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The benefits of bringing women into ranger workforces — for women, for conservation, and for the workforces themselves — are abundant and evident; the costs of not doing so are high.

Towards Gender Equality In The Ranger Workforce:

Challenges & Opportunities

This report is the first comprehensive and global analysis of the challenges and opportunities for bringing gender equality into ranger workforces. The Universal Ranger Support Alliance (URSA) would like to thank the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) for funding the work under the Voices of Diversity Project.
Park ranger Deneb Saldierna performing underwater monitoring in support of the Sea Shepherd in Socorro Island Protected Area. © Melissa Romao
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Rangers are at the heart of nature protection and conservation. They are the often-unsung heroes and heroines of the desperately important effort to protect wildlife. Those on the front lines risk, and too often lose their lives, in the course of duty as they come into contact with poachers, especially the armed gangs of the cartels of the illegal wildlife trafficking. But being a ranger doesn’t only mean being a law enforcement officer – there are ranger educators, wildlife researchers, visitor guides and those responsible for liaison with communities.

Until relatively recently it was rare for a woman to be part of the ranger force, especially working on the front lines. But although this is gradually changing, the hardships they face just because they are women, can seem overwhelming.

For one thing, being a ranger lies outside the bounds of female stereotypes and norms. Ranger workforces are mostly male domains, and women who do enter these domains are often made to feel unwelcome.

This is unfortunate as it is vitally important that we welcome women into ranger ranks. Those who succeed have proven to be quite as dedicated and successful as their male counterparts and in this time of environmental peril, we cannot afford to exclude their contributions. Further, men and women equally benefit from diverse and inclusive workplaces. I salute those persistent women who have succeeded in entering the ranger force and forging pathways for other women who will be inspired to follow in their footsteps.

This comprehensive report details not only the challenges faced by women and the important role they can play in ranger workforces; it also describes the vital role that the world’s rangers play in protecting the natural world and educating people about the importance of maintaining a balance between the natural world and human activities. Shockingly they are too often expected to carry out their duties with far too little support. Few rangers in the world have adequate equipment, pay, or training. I hope this report will encourage us to find ways to address this shocking injustice.

I hope this report will encourage us to find ways to address this shocking injustice.

DR. JANE GOODALL

Primatologist and Environmental Activist
With this work we also celebrate those that took this path.

When you learned that you should be considered, despite believing you are insignificant, you drew the attention of the world. Through the darkness came a light, an opportunity, for a woman to become a professional and to support her society. An opportunity to become a ranger. A woman ranger.

With this work we also celebrate those that took this path, man and woman, those that took this opportunity to become a ranger and make a difference in the fight against the illegal exploitation of wildlife. To work with communities and to empower others. As female rangers we stand strong and speak out to be heard in order to empower others like us, rangers or not, to recognise their power to make a difference. We believe we are now being heard. As a ranger we are protectors of nature but we importantly also exist to serve our communities.

This role has helped shape me into the person I am today. The path to become a female ranger and later, moving from ranger to politician, was not easy but it is one I would take again given the opportunity. At heart, I am forever a ranger. I would like to thank the IRF and Game Rangers Association of Africa for their support and for the opportunity to speak on behalf of all female rangers. We will continue to work as a collective to support all rangers, men and women, to carry out their vital roles and services to society.

DR. PAULA COELHO

Secretary of State for Biodiversity, Government of Angola and Founder of Game Ranger Association of Africa - Angolan Chapter
As many across the world look to tackle the biodiversity and climate crises, rangers are on the front line; at the sharp end. All available resources must be brought to bear to underpin their work and the most important is the human resource; rangers themselves.

Some will be surprised to learn that female rangers only make up between 3%-11% of the ranger profession worldwide. Bringing a host of inherently unique skills, knowledge and perspectives to the sector, female rangers bring a distinctive and additional dimension to the work of rangers. We will continue to celebrate endless examples of the hard work, expertise, dedication and commitment of both men and women rangers across the continents but this report brings together and highlights, for the first time, the immense challenges faced by many female rangers.

As we rise to the challenge of protecting planet and people, barriers to employing, training, promoting and supporting female rangers must be swept away. Equality of opportunity and support is key to enable conservation to benefit from the immeasurable added value the female ranger brings.

Dr. Joni Seager and all who contributed to this report should be congratulated; it is a thorough and detailed document providing robust recommendations for much overdue work ahead. It is sometimes a troubling read; the situations some female rangers find themselves in are intolerable and quite frankly shocking. The International Ranger Federation will work hard to ensure the discriminations, attitudes, prejudices and behaviours towards women rangers highlighted in the report, are addressed and assigned to history.

Only then can the world family of rangers truly utilise all the human resource available to it to protect this wondrous planet that is our home.
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Ninfa Estrella Catanil, a park ranger from Colombia, docks her boat after returning from a routine boat patrol. © ProAves
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Introduction

Bringing women into the ranger workforce is an important human rights and equality goal in itself. Further, there is evidence that women bring skill sets and strengths to ranger workforces that are different from those of men. Evidence, presented in this report, suggests that bringing gender equality into the workforce has the potential to improve conservation, relationships with communities, park management, and wildlife management.

The Chitwan Declaration, signed at the World Ranger Congress in 2019 identified improvements needed to support rangers and to upgrade their work conditions (International Ranger Federation 2019). Integral to this, the Declaration also committed to broad gender-related goals: gender-equal opportunities in hiring, pay, and promotion in the ranger workforce, as well as appropriate measures to provide safety and support for female rangers.

The Universal Ranger Support Alliance (URSA) is a global coalition of conservation groups formed to support rangers, to help implement the Chitwan Declaration through a global action plan to address the challenges that rangers face. As part of their efforts to do so, URSA initiated this study to map the contours of the gender imbalance in the ranger workforce and to identify the obstacles and challenges that women face in entering and thriving in the ranger workforce.

The remit for this study was to produce an evidence-based assessment of gender dynamics in ranger workforces, the challenges and best practices on the pathway towards gender equality.
This report relies on four main sources of evidence:

1. **Quantitative data collected in the “Ranger Perception Survey (RPS).”** The RPS was a global survey conducted between 2016-2019; more than 7000 rangers from 28 countries participated in the survey. A synthesis of some of its findings was published in *Life on the Frontline 2019: A Global Survey of the Working Conditions of Rangers* (Belecky, Singh and Moreto 2019) and several Phase 1 pilot study regional summaries were also released between 2016-2019. This report presents an analysis of the original RPS survey data, disaggregated for gender and regional findings. Where data in this report are attributed to the “Ranger Perception Survey,” the information represents original data analysis from the survey database. The survey database itself remains unpublished and is not in the public domain.

2. **Qualitative evidence from interviews.** Personal interviews were conducted with more than 40 frontline rangers, managers and conservation experts from December 2020 to March 2021. Interviews were confidential, and many of the interviewees asked to remain anonymous. Those who agreed to be identified are included in the Acknowledgements.

3. **The secondary literature on rangers and ranger-related conservation.** This included a review of English, French and Spanish language publications.

4. **A Chitwan Declaration "white paper" pilot project examining the gender imbalance in the ranger workforce,** published in 2021 (Seager, Bowser and Dutta 2021).
Very little information is available on women’s contributions and experiences in ranger workforces. There is no common database on the numbers of rangers overall, nor on the proportion of women.

A ‘best estimate’ is that 3 – 11% of rangers, on global average, are women. The greatest representation of women in ranger workforces seems to be in Iceland, at more than 70%; in many countries, there are no women rangers.

This is the first comprehensive analysis of the Ranger Perception Survey data that disaggregates gender patterns.

More than just being male dominated, ranger work has a ‘macho’ representation. In some measure, this derives from the origins of the profession – derived mostly from law enforcement and militaries.

The narrow and male-dominated public image of what a ranger does, and what a ranger ‘looks like’ deters women.

Women are eager to be rangers and, like men, find great satisfaction in their jobs, as well as much-needed employment opportunities. But the challenges and barriers to women are distinctive.

One category of barriers is women-specific — such as gender norms of appropriate behaviour for women that deter them from taking jobs seen as physically demanding.

Then there are generalized obstacles to attracting and retaining a professional ranger workforce, such as low pay, poor equipment, and limited training opportunities. These affect men as well as women, but with gender-differentiated effects.

Common women-specific barriers include:

a. Women rangers experience pervasive and extraordinarily high levels of violence and harassment – from fellow rangers, from supervisors, and from community members. For example:

   In the Africa region, the percent of women
who experience sexual harassment from their supervisors is double that of men;

- In SE Asia, 74% of women say they fear reprisals from their coworkers were they to report corrupt or illegal activities, compared with 49% of men who fear reprisals;

- On global average, men rangers experience more threats and abuse from community members than women; 26% of women rangers and 36% of men experience threats from community members.

- In the conservation sector in Viet Nam (not only rangers), one study found that 4 out of 7 men, and 6 out of 7 women experienced sexual harassment.

- Among employees of the US National Park Service, in a 2017 survey, 18% of women, and 6% of men reported that they experienced sexual harassment; 42% of lesbians, 36% gay men, 3% heterosexuals experienced sexual orientation harassment.

Harassment is exacerbated by the absence of women managers, and the fact that almost no ranger employers have strong equality and anti-harassment policies. Male managers also tend not to understand the obstacles women face:

- In a recent study in Europe, only 13% of male PA managers perceived obstacles preventing women from accessing executive positions; 40% of female managers expressed awareness of obstacles.

- Everywhere in the world, social norms of gender-appropriate behaviour inhibit women from taking up ranger work.

- Because ranger work is primarily structured on a male model, it is especially difficult for women to reconcile family life with being a ranger. Women rangers as a group are younger, and have much lower marriage and having-children rates than male rangers. For example:

- In the South Asia region, 86% of male rangers compared with 58% of female rangers are married.

- In the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) region, 73% of men rangers have children, compared with 51% of women.

- Women rangers are often slotted into secretarial or administrative jobs, regardless of their qualifications for other ranger work.

b. In much of the world, both men and women rangers are not on permanent contracts but it is worse for women.

- For example: In Africa, 31% of men, and 38% of women are not on permanent contracts; the lowest rate overall is in the Latin America and Caribbean region, where 53% of men and 60% of women are not on permanent contracts.

- Globally, women rangers receive more training than men in navigation and tracking. In SE Asia, the gap is notably large: 71% women / 41% men get navigation training, 57% women/34% men receive tracking training.

b. In much of the world, both men and women rangers are not on permanent contracts but it is worse for women.

- For example: In Africa, 31% of men, and 38% of women are not on permanent contracts; the lowest rate overall is in the Latin America and Caribbean region, where 53% of men and 60% of women are not on permanent contracts.

- Globally, women rangers receive more training than men in navigation and tracking. In SE Asia, the gap is notably large: 71% women / 41% men get navigation training, 57% women / 34% men receive tracking training.
Regional patterns of gender gaps vary tremendously in terms of access to equipment, and provision of basic supplies and protections. On global average, women rangers purchase more of their equipment at their own expense than their male peers:

- boots: 68% of women buy out of pocket, 61% men,
- uniforms: 57% women, 42% men,
- weapons: 14% women, 7% men,
- tents: 54% women, 45% men.

There is almost no analysis of distinct barriers (or opportunities) experienced by racial, ethnic or sexual identity minorities.

Non-ranger social analysis establishes that these identity and intersectional effects are likely to be very significant.

Women's empowerment is closely linked with environmental sustainability. The corollary of this may be that bringing gender balance into the ranger workforce can expand capacities and perspectives on conservation, sustainability, and resource management.

Women bring different skills and interests to ranger work:

- Women as a whole have different environmental perceptions and attitudes.
- In law enforcement or possible conflict situations, women tend to have de-escalation and negotiation skills.
- Women rangers may be better at ‘details’ (including keeping patrol logs) than men.
- Women rangers may have better access than men to different constituencies (especially other women) in communities. Whether for information-seeking purposes, or gathering enforcement intelligence, women can expand the reach of ranger networks.

The best practices to support gender equality in ranger work fall roughly into four categories:

- making space for women, including targeted training opportunities,
making visible and protecting against Gender-Based Violence (GBV),
centering human rights and gender equality in global ranger initiatives,
modifying recruitment and promotion based practices, and providing role models.

Specific practices that facilitate women’s integration into ranger workforces include:

- women-specific training opportunities,
- critical-mass hiring of women (not just one by one),
- strong mission statements of commitment to gender equality, and enforceable and enforced policies of zero-tolerance for harassment,
- women’s and LGBTQI-specific ranger and conservation associations, both formal and informal,
- training programmes for men on gender equality.

Gender and intersectional diversity in representation within organizations is an effectiveness amplifier – in project planning, programme development and execution, priority-setting, decision-making groups. The likelihood of better decision-making is amplified when representatives of the whole – not just half – of the population have the opportunity to be involved.

Ranger employers, associations and conservation organizations can take the lead in modelling commitments to social change in women’s empowerment. To the extent that these entities demonstrate commitments to women’s empowerment and to gender inclusivity within their own organizations and, importantly, through projects and programmes, they can be powerful influencers in changing socially dominant norms – norms that are damaging for men as well as for women.
One of the challenges of investigating the state of the ranger world is that there is no stable or shared definition of what defines a “ranger.” Even the terminology varies considerably from place to place — people who do ranger work may be called wardens, environmental shepherds, custodians, scouts, guards, interpreters, wildlife monitors, patrollers or defenders, among other designations. Some park services distinguish formally between job functions in their employment structure: for example, the US National Park Service hires people under categories such as “Law Enforcement Ranger” and “Interpretation Park Ranger;” the South Africa National Parks system similarly distinguishes among ‘environmental management inspectors,’ ‘community outreach rangers’ and ‘law enforcement rangers.’

The 2021 “Code of Conduct” may help to resolve some of these complications (International Ranger Federation 2021). The Code of Conduct was developed following a global, iterative consultation process with rangers, ranger associations, ranger employers, national and regional governments, human rights organisations and other relevant stakeholders. The key purpose of the Code of Conduct is to build and strengthen the reputation and understanding of the sector, provide an operational framework for rangers and supporters of the profession, and promote implementation of globally accepted best practices. In the course of establishing these principles, the Code also defines the roles and activities of rangers. Despite the Code’s development of a common basis for defining rangers and their activities, communication around the ranger image remains a challenge.
While there is no cross-national study of public perceptions of ‘rangers,’ in popular culture the overwhelming impression is that being a ranger usually involves being outdoors, having a uniform, and most likely having a law enforcement role (which in many places in Africa and in the United States also means having a gun).

Streamlining a definition of “ranger” may seem to be low in the pecking order of problems, but several interviewees in this study mentioned that confusion about what a ranger does is an impediment to bringing women into the ranger workforce – or, rather, that the typically narrow representation of ranger work (as law enforcer and authoritarian) is an inhibitor for women and girls. Several rangers listed the wide variety of tasks that rangers perform: environmental education, host for visitors to protected areas, pest control, repairing fences and park structures, biodiversity monitoring, map-making, keeping censuses of plants and animals, wildlife tracking, monitoring and assisting wounded animals, assisting people using the PA who have accidents or get lost, planting and ecosystem restoration, among others; if there were more messaging about the diverse span of roles that rangers perform, they said, more women and girls might see pathways for themselves into this profession.

Several interviewees for this study suggested that the name “ranger” needs to be changed – while it is a term of great pride, several people said, it is too connected to a male stereotype and ‘old-style’ conservation. Others suggested that the messaging about rangers may be the core problem rather than the terminology itself.
The data problem

The definitional problem also bears on the lack of data about women in ranger workforces. In the first instance, this information is not regularly collected except by a very few PA or parks organisations. There is no common database, and no shared understanding of the importance of collecting sex- or gender-disaggregated data. Moreover, in many countries the total ranger workforce may be under the jurisdiction of a mix of public and private entities, and there is very little cross-sector data availability or sharing (even if the baseline data are collected). Any given manager, particularly of a small ranger force, might know how many women and men are in their ranger complement, but there’s no ‘place’ for this data to be reported or collected. This baseline data problem may be addressed in the 2020 ranger census conducted by IUCN-WCPA, Re:wild (formerly Global Wildlife Conservation) and WWF that will be published in 2021.

In the absence of that census, the best guess is that on global average women represent 3 – 11% of the ranger workforce (Belecky, Singh and Moreto 2019). Detailed data are scattered and idiosyncratically specific.

Figure 2: Known or best-estimate proportion of rangers who are women (selected examples only)

PROPORTION OF WOMEN RANGERS

Identified as a proportion of the ranger workforce in:

Included in consultations for draft ranger Code of Conduct:
First consultation, 19%;  
Second consultation, 14% (IRF 2020).
Diversity of ranger roles

Hawksbill turtle monitoring in Seychelles. © Peter Chadwick / Courtesy of The Game Rangers Association of Africa’s Ranger Legacy Project.

Ilian Gonzalez, a ranger based in Nexaca Protected Area, Mexico, manages a fire. © Hector Garduño

Nyul Nyul, Bardi Jawi Oorany and Karajarri women ranger teams transforming native plants into traditional bush products for community-based social enterprises in the Kimberley. © Kimberley Land Council
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Lead ranger Smritee Lama and her team from Chitwan National Park, Nepal, examine a rescued ill white rumped vulture, a critically endangered species. Smritee found the vulture struggling to survive in the forest and brought it to a vet’s attention. © Smritee Lama

Rangers conducting estuary fish monitoring and research in Garden Route National Park, South Africa. © Peter Chadwick with images courtesy of the Game Rangers Association of Africa Ranger Legacy Project, an initiative to raise the profile of Africa’s rangers and showcase their important and diverse roles in conservation.
BARRIERS, OBSTACLES AND CHALLENGES

Doreen Adongo, a ranger from Kenya Wildlife Service, Nairobi National Park, cooks ugali made from maize flour (cornmeal) for her ranger team. © Jonathan Caramanus / Green Renaissance / WWF-UK
Barriers, obstacles, and challenges

Working with the Ranger Perception Survey (RPS) as a primary evidence base, the question of why there are so few women in ranger workforces might be viewed through two lenses:

1. **Women-specific barriers**: One category of barriers primarily affects women — such as gender norms of appropriate behaviour for women that deter them from taking jobs seen as physically demanding, or pervasive levels of gender-based violence.

2. **Gender differentiated effects of general barriers**: Then there are generalized obstacles to attracting and retaining a professional ranger workforce, as reported in the Ranger Perception Survey and outlined by URSA’s Action Plan, such as low pay, poor equipment, limited training opportunities. These affect men as well as women, but often in different ways — the implications and consequences are gender differentiated.

There is an overlap between these two sets of barriers, but they are distinct enough to be treated separately.

This two-part approach to understanding the challenges of women in the ranger workforce is also informed by an insightful study of the barriers reported by women in US conservation organisations that identifies six categories of gender-related workplace challenges: salary inequality and difficulty negotiating, formal exclusion, informal exclusion, harassment and inadequate organisational response, assumptions of inadequacy, and assumptions of wrongness (Jones and Solomon 2019b). Women in the ranger workforce encounter all six types of challenges.
WOMEN-SPECIFIC BARRIERS

CULTURAL/SOCIAL GENDER NORMS

Stepping out of place

Most analysts and interviewees observe that “cultural norms” or “social tradition” are among the biggest obstacles to women joining ranger ranks (Ströbert-Beloud 2015; Tobeth 2006; Seager, Bowser and Dutta 2021; Eaux et Forets 2019). The pressures on men and women to perform and display behaviours of ‘appropriate’ femininity and masculinity shape everyday life as well as work and family trajectories.

The notion that women should be home-and family-centered has strong social sway across cultures and countries. Everywhere, culturally entrenched gender norms, presumptions, and traditional attitudes, often internalized and expressed by women as much as by men, hold women back from participating in activities that are variously defined (rightly or wrongly) as being “outdoors,” physically arduous, possibly dangerous, or technically and scientifically oriented.

There is particularly strong cultural disapproval of women participating in ranger work that is known or imagined to be acutely dangerous or work that is likely to involve armed conflict. To the extent that ranger and conservation protection, particularly in some regions in Africa, increasingly involves arms and armed conflict with poachers, the dissonance with femininity-appropriate gender norms is also likely to increase.

Men, conversely, are viewed as being more “naturally” suited and better equipped for all of those (presumed) attributes of a ranger. In many instances, the role of ranger-as-protector may seem to be a normal extension of their (presumed) role in households and communities.18

Social messaging that women and girls should not seek out adventurous, perhaps physically demanding, work in male dominated domains starts young.

Some of the specific things women are typically told they can’t (or shouldn’t) do include:

- Handle guns
- Drive cars/boats/trucks/jeeps
- Drive off-road
- Work with tools
- Speak back to men
- Speak in public
- Exert authority in public
- Walk long distances
- Be exposed to bad weather for extended periods of time
Combined with the ‘uniform-gun-car’ archetypal imagery of rangers (see Figure 1), girls have to work harder to imagine themselves in ranger positions and to seek out career pathways that would make them eligible. The ubiquitous reality that women and girls are steered away from science-based or technical education adds another early-socialization impediment.

Gender norms are not just free-floating sociological artifacts — they are in a synergistic relationship with legal structures and political-economic forces. In many countries, gender inequality is enshrined in laws that prevent women's equal ownership of land and property, equal rights to marriage and divorce, employment, mobility, and/or education.19 In many countries, women don't have or can't access reproductive rights or other rights to bodily integrity. Gender-based economic inequalities run throughout all formal and informal structures in most societies. Women are poorly represented in most judiciaries, governments, white-collar professions, and management sectors. Women do most of the world’s unpaid work. “Norms” are shaped and enforced in these larger contexts — a reality that is both hopeful (because there are many points of intervention and possible social change) and daunting (because the barriers are so varied and pernicious).

The absence of role models for women entering ranger workforces can have career-long deleterious effects. One female ranger interviewed for this study observed that role modelling is critically important for women to succeed in ranger workforces. She’s proud of her own role as a model for girls, and noted the importance of bigger-stage modelling too:

“I strongly believe that change for women needs to be modelled by people at all levels from those within organisations to leaders within governments... I hope that more young girls and women see roles such as ranger, fire fighter, police officer, Prime Minister/ President as attainable and achievable and yes they can do what they want to do. I also strongly believe that I can make a difference by being a positive role model too and each and every female ranger is a role model to younger women who aspire to become or may think they want to join such a noble profession.”

She warned, however, not to assume that all women who have cracked the ‘glass ceiling’ then help other women to do so too; female leaders also need to be trained and given positive reinforcement for widening the circle of opportunity. Another ranger interviewee noted that for women to succeed in the ‘tough’ profession of being a ranger, ‘they too have to become tough and masculinized’ – and thus may not be very sympathetic to women [or men] having difficulties in finding the same path. A third woman ranger echoed this caveat, noting that women who can succeed in becoming leaders in male-dominated occupations often only succeed because they mimic the behaviour and approaches of men.
Social norms of mothering

Gender norms exert even greater pressure on women who are mothers. One interviewee in this study remembered Abe Sibiya, former Director of South African National Parks, famously proclaiming that he wouldn’t put ‘the mothers of the nation on the firing line.’

A US National Park woman ranger interviewed in 2016 reported on the sexism she faced during and after maternity leave (cited in Gilpin 2016):

“During and while on maternity leave, I was left out of critical planning meetings on the program I managed, and had responsibilities taken from me. Upon my return, one senior colleague suggested the job was ‘too much of a burden’ on me because I had kids, and that I should hand over key responsibilities. I considered filing an EEO complaint, but there was a fear of retaliation. I eventually confronted supervisors and am now more involved in tasks, but I don’t feel valued or secure in my position. I don’t trust them, and I’m actively seeking other jobs” [emphasis added].

Reconciling work/ family responsibilities

Despite changing gender norms in many parts of the world, it is still almost universally the case that women are primarily responsible for childcare and maintaining households. While men may struggle to balance family/home responsibilities with their jobs, for women achieving this balance is measurably harder. One of the drivers of this is the fact that everywhere in the world, women perform the largest share of unpaid household labor and “care work” (Bhatt and Azcona 2020; Ghosh and Chopra 2019; Chopra 2015). Efforts to strengthen the empowering outcomes of women’s participation in paid work need to take into account the expectations and burdens of unpaid work; redistributing unpaid care work is a prerequisite for gender equality (UN Women 2016).

Studies from the US and Europe underscore that, for many women, the choice is increasingly seen as being between a career and children and marriage – that having both is a high hurdle. For example:

- 33% of young (US) women don’t think that having a career and children is viable. 20
- One strategy for many women is to delay having children: in the US, women in 2020 have their first child at an average age of 26, up from 21 in 1972. 21
- In the UK, only 44% percent of women are in full-time work or self-employed three years after childbirth, compared to 90% of new fathers. 22
- Motherhood comes with measurable career-trajectory and salary penalties; fatherhood does not accrue these penalties.
Few women have ‘aged in place’

The cohort of female rangers as reflected in the RPS is generally younger than the male cohort, and in South Asia considerably younger. This is not unexpected given that, overall, the entry of women into the ranger workforce is relatively recent in most places; there are relatively fewer women who have ‘aged in place’ in the ranger workforce.

Women rangers across all regions have much lower rates of marriage than their male peers, and fewer have children. This reflects gender-specific structural impediments to women trying to combine work and family life. Some interviewees suggested this lower rate of marriage might be due to the younger age of female rangers. But while this may be a factor for any individual female ranger, at a cohort level women rangers across the four regions are well above the average age of marriage for their region – so their relatively younger age does not explain their higher rates of non-marriage.23

“It’s difficult for a woman to find a husband unless you meet someone who’s a ranger as well. I was fortunate to find a husband who’s a ranger like me, who understands me when I go out in the field for weeks.” - Malawian woman ranger

The data specifically reflect marriage; non-marital partnering arrangements are not surveyed. Source: Ranger Perception Survey
A ‘double-bind burden’

Almost universally, the condition of being unpartnered/ not married is economically and sociologically more of a stigma and deficit for (heterosexual) women than for men. This acknowledgement doesn’t diminish the hardship genuinely felt by male rangers, but the stakes and the consequences are higher for women if they can’t combine marriage and their jobs. Women without male partners, everywhere, are more economically vulnerable than are men without women. The material effects — if not the emotional effects — of the incompatibility of patrol-ranger work with personal and family life are more directly consequential for women than their male peers. Since patrol experience is typically the pathway for promotion up the ranks, then this is a significant double-bind burden.

Further, patrol duty often sometimes brings extra compensation, so the inability to patrol comes at a high cost – as does the patrol duty itself:

"Last year I got pregnant but I had to execute my responsibilities, including going for patrols. We usually patrol for 15 days before coming back to camp. I was part of the patrol until I was six-months pregnant. It was an experience I wished I could avoid but couldn’t because not going to the patrols meant no extra allowances which I desperately needed. Most female rangers do this, which is extremely risky for both mother and child" (cited in Belecky, Singh and Moreto 2019).

The material effects – if not the emotional effects — of the incompatibility of patrol-ranger work with personal and family life are more directly consequential for women than their male peers.
Several women interviewed for this study identified family-life obstacles specific to being a ranger, including:

- the common practice of being transferred to a new station, often far from home and often on very short notice,
- lack of paternity and maternity leaves for rangers; several interviewees made the point that both paternity and maternity leaves need to be available, otherwise it is women alone who are seen as the (potentially) ‘expensive’ employees to hire,
- the expectation of in-field weeks-long rotations as a normal part of the job,
- unavailability of uniforms appropriate for women, and especially for pregnant women.

One interviewee for this study made the point that while it might be possible for women to conform to a male ranger stereotype early in their careers – being ‘macho’ and even knowingly putting themselves in danger – they feel they have to stop conforming once they have children. Which means women may be seen as becoming less effective.

According to the Ranger Perception Survey, globally 17% of women and 13% of men rangers are unsure about their organisation’s maternity and paternity leave policies. Among those who are aware, a higher proportion of women than men believe they would have access to such leave – except in SE Asia, where the proportion is strikingly low.

Source: Ranger Perception Survey
The logistics of work for in-field rangers produces hardships for men with families too. In a recent assessment of rangers in South Africa, many men commented on the challenges of being an absent parent:

“Our children forget us, they look puzzled every time they see us, they need to see us and spend time with us and the way we work it is as if we don’t care about our families... The rangers’ situation creates marital problems, disintegration of families, you find that children grow up without knowing their father, the father will be like the cheque kind of a daddy, who pays for certain things, but there's no relationship or bond formed with the father. That is the type of families that they are raising” (quoted in Mathekga 2017).

In the same study, male rangers talked about the challenges of finding a partner and sustaining a satisfactory relationship: “You have no time to find a life partner because there is no time to visit” (male ranger, quoted in Mathekga 2017).

Anecdotal reports from India suggest a degree of family alienation – that some families don’t want the male rangers to return to the family, as they drink too much and exhibit harsh behaviour.

Facilities at ranger field stations seldom accommodate families, or are so under-serviced – and remote from schools – that rangers are reluctant to bring partners and children (Mathekga 2017; personal interviews).
Towards Gender Equality In The Ranger Workforce: Challenges & Opportunities

Conforming to harmful – for everyone - stereotypes

While excluding women from equal opportunities for personal and career development, employment, and social prestige, gender stereotypes and norms also harm men. Framing masculine norms around tolerance for hardship, for example, puts pressure on men to engage in behaviours that may be risky or dangerous.

There was also some discussion with interviewees in this study about masculinity-shaming: men who may be physically smaller or less strong than others in their unit sometimes face bullying or gay-baiting. Two respondents mentioned that men who openly supported gender equality might also be considered less manly.

Other interviewees noted that what was really needed to open up ranger workforces was to reframe stereotypes away from tough manliness – a stereotype that harms both men and women: “men need training... the real problem is masculine stereotypes... ranger needs are diverse and we need diverse types of rangers... need to cultivate other masculine stereotypes.” This interviewee went on to talk about the unrealistic and unfair assumption that women need to conform to male spaces and roles – and be expected to succeed.

Several interviewees in this study challenged the assumption that women who want to be rangers should conform to a male norm:

- "If women want to be put in dangerous places in the name of equality, should we re-examine what equality means?"
- "We need to redefine the notion of 'frontline’ – having women in the classroom, teaching the next generation about conservation – is the frontline."
- "Ranger work may not be a safe environment for women, and without big culture changes it may not ever be [and we do a disservice to force women into these stereotypes]."
- "What I lack in masculinity I have to make up in intellect..."

Exclusion of LGBTQI

Most participants in discussions for this project said they knew of no or very few openly LBGTQI (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, Queer, Intersex) or non-binary rangers. In approximately 70 countries in the world, homosexuality is illegal and in some of those places subject to extreme punishment including the death penalty; even if ranger organisations or individual ranger peers were open to this diversity, there is considerable peril for LGBTQI people in many countries.
RANGER AND CONSERVATION CULTURE

‘Boys’ clubs’

A large proportion of the women (and some of the men) referred to rangering as a ‘boy’s club.’ One male conservation expert interviewed in 2020 remarked that in the ranger workforce there is often “an entrenched, closed ‘brotherhood’ culture, based on shared hardship and experiences all the way from training school, often linked to drinking, customs and male rituals. It is almost impossible for women to break into this (even if they wanted to). To change this, we need to work from the very first levels of training” (cited in Seager, Bowser and Dutta 2021).

Women’s entry into the ranger workforce was in most places fiercely resisted. In the United States, for example, it took Congressional Act — the 1964 Civil Rights Act — before the National Park Service admitted women as fulltime employee rangers. The Service didn’t know what to ‘do’ with women. ‘Between being forced to wear polyester stewardess costumes and pillbox hats and fighting to become more than “touchy-feely” interpreters, women in the [USA] park service have worked tirelessly to be regarded with the same respect as their male counterparts.’

Many women rangers say that they are still treated as anomalies that organisations and coworkers don’t quite know how to integrate fairly and even-handedly into ranger domains.
Greta Iori, a wildlife and anti-poaching expert, spoke recently about her personal struggles:

“As a woman working in wildlife crime in a very male-dominated arena, it hasn’t been easy... any woman working in wildlife conservation, we know it’s not easy to get decision-makers to listen to us... Conservation of wildlife is often considered either a man’s role through scouts and rangers programs or just something a woman shouldn’t be involved in...”

A Nigerian female field conservationist, Rachel Ashegbofe Ikemeh, echoed these remarks:

“The challenges of being a female conservationist and researcher in Nigeria often depends on the task at hand, but can range from being treated with contempt to not being taken seriously to, sometimes, being on the receiving end of [unwanted] admiration. It is, however, predominantly a case of not being taken seriously. If conducting field research, such as leading a field team, traversing vast areas of wild lands, applying unconventional techniques or initiating new methods, it can often be demoralizing and counterproductive to be a female. I have found that being dogged and highly focused helps to overcome these challenges. And, thankfully, the passion for what I do is what drives me.”

There is no comparative database on retention of men and women rangers, but reports are plentiful of women being driven out of their jobs by hostile work settings (for example, Hildahl 2017; Jones and Solomon 2019a). Integrating women into ranger teams (whether office or field) in very small numbers, often literally one by one, perpetuates the burden of minority status. This puts all the responsibility on those women to ‘cope’ with the gender imbalances—and sets them up for failure. There is a large academic and practice-based literature on when the integration of women begins to have an organisational impact. As a general finding, the culture of organisations starts to shift toward being a ‘gender-friendly’ workplace when about 30% of employees are women.

**Origins: law enforcement, militarism, and biological conservation**

Many observers attribute the contemporary male dominance of ranger workforces to the origins of formal conservation and ranger organisations. In organisational – and notional – structures, “origins” carry a lot of momentum. A ranger from Zimbabwe interviewed for this study offered the observation that there were so few women now because ‘that’s the way it has been since the beginning.’

**Operational origins**

More specifically, the particular characteristics of the origins of parks and rangers continue to shape the course of ranger corps today. In much of the world, as national parks were formed, original parks management was under the authority of either law enforcement entities and/or militaries. In colonized countries, parks management was an extension of colonial authority – the appropriation of land for the enjoyment of privileged classes (Rangarajan 2003; Domínguez and Luoma 2020; Lunstrom 2015). The protection of land put aside for elite (non-indigenous peoples, non-colonized people) enjoyment was enforced, in many instances, by heavy-handed and militarized protection of those spaces. Rangers were employed to be the enforcers of what is now widely known as ‘fortress conservation’ (Pennaz 2017). The ‘strong protection model of separation’, one interviewee in this study remarked, is the basis for the problem of macho ranger work today.

Even though fortress conservation is now being challenged, paramilitary protection of specified spaces is now escalating. The current shift in many parts of the world to militarized ranger teams is new – but also is not discontinuous with the origins of rangers and parks.
In response to increasingly commercialized and violent poaching activities in many countries, notably in some parts of Africa and LAC, ranger work has become more risky and violent. While this may be a necessary and reluctant shift to more insurgent-conflict ranger work, it also has important gendered consequences, particularly in reinforcing the type of ranger work most likely to exclude women (Seager, Bowser and Dutta 2021):

- Women are widely seen to be unsuited for work that involves heavy arms; handling of heavy armaments is almost everywhere seen to be outside of gender norms of femininity.

- It escalates the potential for violence between different ranger teams (e.g., community patrol teams and government or private ranger patrol teams) as well as between rangers and communities.

- It can lead to less effective conservation, alienating communities from ranger teams — which then also makes it even harder to recruit women (Duffy et al. 2019).

- Firearms, protective equipment, and associated technology surveillance are expensive; given finite and "one-pie" budgets, more money spent on militarized ranger activities (male) usually comes at the expense of "soft skills" ranger activities (female) such as interpretive and educational services (Duffy 2014; Duffy et al. 2019). The shift in budget allocations/priorities is a gendered shift. Paramilitary training may easily appropriate most of the ranger training budget, as one observer in Uganda notes: "it is important to note that paramilitary training is the primary education method for wildlife rangers in Uganda" (Moreto and Charlton 2021).

- In contexts of violent conflict, women experience higher rates of gender-based violence.

- Increases in arms in everyday ranger contexts increases the likelihood of armed violence in civil society contexts. There is no study of the social effects of the increasing circulation of armaments in ranger communities, but domestic violence studies uniformly show that male ownership of or access to armaments rapidly accelerates the likelihood of violence in households, and quite likely increases violence against all social minorities including LGBTQI people.

Ranger training for heavily armed and conflict conservation can inflict considerable harm on men. In an analysis of one reserve in Zimbabwe, rangers put through violent training were traumatized and suffered 'occupational violence' (Mushonga 2021b):

"Though it may be necessary for them to learn techniques for their safety, training is often conducted in a manner that is overly violent. They are subjected to direct physically harmful punishments and verbal harassment. "After training we are angry!" was a common statement among forest rangers, suggesting the emotional effect of a violent training process...Training instructors defended their methods as part of hardening forest rangers and instilling discipline. Discipline is fundamental in any paramilitary establishment or organisation, but in Sikumi Forest Reserve it systematically entrenches occupational violence against forest rangers. For instance, discipline prohibited forest rangers from questioning orders even if those orders threatened their well-being and safety at the workplace. As a result forest rangers suffered in silence."

**Intellectual origins**

The intellectual origins of conservation and protected areas are also heavily male-reflective. The origin disciplines of conservation — such as forestry, wildlife biology, ecosystem sciences — are heavily male-dominated fields; conservation biology holds an apex position. As protected areas paradigms shift more towards community-based conservation and social analysis, the expert structure is also shifting. This is a gendered shift: community assessment and social analysis — the 'softer/social sciences' — involve considerably more women.

This shift is hotly contested, and in no small measure because of its gendered dimensions. One person interviewed in this study observed that the 'power people' in conservation — scientists, NGO leaders, ranger...
managers – have had control of the field for decades, and that they have locked-in the nature of conservation.

They resist change, she went on to say, and are not willing to talk about the social dynamics of conservation.

In 2013-14, the gendered contestation of conservation expertise boiled over into public view. What seemed to start as a public conversation about different conservation philosophies – between conventional (biodiversity centered) conservation and “new” (socio-economically driven) conservation – rapidly transformed into what many saw as vitriolic and sexist attacks (Tallis and Lubchenco 2014; Matulis and Moyer 2017). The simmering ‘culture war of conservation’ became public when 240 conservation scientists, mostly women, signed an open letter asserting that:

“In our view...this dispute has become dominated by only a few voices, nearly all of them men’s. We see this as illustrative of the bigger issues of gender and cultural bias that also continue to hinder conservation” (Tallis and Lubchenco 2014).

Informal exclusion

As in many workplaces, but perhaps to a heightened degree with rangers, much workplace information, networking and bonding happens in informal settings. Most of the women interviewed for this study reported that they feel excluded from both formal and informal channels of information, decision-making, and planning. Informal exclusion happens all the time, they report. In a recent survey of US conservation organisations, women reported that they were not invited into informal decision-making spaces: “To me that is what the old boys’ [club] is, it’s like these informal side conversations where people are making huge decisions that are then brought back to the table without collaborative, collective decision-making” (Jones and Solomon 2019b).

Women clearly get the message they don’t belong, for example, when their male peers bond over after-work drinks in bars, and they aren’t invited. Or they know they ‘shouldn’t’ participate in those informal settings: there is considerable danger to women drinking with groups of men, especially if in remote places, and there is also considerable stigma in most cultures directed towards women who drink alcohol with (non-relative) males.

Formal exclusion: occupational segregation, progress through the ranks and retention

One of the systemic obstacles to bringing women into ranger workforces is the tendency for organisations to replicate themselves in their own image – if left uninterrupted. In hiring decisions, a strong ‘in-group’ bias means that men tend to recruit men — even if it were generally accepted that women could be rangers, the inertial tendency is that men will be favored in hiring decisions. This ‘in-group bias’ is then typically accelerated by the accumulative effect of unconscious bias, which can have substantial effects even if the bias is very slight:

“Modelling of an organisation with eight levels of management from the very bottom to the very top, which initially had an equal number of men and women at the bottom level, shows that a mere one percent bias against women in all promotion decisions produced almost twice as many men than women in the second-top level reporting to the CEO. A one percent bias in decision making is undetectable in practice, but this modelling showed the significant effect that a tiny amount of bias can have when management makes decisions about its staff.31

The dynamics of unconscious and in-group bias are then amplified by conscious bias.

Presumptions about women’s limitations and men’s abilities produce a ranger workforce that is rank-segregated by gender: most women – even with full “ranger” training – occupy support or administrative roles, which also are often the lower-paid ranks. They are not promoted into or otherwise able to access the full range
of ranger opportunities on the same terms as men. Data are scarce on occupational segregation, but one granular study in Democratic Republic of Congo, for example, found that while women represent a relatively high 25% of employees in the forest sector, they are mainly hired as secretaries, accountants, wood selectors or for outreach activities involving children. In the field, they are mostly assigned ‘medical care and cooking’ (FAO 2007a). When women occupy segregated employment niches, they may be outside the loop of information-sharing and important decision-making meetings and channels. One omnipresent tactic used by men to signal to women that they don’t ‘belong’ is to treat them as bit players and to overlook their qualifications:

“When I first started the last job there was a lot of ganging up against the few female employees that there were, a lot of them didn’t last. A lot of ‘you can make my coffee, you can make my photocopies’ and it was like, ‘I’m actually the biologist here’ [laughs]” (cited in Jones and Solomon 2019b).

Several people noted that the typical career promotion ladder for a ranger requires ‘patrol ranger’ duty. It is patrol positions from which women are most likely to be excluded by gender stereotypes. If “patrol” is the gatekeeping step in career development, then this will be a high hurdle for women.

In a recent study in Europe, only 13% of male PA managers perceived obstacles preventing women from accessing executive positions. In contrast, 40% of female managers expressed awareness of obstacles, which they identified as: professional profiles dominated by men, lack of generational renewal aggravated by the lack of public procurement contracts in recent years, problems in reconciling working and family life and the existence of cultural and educational barriers that generate inequalities.32
SECKING “MALE” WILDLIFE WATCHERS IN PAKISTAN:

In countries where it is legal to post job advertisements that specify male or female applicants, many ranger jobs are typed male. The position (see to the right), for example, was posted in newspapers in Pakistan in early 2021, seeking applicants for positions as “male wildlife watchers” in Chitral Gol National Park. (Two positions are advertised, one reserved for a [male] non-Islamic religious minority).

The position announcement includes requirements such as “Height 5 feet 6 inch; Chest 34x26 inch; 2 kilometer run in 20 minutes,” and a note that a special committee will examine physical fitness. The educational expectation identified in the ad is for “matriculation in sciences, with intermediate in second division.”

TRANSLATED ADVERTISEMENT:

Seeking male applicants for positions as “male wildlife watchers” in Chitral Gol National Park.”

“Special committee will monitor physical examination.”

At the other end of the spectrum, a ranger from Iceland explained that they were trying to find ways to advertise jobs in terms that went beyond the gender binary. A typical job advertisement in Iceland would end with an advisory to the effect that ‘women and men are equally welcome to apply.’ They are now assessing ways of moving beyond this language to extend the welcome to non-binary applicants.

On average, women have more physical endurance than men; men have more strength. If physical tests for ranger candidates — as for the police or firefighter corps — emphasize upper-body strength, women will almost always be excluded at higher rates. There is considerable debate about the nature of physical capacity ‘really’ required to perform police or firefighting duties, and thus about appropriate physical-capacity testing; overall, it is unclear whether physical tests in those domains predict actual performance.

A recent US Department of Justice report concluded that “Research shows that women are disproportionately disadvantaged by certain hiring and physical fitness requirements, and there is a lack of evidence that these tests accurately reflect the actual duties of a law enforcement officer” (National Institute of Justice 2019). The understanding of ‘real’ physical demands and whether there should be sex-differentiated testing thresholds remains fiercely controversial in police and firefighting ranks; this remains under-explored in the ranger world.

Many women rangers said that ranger job openings are often circulated in closed men’s networks — they are not always publicly advertised. Even if they are advertised, some women expressed the view that the jobs are already predetermined to be ’men’s jobs.’

Gender inequality undermines the effectiveness of organisations, particularly if it leads to high turnover. There are no gender-disaggregated studies of retention of rangers in the workforce, but sporadic reports suggest this may be a particular problem for women. For example, an FAO (2007b) analysis of women in Ghana’s forestry sector reports that:

“In some divisions like the Wildlife Division, a conscious effort was made to employ more women during the past 5 years, but the female turnover rate was rather dramatic, because 95% of the women employed abandoned the job due to the nature of the work, while the few that remained requested transfer to the city for various personal reasons. This is attributed to their family responsibilities which they have to carry out as women [emphasis added]. Their aspirations in many instances tend to be influenced by such choices. This is a clear situation where their aspirations are limited by their gendered role.”

One female conservation expert interviewed remarked that gender equity — as evidenced by retention rates, among other key indicators — was as important as equality:

“[There are few women rangers because of] lack of differential solutions for women. One thing is achieving gender equality in the ranger workforce (50:50 representation) and another one is achieving equity (retaining those women). Women have different requirements than men, and it can’t be assumed and expected that by providing the same opportunities, equipment, capacities, infrastructure for both men and women you are going to bridge the gender gap. In this context, it is important to understand how many women start their career as rangers but how many finish. Differential solutions include: having the appropriate uniforms and equipment (women tend to be smaller and ‘weaker’), to being provided with the security and needs they have. Here it is important to think about work-family balance and how many women end up leaving their job as they have kids because there are no good school or health services to protect and educate their kids or the facilities provided by the park service to do so (e.g., special permission to take kids to a far away school or low salaries).”

"In some divisions like the Wildlife Division, a conscious effort was made to employ more women during the past 5 years, but the female turnover rate was rather dramatic, because 95% of the women employed abandoned the job due to the nature of the work, while the few that remained requested transfer to the city for various personal reasons. This is attributed to their family responsibilities which they have to carry out as women [emphasis added]. Their aspirations in many instances tend to be influenced by such choices. This is a clear situation where their aspirations are limited by their gendered role.”

VIOLENCE, SEXISM, AND HOSTILE WORKPLACES

Everyday sexism

Because women who are rangers are seen to be ‘out of place’ – traversing gender norms – they face almost
ubiquitous sexism. Everyday sexism reinforces the messaging that women are in the wrong place. Women rangers report hiding pregnancies (until it is too difficult to hide), facing physical testing by male coworkers, and in some cases being given impossible tasks which they then, inevitably and visibly, fail. The majority of rangers interviewed in South Asia, both men and women, said that men in ranger organisations neither welcome nor fully accept women as rangers.

One female ranger observed that as a woman in the field, all you can do is “climb better, run faster and jump higher” (cited in Pugilese and Levin 2019). Several rangers interviewed for this project made the same point, that women “have to do better than men... they need to over-succeed and work harder to get anywhere” and that the bar is set higher for women, that women have to work harder than men to be judged equally capable.

"Most women that I know who are very high-level conservation professionals are super organized, super dedicated, go above and beyond – you know, and some of the men who are in leadership positions, they can’t even like keep a calendar straight" (cited in Jones and Solomon 2019b).

Several respondents in this study suggested that women and girls’ lower levels of formal education and literacy, a prevalent pattern in many poor countries, is an obstacle to them applying for ranger jobs. This may well be one of the prevailing dynamics, but among the public and patrol rangers included in the RPS, a greater share of women than men hold higher educational credentials. This may reflect the ‘higher bar’ expectation for women and/or it may reflect the gender norm that men’s primary responsibility is to earn an income – for men, getting a job may trump the expectation of staying in school.

Users of protected areas often question the authority of women rangers in sexist terms. One US National Park ranger, Mary Hinson, remembers executing a dangerous, technically complicated winter storm rescue of (male) climbers who had become stuck on a steep rock ledge. An experienced rock climber, Hinson was eager to make this rescue: “I felt like I was born to do this, and it’s my chance, and I’m going to prove myself.” When she finally reached the stranded men, calling out instructions to them, the first response back from them was “whining about a ‘chick’ being sent to rescue them.”

Women rangers – and women in conservation organisations (Jones and Solomon, 2019b) - often face ‘assumptions of wrongness.’ Women are easily and frequently second-guessed by male colleagues. In the interviews for this project, one female ranger in a leadership position recounted several instances when men – most her junior in age and all below her in rank – queried her decisions on hiring and resource deployment. Male colleagues frequently taunt women that they only got their job because they were women: “I definitely encountered a lot of people that..."
either outright told me that I shouldn’t be where I was or that they didn’t believe that I could do the work, or it was pretty obvious that that was the case, and you had to make sure that people saw that you were competent” (cited in Jones and Solomon 2019b).

Social analyses of workplaces generally find that all of these ‘ordinary’ sexist dynamics are amplified for racial/ethnic minorities; there are almost no intersectional or race/ethnicity-disaggregated assessments of ranger workplaces in these terms.

**Protectionism as everyday sexism**

Data from the RPS point to a high degree of rangers’ confidence in mutual protection overall – although there are some interesting regional and gender differences, including lower levels of confidence amongst women in Africa and South Asia, and men in SE Asia.

On the one hand, the ethic of mutual aid and protection amongst rangers and attentiveness to the threats coworkers may face is an essential and positive feature of ranger life.

On the other hand, the protectionism some male rangers express towards women coworkers is usually presented as an obstacle, and as a one-way obligation: male rangers report that they’re not comfortable working with

Figure 9: I ‘agree/ agree a lot’ that my colleagues would assist me in an emergency, even if helping me would put them at risk of serious injury or death

Source: Ranger Perception Survey
women in the field because they feel they need to keep part of their focus on protecting their female coworkers. Women rangers say this kind of one-way and sexist protectionism is a variant on the ‘everyday sexism’ they routinely encounter that reflects skepticism about women’s equal status and unease about women’s place within the corps of rangers.

One woman ranger mused on the gender inequality embedded in one-way protectionism, and framed it as another form of harassment: “Where do we draw the line between being (over) protective and assuming a woman is a weaker being, physically (and mentally?) not able to fulfill the job as good as a man? That would, technically also count as harassment, just in a still quite unusual way. If anything, that’s the kind of unease we would experience here in [country] as women working in this male-ish environment.”

These refrains reflect similar narratives of women entering into policework and soldiering. Feminist analysts in national security fields have examined the protectionism problem: “...the politics of the protector and the protected... distorts power relations: it is much easier to claim the authority to speak for others if one can claim to be The Protector; it is much easier to be silenced and to accept that silencing if one absorbs the self-identity of The Protected... An allegedly ‘natural’ Protector is the person who has not just the physical strength or the collective physical resources to wield definitive power, but who also – allegedly – is the person most capable of thinking in a certain useful way: more ‘strategically, more ‘rationally’” (Enloe 2016). This asymmetrical protector-protected relationship flows directly out of gender norms of masculinity and femininity, and patriarchal narratives about who can and should protect and who needs protecting.

One male ranger trainer said that the men-need-to-pro-tect-women impulse may reflect a lack of confidence in training protocols – or, perhaps, inadequate training or an actual absence of training. He said that if both men and women were confident that everyone received equal training (and equipment) there should be no gender differentiation in notions of mutual aid and protection responsibilities.

**Violence and harassment in ranger workforces**

Women rangers report that they face nearly continuous sexual discrimination, harassment and abuse — from other rangers, the community, and the public. In the words of one former female ranger in Latin America, ‘sexual harassment is ubiquitous.’ A female ranger in South Asia said that male colleagues didn’t support women rangers at work — as a tactic to discourage them and to retaliate for women taking ‘their’ jobs.

Most women rangers report what feels to them to be unending harassment, ranging from sexist jokes to rape. Many men rangers report they aren’t aware of any harassment of women. In the current survey, one male ranger in South Asia flatly said that harassment “doesn’t exist.” Several other male rangers said they were not aware of any harassment in their regions or teams, even if they might have heard – vaguely – that it happened somewhere else.

A few of the male interviewees for this project observed that harassment was subjective and they worried that the line between normal job-related interactions between women and men and “harassment” was too blurry. One interviewee said that in his view ‘25% of what’s called harassment isn’t harassment.’ Another said that he believed that neither men nor women understood what harassment was.

In all workplaces, sexual harassment/abuse is largely a ‘hidden’ problem, so the data on its prevalence should always be assumed to be a significant undercount. Men, too, face harassment and sexual abuse that typically may be even less visible than harassment against women. One male ranger spoke of harassment from a female colleague. Evidence suggests that men more typically face harassment, gender bullying, and assault from other men.
The available literature on workplace dynamics – generally – finds that workplace harassment and abuse is almost always worse for racial/ethnic minorities, and that intersectional harassment (e.g., combined race-gender) is common. There are almost no studies of ranger workforces that provide this level of assessment.

The available quantitative evidence on harassment represents the tip of the iceberg:

**US National Park Service (2017)** in the preceding 12 months:

- 35% W, 10% M experienced gender harassment,
- 18% W, 6% M experienced sexual harassment,
- 1.5% women, 0.6% men experienced sexual assault,
- 42% of lesbians, 36% gay men, 3% heterosexuals experienced sexual orientation harassment,
- 9.5% (equally for M and W) experienced harassing behaviours based on their racial or ethnic background.

A 2000 employee survey in the US National Park system found that over half of female rangers and three-quarters of female park police had experienced sexual harassment on the job (Gilpin 2016).

A subsequent analysis of GBV in the US Department of Interior (the agency responsible for the National Park Service) identified 12 unique environmental factors that increase the risk of harassment, including sexual harassment, occurring in the workplace. Among the twelve were several particularly pertinent to the Parks Service: homogenous workforces; coarsened social discourse outside workplaces; decentralised workplaces; workplaces with significant power disparities; and geographically isolated workplaces (Democratic staff of the House Committee on Natural Resources 2018; Castañeda Camey et al. 2020).

**Viet Nam Conservation Sector, 2020**

- 82.5% of the survey participants (n=94) in the Viet Nam conservation sector (not just rangers), both men and women, experienced sexual harassment in some form in the previous two years: 4 in every 7 men, and 6 in every 7 women.
- Almost 5% of respondents said they had experienced rape or attempted rape in their workplace.
- Sexual remarks and ‘jokes’ were commonplace in the workplace, 88% of which were directed to women.

*In a recent study in Europe, only 13% of male PA managers perceived obstacles preventing women from accessing executive positions. In contrast, 40% of female managers expressed awareness of obstacles.*

**While on duty:**

- For both men and women, rates of bullying, threats and abuse are high.
- Community members remain the greatest source of threat for abusive behaviours overall for men both on and off duty as reported in the RPS survey. For women, the greatest on-duty experience of sexual harassment and violence is from coworkers and supervisors.
- Community members are the source of verbal abuse/bullying, threats, and physical violence for the largest share of both women and men rangers. The trust deficit between communities and rangers, explored more fully in Frontline (Belecky, Singh and Moreto 2019), may be the primary driver of community-based harassment.

- A higher proportion of men than women experience these behaviours from all actors, with almost a third of men rangers experiencing verbal abuse/bullying and threats.
- The greatest danger of physical violence for both women and male rangers comes from community members > then coworkers > then supervisors.
- The greatest danger of sexual violence and harassment for women comes from coworkers > then supervisors > then community members; for men, the threat scale is community members > then coworkers and supervisors almost equally.

**While off duty:** Both men and women rangers experience less abuse off duty than on, except women rangers experience the same level of sexual harassment and violence from community members while both on-and-off duty — a steady reported 1.5%.

**Figure 10: Threat, abuse, violence and harassment while on duty and off duty**

Percent of rangers who say they have experienced the following over the preceding 12 months, global average:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verbal abuse/bullying/harassment</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Physical violence</th>
<th>Sexual harassment or sexual violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From my Supervisor</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From my Co-workers</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From community members</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From my Supervisor</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From my Co-workers</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From community members</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ranger Perception Survey
### VIOLENCE, SEXISM, AND HOSTILE WORKPLACES

#### WOMEN SPECIFIC BARRIERS

**Figure 11: On duty sexual harassment and sexual violence**

Percent of rangers who experience sexual violence and harassment while on duty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Ranger Perception Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From my Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From my Co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From community members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Ranger Perception Survey**

---

### WHILE OFF DUTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal abuse/ bullying/harassment</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Physical violence</th>
<th>Sexual harassment or sexual violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From my Supervisor</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From my Co-workers</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From community members</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Ranger Perception Survey**

---

### Figure 11: On duty sexual harassment and sexual violence

Percent of rangers who experience sexual violence and harassment while on duty
Regional differences in the experience of sexual harassment and violence are stark: The highest rate – by a considerable margin – of on-duty sexual violence and harassment for both men and women occurs in Africa. For women, the greatest threat across 3 regions, excepting Latin America, is from supervisors and coworkers; for men, it is consistently higher from communities (see Figure 10).

The Ranger Perception Survey offers further insights into threats defined both more generally and in specified circumstances:

**Communities as a possible [overall] threat:** The Ranger Perception Survey reveals that high rates of both male and female rangers perceive “communities as an overall possible threat” (Figure 12), although in much higher proportions than the actual threat incidents reveal. There’s considerable regional and gender variation in this perception:

Men and women rangers in Africa perceive communities as a possible source of threat in roughly the same proportions. In SE Asia, women express considerably more concern about possible community threat than their male peers; in LAC and South Asia it’s a notably higher share of men.

The community relations story is more complicated than this single data point suggests. As is discussed later, both female and male rangers overall see themselves as having strong and respectful relationships with their communities.

![Figure 12: Communities as possible [overall] threat](source: Ranger Perception Survey)
Coworkers as a threat: The Ranger Perception Survey reveals that coworkers and supervisors are the primary perpetrators of sexual harassment or sexual violence against on-duty women rangers. The RPS includes one further question about fearing coworkers. Except in the LAC region, women rangers express more fear than their male counterparts about coworkers in response to the hypothetical situation posed in Question 22: “I would be concerned for my safety if I reported a fellow ranger who I witnessed accept a bribe or other corrupt and illegal activity.” Again, SE Asia stands out as a region where notably higher shares of women rangers than men anticipate possible threat from coworkers (see Figure 13).

Harassment is typically met with disregard – and, in many cases, impunity for the perpetrator. The absence of women in ranger leadership positions means that women’s complaints are often ignored. Most managers in ranger organisations are men, and a large number are reported to either ignore harassment or not notice it.

“Unfortunately, there isn’t any female who holds a managerial position here at the park, it’s all men. So, it’s usually tough for them to relate to our grievances” - Catherine Sibale, Malawian ranger.

In some instances, male supervisors appear to simply not understand the nature of harassment and the trauma of it for women — and have not educated themselves or been offered training on these issues. In other instances, they seem to be actively subverting accountability systems in an effort to protect their ‘brotherhood.’ One female ranger in the US National Parks system, Olivia, described a common dynamic (Gilpin 2016):

Days after [reporting an attack] Olivia’s supervisor emailed the chief of interpretation to tell him another intern had concerns about the same young man. He responded: “Thanks for ... trying to keep the rumors from really taking off. I’m glad to hear (Olivia) is getting back into a better frame of mind, but I hope (she) is not creating an uncomfortable environment for (him) if it is not warranted [emphasis added]. Something to watch out for.”

The chief of interpretation encouraged her to keep quiet about the incident. Feeling ashamed, she did. She finished her internship, graduated from college and started working in other parks. She returned to Death Valley as a seasonal employee the next year and has worked there ever since. But the experience taught her to mistrust the system.

“They really have no reporting mechanism,” she says. “They say, ‘Talk to your supervisor.’ What if your supervisor fails you? That’s it; you hit a brick wall, the first person you tell. It rests solely on those individuals as to whether or not they will further your cause.”
Olivia’s report echoes that of other women (Gilpin 2016):

**Anonymous, 2002: Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona:** “A male coworker asked me when I thought we would hook up... Later, he yelled at me and snapped his fingers in my face. He backed me up against a hill, was towering over me, and I felt trapped. I squirmed away and started running back down to our quarters as he yelled after me, ‘Get back here!’ I was sobbing, and I remember feeling very afraid that he was going to hurt me. I tried reporting it twice. I was told to be nicer and to smile more. I wrote an email to (the regional office) and received this: ‘I’m so sorry to hear about your experience at the Grand Canyon. I really appreciate you informing me about this incident. We are currently looking into the trail crew and other divisions at the Grand Canyon.’”

Deepali Chavan

Range Forest Officer **Deepali Chavan** of the Melghat Tiger Reserve in Maharashtra, India, built a reputation for unstinting dedication to forest protection. She was described variously as fierce, no-nonsense, dynamic, dashing, and fearless in chasing poachers and facing down the ‘forest mafia’.

On March 25 2021 Deepali took her life with her service revolver. In a lengthy suicide note, Deepali detailed the unrelenting workplace gender-based harassment, mental, emotional and physical abuse she said she had suffered for more than two years. The case is under investigation.

*Deepali’s family provided consent to share her story and photo.*
Response and effects

Most ranger organisations are singularly unprepared to effectively protect the rights of workers to be free from a hostile work climate. Most interviewees in this study reported that very few of their organisations have policies or training against sexual harassment; fewer still have mechanisms to deal with it when it happens.

There is very little research on the question of whether and how workplace gender inequality and harassment undermines conservation’s ability to achieve its goals of biodiversity protection and ecological stewardship (Matulis and Moyer 2016; Tallis and Lubchenco 2014; Jones and Solomon 2019b). One recent meta-analysis of the gender-conservation literature concluded that there was some evidence of a positive relationship between the engagement of women and environmental outcomes (and also that positive conservation outcomes do not necessarily benefit women, and when women are not considered, conservation activities can perpetuate existing inequities) (James et al. 2021).

Violence and Harassment in conservation organisations

As the global anti-harassment feminist movement, #MeToo, extends into environmental sectors, the internal culture of global conservation organisations has come under scrutiny. The gender equality track record of these organisations bears on their capacity to provide a model, support and guidance for ranger organisations in pursuing this goal. The evidence to date is discouraging: the leadership corps is mostly white and male, and in the past two or three years, revelations have been made public of rampant sexual harassment, including rape, within many prominent conservation organisations. Typically enabled by a culture of impunity, the overall conclusion of one investigation would apply to many: “the culture can make it difficult for women to thrive.” These experiences were intersectionally magnified by race/ethnicity, age, leadership level, and organisation type.

Participants in a study of US conservation organisations reported the same culture of inaction and impunity (Jones and Solomon 2019b):

“There were some harassment issues, of a male harassing a female, at [location redacted]. And the person in charge, the supervisor, was a male, and then the next supervisor was a male, and so the issue never got taken care of.”

In another study, a manager in Southern African reserves expressed fatalism about the likelihood of sexual assault against women rangers: "We had to deal with cases of male rangers raping female rangers... Obviously these guys are drunk and they have been working for two months without seeing their girlfriends, it is a recipe for disaster, if you know men” (cited in Mathekga 2017).

Hostile work climates leave individual women traumatized, and also corrode trust in organisations themselves. The US National Park Survey (2017) found that employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviours were:

- less likely to report supervisory support than employees who were not harassed,
- less likely to trust the organisation than employees who were not harassed,
- less likely to view the organisation as more inclusive than employees who were not harassed,
- more likely to perceive greater pressure to conform to organisational norms (e.g., going along to get along) than employees who were not harassed,
- more likely to perceive the organisational climate to be more tolerant of harassing behaviours than employees who were not harassed,
- more likely to rate the leadership climate to be more tolerant of harassing behaviours than employees who were not harassed,
- more likely to have witnessed harassment against other employees than employees who were not harassed.
GENDER-DIFFERENTIATED EFFECTS OF GENERAL BARRIERS

URSA identifies five main areas where greater support for and professionalization of rangers is needed:

- pay, working conditions, and equipment,
- opportunities for training and learning,
- employment opportunities and conditions,
- trust and accountability (with communities),
- representation and advocacy (ranger associations).

The RPS offers gender-disaggregated insights into all of these.

Pay, working conditions, and equipment:

Rangers, both male and female, generally express high levels of satisfaction with their jobs. At very high rates, and with only quite small gender gaps, both men and women say that they like their jobs better than other people like theirs. Rangers in Africa express the overall lowest levels of "satisfaction" with their job, but even there the levels are quite high and not significantly gender-differentiated.

This high rate of satisfaction is starkly set against overall high levels of dissatisfaction with their pay – for both women and men. The gender gaps are relatively small across the board, except in SE Asia, where the highest proportion of men of any region (70%) feel they are paid fairly, a view not shared by their female colleagues.

One of the most widespread observations about ranger support is that equipment shortages and adequacy fall far below professional standards. All of the studies available, and all of the interviews in which this topic came up, yield findings of rangers using obsolete firearms, having often threadbare uniforms and shoes, and not being provisioned with the most basic equipment (Mushonga 2021a; Kuipers et al. 2020; Shancho 2016; Belecky, Singh and Moreto 2019).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS OF WORK PER WEEK, GLOBAL AVERAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 HOURS PER WEEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 HOURS PER WEEK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS OF WORK PER WEEK AT NIGHT, GLOBAL AVERAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 HOURS PER WEEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 HOURS PER WEEK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERTIME COMPENSATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32% RECEIVE COMPENSATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19% RECEIVE COMPENSATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ranger Perception Survey
### Figure 14: Job satisfaction and wages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>AFRICA</th>
<th>SOUTH ASIA</th>
<th>SE ASIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td>92 %</td>
<td>75 %</td>
<td>84 %</td>
<td>96 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am being paid a fair wage</td>
<td>28 %</td>
<td>37 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>47 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the job better than the average person does in my country</td>
<td>93 %</td>
<td>92 %</td>
<td>92 %</td>
<td>89 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ranger Perception Survey

### Figure 15: Access to supplies/equipment while on patrol

Proportion of rangers who ‘often’ to ‘always’ can access these provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>AFRICA</th>
<th>SOUTH ASIA</th>
<th>SE ASIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firearms (when their use is mandated)</td>
<td>7 %</td>
<td>80 %</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>34 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication devices</td>
<td>26 %</td>
<td>54 %</td>
<td>44 %</td>
<td>47 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean drinking water</td>
<td>45 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>38 %</td>
<td>37 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito Net</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>28 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ranger Perception Survey
The RPS provides gender and region-disaggregated data: The Africa anomaly in firearms is again evident. The gender pattern in South Asia again is interesting in that there are several categories of equipment — such as communications devices — for which women have considerably more access than their male colleagues.

Poor toilet provision is often identified in the literature on rangers as a particular obstacle for women. The RPS findings reveal that the proportion of women who report access ranges from 78% in LAC to 48% in South Asia — the same regional gradient as for men, but for men the range is 72% to 49%.

Provision of basic equipment for rangers while on overnight patrol reveals a repeated finding of least gender equality in LAC.

However, overnight patrol is least commonly encountered by women rangers in LAC — it is reported to be “not applicable” for approximately 40% of women rangers in LAC, compared with about 14% of male rangers in that region. (The “not applicable” count in other regions ranges from about 1% - 5%, for both men and women.)

![Figure 16: Access to supplies / equipment while at outpost or station](image-url)

Percent of rangers who ‘often’ to ‘always’ can access these provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AT OUTPOST OR STATION</th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>AFRICA</th>
<th>SOUTH ASIA</th>
<th>SE ASIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication devices</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>56 %</td>
<td>47 %</td>
<td>45 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean drinking water</td>
<td>62 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>47 %</td>
<td>52 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito Net</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>41 %</td>
<td>26 %</td>
<td>22 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet facilities</td>
<td>78 %</td>
<td>62 %</td>
<td>48 %</td>
<td>51 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running water</td>
<td>58 %</td>
<td>38 %</td>
<td>37 %</td>
<td>46 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ranger Perception Survey
The adequacy of equipment or facilities reveals further perspectives: In general, the RPS reveals that women rangers in Latin America feel less well provisioned than their male counterparts across all categories of equipment; the gender gap is most stark in “basic necessities,” with only 38% of women rangers in LAC saying they are adequate compared with 62% of men.

With the exception of firearms adequacy, in the other regions women generally express more or roughly the same satisfaction with the adequacy of most of the equipment provided.

Figure 17: Adequacy of equipment / provisions
Of those who have this equipment, percent who agree that it is sufficient for the work they do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>AFRICA</th>
<th>SOUTH ASIA</th>
<th>SE ASIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td>18 %</td>
<td>81 %</td>
<td>43 %</td>
<td>45 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(when their use is mandated)</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>81 %</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>64 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication devices</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>61 %</td>
<td>61 %</td>
<td>56 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 %</td>
<td>66 %</td>
<td>45 %</td>
<td>43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing / Shelter</td>
<td>52 %</td>
<td>34 %</td>
<td>60 %</td>
<td>60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>48 %</td>
<td>57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic necessities (toilet, water)</td>
<td>38 %</td>
<td>42 %</td>
<td>67 %</td>
<td>64 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62 %</td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>49 %</td>
<td>67 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing including uniform/ boots</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>58 %</td>
<td>57 %</td>
<td>46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 %</td>
<td>49 %</td>
<td>41 %</td>
<td>57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When needed, medical treatment provided adequate</td>
<td>47 %</td>
<td>60 %</td>
<td>42 %</td>
<td>63 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td>54 %</td>
<td>26 %</td>
<td>56 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic equipment, e.g. binoculars, GPS</td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>64 %</td>
<td>51 %</td>
<td>65 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58 %</td>
<td>60 %</td>
<td>41 %</td>
<td>58 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ranger Perception Survey
The provision of firearms is extremely uneven across the regions. Africa is the anomaly, where most rangers, both female and male, have access to firearms. In LAC, the provision of a firearm is "not applicable" for 78% of female rangers and 75% of male. But even for the minority of rangers in LAC who do receive a firearm, very few say it is adequate.

**Opportunities for training and learning:**

Analyses of rangers’ workplaces conclude that regular training is both critically important for professionalization and honing core competencies – and, also, that training is insufficiently provided (e.g., Belecky, Singh and Moreto 2019; Mathekga 2017; Milda et al. 2020).

**Employment opportunities and conditions:**

Men’s and women’s awareness of policies on promotion is relatively high, although least of all in Africa. Rangers in South and SE Asia have the highest overall policy awareness, and also the biggest gender gaps.

---

**Figure 18: Women rangers purchase more equipment at their own expense compared to male rangers (global averages)**

Percent of rangers who buy the following out of pocket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Women (%)</th>
<th>Men (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boot</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vest</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkie-Talkie</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only where use of firearms are mandated. Source: Ranger Perception Survey*

**Figure 19: Training opportunities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>AFRICA</th>
<th>SOUTH ASIA</th>
<th>SE ASIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The training I received at start was sufficient for my job responsibilities.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 %</td>
<td>76  %</td>
<td>53  %</td>
<td>72  %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 %</td>
<td>72  %</td>
<td>51  %</td>
<td>70  %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The organization provides sufficient additional training such as refreshers. |
| 46 %       | 70  % | 60  % | 76  % |
| 55 %       | 63  % | 55  % | 78  % |

*Source: Ranger Perception Survey*
### Percent of those who have received training* in past 12 months in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Type</th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>AFRICA</th>
<th>SOUTH ASIA</th>
<th>SE ASIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First aid + emergency treatment</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Firearms (when their use is mandated)</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement / combat</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness survival</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife conflict</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranger-based data collection</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol tactic training</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime scene investigation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; regulation</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*of those who know; the "unsure" rate ranges from 1.5-3%, with women on higher end of unsure across all categories
Female rangers generally have higher degrees of awareness than their male colleagues, except in SE Asia.

Similarly, the proportion of women who are satisfied with their chances for promotion is generally higher than men’s — except in SE Asia where the rate of satisfaction is high for both men and women but women are much less satisfied than their male colleagues.

Women rangers have more precarious terms of employment than do men in three of the four regions — except in South Asia where a higher proportion of women are permanent. The gap in SE Asia is particularly dramatic, where 80% of men are on permanent contract but only 17% of women. The SE Asia finding is congruent with the pay dissatisfaction gender gap, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>AFRICA</th>
<th>SOUTH ASIA</th>
<th>SE ASIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% familiar with</td>
<td>70 %</td>
<td>59 %</td>
<td>92 %</td>
<td>82 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization’s policies for promotion and advancement</td>
<td>65 %</td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td>74 %</td>
<td>89 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% satisfied with chances for promotion</td>
<td>51 %</td>
<td>43 %</td>
<td>64 %</td>
<td>78 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>41 %</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>85 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ranger Perception Survey

Figure 20: Job promotion

Figure 21: Type of employment contract, percent of rangers

Permanent contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>AFRICA</th>
<th>SOUTH ASIA</th>
<th>SE ASIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>62 %</td>
<td>90 %</td>
<td>17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47 %</td>
<td>69 %</td>
<td>86 %</td>
<td>80 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limited Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>AFRICA</th>
<th>SOUTH ASIA</th>
<th>SE ASIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57 %</td>
<td>38 %</td>
<td>1 %</td>
<td>80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ranger Perception Survey
Amongst the rangers surveyed in Africa, the same proportions of women and men reported having access to a union, but elsewhere women have lower rates of union representation – to the extent they know they have this access. On global average, 19% of women and 15% of men rangers are unsure whether they have access to a union representative.

**Community relations:**

While rangers see communities as a possible – and, to a limited extent, actual – source of threat (see Figures 10, 11 and 12), both male and female rangers feel that their relations with community members are positive and of critical importance to their jobs.
Towards Gender Equality in the Ranger Workforce: Challenges & Opportunities

Ranger Sandra Montoya from Sierra Abra Tanchipa, Mexico, explains Comisión Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas (CONANP)'s community development program. © CONANP Mexico

BENEFITS OF GENDER EQUALITY
Towards Gender Equality In The Ranger Workforce: Challenges & Opportunities

Guiding Principles

**Supporting/ enacting human rights and gender equality commitments:** As a matter of human rights and gender equality, both women and men should have the same right to opportunities for employment, livelihood, inclusion, information, and recognition.

- Both men and women benefit from living in more gender-equal societies and working in gender-equal workplaces.

- Most global ranger and conservation organizations have already made policy commitments to human rights; gender equality is intrinsic to those commitments.

- Donors in the conservation realm, whether private or state-based, increasingly expect — and many now require — gender-informed approaches and workplans, and gender-integration.

- Women often express considerable eagerness to participate in the ranger workforce. Ranger work can be a source of prestige and pride as well as employment (often in employment-scarce areas) for women as much as for men.

- One woman ranger is recently quoted as saying, "Unlike some years ago, when they used to say this job is for men, now there are women who are working to protect the wildlife. It means a lot to us and makes us continue to do our job because we know that people are behind us, supporting us" (cited in Aldred 2016). In almost all interviews with women rangers for this study and others, most women are enthusiastic about contributing to conservation and sustainability through ranger work (Aldred 2016; Seager 2020; Pugliese and Levin 2016).

**Ranger employers, associations and conservation organizations have the opportunity to be leaders in making positive gender change:** Gender norms are neither ‘natural’ nor unchangeable. Rather, they are made up and remade in everyday contexts. To the extent that these entities demonstrate commitments to women’s empowerment and to gender inclusivity within their own organisations and, importantly, through projects and programmes, they can be powerful influencers in changing socially dominant norms – norms that are damaging for men as well as for women.

**Ranger employment amplifies women’s empowerment:** Findings from a Gender Learning Review in Namibia and
Madagascar in 2020 reflect the wider ‘empowerment amplification’ of bringing women into conservation projects and into formal employment as rangers:

*Most women said that being involved in conservation activities gave them a sense of empowerment, contribution, ‘counting.’ In women-only interview settings, women were even more passionate about saying that through conservation activities women gain broader social connections and exposure to new ideas. In Madagascar, for example, women in the mangrove communities said that bringing women into mangrove conservation work (planting) enhances their own sense of making significant contributions to the local economy, and does seem to garner more overall respect from their male counterparts. The ‘greater respect’ narrative was repeated several times, and in both men-only and women-only meetings participants said that having women more involved in conservation activities meant that men overall respect women and women’s opinions more.*

*Women also said that being involved in ‘outside’ conservation activities gets them away from being ‘stuck’ at home where outlets for their ideas and energy are limited. Many women said that they find personal growth through community activities and contributing to conservation. One woman in the #Khoadi//Hoas Conservancy (Namibia) made an impassioned observation that ‘when a woman just stays at home, she doesn’t know her own potential.’ A woman from Anabeb Conservancy (Namibia) echoed this, saying that because of traditional attitudes women were ‘left to just sit, and we get used to just sitting’ (Seager 2020).*

**Instrumental / Operational Benefits**

*Diversity is an organisational effectiveness amplifier:* Diversity makes the work of organisations smarter and more effective; diversity and gender-balanced inclusion improves organisational thinking, planning and outcomes.

Gender and intersectional diversity in representation within organisations is an effectiveness amplifier – in project planning, programme development and execution, priority-setting, decision-making groups. The likelihood of better decision-making is improved when representatives of the whole – not just half – of the population have the opportunity to be involved.

There is extensive evidence that diverse policy, decision-making and leadership groups produce better plans, decisions and outcomes. Much of the evidence of this comes from the corporate world, where decision-making diversity has been proven to yield better tangible outcomes. Diverse teams benefit from ‘collective intellect’, which improves overall performance.

One female ranger interviewed for this study observed that without women in the ranger workforce, there would be a “lack of development of ideas. As we know the ideas and perspectives of men and women are quite different from point of view. Women are also often more creative and savvy than men especially in the field of management. As such, if there are no or few women workers in this field, the development of ideas in resolving or addressing issues in this career field will certainly be limited. …it is [also] possible that there are things overlooked if only male workers or only a few female workers in this field of work.”
Opening doors for women in the workforce also doubles the pool of possible skills and capacities.

**Women’s empowerment is key to environmental sustainability; gender balanced inclusion improves resource management and conservation outcomes:** A considerable literature shows that women’s empowerment is closely linked with environmental sustainability (James et al. 2021). The corollary of this may be that bringing gender balance into the ranger workforce can expand capacities and perspectives on conservation, sustainability, and resource management.

Some research suggests that protected area projects that have incorporated gender equality principles and promoted women’s participation are more effective and balanced (Biermayr-Jenzano 2003). In 2014 the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) added recognition that gender considerations were key to meeting the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

In natural-resource dependent communities, men and women are differentiated users of natural resources: men collect turtles, women collect turtle eggs; women collect medicinal plants and herbs; men harvest trees for their timber and structural uses, women selectively harvest trees for their heat and light burning qualities; indigenous women conserve ‘heritage crops’ and enhance genetic diversity; where women and men both fish, they often fish for different species and use different tools and techniques (Aguilar 2002; Blair 2014; Khadka and Verma 2012; Gurung 1998; Leach 1991; Rocheleau 1995; Rocheleau 1997; CBD; Olivera 1999).

Bringing both women and men into ranger workforces from these communities means that they will bring with them a differentiated base of environmental knowledge, and allying with both women and men will enhance protection.

Women are in the forefront of environmental activism around the world. Bringing women with these skills and capacities into ranger work will enhance its effectiveness and reach.

A related outcome of having more women rangers is that it might encourage women’s and girls’ participation in conservation/natural resource management more widely. There is no ranger-based evidence on this, but role-model effects are possible and warrant closer attention.

As a cautionary note, however, it is important not to assume that the inclusion of women automatically will bring instrumental benefits into wildlife and natural resources management (Sundstrom et al. 2019). Women are not always pro-conservation, nor environmentally enlightened, nor wise resource managers. Stereotypes about women being ‘natural environmentalists’ are themselves gender-delimiting. Nonetheless, it is a strategic mistake to exclude half the community from engagement and intentionally excluding stakeholders (such as young men and women) from conservation planning can lead to “… in devastating and irreversible impacts for wildlife and people” (Gore 2012).

**Economic amplifier effects of women’s employment:** There is widespread evidence that when women earn money they put a higher share of their earnings into family and household wellbeing, compared with men who put a larger share of earnings into personal spending. The inclusion of women in income-earning opportunities, especially in opportunity-constrained settings, can have wide-scale effects at both household and community levels.44

**Women may be more attentive and detail-oriented, and better at data collection and keeping records:** Three interviewees in this study expressed strong views that women rangers were more attentive to detail, better observers, more systematic, conscientious, patient, and much better data collectors and record-keepers than men.

Evidence from police work supports these observations that women are particularly good at gathering intelligence and at noting and keeping track of detail. (UNODC, INTERPOL and UN Women 2020). Given the importance of “data collection” – including, importantly, patrol logs – for effective ranger work, this could be a significant benefit.
**Police analogues: women rangers may make “enforcement” activities more efficient, community-sensitive, and less violent**

Evidence from research on integrating women into civilian police forces reveals key findings most likely pertinent to ranger gender integration.

- Most policing is about skill, not strength. Having women on enforcement teams increases effectiveness, and decreases enforcement-related violence.

- Law enforcement is more effective when it draws on the talent, knowledge, skills, and capacities of the entire population.

- Female officers are less likely to use force, use excessive force, or be named in a lawsuit than male officers. Women police/enforcement actors tend to de-escalate tense situations, and women tend to turn first to negotiation and cooperative approaches to enforcement. Women are found to have a calming effect on male partners in high-stress and dangerous assignments, resulting in fewer police deaths. Higher levels of female representation are associated with organisations that emphasize community policing.

- Women on enforcement teams are available to search and question female suspects – a task that men are culturally prohibited from doing, and shouldn’t be doing anyway.

- Women are consistently rated as more trusted by their communities and, importantly, are motivated to serve communities in an era of decreased police legitimacy. Women have high levels of interpersonal communication skills, which translates into more effective practices in the field. Women might be able to deploy community-based diplomacy and de-escalation in conflicts over land or wildlife management, both because of their access to women’s networks and because they are less likely to be socialized to think of armaments as a frontline tool.

- Female officers are more likely to acknowledge that community policing, including building ties and working closely with the community, is an important component of policing. The participation of female officers increases positive perceptions of police legitimacy.

- Having female officers results in improved responses to sexual and gender-based violence, and greater likelihood that women who are victims of this violence will report.

- Male-dominant enforcement actors are demonstrably more likely than mixed sex or women-only enforcers to deploy violence against community members and individual PA users. There is credible evidence of widespread sexualized violence against community women by male rangers, especially anti-poaching rangers who may use violence or the threat of violence against community members to extract information on poaching (OHCHR 2010; McVeigh 2019). IUCN’s groundbreaking assessment of gender-based violence in environmental sectors reveals evidence of both systematic and random violence of sometimes epidemic proportions (Castañeda Camey et al. 2020).

(INTERPOL 2020; Roman 2020; Subramania 2019; UNODC, INTERPOL and UN Women 2020)
Community relations and corruption: Communities are seen as pivotal actors in the new frameworks of participatory conservation – often as ‘agents of change,’ as primary stakeholders, as partners, or as the ‘first line of defense.’ Good community relations between rangers and ‘communities’ are essential for effective ranger work, as most rangers recognize (see Figure 23 above, and also Moreto, Brunson and Braga 2017; Moreto and Charlton 2021, Milda et al. 2020). The URSA Action Plan (2021) emphasizes strengthening trust and accountability between rangers and communities. Poor community relations will undermine ranger and conservation effectiveness.

Many interviewees for this report, and much of the available secondary literature, suggests that bringing women into ranger forces will enhance community relations.

Some interviewees for this study cautioned that this can be a simplistic interpretation, and, further, that not all women are good community interlocutors. This notion reinforces sexist stereotypes of women’s best (or ‘natural’) capabilities. There is some shared discomfort with the assumption that women are inherently “better” at community relations – one interviewee said this reinforces the “same old gender norms...that women are assuming their ‘expected’ roles...that women are carers, men are warriors.” But, on the other hand, she observed that ‘we may need to face the reality that field conditions just might not be suitable for women, and that community work is critically important.’

Experts interviewed for this study identify several ways in which women rangers improve and extend ranger-community relationships:

- The effect of women rangers de-escalating violence (described above) is important to gain community trust and partnership.
- Women rangers may have better access than men to different constituencies (especially other women) in communities. Whether for information-seeking purposes, or gathering enforcement intelligence, women can expand the reach of ranger networks. One Zimbabwean ranger interviewed for this study pointed out that “women can talk more with other women... men frighten women... it would be very tricky for men to approach women in villages.” A South Asian ranger echoed this, saying: “Communities are not afraid of women rangers. Women rangers are more liked by communities as they are less corrupt.”
- A Latin American expert interviewed for this study observed that women bring complementary skills: “Women bring a feminine principle of ‘caring’ – both for social relationships and ecological – they try harder to understand the needs of communities and bring a sense of wellbeing and care – male stereotypes are narrow, and we need to awaken these feminine principles of caring and social awareness in men.” Many interviewees observed that women rangers seem more interested in social dynamics and processes, not just wildlife conservation.
- In many parts of the world, where fuelwood and water collectors are mainly women from nearby communities, rangers in the field are likely to encounter women on a daily basis. Having women in the ranger force can make these encounters less fraught.
- A female ranger in South Asia reported that “It is women, not men, who have prominent roles in leading work in villages (agriculture, forest wood collection) and they also engage in forest wood extraction which is why they need women rangers for resolving issues that may come up in their work.”

The notion that women are less-corruptible than men has gained currency as a narrative about national elected women leaders, women in judiciaries, in financial industries – and in conservation, especially in work on the illegal wildlife trade. The fact that this seems to be simultaneously a sexist stereotype and also an evidence-based reality means that it needs careful situation-specific scrutiny. Structural explanations are more likely than ‘natural tendencies’ to explain why women are less involved in bribery and corruption (UNODC 2020).

There are no known studies on gender differences in ranger corruption.
BEST PRACTICES AND GENDER-INCLUSIVE INTERVENTIONS
Best practices and gender inclusive interventions

The best practices to support gender equality in ranger work fall roughly into four categories:

- making space for women, including targeted training opportunities,
- making visible and protecting against Gender-Based Violence,
- centering human rights and gender equality in global ranger initiatives,
- modifying recruitment and promotion based practices, and providing role models.

**Making space for women, including targeted training:**

Several people interviewed in this study emphasized the need to create spaces for women to have conversations with one another, support each other and receive training; one expert punctuated this by observing that ‘we need female spaces to counter the ubiquitous male-ness spaces of conservation.’

Creating women-centered opportunities, networks and spaces includes examples such as:

**All-women ranger teams:** There are now more than a dozen models of women-only ranger teams including the “Black Mambas” (South Africa), “Team Lioness” (Kenya), the “Seed Women,” a mostly indigenous women's team of rangers in Western Australia, and the Akashinga in Zimbabwe. A few of these – the Akashinga particularly – train women into heavily masculinized models of armed ranger work, but most rely on non-militaristic approaches. Some gender experts view the women-only militarized teams with skepticism: on one hand, they may amplify women’s empowerment and have received a lot of positive public attention; on other hand, they might be...
seen as doubling-down on male conformity and stereotypes. There are logistical and perhaps legal obstacles in moving women-only ranger teams from their current status as notable exceptions to a scalable model.

**Women ranger associations and networks:** There is no comprehensive database on women's associations and networks, but examples include:

- Chile’s upcoming “Congress for Women Rangers in Latin America” in October 2021,
- the 2018 dedicated programming and space afforded to the women's network in the 2018 Latin American Congress of Protected Areas,
- the 2019 Latin America and Caribbean “Women in Conservation” Network (Mujeres en Conservacion)’s “Declaration of Women in Conservation” that made specific proposals for achieving gender equality,
- a WhatsApp women's group of the Mexico National Commission of Protected Areas,
- the International Rangers Federation's steps towards forming a women ranger caucus,
- gender-focused conferences and panels, including, recently: “Pathways Kenya,” a 2020 all-women panel of conservation leaders; a 2020 panel discussion hosted by Targeting Natural Resource Corruption on “Female rangers and anti-poaching strategies to stem corruption;” the 9th World Ranger Congress in Chitwan Nepal in 2019 had the highest proportion of women participants of any Congress (40-50%), and included several dedicated panels and themes on women rangers.

**Non-ranger, but affiliated groups:** Moving beyond the sphere of ranger-specific women's groups, there are many independent ‘sister’ groups that enhance visibility for gender equality and intersectional diversity in conservation-related professions and activities. For example:

---

**US National Park Service Office of Relevancy, Diversity and Inclusion:**

**Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ) Employee Resource Group**

The National Park Service LGBTQ employee group serves the agency and its employees by addressing the unique needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer personnel and visitors. The group formed in April 2015 and will enhance the visibility of LGBTQ history in the National Park System and assist the agency in improving the working environment for and hiring, retaining, and improving visibility of its LGBTQ employees.

**Women’s Employee Resource Group**

The Women’s Employee Resource Group (W-ERG) enhances the visibility of women's issues and achievements in the NPS, creating a gender-equitable work environment. The W-ERG is a resource specifically for NPS staff interested in workplace gender equity and in increasing opportunities for women—across disciplines, geographies, backgrounds and experiences. The group provides community, personal and career resources, and information around gender issues, and advises NPS senior leadership on these issues and on behalf of its membership.

Employee groups under the auspices of this Office also include groups for Hispanic employees, Indigenous employees, and disabled employees.

Source: [https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1244/index.htm](https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1244/index.htm)
Minorities in shark science

Who are we?

“We were founded by four Black female shark researchers. We strive to be seen and take up space in a discipline which has been largely inaccessible for women like us. We strive to be positive role models for the next generation. We seek to promote diversity and inclusion in shark science and encourage women of color to push through barriers and contribute knowledge in marine science. Finally, we hope to topple the system that has historically excluded women like us and create an equitable path to shark science. We believe diversity in scientists creates diversity in thought, which leads to innovation.”

Source: http://www.misselasmo.org/

Women for the Environment Africa (WEarica) https://womenforenvironment.org/
Women in Ocean Science https://www.womenin-ocean.science.com/
Young Women in Conservation Biology in Africa https://conbio.org/groups/sections/africa/ywcb/
Black Science Network https://blackscienetwork.com/
Women for Wildlife https://www.womenforwildlife.com/
Women in Antarctic Research https://www.scar.org/antarctic-women/
“Diversity in the Outdoors,” aiming to bring LGBTQ people into outdoors activities, and also to ‘connect and support LGBTQ rangers worldwide’ https://www.diversifyoutdoors.com/hannah-malvin

Some of these networks are now well-established; some are under the aegis of an NGO; most are independent scholar and practitioner networks. Lack of Internet connectivity for rangers is a significant obstacle to organising. Many are fledgling and under-resourced, such as the ad hoc Women for Conservation network in Namibia, a 2018 initiative of women, mostly single mothers, from six Conservancies; their vision is to become a national force for conservation in Namibia (Seager 2020).

Professional development opportunities: Professional enhancement opportunities for women rangers provide both material support and also signal credibility for and to women rangers:

WWF’s “Education for Nature” programme includes a Fellowship opportunity to support applicants for graduate-level studies in the “Role of Gender Equity in Achieving Sustainable Blue Economies Outcomes.”

Colorado State University (USA) runs training institutes on “Gender in Protected Areas” to develop and expand leadership capacities for women rangers.

As part of their “Women and Conservation” programme in Asia-Pacific, The Nature Conservancy has developed specialized training programmes for “Women Rangers in Northern Australia” to build community support for and awareness of women’s role in Indigenous land management.

Making visible and protecting against Gender-Based Violence (GBV):

Women rangers face unrelenting sexual and gender
harassment and violence. Many male rangers say they generally are unaware of it happening. Many managers ignore it. Efforts to make this issue visible are critically important to bridge this gap and bring the topic – long taboo – into ranger agendas.

The most comprehensive programme to do so is the IUCN-USAID “RISE” (Resilient, Inclusive, and Sustainable Environments) programme. Now in its second year, RISE sponsors several programmes that collectively aim to make changes to women’s agency in conservation, always through a filter of reducing GBV.50

Among the awardees for 2020 grants funding is Viet Nam-WildAct, which will use the funding for a project “to empower local women, leaders, and conservation organizations in Viet Nam to address the challenges of gender inequality, harassment, and unsafe working environments that women face in wildlife conservation. WildAct-Viet Nam and its partners are establishing workshops and trainings with employees working at all levels within wildlife conservation organizations to discuss their working environment, fieldwork safety, and perceptions of harassment in the workplace...and establish a Vietnamese Women in Conservation Network.”

In the aftermath of public revelations of considerable sexual violence against rangers in the US National Park system, the Congressional oversight committee developed a template for a robust sexual harassment policy. See Annex 1.

Centering human rights and gender equality in global ranger initiatives:

Three currently-underway ranger initiatives foreground gender equality:

1. **The Chitwan Declaration** of the World Ranger Congress 2019 commits to broad gender-related goals: gender-equal opportunities in hiring, pay, and promotion in the ranger workforce, as well as appropriate measures to provide safety and support for female rangers.

2. **The International Ranger Federation’s (IRF) Ranger Code of Conduct** includes the expectation that rangers respect people regardless of age, sexual orientation, gender, economic status and religious belief, among other identifiers. It also generally states that rangers should not “harass” people on any basis. In the 2021 V.1 version, there is no specific language on sexual violence or harassment.

3. **The IUCN “Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas”** is a certification programme to identify and certify protected areas that meet “best practice area conservation standards.”51 A current initiative will integrate gender equality indicators into the Green List standards.52
RECOMMENDATIONS & CONCLUSION
Several of the experts and rangers interviewed for this project raised the need for *systemic* interventions and the need for wide-ranging overhauls of the ranger workforce.

The time seems ripe for introspection and finger-on-the-pulse assessments of what ranger work is and why the field has such a significant gender imbalance. Global ranger organisations – either URSA or the IRF – might convene a series of collaborative discussions on the structural challenges that several interviewees in this study raised (as detailed in Chapter One). Collaboration amongst international NGOs, with implementing assistance by national and local NGOs and CSOs, donors and other international organisations, could be helpful to these efforts (Woodside et al. 2021).
The ‘rethinking the entire system’ interventions that would enable women’s integration into the ranger workforce have been discussed more fully in Chapter One of this report, and include:

- rethinking the name “ranger” and associated terminology, and the notional basis that terminology implies; and/or rethinking the messaging about rangers,
- ranger organisations and conservation NGOs should explore the ways they present ranger imagery and stereotypes,
- considering how to address large ‘cultural’ gender norms as obstacles to equality, and the roles that ranger organisations might play as social leaders in foregrounding gender equality,
- turning the table: rather than assuming that women need to conform to the existing male ranger model, the ranger model itself might best be overhauled to accommodate a wider-spectrum definition of rangering, of conservation, and what it means to put aside ‘protected areas.’ The 2021 Code of Conduct defines ranger activities broadly and not primarily through an enforcement lens, and as the Code is promulgated and adopted this might catalyse some of these changes.

Other mostly-male organisations, including police departments, have gone through/are going through similar self-reflections that might provide some insights. Experts from those domains might be brought into the conversations.

2 DEPLOY POLICY FOUNDATIONS

All ranger, conservation organisations that provide support for rangers, and government ministries responsible for rangers, regardless of provenance, mission or size, need to develop core mission statements and policies that specify:

- Unambiguous commitment to gender equality as a foundational principle and an operational goal. Models for this already exist: for example, the National Wildlife Federation in the US offers this gender-sensitive mission statement.

- Zero-tolerance for sexual harassment and violence. Annex 1 provides a model of a well-developed anti-harassment policy. The starting principles, taken from the “6 Minimum Elements of an Anti-Harassment Policy” by the Democratic staff of the House Committee on Natural Resources (2018) include:

NEXT PAGE
The development of these core policies needs to be matched by knowledge distribution: mandatory gender-equality information training should be enacted for all paid employees and volunteers involved in ranger work. Trainings should be repeated on a regular basis, at least yearly, and anyone associated with the workplaces, no matter how peripheral, must participate in these trainings. Trainings should be offered in all dominant local languages.

3 CONDUCT GENDER AUDITS

Ranger employers and ranger associations must conduct gender audits. Conservation NGOs have an important role to encourage and support these processes as part of their core conservation support. These audits should include an assessment of workplace conditions for men and women, policy structures in place that support or subvert gender equality, salary scales, the roles women and men play in the organisation. Conservation organisations need to take on board their moral obligation to advance gender equality.

This audit should also include a review of the images of rangers and their activities and how information about rangers and their work is conveyed both inside and outside organisations. Ranger employers should commit to acknowledge, celebrate and develop different types of ranger activities that women and men perform.
Conservation NGOs should play a lead role in assessing ranger identities and activities featured on their websites, in social media and through online and print communications.

4 ESTABLISH GENDER-DISAGGREGATED DATABASES

Collecting basic gender-disaggregated data on even the most basic ranger profiles needs to be prioritized, including how many male/female rangers there are (and LGBTQI if collecting that information doesn't put people in peril).

Commitments need to be made to ensuring gender disaggregation of all ranger/conservation surveys and data collection efforts, including the rangers who have lost their lives in the line of duty.

5 HOST TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES FOR RANGERS

Both men and women would benefit from repeated training to:

- sharpen basic ranger skills, included, where needed, numeracy and literacy skills,
- develop a shared foundational understanding of gender equality and its social and conservation benefits,
- promulgate organisational anti-harassment policies;
- provide a shared foundational understanding of biodiversity, conservation, and roles of rangers in environmental protection,
- introduce/reinforce understanding of the conservation benefits of a more diverse workforce.

Specific training opportunities for women in single-sex settings are needed in:

- developing leadership mentor networks and skills: “What’s been really helpful is participating in some leadership trainings, some really good ones, and then I think that taught me the skill to seek a mentor, to seek mentors or to seek assistance where I probably wouldn’t have done it” (cited in Jones and Solomon 2019b).
providing safe space to allow women rangers to share strategies of confronting harassment and to discuss what forms harassment takes.

Indigenous communities, and specifically indigenous women, should be given specific opportunities to participate in training and professional development.

**Specific training opportunities for men in single-sex settings are needed to:**

- make spaces for men to talk about male modelling, masculinities, how to interrogate how they understand their roles as men,
- discuss and widely promulgate information about the nature and scope of sexual/ gender/ minorities harassment and to ensure familiarity with anti-harassment policies,
- develop leadership skills that are predicated on commitments to gender equality as a core leadership quality.

More than one interviewee made the point that male rangers need to be educated about harassment and equality before women can be successfully integrated into ranger workforces.

**6 ENGAGE DONORS IN SUPPORTING GENDER EQUALITY**

Some of the steps toward creating a more gender-balanced and equitable ranger workforce can be acted on with little expansion of resources. Others will require substantial increases in organisational capacity and financial resources.

Donors increasingly require safeguarding policies and practices to be in place, or at least to be in credible stages of development. Many donors are keenly interested in gender integration. Campaigns could be developed to encourage donors to support gender safeguarding and equality as specific and actionable goals.

**7 ENGAGE DONORS, GOVERNMENTS AND NGOs IN IMPROVING RANGER CONDITIONS AND SUPPLIES**

Men and women rangers face poor provisioning, supplies, accommodations, clothing, protective devices and technological availability. Beyond the basic deprivation this imposes, some of the effects are different for
men and women and deficiencies in ranger support hinder gender equality.

Governments have a primary responsibility to provide adequate support for rangers, and need to take strong actions to improve work conditions and supplies for rangers. NGOs might use their influence to encourage national governments to provide stable and better funding for ranger corps.

NGOs and global conservation organisations themselves should redouble efforts to finance ranger support at appropriate levels.

ENGA GE N AT I O NA L G O V E R N M E N TS

National governments, globally the largest employers of rangers, should enhance and stabilize funding for ranger support. Targeted funding should be provided to integrate women, LGBTQI, racial/ethnic minorities, and indigenous peoples into the workforce.

Governments are also well positioned to develop, offer and mandate training (for both men and women) on equality, anti-harassment and safeguards.
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Specific reforms and enabling policies

1. **Enact enabling policies in recruitment and promotion**

   Changing “cultural attitudes” about men and women in the ranger workforce can be a slow process, but specific enabling policies need to match the core principles detailed above:

   - "Critical mass" hiring of women rangers (just hiring one woman is going to set her up for failure);

   - enacting policies that address work conditions so that being a ranger is an appealing career for both women and men. Ensuring inclusive work opportunities and reassessing conditions-of-employment practices might include these initiatives: maternity and paternity policies; guaranteed time off to male and female employees for taking care of ill family members; daycare for children of both male and female employees; accommodation for workers who are pregnant; promotion and reward systems that aren’t predicated primarily on field patrol experience; reconsidering long-duration field tours of duty for men as well as women; reconsidering policies that prohibit families from joining rangers on long-term field duty.

   - Recruitment policies are particularly important. Announcements of ranger opportunities (paid or volunteer) should be couched in gender-neutral terms and specify a commitment to non-discrimination. Affirmative statements to the effect that “women and minorities are encouraged to apply” are often beneficial in establishing a diverse applicant pool.

   - Accountability should be embedded in personnel review mechanisms to ensure that leaders and supervisors understand the importance of gender equality in their work and that they will be held responsible for its success.
2. PROMOTE POLICY AWARENESS

Rangers currently report a high degree of uncertainty about existing policies, and women more so than men:

- Availability of maternity/paternity leave:
  - Women: 17%
  - Men: 13%

- Access to union rep:
  - Women: 19%
  - Men: 15%

- Whether organization needs to give termination notice:
  - Women: 32%
  - Men: 20%

- Various types of training, average across training types:
  - Women: 2.9%
  - Men: 1.6%

Efforts to "make" policies need to be matched by efforts to "make them known." An important piece of this is to ensure that all organisational policies and functional materials need to be available in local languages.

3. CREATE AND MAINTAIN DATABASES

All ranger employers should collect and maintain databases that include, at a minimum, the following information points, collected on a regular basis. These data by necessity should be collected locally; if compiled at a subnational or national level, the local disaggregation should not be erased. All information should be anonymized and made publicly available.

- Raw numbers and the percentage of staff members and volunteers by gender identity (men, women, and non-binary).

- Employment data by gender identity cross-tabulated by work assignment and job type/rank/category (e.g., administrative staff, support staff, patrol rangers, pay level or volunteer status, seniority level).

- Promotion, retention and progress-through-the-ranks data disaggregated by gender identity.

- Data on harassment and gender-based violence to be collected through appropriate and confidential channels.

Sound policies require sound information. Surveys can help assess the gender-differentiated experiences of being in the ranger workforce, both positive and negative, including gender-specific experiences of violence and discrimination. A good model for a sexual violence survey might be the "Stop the Sexual Assault" reports developed to track the experiences of humanitarian and development aid workers (Mazurana 2017). Doing a survey, in itself, is not sufficient: it’s important to develop a plan and timeline to extract the lessons learned from the surveys (and from the data outlined above) and to develop action plans based on the findings.

4. UPSTREAM EDUCATION:

Creating ‘upstream’ opportunities for girls and women in conservation education. Increasing the number of women and girls who consider ranger work to be a viable
option requires education and outreach. This might be effectively achieved through partnering with schools and existing non-ranger-specific education programmes. “Junior Ranger” programmes should include women as well as men rangers as teachers, and girls and boys as participants, and should expose children to the entire range of conservation activities that rangers undertake.

Early pre-and in-service training for rangers should incorporate gender-related content, and also actively demonstrate gender equality in the personnel and topics.

5 COLLABORATE WITH GENDER ALLIES:

If there are national gender-equality laws and expectations, a localized policy to leverage and amplify those mandates should be developed. Ranger federations could review the equal opportunity legislation in the countries where they operate, and lobby for these to be improved if necessary.

Alliances with local women’s and LGBTQI groups, both official and unofficial, can amplify efforts to make the ranger workforce more inclusive – and will extend messaging about the diversity of ranger needs, skills, capacities.

Research needs

The universe of ‘unknowns’ about gender equality in relation to ranger work is considerably longer than the ‘knowns.’ To some extent, then, all possible research is welcome and needed.

More specifically, a high-priority research agenda includes:

- Gender Based Violence (GBV): Evidence shows that defending national parks and protected areas is becoming increasingly dangerous – for men and women. Gender-based violence is high on the list of dangers women face. However, little is known about the gender-differentiated violence that women suffer when doing their work. More research is needed on the types, frequency, and nature of GBV women rangers are exposed to, and on
the gender-differentiated protection measures for male and female rangers (Castañeda Camey et al. 2020).

Much of the evidence base for ranger work is drawn from cognate fields. Specific ranger-based research is needed on:

- the agreed wisdom that enhancing diversity in enforcement, and especially bringing women into enforcement teams, reduces enforcement-related violence,
- the presumed enhanced relationships women rangers can/do provide with communities,
- the asserted relationships between gender inequality and environmental unsustainability,
- metrics that are currently used or are needed to appropriately measure ‘success’ in ranger work,
- the extent to which more violent ranger enforcement may fuel a ‘violence cycle’ in local communities and homes, especially domestic violence, linked to the increasing circulation of small arms.

With increasing use of technology such as SMART-based patrol approach to track performance, it should be possible to get fine-grained data on performance of patrol groups and indicators such as whether having mixed patrols results in more/less distance walked, or more law enforcement actions, etc. These possible data repositories need to be systematically assessed.

Almost no research exists on the inclusion of LBGTQI and non-binary people in ranger workforces and their experiences as rangers. Similarly, almost no research exists on the effects of race/ethnicity and racism on any of the dynamics presented in this report, and the extent to which intersectional identities amplify discrimination and raise even higher barriers.
Conclusion

The benefits of bringing women into ranger workforces — for women, for conservation, and for the workforces themselves — are abundant and evident; the costs of not doing so are high. But changing the patterns and demographics of ranger workforces will take considerable introspection, organisational reform, and policy intervention.

Sustainable actions to remedy the gender imbalance in the ranger workforce need to be developed on a firm basis of evidence. The goal of this report is to provide the strongest evidence base currently available on the barriers, benefits, and enabling conditions to support policies and action plans to move towards gender equality.

This report is a beginning point, not an end point.
Towards Gender Equality In The Ranger Workforce: Challenges & Opportunities

Marine rangers set out to monitor the health of Kisite-Mpunguti Marine National Park. © WWF-Kenya
ANNEX 1:

Checklist for specific elements of a sexual harassment policy, developed for the US Department of Interior by the “Democratic staff of the House Committee on Natural Resources” (2018):

1. DEFINITION OF HARASSMENT
- Does the policy clearly define harassment and state that such conduct is prohibited?
- Does it provide specific examples of prohibited conduct?
- Does it include harassment that has not yet become unlawful (i.e., “severe or pervasive”)?
- Does it specify to whom the policy applies (e.g., employees, contractors, and/or non-employees) and where the harassment can occur (e.g., off-duty, online)?

2. RETALIATION
- Does the policy assure that complainants, witnesses, and any others who provide information concerning claims are protected from retaliation?
- Does it state that corrective action may be taken against any employee who retaliates against complainants, witnesses, or any others who provide information concerning claims?

3. CONFIDENTIALITY
- Does the policy assure confidentiality, to the extent possible, of individuals who bring harassment claims?
- Does it state that exceptions to confidentiality may be made on a need-to-know basis?
- Does it also assure that information gathered during an investigation will be kept confidential to the extent possible?

4. COMPLAINT PROCESS
- Does the policy adequately describe the complaint process?
- Does the process include multiple avenues for reporting?
- Does the process include at least one official outside of the employee’s chain of command?

5. INQUIRY/INVESTIGATION PROCESS
- Does the policy assure a prompt, thorough, and impartial investigation?
- Does it identify who is responsible for conducting investigations?
- Does it include reasonable time limits for the managers/supervisors to refer the complaint for investigation?
- Does it include reasonable time limits for conducting investigations?
- Does it state that intermediate measures may be necessary before completing the investigation to ensure that further harassment does not occur?
- Does it state that no intermediate measures may be taken against the alleged victim without his/her consent?
6. CORRECTIVE ACTION

☑ Does the policy assure immediate and appropriate corrective action?

☑ Does it state the corrective action is proportionate and may include discipline or removal of employees?

☑ Does it identify who is responsible for administering corrective action?

7. MANAGER/SUPERVISOR ACCOUNTABILITY

☑ Does the policy indicate that managers and supervisors will be held accountable for adhering to anti-harassment policies and procedures?

☑ Does it state that corrective action may include discipline or removal of managers/supervisors who fail to adhere to their responsibilities as outlined in the policy?

☑ Does it state that managers and supervisors will be evaluated on their adherence to anti-harassment policies and procedures in their performance evaluations?

8. ACCESSIBILITY, CLARITY, AND READABILITY:

☑ Is the most recently updated policy posted on the bureau’s website?

☑ Is it written in plain language? [Is it available in all of the most used local languages?]

☑ Is it organized into logically ordered sections and subsections?

☑ Are acronyms and abbreviations spelled out?

———

Costa Rican ranger Sofía Chavarría Chinchilla speaking on the importance of leadership from indigenous people in her work at the World Ranger Congress 2019. The event was attended by over 500 rangers from 70 countries, 40-50% of which were women. The Chitwan Declaration was unanimously endorsed by all rangers in attendance. © Ranjan Ramchandani
ANNEX 2: ASEAN MODEL FOR INTEGRATING WOMEN INTO POLICE FORCES

Source: UNODC 2020
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