of our meat production in this country isn't sustainable, and so I choose not to partake. It's a really great teachable moment, anytime somebody asks 'Why don't you eat meat?' I tell them why." (12)

Women's environmental values both align with and depart from men's. Both genders valued educating others as the most effective activist activity, with women valuing it slightly more highly than men. Within an organizational context, women value collaboration most highly, which relates to women's presumed ethical orientations creating a "connected self" that values relationships (Dobson and White 1995).

The Organization Experience

The female experience in environmental organizations is complex. It is characterized by relative social exclusion, barriers to forming professional relationships, constant exertion of effort, an ever-expanding task list, dismissal, and anxiety. Identity and values are intertwined with the female experience in environmental organizations. Women's skills and qualities have been strategically exploited for organizational benefit in ways that men's attributes have not been. Women are acutely aware of problems within the organization, and often, the discriminatory treatment they have been subject to. Yet, included within these narratives of female struggle are stories of women overcoming the stereotypes used against them, even manipulating said stereotypes to their advantage.

On Building Relationships – Barriers and Impacts Women have difficulty forming relationships – whether with colleagues, board members, or constituents – for a multitude of reasons. Structurally, the part-time roles women more often occupy in organizational settings distances them from the full-time employee base; this makes the construction of strong relationships with colleagues difficult.[10] Part-time roles within an organization are almost invariably supportive positions. The majority of participants indicated that there were observable gendered patterns in positions of support within their organization, noting that women tend to occupy these positions (whether historically, contemporarily, or both). A male subject explains, "it's how males and females look at their career possibilities." (10) The prevailing stereotype of the male breadwinner and the female housewife is evident here. This subject argues that men don't occupy supportive positions

[10] All but one environmental organization surveyed in this study maintained at least one part-time position; some organizations had more part-time employees than full-time employees. The nature of many of these small, relatively local environmental organizations lends itself to significant opportunity for part-time work, making this an important consideration for this study.

because they do not tend to pay enough to support a family; therefore, these roles are sought out and occupied by women. (10) This dynamic was captured in dialogue with another subject; "the people who were [working in this supportive position] before that, two of them were stay at home moms… their [kids] were just starting elementary school, so they were looking for something that allowed them to [stay involved with their children and] start to get back in the workforce." (7) It is important to note that even though the male breadwinner/female housewife paradigm is surely antiquated and increasingly falsified, the narrative it captures is evidently still at play in some cases. The challenges women face building relationships with colleagues is, in part, a consequence of their largely supportive, part-time status in organizational settings.

Culturally, women face additional challenges as they endeavor to build professional relationships, both within and outside of the organization itself. The masculine culture that persists, albeit subtly, throughout the environmental sector (and ideas of environmentalism) continues to operate against women's full inclusion. This masculine culture was observed in an organizational setting, both in the context of the board of directors and interactions with constituents, and in a social setting, where women are often excluded from social circles forming outside of the workplace. In these two areas, the "Old Boys Clubs" or "Networks" remain strong.

Women are frequently being treated dismissively, condescension and belittlement in their interactions with their respective board of directors. The masculine privileging that has prevailed in the environmental realm has instilled an attitudinal devaluation of women's knowledge and contributions that has proven difficult to totally overcome. As a consequence of their perceived or experienced exclusion, women are continuously exerting energy – considerably more than their male counterparts – to achieve the same degree of respect and acceptance amongst board members. The emotional, mental, and physical toll such effort takes on a female employee is difficult to quantify; strained relationships with board members are just one way in which the consequences of masculine culture in environmental organizations manifest – professional fatigue, poor performance, and job dissatisfaction are just a few of the other potential consequences that merit investigation.

Establishing relationships with constituents is another intriguing point of difficulty women reportedly encounter in their experience in environmental organizations. “I work [in a region] with a lot of farmers, and I want them to protect land, and so, I don’t know whether I, as a female, from [another region] with a Latino name, projects may not have come to fruition [because of those identities]. [Land trust work] is a very male-dominated world… there’s all the office dynamics in the organization, but then there’s the work we do outside.” (4) “I think in some ways, the areas where my gender has maybe played a bigger role in creating obstacles, is some of the landowners that we work with – the fact that I’m female. It is getting better, or maybe it’s because I’m getting older… but I’ve been in numerous situations, we’re working on a project – whether it’s a landowner or a township supervisor, you know, grumpy old men – who, whether because of my age or my gender, they didn’t want to take me seriously. A lot of times if I see that happening in a project, I realize I won’t necessarily be able to change their minds, so I’m not going to try to do that.” (7) She goes on to state that, in particular cultural-religious clusters within her constituency, she is literally unable to work. She calls upon a male colleague to interact with constituents in these communities because, as a female, she would not be well received. Another female subject from a similar region echoed these experiences: “For the most part [I’m received] pretty well… The [cultural-religious] communities are a different story, they’re more reluctant to want to work with a woman. I know if I go out on a farm [in this type of community], and I’m with a man, [the farmer is] not going to look at me, they’re going to look at the man. It’s not just the[se cultural-religious groups], but a lot of the older farmers too, they’re not used to having a woman in this role.” (9) Cultural barriers stemming from cultural-religious identity, age demographic and/or gender biases regarding who is a legitimate and valued participant in a certain field are perpetuating elements of the “Old Boys’ Club” in environmental stewardship that create barriers for women. Here, gender roles seem to be defined according to the traditions of these constituent groups. The conservative philosophies that are often found in cultural-religious groups, older demographics, and occupational histories (i.e. the tradition of farming) continue to operate in pockets throughout society. In other words, constructions of women’s roles are occurring at different rates depending socio-cultural contexts; although women’s roles have been

transformed in progressive ways throughout most of modern (Western) society, certain communities maintain their traditional, conservative constructions and project them onto women who enter their communities.

It is important to consider how such barriers may impact the quality and quantity of environmental services provided to the public. Women's difficulties achieving these target groups have ripple effects; farmer populations such as those previously described are key partners in environmental stewardship and restoration initiatives, particularly in Maryland and Pennsylvania, therefore any hindrance to the formation of partnerships between environmental organizations and these populations should be constructively analyzed. Organizations, particularly conservation-based[11] organizations, may wish to consider their approach to reaching these constituencies, or create a means of supporting their female employees' integration into these male-dominated spheres. Women should be aware of the potential obstacles that await and understand their source to better navigate and overcome situations in which these sorts of biases hinder their professional experience.

Another source of anxiety for women, especially those whose role requires making site visits, is personal safety. "When we go and monitor pieces of property, as part of my job, I'm very aware of my safety, I'm *very* aware of my safety. There have been times where I've asked [a male colleague] 'Can I borrow [a female colleague] for the day?', so I don't go alone. And, always, the answer has been yes. I have always been supported in that… I'm not sure that [personal safety on a site visit is] something that would ever cross a male counterpart's mind." (4) Other female subjects note their experience with sexual harassment, one limiting her response to "Me Too.[12]" Another female participant, who had not experienced sexual harassment in the workplace herself but was aware of its presence in her organization, noted

> "There have been some issues with inappropriate behavior and talking, like sexual harassment… because there really isn't a strong policy [to protect against it], because so many people have been in relationships within the organization… there have people that have been accused of either sexual harassment or saying inappropriate things, and they've gotten a slap on the wrist until it looks bad for the entire organization, or until the majority says 'Me Too.'" (11)

[11] E.g. land trusts, conservation districts, conservancies, parks services, etc.
[12] The "Me Too" movement began in October of 2017 to spread awareness about the prevalence of sexual harassment and assault. This subject was intentionally left anonymous here.

When colleagues are interacting at organizational functions, beyond the four walls of the workplace, problems seem to intensify. "It's almost expected that that will happen when we're together on retreats – you expect some of that behavior to happen." (13) The subject says that the harassment comes in the form of "Making jokes, or talking about someone's appearance, it's almost like cat-calling, 'look at the rack on her' kind of thing, or making sexual innuendos. I think it has gone as far as touching." (13) And of her organization's response to the issue, and the effects she has experienced, she says, "[The sexual harassment problem is] not taken seriously [by the organization]. [The persistence of sexual harassment] makes you feel gross, number one, but it also makes you feel deflated. I think a lot of times we respect the people that we work for, because a lot of the times the people that are doing this are in powerful positions or leadership positions, so you respect them, but it almost makes you feel like you can't trust them." (11)

Evidently, though not a victim herself, the prevalence of sexual harassment in this woman's organization has had an impact on her professional experience: she finds it difficult to build trust with some of her overseers. There are legitimate reasons not to feel comfortable or protected within the organization as a female. Without security within the organization, and strong foundations of trust between colleagues, performing coherently as an organization becomes strained. Though sexual harassment perpetuated by males and directed at females is not an occupational hazard specific to environmental organizations, these organizations may be less equipped to address such concerns. As this subject notes, her organization did not have "a strong policy" to prevent and prosecute sexual harassment cases. This could be a residual effect of environmental organizations being crafted by and for men (i.e. those who don't typically have to worry about being victims of sexual harassment, those who perhaps even benefit from the ability to sexually harass), or a consequence of relatively low female representation at the highest levels of direction of these sorts of organizations; regardless of its origins, however, the impact of sexual harassment in the workplace on individuals, and ultimately organizational functionality, is of particular concern in the environmental realm where personnel's uninhibited participation is paramount.

No Rest for the Weary – Women's Increasing Responsibilities Women reported, both in dialogue during interviews and survey responses, that they are taking on more and more responsibilities within their organizations, both formally and informally. Nine women reported regularly experiencing increases in responsibilities in the workplace, compared to just three men. This begs the question, are the increasing number of responsibilities allotted to women of increasing importance to the organization's functionality? That is, are women taking on more work that is allowing them to participate more actively and directly in important organizational processes, or are they being bogged down with more supportive tasks that keep them in a realm of relatively low influence? Discussions with interviewees provide some insight into these inquiries; this study did not thoroughly probe the dimensions of this particular issue, but this certainly is worthy of more scholarly attention.

Narratives emerged that depicted women as being forced into taking on burdensome loads of work, as well as voluntarily absorbing certain roles or tasks for the overall betterment of the organization. These scenarios have different implications. In the first case, women are shouldering more work, often tasks that should be someone else's responsibility (i.e. the scope of their own role isn't changing and expanding, they're picking up someone else's [or the organization's, in the case of an unfilled position] slack), with little to no personal and professional benefit. In the second case, women are exercising deeper engagement with their organization, both in a formal and informal sense (i.e. taking on tasks for the betterment of the organization itself juxtaposed with tasks that benefit the staff).

A female subject from a quasigovernmental organization shared her experience involuntarily assuming a greater workload. At the center of a bureaucratic network, this subject was uniquely positioned to take on additional work within the context of her specific organization, as well as the work of partner organizations. When a vacancy in her own office required employees to fill essential gaps, she was called upon to take up a considerable responsibility for which she had no real experience. When she expressed reluctance, she was met with harshness. "I was told basically that I had to take [this task on], or 'there's the door' and they would hire someone else to do it." (8) She also bore the burden of picking up the slack of those (predominately

male employees) in a partner office[13]. "Some things are supposed to be done through [a partner office, for example a certain project is supposed to be done by this partner office]… that paperwork is supposed to be done through [that office], and pretty much I do that, they just sign the paper. The same with nominating organizations, [they] give names for our directors for the board, that's all supposed to be run through [another office] – pretty much, I do that. Some of those things that I shouldn't be doing somehow filtered down through." (8)

Other subjects experienced an increase in responsibilities following a position vacancy. For one woman, location further complicated her circumstances. She explains: "There used to be a director of the program, who is no longer with [the organization], so I have assumed some of those duties. And, I am the only person right now working in [this city] for the organization so I am the 'catch-all' for everything related to the city. So, whether it be policy, or outreach, or political meetings, or running programs to get people outside, I do it all." (11) Another subject explained how position vacancies in her organization have impacted upon her organization in general. "[Capacity] has been an ongoing issue since I started at [this organization] five years ago. There just never seems to be quite enough bodies to do the work that needs to be done… It impacts certain positions more than others… I do think that when you have a revolving door of employees coming in and out of certain positions, it affects morale." (1) As she thought more deeply about the impacts of these vacancies, she noted the gendered effects. "It does tend to be the women who step in and fill [a vacant position's] roles when we are [without a person in that position]. I think people pitch in on different levels, and some people pitch in more, but I do think the women tend to pitch in more." (1) In these anecdotes, women are seen taking on additional work as a matter of obligation.

In contrast, other narratives illuminate a side of this aspect of women's experiences in environmental organizations that is much more positive and productive. A female executive director, in addition to the many responsibilities she already carries, has taken on the task of writing meeting notes for the chair of her board of directors. She says, "I do this all day every day," and the board members do not,

[13] This particular office was not interviewed in this study.

therefore her notes would be more useful in meeting settings. (7) Irrespective of the validity of such an assessment, this woman is nonetheless taking an additional duty upon herself, completely voluntarily, for the perceived betterment of the organization.

Women are also voluntarily undertaking socially-focused projects within their organizations; one subject spoke of her efforts to better the experience of staff members: "I have recently been pushing for us to look at our benefits package – you know, how much time off do we allow people… do we allow people to have a sabbatical, and if so, when does that kick in, because frankly we've been around for a while and I don't think anybody's ever really looked at those things. So I have been pushing for the last year or so… like here's what other groups do… if we're not going to get pay increases maybe we could offer up more time off or better benefits packages as an incentive for our staff. So it wasn't really assigned to me but it's something that I've felt strongly about and have continued to work on." (13) Though not directly related to its functionality, this subject is nonetheless taking on an important job within her organization to improve the experience of her colleagues and future generations of employees. In this way, she is committing herself to her coworkers and to her organization; her campaign, if successful, would produce collective benefits and potentially enhance the reputation of the organization (from a staff perspective).

The Female Experience narrative conveys some of the most persistent, gender-based obstacles women face as members of environmental organizations, yet also illustrates the great strides women are making in these spaces. In this narrative, I have discussed the perceptions, attitudes, behaviors and values that underpin the ways women engage with environmentalism. Women's difficulty forming relationships and earning respect have been explained within the context of the "Old Boys' Club" culture in environmental organizations. I discussed that women are frequently experiencing increases in their workload and responsibilities, and questioned whether this was indicative of more organizational influence being allotted to women as well. However, this does not appear to be the case; the work being assigned to or taken on by women is not augmenting their ability to participate in or influence organizational decision-making. Yet despite the hardships women face, they still feel a deep connection to their jobs and the work that they do. There are no feelings of weariness

or fatigue. Indeed, it seems that, even as elements of the "Old Boys' Club" persist to marginalize, undermine and exclude women, women will persist to break down these barriers, asserting themselves and their value in environmental organizations and the environmental movement at large.

Limitations

Lack of existing research, sample size and subject/organizational diversity were each limiting factors in this study. As a consequence, the generalizability of this research is also limited, but this only serves to justify continued study.

Research at the intersection of gender, organization and environment is a relatively novel field. For this reason, it was difficult to conceptualize and direct my research at times. My own understanding of my research changed throughout the process of interviewing and interpreting my data as a result of this; by the end of the process, I had a clear understanding of what I should be inquiring about, how I should frame my questions, etc. However, this point would have been reached much more quickly, and the subsequent research would have been much more robust, had there been existing research available to reference. Lack of existing research became quite challenging as I began discussing my findings and their implications, as there was little to ground my analysis in. It is my hope that this study may serve as a catalyst for other research in this field.

Sample size was limited by a few key factors, namely time and accessibility. Time was a limitation in this study insofar as it restricted the number of people I was able to interview and survey. Interviewing took place over a period of about six weeks and thirteen individuals were able to participate. The initial goal stated in the proposal was an interview sample of twenty participants, a goal that would have been difficult to achieve in six weeks even in the absence of other challenges. Underestimated obstacles, such as scheduling conflicts, constrained the six-week timeframe even more. Future researchers could acquire a greater breadth and depth of interview material by allotting more time to conduct interviews.

Accessibility was another factor that limited the size of the sample group. The selection criteria for the organizations of interest in this study was honed over time, and eventually pared down to nonprofit and (quasi)governmental organizations governed by a Board of Directors. This narrowed the pool of potential subject organizations

considerably, thus becoming an accessibility issue. There was not a wealth of these sorts of organizations in the regions I was confined to, so some travelling was necessary to reach participants. Again, had time not been such a constraint, more travel would have been possible. In addition to accessibility in terms of proximity, there were also accessibility issues in terms of initiating communication. Only about half of the organizations contacted for potential involvement responded. The small interview sample impacts upon the generalizability of the findings of this research.

The small interview sample was, unsurprisingly, also low in diversity, in terms of the kinds of organizations and the characteristics of participants (both demographic and organizational). There was relatively little diversity in the functions of the organizations surveyed in this study. Five of the eight organizations were conservation-based, the other three were focused on varying aspects of water quality and protection. The generalizability of the findings of this research would have been augmented by greater representation of all the different kinds of environmental organizations that exist. Furthermore, in order to get a sufficient amount of interviews, I often had to interview multiple people from the same organization, constricting the diversity of the participant pool, both in terms of their organizational characteristics (such as role, experience, etc.) and demographic characteristics (such as race, age, geographic region, etc.). Future studies would be strengthened by amassing a larger participant pool, representing a variety of organizations.

Part IV: Conclusion

The final chapter of this paper summarizes my findings, reaffirms their significance, and suggests points of inquiry for further research. This research has demonstrated the ways in which remnants of the "Old Boys' Club" continue to operate within environmental organizations. The cultural, behavioral and structural residues of this masculinist construction have impacted women's experiences as members of their organization(s). Female leadership and involvement might suggest that environmental organizations have moved beyond this culture, but the "Old Boys' Network" often still appears as an obstacle for women in less visible ways.

The findings report that women have more trouble forming relationships with colleagues and constituents of their organization; they must work harder to gain the respect of those around them; their knowledge and contributions continue to be devalued or dismissed; they do not wield the same influence or have access to the same resources as their male counterparts. While men's experience in environmental organizations is not without hardship and frustration, they remain in a better position to exercise their agency and influence matters of environmental decision-making.

A cursory exploration revealed differences in the ways men and women express their environmentalism, in terms of their behaviors, attitudes, perceptions and values. This study supports the notion that men are big-picture thinkers and women are more concerned with matters in their immediate community. It has shown that women depart from men in their expression of environmentalism through their consumer practices; they favor supporting environmentally-friendly products and consumer habits, and refrain from certain consumer sectors that are known to be unsustainable. The data has supported conceptualizations of men as competitive and interested in self-enhancement, yet by the same token challenged popular gendered conceptualizations (such as women's tendency to value altruistic behavior higher than men, the devaluation of sustenance-based work, etc.).

This research can support the project of creating equity and inclusion in environmental organizations and the environmental movement at large. I have constructed a preliminary understanding of men and women's experiences with environmentalism and as members in environmental organizations. I have identified key

barriers to total gender inclusion in these spaces, within environmental discourse and within the environmental movement. With these impediments identified, a collective deconstruction of the formidable and importunate dynamics, interpreted here as remnants of the "Old Boys' Club," can begin to take place. As these exclusive barriers are dismantled, opportunities arise for other marginalized groups to share their voices and perspectives and advocate for their own inclusion as well. This research also supports the construction of a theory of gendered environmentalism, which could be a significant contribution to the understandings of environmental affairs.

Gendered Environmentalism

I introduced the concept of gendered environmentalism as "The idea that attitudes, behaviors, perceptions, values and access to resources with respect to the environment are impacted by gender." The data collected through this research certainly supports the argument that gender is a relevant factor in the construction of individual environmentalisms and impacts an individual's experience within the realm of environmentalism. In this way, this research compels us to consider that gendered environmentalism is a real construct that has observable manifestations and consequences in the material world.

This research has uncovered certain gendered patterns in matters of environmental perception, attitude, behavior and values. Its more significant contribution to the discussion of gendered environmentalism, however, relates to gendered access to environmental resources. This research suggests that gender impacts how a person is *received* and *perceived* in environmental organizations. Male gender eases reception and conjures a perception of authority, knowledge and camaraderie. Female gender complicates reception, which impacts upon the individual's ability to form relationships, and is accompanied by perceptions of 'otherness' that manifest as the devaluation of female contributions and knowledge, general dismissal and sexual harassment. Perception and reception are important in the discussion of gendered environmentalism because they help determine the sorts of resources that a person will be able to acquire. How a person is perceived and subsequently received places them in positions of social and/or organizational hierarchy. Specific resources are assigned to (or kept from) these positions. The "Old Boys' Network" by which the nexus of environmental organizations

in the United States were developed has created an implicit bias for the inclusion and privileging of men by virtue of how men are received and perceived in environmental contexts. In this way, this research can begin a discussion of gendered environmentalism as it operates in organizational contexts; it affirms the importance of critically evaluating the role of gender in shaping systems of power and knowledge; it illustrates that, while environmental organizations are becoming somewhat more inclusive in terms of gender and moving beyond the "Old Boys' Club," there is still progress to be made in creating a completely inclusive culture in environmental organizations.

Further Inquiry

This research can serve as a stepping-stone to catalyze further research on gender dynamics in environmental organizations and their impacts on individual performance and organization functionality. Further research on the subtle persistence of the "Old Boys' Club" culture in these organizations, particularly in areas such as the board of directors, is certainly warranted. Additionally, other research that supports the construction of a theory of gendered environmentalism should follow. The material environmental impacts of the masculinist discourse that has structured environmentalism in America also merits exploration. There are infinite branches that could grow from the sort of research I have done here. Continued inquiry and analysis of the intersections of gender, organizations and the environment is paramount at this stage of human history. Situated within the context of ongoing movements concerned with power, social relations and environmental decay, this line of research has the potential to incite a reimagination of the way individuals relate to epistemologies, ideologies, each other and the natural world.

Appendices

a. Survey Interpretation Tables

Table 3: Concern for Environmental Issues by Scale

Scale	Level of Concern	Gender	#
Local	Least Concerned	Men	0
		Women	1
	Mildly Concerned	Men	7
		Women	4
	Moderately Concerned	Men	4
		Women	5
	Most Concerned	Men	6
		Women	10
		Unknown	1
National	Least Concerned	Men	0
		Women	0
	Mildly Concerned	Men	1
		Women	8
	Moderately Concerned	Men	9
		Women	7
		Unknown	1
	Most Concerned	Men	4
		Women	2
Global	Least Concerned	Men	0
		Women	0
	Mildly Concerned	Men	4
		Women	4
		Unknown	1
	Moderately Concerned	Men	3
		Women	9
	Most Concerned	Men	10
		Women	8

Table 4: Informational Resources

Resource	Gender	#
Formal Education (classes at a university or other institution)	Men	8
	Women	7
News sources (newspapers, internet searches, television)	Men	17
	Women	20
	Unknown	1
Educational literature (subscriptions to magazines or journals) and books	Men	26
	Women	19
Membership in an environmental club	Men	10
	Women	8
Documentaries	Men	13
	Women	10
	Unknown	1
Personal experience (fieldwork, day-to-day interactions or observations)	Men	16
	Women	18
Other*	Men	2
	Women	2

Table 5: Degree of Knowledge of Environmental Issues

Scale	Gender	#
Community	Men	2
	Women	9
National/Global	Men	5
	Women	3
	Unknown	1
Equal	Menx	11
	Women	8

Table 6: Concern for Specific Environmental Problems

Environmental Problem	Degree of Concern	Gender	#
Agricultural pollution in waterways	Mildly Concerned	Men	2
		Women	2
	Moderately Concerned*	Men	4
		Women	4
	Extremely Concerned	Men	11
		Women	13
	No Opinion	Men	1
		Women	1
Municipal water quality	Unconcerned	Men	1
		Women	1
	Mildly Concerned*	Men	4
		Women	4
	Moderately Concerned	Men	7
		Women	7
	Extremely Concerned	Men	6
		Women	7
	No Opinion	Men	0
		Women	1
Loss of arable farmland	Unconcerned	Men	1
		Women	0
	Mildly Concerned*	Men	3
		Women	7
	Moderately Concerned	Men	5
		Women	6
	Extremely Concerned	Men	9
		Women	5
	No Opinion	Men	0
		Women	2
Loss of wilderness and open spaces	Mildly Concerned	Men	1
		Women	0
	Moderately Concerned*	Men	7
		Women	7
	Extremely Concerned	Men	10
		Women	12
	No Opinion	Men	0
		Women	1
Rising sea level and rising global temperatures	Unconcerned	Men	1
		Women	0
	Mildly Concerned*	Men	1
		Women	0
	Moderately Concerned	Men	4
		Women	4
	Extremely Concerned	Men	11
		Women	15
	No Opinion	Men	1
		Women	1
Natural disasters	Unconcerned*	Men	0
		Women	0
	Mildly Concerned	Men	7
		Women	4
	Moderately Concerned	Men	8
		Women	7
	Extremely Concerned	Men	3
		Women	8
	No Opinion	Men	0
		Women	1
Environmental refugees (those who have lost their home and/or livelihood due to natural phenomena)	Unconcerned*	Men	1
		Women	1
	Mildly Concerned	Men	5
		Women	3
	Moderately Concerned	Men	6
		Women	9
	Extremely Concerned	Men	5
		Women	6
	No Opinion	Men	1
		Women	1
Rate of use of natural resources	Mildly Concerned*	Men	2
		Women	1
	Moderately Concerned	Men	11
		Women	3
	Extremely Concerned	Men	6
		Women	15
	No Opinion	Men	0
		Women	1
Pollution from manufacturing and waste disposal (landfills, incinerators)	Mildly Concerned	Men	2
		Women	3
	Moderately Concerned	Men	6
		Women	3
	Extremely Concerned*	Men	10
		Women	13
	No Opinion	Men	0
		Women	1
Environmental refugees (those who have lost their home and/or livelihood due to natural	Unconcerned*	Men	1
		Women	1
	Mildly Concerned	Men	5
		Women	3
	Moderately Concerned	Men	6
		Women	9
	Extremely	Men	5

phenomena)	Concerned	Women	6
	No Opinion	Men	1
		Women	1
Rate of use of natural resources	Mildly Concerned*	Men	2
		Women	1
	Moderately Concerned	Men	11
		Women	3
	Extremely Concerned	Men	6
		Women	15
	No Opinion	Men	0
		Women	1
Pollution from manufacturing and waste disposal (landfills, incinerators)	Mildly Concerned	Men	2
		Women	3
	Moderately Concerned	Men	6
		Women	3
	Extremely Concerned*	Men	10
		Women	13
	No Opinion	Men	0
		Women	1
Biodiversity loss	Mildly Concerned	Men	2
		Women	1
	Moderately Concerned	Men	4
		Women	9
	Extremely Concerned*	Men	12
		Women	9
	No Opinion	Men	0
		Women	1
Loss of natural and cultural heritage (e.g. shirnking public lands, loss of indigenous cultures, etc.)	Unconcerned	Men	0
		Women	1
	Mildly Concerned	Men	5
		Women	0
	Moderately Concerned*	Men	6
		Women	8
	Extremely Concerned	Men	6
		Women	9
	No Opinion	Men	1
		Women	2

Table 7: Statement Response

Statement	Response	Gender	#	Statement	Response	Gender	#	Statement
ewardship of the vironment primarily a personal sponsibility	Agree	Men	6	Stewardship of the environment is primarily the responsibility of the government	Agree	Men	7	Human society needs to alter its systems and paradigms to better serve the environment
		Women	10			Women	8	
	Disagree*	Men	9		Disagree*	Men	9	
		Women	9			Women	12	
	No Opinion	Men	3		No Opinion	Men	2	
		Women	0			Women	0	
ewardship of the vironment primarily a collective sponsibility	Agree*	Men	17	Human ingenuity and technology can solve any environmental problem	Agree	Men	0	Change is most effectively brought about from the grassroots level
		Women	18			Women	3	
	Disagree	Men	1		Disagree*	Men	16	
		Women	1			Women	15	
	No Opinion	Men	1		No Opinion	Men	2	
		Women	0			Women	1	
ewardship of the vironment primarily the sponsibility of ganizations uch as my own	Agree	Men	5	I need to alter my way of living to better serve the environment	Agree*	Men	11	Change is most effectively brought about through a top-down approach
		Women	6			Women	18	
	Disagree*	Men	11		Disagree	Men	5	
		Women	14			Women	1	
	No Opinion	Men	1		No Opinion	Men	2	
		Women	2			Women	0	

Table 8: Environmental Behaviors

Behavior	Frequency of Engagement	Gender	#
Recycling	Never	Men	0
		Women	0
	Sometimes	Men	0
		Women	0
	Often*	Men	4
		Women	5
	Always	Men	12
		Women	12
Reducing consumption of material goods (e.g. clothing, furniture, accessories)	Never	Men	0
		Women	0
	Sometimes	Men	2
		Women	2
	Often*	Men	12
		Women	11
	Always	Men	3
		Women	5
Reducing consumption of meat	Never*	Men	4
		Women	1
	Sometimes	Men	7
		Women	4
	Often	Men	3
		Women	6
	Always	Men	3
		Women	7
Veganism	Never*	Men	12
		Women	9
	Sometimes	Men	2
		Women	4
	Often	Men	1
		Women	3
	Always	Men	2
		Women	2
Cleaning up litter	Never	Men	0
		Women	0
	Sometimes*	Men	3
		Women	6
	Often	Men	6
		Women	7
	Always	Men	8
		Women	5
Eating and/or shopping locally	Never	Men	0
		Women	0
	Sometimes*	Men	4
		Women	4
	Often	Men	8
		Women	11
	Always	Men	5
		Women	3
Using a reusable water bottle	Never	Men	1
		Women	0
	Sometimes	Men	3
		Women	1
	Often*	Men	8
		Women	6
	Always	Men	5
		Women	11
Reducing driving	Never	Men	1
		Women	2
	Sometimes*	Men	8
		Women	8
	Often	Men	5
		Women	6
	Always	Men	2
		Women	2
	N/A	Men	1
		Women	0
Purchasing ecofriendly products (e.g. organic produce, recycled goods)	Never	Men	2
		Women	0
	Sometimes*	Men	7
		Women	3
	Often	Men	8
		Women	12
	Always	Men	0
		Women	3
Using reusable bags when shopping	Never	Men	2
		Women	0
	Sometimes*	Men	5
		Women	2
	Often	Men	7
		Women	8
	Always	Men	3
		Women	8
Producing your own food (e.g. gardening, hunting)	Never*	Men	5
		Women	5
	Sometimes	Men	5
		Women	5
	Often	Men	3
		Women	6
	Always	Men	4
		Women	2
Ecosystem restoration projects	Never	Men	2
		Women	4
	Sometimes	Men	5

		Women	7
	Often	Men	6
		Women	4
	Always	Men	3
		Women	3
	N/A*	Men	1
		Women	0
Reducing energy consumption at home	Never	Men	0
		Women	0
	Sometimes*	Men	1
		Women	5
	Often	Men	10
		Women	9
	Always	Men	6
		Women	4
Using alternative transportation (bikes, walking)	Never	Men	3
		Women	0
	Sometimes*	Men	8
		Women	12
	Often	Men	3
		Women	5
	Always	Men	2
		Women	1
	N/A	Men	1
		Women	0
Composting	Never	Men	5
		Women	6
	Sometimes*	Men	1
		Women	2
	Often	Men	4
		Women	6
	Always	Men	6
		Women	4
	N/A	Men	1
		Women	0
Permaculture	Never	Men	7
		Women	12
	Sometimes	Men	1
		Women	4
	Often	Men	2
		Women	0
	Always	Men	3
		Women	1
	N/A*	Men	3
		Women	1

Table 9: Average Perceived Effectiveness of Activism Behaviors

Behavior	Gender	Avg.
Communicating with an elected representative	Men	2.83
	Women	4
Making consumer choices	Men	4.8
	Women	5
Mobilizing the community (forming groups and clubs)	Men	4.27
	Women	5.32
Educating others	Men	5.3
	Women	5.47
Marching or protesting	Men	2.5
	Women	2.3
Doing the work yourself	Men	4.2
	Women	2.6
Donating to environmental organizations	Men	3.8
	Women	3.2

Table 10: Values within the Organization

Wokplace Variable	Gender	Avg. Rating	Wokplace Variable	Gender	Avg. Rating	Wokplace Variable
	Men	5.83		Men	6.1	
Formal leadership	Women	7.11	**Autonomy**	Women	7.2	**Collaboration**
	Men	5.2	**Creating and maintaining community**	Men	4.27	
Informal leadership	Women	7.5		Women	3.6	**Openness to change**
	Men	8.1		Men	4	
Organizational status (position title)	Women	7.6	**Altruism**	Women	7.1	**Competition**
	Men	4.7		Men	5.27	
Involvement in organizational decision-making	Women	5.7	**Democratic culture (equal influence of colleagues)**	Women	7.3	**Transparency of leadership**
	Men	7.8				
Self-enhancement	Women	7.9				

Table 11: Experiences

Experience	Frequency	Gender	Number
Anxiety about the future	Never	Men	3
		Women	2
	Sometimes*	Men	7
		Women	5
	Often	Men	6
		Women	6
	Regularly	Men	1
		Women	3
	N/A	Men	0
		Women	1
Planning for the future	Never	Men	1
		Women	0
	Sometimes*	Men	2
		Women	1
	Often	Men	9
		Women	9
	Regularly	Men	5
		Women	6
	N/A	Men	0
		Women	1
Professional or occupational interactions in which you are left feeling undermined	Never	Men	6
		Women	4
	Sometimes*	Men	8
		Women	9
	Often	Men	0
		Women	1
	Regularly	Men	1
		Women	2
	N/A	Men	1
		Women	1
An increase in responsibilities in the workplace	Never	Men	2
		Women	0
	Sometimes*	Men	3
		Women	1
	Often	Men	4
		Women	3
	Regularly	Men	3
		Women	9
	N/A	Men	4
		Women	4
Voluntary lifestyle changes (e.g. picking up a workout routine, becoming a vegan, etc.)	Never	Men	0
		Women	0
	Sometimes*	Men	11
		Women	6
	Often	Men	1
		Women	6
	Regularly	Men	5
		Women	3
	N/A	Men	0
		Women	1
Frustration with the current political administration	Never	Men	2
		Women	0
	Sometimes	Men	2
		Women	2
	Often	Men	4
		Women	2
	Regularly*	Men	8
		Women	10
	N/A	Men	1
		Women	2
Frustration with the current economic system	Never	Men	2
		Women	0
	Sometimes	Men	6
		Women	3
	Often*	Men	4
		Women	5
	Regularly	Men	4
		Women	6
	N/A	Men	1
		Women	2

b. Survey Questions

Pardoe Thesis Survey

Background

This survey is part of the research for Kat Pardoe's thesis, a Bucknell University research project. The subject of the thesis is gender dynamics in environmental organizations; the purpose of this portion of the research is to understand individuals' environmental behavior, attitudes, perception and values. The survey should take approximately 20 minutes. Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary and deeply appreciated. Please understand that:

- **Your responses will be used in tandem with other participants' responses to make statements about gendered aspects of environmentalism and gender dynamics in environmental organizations.**
- **None of the information you share will be revealed to your employer or any other party; all participants will remain anonymous and your responses are securely protected.**
- **There are no foreseeable risks posed by participating in this survey.**
- **The expected beneficiaries of this research are environmental organizations. There is no personal compensation for participating in the study.**

By participating in this survey you affirm that:

- **You are 18 years of age or older.**
- **You are providing consent for your responses to be used anonymously in the thesis.**

For the purposes of this survey, please keep in mind one environmental organization you have bee most involved with (whether most recently or for the longest term), and respond to all organizationally-focused questions (4, 5, 6, 17, 18) with your experience in this organization as a reference point.

Thank you for your participation! If you have any questions or concerns, you may reach Kat Pardo at kep016@bucknell.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, please contact Matthew Slater, Chair of Bucknell University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) at mhs016@bucknell.edu

1. Name (optional):

* 2. Did you participate in an interview with Kat Pardoe?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

* 3. Please indicate your gender

- ◯ Male
- ◯ Female
- ◯ Prefer not to respond
- ◯ Other (please specify)

4. Please indicate the name of your organization (optional)*:

*For students, please indicate the name of your major department

* 5. Please indicate the type of environmental organization referred to above:

- ◯ Nonprofit
- ◯ Governmental (or quasi-governmental)
- ◯ Informal (such as a member in a club, a student, a volunteer)
- ◯ Other (please specify)

6. Please name and describe your role within the organization referred to above*:

*For students, please consider your role as a student within your major department. How are you interacting with the program?

* 7. In a few sentences, please describe the reasons you chose to become involved in the environmental field.

Pardoe Thesis Survey

Environmental Perception

This page is intended to provide an assessment of environmental problem p participants. Various sorts of questions will be asked. Some will prompt you concern of varying environmental issues. Please select the response that m your sentiments.

* 8. The following question explores environmental problems at various scales. I concern.

	Least Concerned	Mildly Concerned	Moderately Concerned	Mo
Local (in your community) environmental problems	○	○	○	
National environmental problems	○	○	○	
Global environmental problems	○	○	○	

* 9. How do you stay informed about environmental issues? You may select mor

- ☐ Formal education (classes at a university or other institution)
- ☐ News sources (newspapers, internet searches, television)
- ☐ Subscription to educational literature (journals, magazines)
- ☐ Membership in an environmental club
- ☐ Documentaries
- ☐ Books
- ☐ Personal experience (field work, day-to-day interactions or observations)
- ☐ Other (please specify)

* 10. Are you more informed about local environmental problems or national/global environmental problems

- ○ I am more informed about local environmental problems in my community.
- ○ I am more informed about environmental problems at the national/global level.
- ○ I am equally informed about environmental issues at all levels.
- ○ I am not particularly informed about environmental issues at any level.

* 11. Please evaluate your concern on the following issues:

	Unconcerned	Mildly Concerned	Moderately Concerned	Extremely Concerned	I don't know enou about this issue have an opinior
Agricultural pollution in waterways	○	○	○	○	○
Municipal water quality	○	○	○	○	○
Loss of arable farmland	○	○	○	○	○
Loss of wilderness and open spaces	○	○	○	○	○
Rising sea level and rising global temperature	○	○	○	○	○
Natural disasters	○	○	○	○	○
Environmental refugees (those who have lost their home and/or livelihood due to natural phenomena)	○	○	○	○	○
Rate of use of natural resources	○	○	○	○	○
Pollution from manufacturing and waste disposal (landfills, incinerators)	○	○	○	○	○
Biodiversity loss	○	○	○	○	○
Loss of natural and cultural heritage (e.g. shrinking public lands, loss of indigenous cultures, etc.)	○	○	○	○	○

* 12. Please choose the environmental problem you feel most strongly about from the previous question and explain your concern (in a few sentences).

Pardoe Thesis Survey

Environmental Attitude

The next few questions will ask you if you agree or disagree with cert the response that most accurately reflects your sentiments. You have response in more detail.

* 13. Please indicate whether you agree, disagree, or do not have an

	Agree	Disagre
Stewardship of the environment is primarily a personal responsibility.	○	○
Stewardship of the environment is primarily a collective responsibility.	○	○
Stewardship of the environment is primarily the responsibility of organizations such as my own.	○	○
Stewardship of the environment is primarily the responsibility of the government.	○	○
Human ingenuity and technology can solve any environmental problem.	○	○
I need to alter my way of living to better serve the environment.	○	○
Human society needs to alter its systems and paradigms to better serve the environment.	○	○
Change is most effectively brought about from the grassroots level.	○	○
Change is most effectively brought about through a top-down approach.	○	○

14. Please pick one statement from the question above that you feel m you responded in the way that you did. (Optional)

Pardoe Thesis Survey

Environmental Behavior

The following page lists a set of various environmentally-focused behaviors. Please rate the deg to which you engage with each of them.

* 15. Please assess the degree to which you engage with the following.

	I do not engage with this behavior.	I engage with this behavior sometimes.	I often engage with this behavior.	I always exhibit this behavior.	N/A
Recycling	○	○	○	○	○
Reducing consumption of material goods (e.g. clothing, furniture, accessories)	○	○	○	○	○
Reducing consumption of meat	○	○	○	○	○
Veganism	○	○	○	○	○
Cleaning up litter	○	○	○	○	○
Eating and/or shopping locally	○	○	○	○	○
Using a reusable water bottle	○	○	○	○	○
Reducing driving	○	○	○	○	○
Purchasing ecofriendly products (e.g. organic produce, recycled goods)	○	○	○	○	○
Using reusable bags when shopping	○	○	○	○	○
Ecosystem restoration projects	○	○	○	○	○
Producing your own food (e.g. gardening, hunting)	○	○	○	○	○
Using alternative transportation (bikes, walking)	○	○	○	○	○
Reducing energy consumption at home	○	○	○	○	○
Composting	○	○	○	○	○
Permaculture	○	○	○	○	○

Other (please specify)

* 16. The next question lists a few of the ways individuals may work to raise awareness an
change for environmental causes. Please rank the behaviors according to how effective y
are on the following scale.

	Least effective			Moderately effective		
Communicating with an elected representative	○	○	○	○	○	○
Making consumer choices	○	○	○	○	○	○
Mobilizing the community (forming groups and clubs)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Educating others	○	○	○	○	○	○
Marching or protesting	○	○	○	○	○	○
Doing the work yourself	○	○	○	○	○	○
Donating to environmental organizations	○	○	○	○	○	○

Pardoe Thesis Survey

Values

**This page will ask you to rank several different values on a spectrum from most impo
important.**

* 17. Please evaluate and rank the personal importance (with 1 as the most important, an
important) of the following in the context of your satisfaction as an employee or member
organization.*

**For students, please consider the following in the context of your academic experience.*

	Formal leadership	☐ N/A
	Informal leadership	☐ N/A
	Organizational status (position title)	☐ N/A
	Involvement in organizational decision-making	☐ N/A
	Self-enhancement	☐ N/A
	Autonomy	☐ N/A
	Creating and maintaining community	☐ N/A
	Altruism	☐ N/A
	Democratic culture (equal influence of colleagues)	☐ N/A
	Collaboration	☐ N/A
	Openness to change	☐ N/A
	Competition	☐ N/A
	Transparency of leadership	☐ N/A

* 18. To what degree do you experience/engage with the following:

	I do not experience or engage with this.	Sometimes I experience or engage with this.	I often experience or engage with this.	I regularly experience or engage with this.	N/A
Anxiety about the future	○	○	○	○	○
Planning for the future	○	○	○	○	○
Professional/occupational interactions in which you are left feeling undermined	○	○	○	○	○
An increase in responsibilities in the workplace* *For **students**, please select N/A	○	○	○	○	○
Voluntary lifestyle changes (e.g. picking up a workout routine, becoming a vegan, etc.)	○	○	○	○	○
Frustration with the current political administration	○	○	○	○	○
Frustration with the current economic system	○	○	○	○	○

Explain your responses (optional):

c. Consent Form

SUBJECT CONSENT FORM
PARDOE HONORS THESIS 2017-2018

You are being asked to participate in a study on gender dynamics in environmental organizations by Kat Pardoe at Bucknell University in association with her senior honors thesis.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to reveal operations of gender bias in environmental organizations through assembling a series of narratives of men and women's experiences as members of these groups. Participants of this study are chosen for their experience with environmental organizing and planning.

Scope of Participant Involvement: If you agree to be in this study, I will conduct an interview with you, and may ask you to participate in a follow-up survey. The interview will include questions about your background, your job, your workplace environment, your professional relationships, and related subjects. The interview will take approximately one hour. If you permit, I will tape-record the interview.

Risks and Benefits: There is a risk that some of the questions posed in the interview regarding your job conditions may be sensitive. To minimize the risk of this information circulating beyond the confines of this research project, your identity will be kept private through a coded system, any tape-recorded interviews will be password-protected, and any paper notes taken during the interview will be stored in a locked drawer. There are no personal benefits offered to subjects for choosing to participate in this study. All materials with personal content will be destroyed at the end of the research project (May 2018).

Your answers will be confidential. The records of this study will be kept private. The final thesis will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you. Research records will be kept in a password protected device or locked drawer; only I will have access to the records. If the interview is recorded, I will destroy the tape after it has been transcribed, which we anticipate will be within three months of its taping.

Your participation is voluntary. Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. You may decline to answer any question at any time, and may also withdraw from the study at any time.

If you have questions the contact for this research project is Kat Pardoe. I can be reached via email at kep016@bucknell.edu. If you have immediate questions, please ask them now. I am working under the supervision of Professor Ben Marsh at Bucknell University. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a subject in this study, you should contact my advisor via email at marsh@bucknell.edu or the Bucknell Institutional Review Board (IRB) at 570.577.2767.
or access their website at https://www.bucknell.edu/about-bucknell/institutional-research-and-planning/about-our-office/contact-information.html.

You will be given a copy of this form for your records. Upon your request I will share my final written results with you.

I, (print name) _____understand that

- I will be participating in a research project studying gender bias in environmental organizations described above.
- I may be asked personal questions about my professional life as part of this study.
- I am under no obligation to answer questions that may put my professional life or reputation at risk, or any other question for any reason.
- Notes are being taken of this interview, and my responses are being recorded if I agreed with my signature below.
- My responses may be published in the final thesis, but that their publishing would not reveal my identity.
- Information I reveal will never be shared with my employer or anyone else within the limits of the legal system.
- Any responses will be used in tandem with other participant responses to make statements about patterns of gender bias in environmental organizations.

I affirm that:

- The researcher has clearly outlined my role and rights as a participant.
- The researcher has assured me of the protection of my information.
- The researcher has clearly outlined the goals and purpose of this project.
- The researcher has answered all of the questions I have posed at this time.
- I am 18 or older.
- I consent to participate in this study.

In recognition and confirmation of the above:

Signature: _____

Date: _____

In addition to consenting to participate, I also consent to have the interview tape-recorded (optional).

Signature: _____

Bibliography

Antolini, Denise E. "National Park Law in the U.S.: Conservation, Conflict and Centennial Values." *William & Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review*, 2009: 851-921.

Bradley, Harriet. *Gender.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2012.

Brulle, Robert J. "Environmental Discourse and Social Movement Organizations: A Historical and Rhetorical Perspective on the Development of U.S. Environmental Organizations." *Sociological Inquiry*, 1996: 58-83.

Bruni, Attila, and Silvia Gherardi. "En-gendering differences, transgressing the boundaries, coping with the dual presence." In *Gender, Identity and the Culture of Organizations*, by Iiris Aaltio and Albert J Mills, 21-39. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Buckingham-Hatfield, Susan. *Gender and Environment.* London: Routledge, 2000.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey.* United States Department of Labor. January 19, 2018. https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat08.htm (accessed March 23, 2018).

Chan, Jody, and Joe Curnow. "Taking Up Space: Men, Masculinity and the Student Climate Movement." *RCC Perspectives* (Rachel Carson Center), 2017: 77-86.

Corry, Stephen. "The Colonial Origins of Conservation: The Disturbing History Behind US National Parks." *Truthout*, August 25, 2015.

Department of Defense. *2015 Demographics: Profile of the Military Community.* Report, Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, 2015.

Dietz, Thomas, Linda Kalof, and Paul C. Stern. "Gender, Values and Environmentalism." *Social Science Quarterly*, 2002: 353-364.

Dobson, John, and Judith White. "Toward the Feminine Firm: An Extension to Thomas White." *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 1995: 463-478.

Feldman, Daniel C. "Reconceptualizing the Nature and Consequences of Part-Time Work." *The Academy of Management Review*, 1990: 103-112.

Finney, Carolyn. *Black Faces, White Spaces.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

Goodstein, Jerry, Kanak Gautam, and Warren Boeker. "The Effects of Board Size and Diversity on Strategic Change." *Strategic Management Jounral*, 1994: 241-250.

Granovetter, Mark S. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Jounral of Sociology*, 1973: 1360-1380.

Hearn, Jeff. "Alternative conceptualizations and theoretical perspectives on identities and organizational cultures: A personal review of research on men in organizations." In *Gender, Identity and the Culture of Organizations* , by Iiris Aaltio and Albert J Mills, 39-56. New York : Routledge, 2002.

Hennessy, Rosemary. *Materialist Feminism and the Politics of Discourse.* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Holmes, Janet. "Power and Discourse at Work: Is Gender Relevant?" In *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, Power and Ideology in Discourse*, by Michelle M. Lazar, 31-60. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Huffaker, Greg. "The Pitfalls of the Pittman-Robertson Act: Threats to an American Wildlife that Ensares Hunters and Hikers Alike." *Cardozo Public Law, Policy and Ethics Journal*, 2013: 529-568.
Ibarra, Herminia. "Homophily and Differential Returns: Sex Differences in Network Structure and Access in an Advertising Firm." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1992: 422-447.
Layzer, Judith A. *Open for Business: Conservative's Opposition to Environmental Regulation .* Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012.
Lazar, Michelle M. "Poloticizing Gender in Discourse: Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis as Political Perspective and Praxis." In *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, Power and Ideology in Discourse*, by Michelle M. Lazar, 1-30. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
Lin, Nan, Walter M. Ensel, and John C. Vaughn. "Social Resources and Strength of Ties: Structural Factors in Occupational Status Attainment." *American Sociological Review*, 1981: 393-405.
Mandelker, Daniel R. "The National Environmental Policy Act: A Review of Its Experience and Problems." *Washington University Journal of Law and Policy*, 2010: 293-312.
Merchant, Carolyn. "American Environmental History A to Z: Agencies, Concepts, Laws and People." In *The Columbia Guide to American Environmental History*, by Carolyn Merchant, 191 - 248. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
Merriam-Webster. "Gender." Merriam-Webster, February 10, 2018.
Miles, Maria. "Feminist Research: Science, Violence and Responsibility." In *Ecofeminism*, by Vandana Shiva and Maria Miles, 36-54. King's Lynn: Biddles Ltd, 1993.
Morgan, Allison, Jeria Quesenberry, and Eileen Trauth. "Exploring the Importance of Social Networks in the IT Workforce: Experiences with the "Boy's Club"." *Tenth Americas Conference on Information Systems.* New York: AIS Electronic Library, 2004. 1313-1320.
National Geographic . *U.S. National Parks - In the Beginning.* May 26, 2010. https://www.nationalgeographic.com/travel/national-parks/early-history/ (accessed March 30, 2018).
O'Niell, Brenda, and Elisabeth Gidengil. *Gender and Social Capital.* Abingdon: Taylor and Francis , 2013.
Organization for Security and Co-Operation in Europe. "Gender and Environment." January 2009. http://www.osce.org/gender/36360?download=true (accessed September 5, 2017).
Outon, Peggy. *Women in Nonprofits: Then & Now.* November 20, 2015. https://trust.guidestar.org/blog/2015/11/20/women-in-nonprofits-then-now/ (accessed February 22, 2018).
Phillips, Mary. "Re-Writing Corporate Environmentalism: Ecofeminism, Corporeality and the Language of Feeling." *Gender, Work and Organization*, 2014: 443 - 458.
Plumwood, Val. "Nature, Self and Gender: Feminism, Environmental Philosophy, and the Critique of Rationalism." *Hypatia*, 1991: 3-27.
Riketta, Michael. "The Causal Relation Between Job Attitudes and Performance: A Meta-Analysis of Panel Studies." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2008: 472-481.

Seager, Joni. "Rachel Carson Died of Breast Cancer: The Coming Age of Feminist Environmentalism." *Signs* 28 (2003): 945-972.
Shiva, Vandana. "Reductionism and Regeneration: A Crisis in Science." In *Ecofeminism*, by Vandana Shiva and Maria Miles, 22-36. King's Lynn: Biddles Ltd, 1993.
Shiva, Vandana. "The Impoverishment of the Environment: Women and Children Last." In *Ecofeminism*, by Vandana Shiva and Maria Miles, 70 - 90. King's Lynn: Biddles Ltd, 1993.
Snow, Donald. *Inside the Environmental Movement.* Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1992.
Stewart, Mart A. "Slavery and the Origins of African American Environmentalism." In *To Love the Wind and the Rain: African Americans and Environmental History*, by Dianne D. Glave and Mark Stoll, 9-20. Pittsburgh, 2006.
Taylor, Dorceta E. "The Role of Race, Class and Gender in Shaping Activism." *Race, Gender & Class*, 1997: 16-62.
Warren, Karen J. *Ecological Feminist Philosophies.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.
Wehrmeyer, Walter, and Margaret McNeil. "Activists, Pragmatists, Technophiles and Tree-Huggers? Gender Differences in Employees' Environmental Attitudes." *Jounral of Business Ethics*, 2000: 211-222.
Wehrmeyer, Walter, and Margaret McNiel. "Activists, Pragmatists, Technophiles and Tree-Huggers? Gender Differences in Employees Environmental Attitudes." *Journal of Business Ethics* 28 (2000): 211-222.
Youngs, Gillian. "Feminist International Relations: a contradiction in terms? Or: why women and gender are essential to understanding the world 'we' live in." *International Affairs*, 2004: 80-87.