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ABSTRACT

Fifty years ago, Second Wave feminists theorized that American culture was dominated by patriarchal systems that subordinated women to second class citizenship status (Brown, 1988; Dolan, Deckman & Swers, 2010). In the 21st century, women have become highly visible candidates for office on a national level. Since 1925, 31 women have served as governors; 20 were elected to office, three replaced their husbands, and eight became governor by Constitutional succession (CAWP, 2012). Many women of the Third Wave generation, or Post-feminists, reject the theory that male oppression continues to influence women’s life choices, some claiming that there is no need today for organized efforts on behalf of women’s equality (Jackson, 2010).

However, little is actually known about the leadership experiences of female governors, in part because there are still relatively few to sample (Thomas, 2003). Qualitative research provides the appropriate methodology to determine the impact of gender on the leadership experiences of female governors by documenting their own narratives (Glesne, 1999) about their terms ranging from 1984 through 2005. In the mini-case studies of seven women who served as governor, the degree to which women experienced asymmetrical power as a result of patriarchal systems they encountered in office is examined through their oral histories. The study found that all of the women governors perceived that a double standard applied to their leadership: receiving less support from their colleagues in political parties, as well as more criticism and inequitable coverage from mass media news sources. All of the women reported an inability to discuss gender-related leadership issues for fear of handicapping their administrations. Thus, the study concludes that patriarchal systems continue to affect women governors, despite their winning the highest elected office in the US, short of the Presidency.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Background

Women make up a slight majority (50.8%) of the American population (US Census Bureau, 2011, December 23); yet very few women have been elected to the governor’s office. Since 1975, only 26 women have been elected governors in their own right; five women assumed office by succession and held the seat for a limited time (Center for American Women and Politics [CAWP], 2011b). In 2012, only six women (12%) held governors’ seats, a number that has declined from a high of nine in 2004 and 2007 (CAWP, 2012): Jan Brewer, R - Arizona; Mary Fallin, R - Oklahoma; Susana Martinez, R – New Mexico; Beverly Perdue, D - North Carolina; Nicky Haley, R – South Carolina; Christine Gregoire, D - Washington.

Women serving as governors have remained a small number in part because fewer seats are available (i.e., 50 state executive offices compared to the 535 positions available in Congress and nearly 8,000 seats in state legislatures across the nation). However, even in much larger elected legislative bodies, the pattern holds: women simply are not equally represented. Women hold only 90 (16.8%) of the 535 seats in the US Congress and 1,750 (23.9%) of the 7,382 seats in state legislatures (CAWP, 2012). Minority totals are even less representative. Only 31 African American women have served in Congress since 1968 (one in the Senate, 30 in the House), including the 15 serving in the 112th Congress. Eight Hispanic women have been elected to the House; seven serve in the 112th Congress. Six Asian American women have served in the House, including four in the 112th Congress (Manning & Shogan, 2011).

Additionally, the numbers of women seeking elective office over the last two years have been dubbed “stagnating” (Kusnetz, 2010, June 7, para 1). Notably, for only the second
time since the 65th Congress (1917-1918), the number of women dropped from the previous Congress (See Figure 1). According to Manning and Shogan (2011) of the Congressional Research Service (CRS), 90 of the 435 voting members in the 111th Congress were women, as compared with 89 at the beginning of the 112th Congress.

![Graph showing percentage of women in Congress and State Legislatures from 92nd Congress to 112th Congress, 1971-2013.](http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL30261.pdf)


Note: Delegates are not included in these data. The 112th numbers are for the beginning of the Congressional session.

Some researchers (Cantor, Bernay, & Stoess, 1992; Elder, 2004; Harrison, 2003; Thomas, 1994) have attributed the influence of the mass media, particularly the images broadcast on the medium of television through advertising, as an important reason for the lack of equitable participation by women in the political process or, indeed, other positions of power in business or education. However, to a large degree, women have good reason to suspect they are not welcome in elected executive suites. From earliest childhood, girls hear
and see, on various forms of mass media, the portrayal of male dominance in leadership roles, establishing a cultural norm – men are leaders, and women are followers (Elder, 2004).

Feminist theorists (Brown, 1988; Burrell, 2004; Cantor, D., Bernay, T., & Stoess, J., 1992; Dolan, Deckman & Swers, 2010; MacKinnon, 1987; Pollitt, 2005; Rosenthal, 1998) suggest that social systems that benefit male dominance, otherwise known as “patriarchy,” strongly influence women to avoid seeking leadership roles that challenge the traditional social construct of male leadership. Research (Jewell & Whicker, 1993; Lorber, 2005) has established that traditional family structures require women to divide their attention among family, childcare, and work outside the home, thus limiting female access to the time and financial resources necessary to mount campaigns for elected office. Regardless, as the earlier numbers show, some women do pursue and attain elected office.

Although a great deal of literature exists in terms of the professional fields of business and education where women have managed to attain executive leadership roles, little research is available on the leadership styles, experiences, or policy priorities of female governors. Thomas (2003) pointed out that research regarding the impact of women governors on public policy has been difficult to pursue. “Put simply, studying women as a group means that a group has to be present in the first place,” (Thomas, 2003, p. 90). Thus, whether significant leadership or policy differences exist between women and men governors is largely unknown (Shafer & Herrera, 2010). Researchers have looked to the policy output of women in state-level legislatures to evaluate female policy impact and priorities even more so than that of women in the US Congress, because more women have been present in state legislative bodies (The White House Project, 2003).
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A substantial body of research concerning the impact of female legislators at both the state and national levels has documented that elected female leaders have generally influenced public policy in areas affecting the interests of women, children, and families well beyond that of male leaders, whether Republican or Democrat (Burrell, 2004; Carroll, 2001; CAWP, 2001; Conway, Steuernagel, & Ahern, 1997; Darcy, Welch, & Clark, 1994; Elder, 2004; Green, 2003; Harrison, 2003; Witt, Paget, & Matthews, 1995). Research has shown that elected women leaders also bring a unique procedural method to their participation on committees and in legislative bodies, such that leadership “styles” can be distinctly defined as male or female (Burrell, 2004; Cantor, Bernay, & Stoess, 1992; Jewell & Whicker, 1993; O'Toole, 1995; Rosenthal, 1998). Further, scholars have noted that female leaders influence male leaders to create legislative bodies where the “female” style (i.e., consensus building) is the preferred leadership strategy (Arnold & King, 2002; Jewell & Whicker, 1993; Levy, Tien, & Aved, 2001; Thomas & Welch, 2001).

However, researchers have also determined that other factors, including ideology, partisanship, the number of women in the legislature, and the political culture of the state from which the representative is elected, may mitigate the more liberal trends of past female representation, especially as parties have become more polarized in the last decade (Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2010). How these new conservative female members of state legislatures and Congress will eventually impact statutes favorable to women’s rights or family issues remains to be seen in long-term trends. By comparison, even less is known about the policy impact of female governors (Shafer & Herrera, 2010).

As more women attain full-term governorships, they become responsible for leading their states in the development and implementation of public education policy (Mazzoni,
GENDERED GOVERNING: LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCES OF 7 WOMEN FORMER GOVERNORS

1994). The education policy arena is considered critical in the matter of ensuring American economic as well as physical health (Jennings & Rentner, 2006) and, starting with the Reagan administration (Bell, 1988), has become an ideological battleground. Republican challenges to the efficacy of public education have resulted in an increasing push to privatize American schools (Bystrom, 2006; Cizek, 1999; Hess & Rotherham, 2007). The concerns about American public education suggest that the characteristics and effectiveness of leadership are critical as well. Thus, the question of policy priorities for women governors, as well as other factors that influence their performance as leaders, deserves careful attention.

Statement of the Problem

Although few in number overall, as chief executive of the state, female governors are uniquely positioned to lead in all areas of state policy initiatives and implementation. To date and to my knowledge, no studies have queried female governors directly to determine their leadership challenges, their policy focus, or whether they are committed to represent other women and family issues, including education, when they enter office. As indicated earlier, past research has determined that many women in leadership also tend to favor a collaborative leadership style, which could support developing consensus on complex policy issues. However, we currently do not know whether women governors consciously choose to implement a collaborative- or consensus-driven leadership style and whether they employ that “female” style to further their policy initiatives. Therefore, asking the governors themselves about how they see the impact of “being female” on their policy agendas, their leadership styles and strategies, as well as the challenges they face as women leaders will narrow the gap in the research.
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Purpose of the Study

This investigation was undertaken to determine whether, and if so, how, the leadership experiences of female governors were influenced by their gender, based on their own personal perspectives. The policy arena of public education was chosen to provide a framework for the governors’ reflections on leadership priorities and strategies required to advance policy initiatives. In order to address the question, the following research questions are presented:

- How does gender influence the decision-making and leadership functions of the female governor?
- What type of leadership style do women governors prefer and practice?
- To what extent do women governors focus on public education when generating policy initiatives?
- How do other influencers, such as legislators, staff, family, and coverage from the mass media, affect their leadership experiences?

Organization of the Dissertation

The dissertation is organized into eight chapters. Such an arrangement is necessary to present the wealth of information derived from the seven female former governors. The contents of the eight chapters are organized as follows: Chapter 1 presents the introduction and background of the study, including the basis for and the purpose of the research. In Chapter 2, I explore the context of female leadership within which this research took place, including women leaders in the fields of business and education; the leadership role of the governor regardless of gender, particularly examining the responsibilities of the state executive officer to guide public education policy; and a survey of research regarding the
practices of mass media news coverage in relation to female political leaders. The conceptual framework of feminist theory is presented to illustrate the impact of cultural narrative on the expectations and realities for American women. Media feminism is presented as the lens for examining the leadership experiences of female governors within the realms of leadership styles, policy emphasis, and coverage by the mass media press corps. Chapter 3 offers a description of the research methodology used in this study, including data-collection procedures and the conceptual framework on which the analysis is based. Chapter 4 highlights the stories of Martha Layne Collins (D-Kentucky) and Madeleine Kunin (D-Vermont), two women governors who successfully navigated the challenges of their terms in office. Chapter 5 features the leadership experiences of governors who dealt with personal crises during their terms with very different results: Governor Christine Todd Whitman (R-New Jersey) successfully managed to control the first major crisis she faced within hours of her election that challenged the legality of her campaign. However, Governors Judy Martz (R-Montana) and Jane Swift (R-Massachusetts), were overwhelmed by personal crises during their terms in office from which their political careers never recovered. In Chapter 6, I examine the experiences of two governors who attempted to implement tax reform in their states that ended in failure. Governor Barbara Roberts (D-Oregon) began her term in office with a stunning surprise on the night she was elected that threw the state budget into chaos, which was further complicated by the failure of her tax initiative, the collapse of the timber industry, and three recall attempts. In contrast is the unusual tale of extraordinary approval ratings Governor Olene Walker (R-Utah) enjoyed from members of the press and the public, even spilling over to support her tax reform proposals, but to no avail. Chapters 4 through 6 provide the foundation for
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presentation of emergent themes in Chapter 7. Chapter 8 contains the conclusions of the study along with recommendations for action and further research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

You’ve come a long way, Baby! The iconic phrase surfaced in the late 1960s thanks to a cigarette advertisement summarizing what must have seemed obvious to everyone – women were not equal to men in America but were making significant progress in reaching parity. Some 40 years later, we are still attempting to breach the inequality barriers. On the surface, American women appeared to be equal to men in 2012 in many ways, especially because personal sexuality for both men and women is so much freer today (Roseneil, 2006). Statistics have documented that many women were not sorry to see the reduced emphasis on sexuality that was previously chain-linked to marriage (Quindlen, 2001). According to 2010 census figures, American women 18 and older totaled 53% of the unmarried US population (US Census Bureau, 2011, August 26); and many women were deliberately choosing to remain single. “For the first time in history, women do not gain power and influence solely through the two M’s--Mrs. and Mom” (Lake, Conway, & Whitney, 2005, p. 30).

Another notable statistic was the rise in births to unmarried women. According to a study by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press (2010), a record 41% of 2008 births in the United States were to unmarried women, up from 28% in 1990. Compared with mothers of newborns in 1990, mothers were older and better educated. Non-married births were highest for Black women (72%), followed by Hispanics (53%), Whites (29%), and Asians (17%); but the increase over the past two decades was greatest for Whites -- the share rose 69% (Livingston & Cohn, 2010). Further, 2010 census data (US Census Bureau 2011, August 26) revealed that the number of women between the ages of 25 and 30 with college degrees surpassed men, a milestone predicted to make a significant difference in future job markets (Saenz, 2011). These trends, however, did not signal a feminist triumph in US social
mores and politics; in fact, the likelihood was low of a major liberal swing in attitudes and behaviors.

Despite the introduction of the birth control pill in the 1960s, the “love-ins” of the 1970s, and the “Madonna-Whore” (Troy, 2005, p. 196) fashions and mores of the 1980s, the 1990s took an interesting turn. The decade began with promise when the all-girl British pop group Spice Girls introduced “Girl Power,” a concept by which they proclaimed their sexual freedom while demanding that their boyfriends treat them with respect. They even made UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher an honorary Spice Girl (Douglas, 2010). Ironically, the girl group also announced that “feminism” was a dirty word. Taft (2004) pointed out that the Spice Girl version of female empowerment celebrated and affirmed the strength of girls but promised to give feminism “a kick up the arse,” (Spice Girls & Dickenson, 1997, p. 49) by stressing fashion, beauty, and sexiness, rather than challenging entrenched male-dominated power positions. As a result, Girl Power “easily play[ed] into anti-feminist backlash and a negative image of feminism instead of challenging those who have made feminism a dirty word” (Taft, 2004, p. 71).

Over the years, feminist-bashing has become an accepted part of American culture, a conservative counterpoint to progressive social change (Faludi, 1991). Conservative voices have argued that increased threats to the nation’s social and economic harmony are the result of women choosing to ignore traditional “divisions of labor” that have promoted men in public and leadership roles but keep women pregnant, tending the home fires. Some well-established conservatives like Phyllis Schlafly, founder of the Eagle Forum and leader of the successful defeat in 1982 of the Equal Rights Amendment (STOP ERA), have continued to assert that America’s economic future depends on a return to the traditional practices such as
“husband-provider marriage . . . the mainspring of economic solvency” (Schlafly, 2011, September 1, para. 2).

Internet blog sites allow lesser-known voices to weigh in as well. For some, the good old days of *kinder küche kirche* (German for “children, kitchen, church”) were deeply mourned, as one stout supporter pointed out in *Five Points to Keep Women in Their Place* (2009): “In the olden days, women KNEW where they belonged in the grand scheme of things, and that was beneath (not beside) their husbands!” (Bob4God, 2009). In fact, a sub-plot to modern feminist-bashing was the fear that men had been buried in feminist excess, beaten down to social confusion by their new status as the “second sex” (Douglas, 2010). However, the numbers proved a different reality. Despite the influx of women into the work force and new female independence on many fronts, American women have made few advances in pay and have continued to lag in leadership roles in business and education as well as in politics. In 1950, only 29% of American women worked outside the home. In 2000, nearly 75% were in the job market. Female employment peaked in 2009 at just under 50% of the US work force. That figure declined to 49.4% in 2012 as the US began to recover from devastating unemployment numbers as a result of the Great Recession. More importantly, men began taking jobs in retail and service industries previously held by women. Additionally, in the 12 months leading up to November 2011, manufacturers hired over 250,000 men while cutting 33,000 women from the workforce (Mullaney, 2012).

Historically, women’s wages have never equaled men’s; and the situation was no different in 2012. In 1950, women earned 59 cents on every dollar earned by a man, a figure that had risen to 73 cents on average in 2000 (Cotter, Hermsen, & Vanneman, 2005). Ten years later, in the second quarter of 2010, women earned 82.8% of men’s median weekly
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wage, the highest amount ever recorded, perhaps only because men lost jobs at a faster rate than women in the Great Recession (Cauchon, 2010). According to the American Association of University Women (AAUW), the wage gains for women in 2012 slipped to 77 cents for every dollar earned by a man; the AAUP noted that “women have only gained 13 CENTS toward pay equity with men in the last 30 years” (AAUW, 2012, para. 6). In addition to financial disparities, in 2011 the National Organization for Women (NOW) reported increasing levels of domestic violence against women, indicating that women faced increasing threats both inside and outside domestic relationships. NOW’s leaders also recognized the general failure of women to develop to their fullest potential, a statement that is surely substantiated by the lack of female representation in American politics.

Measured by the percentage of women, America has fallen behind other democratic countries in the world and has continued on this downward spiral. In 2003, the US was 58\textsuperscript{th} worldwide in terms of women in elected representative political roles, behind the numbers of women representatives in international governments including Germany, Italy, New Zealand, Sweden, Denmark, and Norway (Hill & Richie, 2003). In 2004, Burrell (2004) released an international comparison that placed the US even further behind, with 67 countries boasting a larger percentage of women in their national governments. In 2011, the US reached a new low in numbers of female Congressional representatives, ranking along with Bosnia-Herzegovina 70\textsuperscript{th} out of 187 nations with elected representatives (Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2011).

The male-dominated US Congress has also demonstrated an increasingly conservative slant. According to the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League (NARAL), known as NARAL Pro-Choice America, young women in 2012 faced
more legislative obstacles than their mothers in attempting to control their personal reproductive freedom. Since January 2011, an anti-choice majority in the US House of Representatives has tried to eliminate funding for birth control and cancer screenings at Planned Parenthood clinics nationally; additionally, the House has passed legislation that would deny emergency abortion care to women even if they would die without such care. Further, over the last 15 years, state legislators have enacted more than 700 anti-choice measures (NARAL, 2012).

Pro-choice women’s groups have categorized such actions as a “War on Women” (Keenan, 2012, May 10; Richards, 2012). Moreover, as the 2012 US presidential election cycle proceeds, President Barack Obama’s health-care policies have prompted the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) to organize nationwide rallies in opposition to birth-control coverage (Keenan, 2012, June 20). In the meantime, the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) has been reintroduced into every Congress since 1982 with the hope that if three more states voted “yes,” the ERA could become the 28th Constitutional Amendment; yet in 2012, Constitutional equality remained only an unfulfilled possibility for American women. The fact that women have not attained equality with men in everyday life or made significant gains in elected or other influential leadership roles is not surprising, according to King (1995): “In most developed industrial countries, including the United States, masculinity is the dominant sex role and is valued more highly than femininity” (p. 82). The fact that men have been traditionally identified as leaders has led to the expectation that leaders behave in a certain way called “norms,” suggesting that the very concept of leadership is gendered (Thomas, 2003).
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In short, in 2012, a profound disparity exists between understandings of the roles women can and should play in American society. The consequences of women’s choices are poorly understood as well. Proponents of viewpoints that range across a broad ideological spectrum have lobbied to gain influence within political parties and now aggressively promote social movements that further their goals (Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2010), striving for access to powerful communication outlets such as radio, television, newspapers, and, more recently, online internet outlets.

Clearly, the media have played a significant role in the debate over women’s societal role via widely-spread portrayals of women in advertising and entertainment (Gauntlett, 2002; Putrevu, 2001). A body of research (Harrison, 2003; Kahn, 1994; Kropf & Boiney, 2001; Norris, 1997) examining the impact of media on elective politics shows that mass media coverage is extremely important and often biased against women. According to Klenke (1996), the mass media, more so than any other type of organizational system, has shaped the public response to leadership, primarily because “media messages suggest that women do not belong in politics” (Loke, Harp, & Bachman, 2010, p. 208). Women candidates can be damaged more (and more uniquely so) than men by the kind of news coverage that suggests they are incompetent as leaders.

Given all the challenges facing women who define themselves as leaders and choose to campaign for office, Palmer and Simon (2006) have contended that such women require extraordinary courage and commitment. Further, women must overcome greater obstacles to their entering politics, including these: socialization that politics is a “man’s game”; childcare requirements that fall largely on women to resolve; and, perhaps most importantly, their own perceptions that they are not qualified to lead, despite holding equal or sometimes better
credentials than male candidates (Dolan, 2006; Fox & Lawless, 2008). However, among all the studies, the voices of the women leaders themselves are rare. The purpose of this qualitative research study was to determine from the personal perspectives of the female former governors whether gender made an impact on their leadership experiences. They were also asked to assess whether the coverage they received from the members of the mass media press corps was influenced by their gender and how that helped or hurt them during their campaigns as well as tenure in office.

To conduct this study, a critical review of current literature was completed in these three major areas: 1) the impact of gender on leadership style and political policy, specifically regarding public education; 2) how coverage from the mass media press corps affects female leadership experiences; and 3) feminist theory. The review was compiled throughout all phases of the study including data collection, data analysis, and interpretive synthesis. A review of feminist theory defined the context necessary for understanding the scope of the female governors’ experiences and their resulting perceptions as to whether their leadership experiences were influenced by their gender and, if so, how.

Conceptual Framework

Within the framework of feminist theory, a number of perspectives provide insight into the impact of gender on a female governor and the attendant effects on leadership experiences. Relevant issues include the following: 1) the cultural narratives that privilege male models of leadership and influence disproportional representation of women in elected offices; 2) the impact on, and the interruption of, established male-dominated systems, often referred to as “Good Old Boys,” who are necessary for generating public policy within political bodies, aka, powerful men who can assist or resist the leadership efforts of the
woman in charge; and 3) bias and stereotypical portrayals of women within forms of mass media. Figure 2 is a concept map that illustrates the conceptual framework for this study. The multi-directional arrows indicate important forces examined in this study with which the female governor must interact effectively as a leader.

In the following sections, the necessary contextual foundations upon which to build understanding of the governors’ reported leadership experiences are presented through a review of the relevant literature. Sections occur in the order described as follows: 1) Feminist Theory; 2) Female Leadership Style and Public Education Policy Interests; and 3) Media Feminism. Each section provides insight into the formation of American cultural narratives that describe and shape the leadership roles of women, while profoundly influencing the leadership experiences of the former women governors in this study.

Figure 2. Gendered Influences on the Leadership Experiences of Former Women Governors. Information adapted from Brown, 1988; Duerst-Lahti & Kelly, 1995; Fowler, 2000; Lorber, 2005.
Feminist Theory

Feminist theory is a body of Western thinking and writing about the asymmetrical relationship that exists between men and women as influenced by race, sexual preference, social and economic class, and intellectual analysis (Lorber, 2005). Woven within the theoretical strands of feminism are many different perspectives originating from a central concept: The condition of being a woman as the basis for political interpretation, logically followed by the establishment of a political identity (Donovan, 2004). Feminist thinking has evolved from the 19th century First Wave “Woman Movement,” a time when women believed they would attain equality with men by proving their intellectual and moral capacities. Although not grammatically correct, the use of the term “Woman Movement” emphasized the vision of the time, which was female solidarity -- one movement to benefit the female sex. The term “feminism” did not surface until after the “Woman Movement” had nearly won suffrage in the early 1900s. Feminism (with a capital “F”) was forged deliberately to underscore the revolutionary vision of equality proponents held regarding the relationship between the sexes (Cott, 1987).

A century later, many Second Wave feminists noted that equality between the sexes remained largely a theoretical concept; they asserted that men chose to withhold access to power and resources from fear that female equality would diminish male dominance. The demand for an end to sexual hierarchy prompted a political battle between Conservative and Progressive interpretations of women’s role in American life framed largely through the experiences of White, middle class women (Lorber, 2005). At the end of the 20th century, feminism began to diverge from a monolithic focus on the oppression of women. Resistance to the Second Wave feminists’ ethnocentric focus on middle class White women opened the
door to broader considerations of the specific differences made by race, class, ethnic background, and sexuality, particularly among women but also including men (Donovan, 2004; Gill, 2007). However, whether examined through a conservative or liberal frame, the consistent thread through all feminist thinking is the examination of the gender asymmetry between men and women (Kolmar & Bartkowski, 2005).

A review of the historical antecedents of First and Second Wave thinking is now necessary to understand the fundamental tenets of feminist theory and its relevance to the experiences of the former female governors in this study. The roots of American feminism begin with the first colonists to arrive on the continent in the 17th century.

The impact of gender on leadership – a brief historical survey. Many studies have examined the prevailing models of male leadership that continue to define and uphold the behavioral and cultural characteristics of men as ideal leaders (Burrell, 2004; Cantor, D., Bernay, T., & Stoess, J., 1992; Jewell & Whicker, 1993; O'Toole, 1995; Rosenthal, 1998). Interestingly, the roles of both men and women have evolved historically to differ greatly in some respects from the early 17th century. In that era, women concerned themselves strictly with duties of wife and mother as modeled on Biblical patriarchy (Zagarri, 1992). When fathers worked close to or at home as artisans, farmers, craftsmen, and tradesmen, they actually took an active part in childrearing. Fathers were typically the only parent entrusted to tutor children in critical Biblical teachings, the primary focus of education, as women were not considered capable of interpreting scripture. Married couples were defined as a single entity, represented exclusively by the husband (Burrell, 2004; Witt, Paget, & Matthews, 1995), with no legal rights to property, income, or even their children through the act of
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marriage (Harrison, 2003). In turn, women were supposedly protected from the harsh outside world or the public sphere.

The role of women changed significantly during America’s Colonial era, a period from approximately the late 17th to the 18th centuries. Parental roles altered as commerce in American cities became a dominant force in formerly agrarian colonies. With the beginnings of the industrial age, fathers were more likely absent from the home. New wealth and access to indentured help or slaves removed intensive labor demands from privileged White women. Improved living conditions tended to remove social barriers between women and men, and the Puritan influence began to ebb. For the first time, freedom from the brutal demands of mere survival introduced the concept of leisure as well as a new emphasis for women (e.g., family moral development) (Zagarri, 1992). Women’s maternal role was greatly expanded and more specialized, following popular writings from the English homeland that were heavily influenced by Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The French philosopher argued that women were naturally passive; his views influenced growing trends in French and American society where “the collapse of the older patriarchy gave way to a more pervasive gendering [sic] of the public sphere” (Landes, 1988, p. 2). Ministers preached the vision of maternal moral influence permeating society, a compelling argument to justify the restriction of women to an ever narrowing domestic role in the 19th century (Bloch, 1978). A woman’s access to education, formerly not a priority, was framed as necessary to support her maternal role as moral guide. “Republican Mothers” (Kerber, 1976, p. 202) demonstrated their love of country and participation in republican philosophies by educating their children to uphold civic virtues.
Religious revivals. In the early 19th century, churches wielded more power than the state or federal government. As secular concerns increased, so did religious fervor; religious “revivals” swept the nation (Sklar, 1976; Wuthnow, 1988). Revivalist preachers toured communities preaching the tenets of Christian perfectionism (i.e., that each individual had the responsibility for saving his own soul and everyone else’s including drunks, slaveholders, and prostitutes). Women were allowed to pray, testify, and confess in public, a shocking liberty that created a behavioral paradox for women.

According to Ellen DuBois (1981), early 19th century feminists resolved to improve the position of women vis-à-vis their natural rights and duties while at the same time accommodating their charge to strive for perfection on Earth. The answer lay in elevating women’s role in “the domestic sphere” (p. 5). Chief among proponents was Catharine Beecher, who rose to prominence in 1830 by insisting that women could lead the nation through control of the family and home. Beecher’s father was the prominent Calvinist preacher Lyman Beecher. Daughter Catherine promoted an evangelical vision of America as a country shaped by Christianity to counter the increasing influence of secular institutions.

As the nation marched further into the 19th century, the rise of a two-party political system reflected a growing interest in national politics and the distribution of patronage at the local level. Universal White male suffrage offered men across all social classes the experience of equality. Men identified heavily with particular partisan groups, forming strong fraternal ties. If all men were not equal, they were at least not women. Voting was often carried out in saloons, barber shops, or other locales unsuitable for women, further separating women from the public sphere (Baker, 1984).
Beecher advocated that women accept their submissive roles in relationships with men and society in general, not because women were weak or intellectually inferior but because their self-sacrifice exemplified true morality. She believed women’s selflessness could provide a moral compass to the nation’s leaders (i.e., men who were engaged in political and financial activity that threatened American stability), especially after the panic of 1837 (DuBois, 1981). While capitalists were encouraged to adopt moral attitudes to justify their new positions of secular leadership and authority, Beecher promoted women and family as crucial to controlling the relationship between virtue and commerce. Family became understood as a key transmitter of customs, morals, and manners, a basic building block of society that reined in individual excess. A virtuous family created the desire to protect the society outside one’s immediate family for the good of the whole. The value of government followed from the desire to live under laws that served the collective good (Sklar, 1976; Zagarri, 1992). Beecher’s ideas were well-received, especially by middle- and upper-class White women who believed female “rectitude and decorum” (Flexner, 1975, p. 24) would be tainted by exposure to contact with men in professions that operated in the public sphere. Beecher also strongly advocated for women to enter the teaching profession, which she saw as a logical extension of the woman’s role within the family home (Sklar, 1976).

**Set back by “science.”** In the mid-1800s, British naturalist Charles Darwin, who proposed the theory of evolution, concluded that women were biologically inferior to men. Influenced by Darwin’s writings, other scientists of the day postulated that the size of women’s brains indicated their intellectual capacity equal only to that of “feeble” White men and Negro slaves; as such, women were perceived to be easy prey to wicked ways (Bergman, 2012). Beecher labored to convince men regardless of class that the fair, gentle sex deserved
their protection against the rough realities of drunkards, sexual abuse, political skullduggery, and financial swindles. Ironically, women were often victims of those very brutalities; but as the legal property of their husbands, they had no means of redress (Burrell, 2004). Women began to protest women’s lot in churches and other carefully arranged events where even men might be present in support of certain moral initiatives to correct social ills (DuBois, 1981). However, women’s opinions were not generally thought to be significant; if covered at all by newspapers of the day, women were often mocked as “an aberration of womanhood and therefore . . . given little recognition” (Kennedy & O'Shields, 1983, pp. xvii – xviii).

Influencing public policies. The lack of female access to legislative power and a general interest in social reforms to correct moral failings prompted White middle class and upper-class women to form their own organizations. Feminists and proponents of abolition like the Grimke sisters traveled to speak around the country directly comparing women’s lack of rights and legal status to the circumstances of slaves (Flexner, 1975). The battle to achieve protections for women, whether the right to divorce, to own property, or to retain custody of their children, demanded leadership skills and stamina that eventually caused women to seek the right to vote (Burrell, 2004). Elizabeth Cady Stanton and her colleague as well as friend Susan Brownell Anthony were among the first suffrage leaders to emerge in the mid-19th century. Feminist thinking from this period responded to the same forces that stimulated the creation of the American Declaration of Independence in 1776, which proclaimed that all people have certain inalienable or “natural” rights protected from government intrusion (Donovan, 2004, p. 17).

Stanton was a frustrated housewife when she built upon Enlightenment assumptions about the equality of all people to create the Declaration of Rights and Sentiments in 1840,
demanding equality between men and women (Griffith, 1984). Introduced at the first Woman’s Rights Convention in 1848, Stanton accompanied the Declaration with the first public call for suffrage (Stanton, 1993). Although Stanton and Anthony agreed that women possessed unique moral properties that distinguished them from men (Baker, 1984), suffrage was understood as the most effective way to realize civic virtue within the family and the nation by participating as a citizen in the creation of law (Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2007).

As agitation increased nationally over free and slave states entering the Union, Stanton, Anthony, and other feminists also fought passionately for the abolition of slavery as an expression of the natural rights of all people to freedom (Barry, 1988; DuBois, 1981). The call for suffrage and equality for women rapidly spread, forming a national movement identified by scholars in later generations as the “First Wave” of feminism (Burrell, 2004, p. 4).

However, Stanton and Anthony’s vision of changing women’s role in America through the ballot box countered Beecher’s contentions that women should accept their submissive status. Anti-suffragists argued that if women voted, they would “abandon the home and womanly virtues. The differences between the sexes would be obscured: Men would lose their manhood and women would begin to act like men” (Baker, 1984, p. 638). Thus, a fundamental divide that emerged centuries ago over the definition of the proper female role remains with us today (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1988).

**The seeds of bitterness.** After the Civil War, when the battle began over ceding suffrage to freed slaves, women were counseled to wait their turn rather than pressing for female suffrage to be included in the Fifteenth Amendment to the US Constitution. Women leaders like Stanton and Anthony were infuriated and considered themselves betrayed by
many of their male Black allies, Frederick Douglass among them (Barry, 1988). Even though Douglass had been the first man to support Stanton’s call for female suffrage in 1848, he supported the Republican strategy to simplify the drive to enfranchise Black men by excluding women. He defended his position by arguing that women were not being lynched for being female, while Black males were being lynched for being Black. Douglass believed the dire circumstances of the Reconstructionist South justified asking women to honor “the Negro’s hour” (Flexner, 1975, p. 146). The two women reacted bitterly, turning their backs on their former abolitionist allies to charge that Black men were inferior to educated White women and should not be granted the franchise privilege to the exclusion of women (Sherr, 1995).

When the new amendment permitted only Black males to vote, Stanton and Anthony broke from other reform groups to form the National Women’s Suffrage Association for women only. The American Woman Suffrage Association, led by Lucy Stone and her husband Henry Blackwell, continued to admit men and adopted a more conservative agenda, seeking support from influential community members on behalf of suffrage alone. Stanton and Anthony’s group was considered more radical as it championed other causes such as organizing working women and demanding divorce rights. Stanton went so far as to criticize Christian interpretations of the Bible that ascribed an inferior position to women in society (Flexner, 1975). The two groups remained split for 20 years, an action that further delayed attaining their own enfranchisement (DuBois, 1981) and further separated White women from Black feminist movements (Odem, 1995), a topic that will be discussed further in the next sections.
**The Progressive Era.** Beginning in the late 1800s, progressive reform movements were the principal expression of women’s political activities without the vote (Swers, 2002a). Feminist suffrage efforts were conjoined with other women interested in social reform. Progressive social reform groups were often dedicated to the care of the less fortunate including indigents, the education of orphans, the elimination of prostitution, temperance, and the abolition of slavery (DuBois, 1981; Harrison, 2003). Reform efforts were originally aimed at improving the moral character of men, especially young men, who were assumed to be the future leaders of America (Stanton, 1860) and the naturally immoral sex (Baker, 1984). As women grew more practiced at speaking and organizing, they began to have a measurable effect on social policies. Even without the vote, “middle and upper-class White women had so thoroughly expanded and empowered their separate ‘sphere’ that it had become more an instrument for political influence than a barrier to freedom” (Chafe, 1991, p. 5). The Women’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), founded in 1874, worked tirelessly to reform drunkards and pass local temperance laws, driving alcohol from a number of American communities (Flexner, 1975). By the mid-19th century, the shift from a primarily agrarian society to an urban cultural emphasis across America had a significant impact on social controls over both sexes.

Young, single women working in factories and living outside the family home became a major concern to social reformers (Barry, 1988). Not only were women exploited by long hours and cheap wages but their susceptibility to unscrupulous suitors led to an alarming increase in so-called “fallen women” (Odem, 1995, p. 3). In 1885, reformers were appalled to discover that the age of sexual consent in most states was only 10 years old; in
some states, the age of consent was placed at only age 12; and in Delaware, a child of 7 was legally allowed to “give consent.”

The Women’s Christian Temperance Union, following President Frances Willard’s “Do Everything” motto, led the charge of White middle- and upper-class female reformers as well as religious organizations in a “purity” campaign to raise the age of consent to 18 years of age to prevent young White women from becoming “White slaves” (Odem, 1995, p. 4). The purity campaign cast sexually active young White women as the victims of unscrupulous men, aggressors who were rarely viewed as offenders. Reformers noted that only women were punished by society. In a state-by-state assault, reformers convinced most legislators to raise the age of sexual consent to 14 or 16. By 1920, every state legislature but one had increased the age of consent to 16 or 18; however, Georgia’s legal age of sexual consent remained at 14 (Odem, 1995).

The Progressive Era in American history flourished from the end of the 19th century through the 1920s and continued, to a lesser extent, through the 1930s and 1940s. However, such efforts ultimately shored up patriarchal systems by maintaining that the chief importance of women lay in making men moral leaders (Mink, 1990).

Seeds of separatism. The WCTU and other White women reformers including suffragists sidestepped concerns for protections and reforms that would assist Black women and girls. Although abolitionists had decried the sexual exploitation of Black female slaves by White men before the Civil War, reformers at the end of the 19th century did not concern themselves with protecting young African American girls, even in their purity campaigns (Odem, 1995). White women reform leaders were not only attempting to shore up Southern and conservative support for suffrage; some believed that Black women were “incapable of
monogamous morality” (Flexner, 1975, p. 191). Such discrimination deeply angered African American women, prompting the formation of separate Black organizations. This early division between Black and White women as a result of White prejudice and political expediency continued throughout the push for suffrage and even beyond.

Feminists continued to debate the necessary tactics to push for enfranchisement as well as the goals of a future society where women could vote. In the early 1900s, a new generation of women took over the leadership reins. Carrie Chapman Catt emerged as one of the most powerful leaders of the women’s movement (i.e., as the elected president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, an amalgam of the former two groups). Suffrage became the sole focus of the movement (Chafe, 1991). Alice Paul, younger still than Catt, created the more militant Woman’s Party. Catt and Paul were bitterly divided over the use of protest tactics, but together they eventually got results. The 19th Constitutional amendment was ratified on August 18, 1920, granting women the full voting rights of citizens (Flexner, 1975).

**After suffrage.** Much had changed in America since the 19th century. Many Americans had moved from farms into cities where technological advances such as gas lighting had given way to electricity, new communication systems, and home appliances that had transformed life (Flexner, 1975). The First World War had shattered the naïve faith that humanity was making moral progress toward American ideals of freedom and justice for all.

The domestic sphere had eroded as women ventured further into the working world, though old guard notions of purity and women’s place continued to endure. Margaret Sanger began a protracted battle to publish birth-control information that ultimately landed her in jail (Chesler, 1992). Women themselves could no longer be assumed to be of one mind about the
importance of home, family, and virtue or even the purposes of feminism. New advertising
drove the national economy forward by urging women to free themselves from domestic
drudgery. With their free time, a new image of womanhood emerged as symbolic of the era:
The Flapper.

The youthful, eroticized flapper, her hemline dramatically and provocatively
shortened, was emblazoned in national magazines and on billboards. Her figure lean
and angular, her hair short and shingled like a man’s . . . she symbolized the assertion
by women of social and sexual parity. (Chesler, 1992, p. 208)

The divisions between women further diminished the development of a women’s
political voting bloc, although politics was clearly no longer a male privilege (Baker, 1984).
Realizing that suffrage had not changed women’s stature in American society, “hard-core
feminists” (Lemons, 1973, p. 182) pressed for the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment
(ERA) in Congress. In 1923, the ERA was first introduced to affirm that women and men
have equal rights under the law; the amendment died a quick death with little organized
support (Mathews & DeHart, 1990). Younger women rejected the stridency of the earlier
feminist movement, taking the hard-fought-for results for granted (Chesler, 1992).

As cities grew in size, so did the problems of poverty, prostitution, and other social
ills that did not yield easily to sporadic interventions of organized church or women’s groups.
Government assumed more and more responsibility to resolve and even prevent social
problems through public policy. Eleanor Roosevelt, wife of President Franklin Roosevelt,
became a strong leader of “social feminists” (Lemons, 1973, p. 181). She mastered special
interest tactics to exercise influence on her husband’s government from 1932 until his death
in 1945. Such strategies made for sweeping reforms rather than one-on-one conversion of
individuals. For example, in 1938, the US Labor Department for the first time began the regulation of women and child labor when Congress enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act (Burrell, 2004).

After all the fuss in pursuit of women’s suffrage, the 19th Amendment seemed to make little difference on the electoral landscape. Burrell (2004) noted that “contrary to the hopes of the suffragists” (p. 91), women voters did not flock to the polls to vote, even in the first presidential election open to them in 1920. Only about a third of the eligible women voted, compared to the turn-out of approximately two thirds of the eligible men (Baxter & Lansing, 1981). The dearth of women voters was matched by the lack of women seeking political office. The assumption remained that men spoke for themselves and their wives in political matters (Evans, 2005).

As a result, the women’s suffrage movement had little immediate impact on women or politics. Women did not attain discernible equality nor did women vote as an organized bloc. The only immediate impact from women’s suffrage was to double the electorate; women rarely voted any differently than men (Baker, 1984). However, activists countered that the triumph of the suffragist and feminist movements went beyond immediate attainment of the vote, property rights, and economic independence. First Wave feminists insisted that girls have equal access to education. As a result, women’s place has expanded outside the domestic sphere and ultimately changed American society (Lorber, 2005).

Training “Rosie the Riveter.” The important role of a mother as the first teacher of her children supported the demand for informed womanhood; but from 1750-1865, the pedagogical approach was limited to female-only seminaries, where young women learned to draw, sing, or play the piano. Emma Willard founded the Troy Female Seminary in New
York in 1837, which signaled the beginning of higher education for women in the United States and proved that women were not intellectually inferior to men. Even conservative Catharine Beecher strongly advocated for women to enter the teaching profession, which she saw as a logical extension of the woman’s role within the family home (Sklar, 1976).

Eventually, feminists demanded that women and men be educated together as the only way of ensuring equality (Lorber, 2005) despite opponents who warned that girls schooled with boys would lead to the “coarsening” of feminine traits or that the mental strain would challenge the reproductive capacity of women (Odem, 1995). However, by the 1870s, 90% of high schools were co-educational, although few children attended; only 6.7% of high school-age children were in the nation’s classrooms by 1890 (University of Michigan, 2007).

More persuasive to critics of coeducation at the end of the 19th century was the growing need for teachers; eventually economic expediency led to educating both sexes together (Rosenberg, 1988).

Opportunities for women to be educated outside the home grew from the early 19th century onward. Women were trained and employed in many factories around the nation as full-time wage earners. Women workers, particularly emigrants, were in demand for cheap labor as American industry expanded throughout the end of the century. By 1890, 18% of women ages 14 and over were employed, with over 4 million of them in factory jobs (Flexner, 1975). Women also began to work their way up from the factory floor. In 1900, women made up half of the students enrolled in business and commercial courses in high school, a number that increased to 75% by 1922. By 1920 about one million women occupied clerical jobs in the US. The total percentage of children attending high school had increased significantly by 1930 to 51.4% (University of Michigan, 2007).
The Great Depression did not halt the movement of women into the American workplace. In fact, the number of working women increased by nearly 25%, despite complaints that they were taking jobs from men (Margo, 1992). According to the 1930 census almost 11 million women, or 24.3% of all women in the country, were gainfully employed, with nearly 2 million of them as domestics. A little over 1.5 million women worked in factories. Of the approximately one million professional women, three-quarters were schoolteachers or nurses (Dutcher, 1933). Conversely, marriage rates plunged significantly along with fertility rates, numbers that stayed consistently low throughout the decade (Margo, 1992).

The 1940 census did not indicate dramatic changes in the numbers of working women as the new decade began. Thirteen million women or 25.4% of all women over the age of 14 were working. However, from the Pearl Harbor attacks in December 1941 to March 1944, over 6 million women entered the labor force for the first time, forcing up the number of working women significantly (Hooks, 1947). The US government created the image of “Rosie the Riveter” (Burrell, 2004, p. 8) as a woman who stepped in to do her part to win the war. The US government used the Rosie icon to promote necessary training programs and urged women to enter the work force. Women responded in unprecedented numbers.

At the height of the war in July 1944, women in the labor force totaled 20.6 million, compared with 13.8 million in March 1940. Over 6 million women went to work in professional environments as well as in factories, in offices, and even by driving taxi cabs, an increase of 50% in the female workforce (Chafe, 1991). On the one hand, from March 1940 to March 1944, the proportion of employed women who were craftspeople, line supervisors, operatives, and non-farm laborers as well as the proportion who served in clerical positions
increased. Women in professional and semiprofessional occupations, on the other hand, although they increased slightly in absolute numbers, decreased in proportion to the total; and women domestic service workers declined (Hooks, 1947). Black women who had been limited to farm labor or domestic work also saw opportunities expand over the war years. The proportion of Black women who found factory work jumped from 7.3% to 18.6% even though they continued to suffer racially discriminatory practices as well (Chafe, 1991). Reyes (2011) pointed out that Black women’s wages were extremely low during the period between 1940 and 1960. Therefore, when income data from the US Census were analyzed for economic impact, the Black women’s wages were frequently identified as remote outliers and dropped from the analysis (Reyes, 2011, p. 21).

Despite new opportunities and higher paychecks, women still faced serious problems both inside and outside the workplace. Employers objected to the costs of adapting facilities for women workers; men who remained on the job often ostracized or hazed female co-workers; critics sometimes charged that children, already coping with the absences of their fathers, were further disturbed by working mothers; increased childhood neuroses, delinquency, and runaways were attributed to mothers on the job. Childcare needs also directly affected wartime production, which pressured federal government officials to provide a solution. For example, in the summer of 1943, Los Angeles aircraft manufacturers petitioned the city executives to open the public schools when women left their jobs to supervise their vacationing children (Chafe, 1991).

Government-operated daycare centers were criticized as supplanting the American family structure. Despite Congressional and White House fears that the controversy could have political consequences, national war production was the priority of the hour. The
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Lanham Act provided funds to build childcare centers around the country; and by 1945, more than 1.5 million children were in daycare (Polakow, 2007). During this period, activists continued to debate whether women in the workforce needed special protections or the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) to alleviate discrimination in the workplace. The ERA debate slowed when men returned from war to reclaim their jobs, take a wife, and start a family. Although numbers of working women never fell back to the lows prior to the war years, the truth about the extent of female equality at home and at work was quickly re-established. Government officials were unwilling beyond the war to tangle with societal forces that opposed women working; funding for childcare centers ended shortly thereafter (Chafe, 1991). Presented as part of the US government’s “return to normalcy” (Burrell, 2004, p. 9) campaign, women were urged to return to their responsibilities as wives and mothers. Despite the propaganda, 78% of unmarried women remained in the workforce (Greenwood & Guner, 2009).

Rosie retires early. Americans generally experienced the benefits of unprecedented economic growth during the period following World War II. By the 1950s, White Americans were moving into the middle class and out of the cities to suburban homes with new appliances and an all-important automobile (Halberstam, 1993). Much like the period of mid-19th Century, women were told to create and embrace the beauty, tranquility, and stability of the American home and family. The 1947 bestseller Modern Woman: The Lost Sex, penned by historian Ferdinand Lundberg and psychiatrist Marynia Farnham, MD, utilized contemporary psychoanalytic theory to explain that women who were no longer content to stay at home or to bear children were victims of a neurosis caused by the failure to accept their womanhood. In short, feminists were once again described as being mentally ill.
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Further, the authors of the popular book charged that First Wave feminists were responsible for infanticide and abortion; and their claims of male oppression past or present were absurd (Lundberg & Farnham, 1947). In the face of widespread acceptance that their biology was, in fact, their destiny, American women appeared to accept their societal marching orders. Marriage rates increased by 25% from 1930 to 1950 (Hill, 2011); 82% of women between the ages of 18 and 64 were married (Greenwood & Guner, 2009). The American birth rate soared by 45% from 1945 to 1955 (Hill, 2011) but so did the incidents of female physical and mental health complaints, which were often treated by the introduction of tranquilizers in the 1950s (Friedan, 2001; Halberstam, 1993). Only 23.7% of married women worked (Greenwood & Guner, 2009). Social interaction between women outside the suburban home was considerably diminished from a century earlier – beyond the occasional coffee klatch, no barn raisings or quilting bees offered relief from their daily isolation or child-rearing. Women were beginning to experience the “problem that had no name” (Friedan, 2001, xvi), a confusing sense of discontent with lives that appeared to be pampered on every front.

In the meantime, Simone deBeauvoir published The Second Sex in France in 1949. The book was translated into English and published in the US in 1952. Her writing argued against Freud’s theory of female inferiority. She pointed out that men set the standards for society, thus establishing themselves as the first, most important sex and women as the second. deBeauvoir described women’s subordination to men as a result of socialization rather than biology (Lorber, 2005). American critics dismissed deBeauvoir as irrelevant, claiming that American women were not subordinate to men, merely different in their stay-at-home contentment (Friedan, 2001). Until the publication of Betty Friedan’s The Feminine Mystique launched the Second Wave of feminism in 1963 (Kolmar & Bartkowski, 2005), the
subject of women’s rights seemed to have disappeared along with bloomers and suffragist protest marches.

The “problem” gets a name. Although Friedan ignored the problems of minority women in America (Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2010), her book debunked the notion that motherhood and housework were ultimately fulfilling tasks (Klenke, 1996). At the same time, those women in the 1960s who did seek work outside the home were offered low-paying, low-challenge jobs under the “For Women Only” columns in want advertisements. A number of women began to admit their frustration to each other in sessions that gradually came to be identified as consciousness-raising activities (Brown, 1988). Feminists examined the relationships between men and women and determined that systems previously described as “paternal,” which seemed like a charming word to describe a “Father Knows Best” sort of family life, were instead “patriarchal,” a system whereby “male supremacy and the subjugation of women was [sic] indeed the root and model [of] oppression in society” (Donovan, 2004, p. 156).

Agitation for equality had also begun in African-American communities in the 1950s, especially in the American South; Black citizens, particularly those who had fought for American interests in an integrated army in World War II, demanded an end to segregation at home (Halberstam, 1993). The call for civil rights ramped up in the 1960s just as the feminist movement began the demand for equality with men (Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2010). Importantly, though, the predominant feminist writers of the era were White middle class women whose experiences did not represent women of color. Old divisions between Black and White women such as racism and class rapidly re-appeared and quickly led to segregation of interests (Frye, 1983). The formation of the Black feminist movement became
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official with the founding of the National Black Feminist Organization in 1973 (Burrell, 2004).

The “Second Wave” of feminism. Congress heard women roar in the 1970s whatever their color or class and revived the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), which had been introduced into every session of Congress from 1923 and 1972. The proposed amendment, “Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex” (Alice Paul Institute, 2011), sailed out of Congress in 1972, seemingly on its way to quick ratification. Even advertisers acknowledged the trend. Launched in 1968, the Virginia Slims cigarette advertising campaign, You’ve come a long way, Baby!, suggested that women's freedom, emancipation, and empowerment could be summed up with a cigarette (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2000). Outward signs seemed to indicate that women’s demands were being taken seriously.

By the end of the 1970s, women started running for elective office (see Figure 3).
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Laws that had prohibited a woman’s access to credit, to divorce, or even to the right to retain her maiden name in marriage were overturned. Women were granted the right to demand female members on a jury in the 1975 Supreme Court ruling *Taylor vs. Louisiana* (American Civil Liberties Union [ACLU], 2006). The Court recognized sexual harassment as a form of sex discrimination in 1976; and Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, the first woman appointed to the Supreme Court, arrived in 1981 (Burrell, 2004).

Conversely, a number of American women protested that they valued being “special” and did not want equal rights with men. Led by conservative Phyllis Schlafly, founder of the Eagle Forum, earlier concerns from anti-suffragists were recycled, namely that women would lose valuable protections if they were granted total equality under the law. Schlafly’s contemporary concerns included claims that women would be subject to the draft and military combat as well as unisex bathrooms (Schroeder, 1999). Women from conservative and religious groups quickly mobilized against the ERA, although opposition included women from all walks of life. The amendment stalled after having been ratified by 35 of the necessary 38 states. The seven-year time limit for passage was extended by Congress until June 30, 1982, but ratification fervor had passed (Mathews & DeHart, 1990).

**Grappling with “Difference.”** The Second Wave of the feminist movement led to much deeper thinking about the behaviors evidenced by women in comparison to the behaviors of men. For example, one of the key distinctions of Second Wave feminism was the examination and rebuttal of Freudian doctrine that the male sex is superior to the female. On the one hand, feminists actively challenged Freudian influences on the medical and psychiatric professions that had based treatments for both sexes on appraisals of societal male norms of behavior or response to therapies. On the other hand, some theorists used
Freud’s assertion of natural male aggression to suggest that women were the natural antithesis (Donovan, 2004).

Meanwhile, Black and Latino feminists challenged White feminist pronouncements that revealed a lack of awareness about the realities faced by women outside the middle- and upper-class White world. Noting the lower levels of pay and less desirable job opportunities open to them, feminist women of color mocked the notion that work outside the home was fulfilling (Frye, 1983). Consequently, the 19th century argument about the difference among men and women, Whites, and people of color began again in earnest.

“Nature vs. nurture.” Two broad categories of feminist thinking have been used to explain male and female behaviors (Donovan, 2004). “Difference feminists” contend that differences between the sexes are significant and inherent, whether instilled biologically or culturally. Difference feminists are often referred to as “cultural feminists,” or “essentialists” (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1988, p. 458) referring to their claim that consistent qualities or characteristics typify the sexes. Some difference feminists seek broader cultural transformation, citing the positive characteristics of so-called female attributes such as anti-violence, anti-racism, or environmentalism (Donovan, 2004). Essentialist concerns are also expressed by some feminists of color, who suggest racial differences create fundamentally and profoundly different experiences for women of color who do not relate to the experiences of White women (hooks, 1994). In contrast, equality feminists argue that equal rights across the spectrum of American life permit men as well as women, whatever their race, religion, or ethnicity, freedom to live outside of culturally imposed limitations or gendered expectations (Pollitt, 2005).
Studying difference. In 1982, Carol Gilligan introduced critical findings of gendered differences based on cultural socialization that occurred throughout the maturing lives of males and females, both children and adults; she contended that a significant difference in worldview existed between the sexes (Gilligan, 1993). Gilligan challenged Freud’s assertion that women lacked the capacity for ethical judgment when compared to men and suggested that female behavior tends to be the result of socialization in girlhood to be subordinate to, and relatively dependent on, boys. As a result, women were conditioned throughout their lives to restrain from voicing their innermost thoughts, judgments, and feelings; in effect, they become “selfless” (Gilligan, 1993, p. x) in service to attracting or maintaining relationships, particularly with men. Gilligan postulated that sustained periods of self-repression led women to perceive that consideration for their own desires and choices was profoundly selfish, an immoral act. Gilligan concluded, along with Freud, that female identity was defined within the context of relationships judged by standards of responsibility and care. Male identity was described though individual achievement rather than attachments to others, judging themselves based on the strength of their ideas, unique attainments, or activities (Gilligan, 1993, pp. 160 & 163). Gilligan also argued for the development of a kind of female solidarity that could counter the aggressive and competitive aspects of male influence on society (Donovan, 2004).

Although Gilligan’s work was considered groundbreaking, she revived debates familiar during the 19th century about the aggressive nature of men and the selfless proclivities of women. In 1987, Catherine MacKinnon argued that differences attributed to the sexes are actually caused by social inequality, not by biology.

One of the most deceptive antifeminisms in society, scholarship, politics, and law is
the persistent treatment of gender as if it truly is a question of difference, rather than treating the gender difference as a construct of the difference gender makes.

(MacKinnon, 1987, p. 9)

Two decades later, the debate continued. Equality feminist Katha Pollitt (2005) charged that Gilligan’s sample was too limited, an “elaborate theory of gendered ethics rest[ing] on interviews with a handful of Harvard-Radcliffe undergraduates and . . . unaware that this limits the applicability of data” (p. 141) and that Gilligan’s results were too narrowly examined. Pollitt contended that attributing difference to women based on their caring natures ignored obvious examples of male parenting and nurturance; she charged that Gilligan’s work overlooked the fact that tendencies for violence and domination exist in every human being, as violence against children by both sexes illustrates. Additionally, Pollitt (2005) claimed that Gilligan’s difference theory fundamentally supported a patriarchal insistence that women remain at home tending children and family because they possess a nature to do so. Supporting MacKinnon (1987), Pollitt (2005) argued that equal rights under the law would remove barriers that currently deny both men and women the choice of roles and behaviors currently controlled by social programming.

Gilligan’s work has also prompted criticism from other psychologists. According to Hyde (2005), a number of early 20th century psychological studies led researchers to determine that gender differences were well established in only the following four areas: verbal ability, visual-spatial ability, mathematical ability, and aggression. A more significant amount of evidence supported gender similarities. However, after wide acceptance of Gilligan’s difference theory, textbooks and other publications tended to report almost
exclusively on gender differences, suggesting the erroneous conclusion that differences were greater than similarities between genders (Hyde, 2005).

Gilligan’s work also faced significant criticism from feminists of color, such as bell hooks (1990, 1994), who pointed out that identity formation within the African-American experience of racism was completely absent from Gilligan’s research. Burrell (2004) identified these three areas where women of color are less advantaged than White women: “poverty and the lack of economic opportunity, political disenfranchisement, and a cultural ideology that presents degrading images and beliefs about them as women” (Burrell, 2004, p. 10). Thus, feminists of color faulted Gilligan’s work for assuming that gender is the prime determinant in power relationships between the sexes. In fact, Black feminist hooks argued that race is a more important source of oppression than gender (hooks, 1990, 1994).

**The “Second Wave” under attack.** Although feminists of color demanded that White theorists of the Second Wave era include consideration of race when analyzing complex cultural relationships, compliance was not always possible, even with the best of intentions. In 1983, White feminist Marilyn Frye reflected on her frustration over the racial divide she experienced with feminists of color. Frye termed the privileged status she was accorded in American culture as “race supremacy” (Frye, 1983, p. 110). Frye admitted that she felt defensive in her relationships with women of color. No matter what actions White feminists took or did not take, they were assumed to be racist. Frye eventually understood that her very option of being able to choose when to relate with women of color “poisoned” every situation because the choice was hers. She had a White option that she was free to choose, and they were not. Thus, she believed total equality simply was impossible between her and feminists of color, even when they shared similar goals.
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Obviously aware of the privileged status of White communications, bell hooks urged Black theorists to embrace Post-modernist examinations of essentialist theories about Black culture. Despite fears that such explorations could weaken an important sense of history or culture that arose from the unique African-American experience, hooks charged the following greater threat: that failure by Black theorists to examine the differences within Black culture weakened cultural bonding. Further, people of color needed to work together in the face of various crises in American society that influenced their lives (hooks, 1994, p. 4). Chief among hooks’ concerns was conceding the discussion of Black issues of crisis to White theorists.

The 21st Century woman. Second Wave feminism also encountered aggressive political opposition when members of the Reagan administration formed alliances with religious groups that revived complaints from earlier generations, namely, that feminism and affirmative action posed threats to the nuclear family as well as healthy child-rearing and that they lessened the chances of working, single women for marriage or family (Faludi, 1991). Faludi (1991) termed the trend a backlash against the gains made toward female equality in the mid-20th century, writing, “It [The backlash trend] stands the truth boldly on its head and proclaims that the very steps that have elevated women’s position have actually led to their downfall” (Faludi, 1991, p. xviii). Proof of the paradox is found in the fact that many young women, particularly White Conservatives, appear less concerned with lower pay and reduced health care options for women; they are instead more concerned with banishing the culturally imposed limitations upon men who wish to stay home with children or enter professions traditionally considered feminine (Zucker, 2004). Such women have scorned the early
Second Wave theorists as “out of touch” with contemporary issues and scoffed at the contention that women are generally relegated to a second-class status in American society.

Representative writers such as Camille Paglia have accused Second Wave feminists of neglecting real concerns of women in favor of “gender-bashing” men. Critics (Paglia, 1997; Sommers, 2000; van Zoonen, 1994) have claimed that feminist theory has become outdated in 21st century America, an assertion to which many younger women have responded, understanding feminist analysis of patriarchy systems as divisive or sexist (Carolina Journal & Cupp, 2011).

As a result of the cultural backlash (Faludi, 1991) against feminism during the last two decades of the 20th century, new strands of feminist thought have emerged. After rejecting the traditional Second Wave feminist construct that women are oppressed in a patriarchal society, a “Third Wave” interpretation of female influence, described as “girl power,” has surfaced. Decrying their foremothers’ attitudes toward sexual relationships as “puritanical” and embracing “girlie culture” (Lorber, 2005, p. 298), proponents express “girl power” through music, fashion, and cosmetics. The typical adherents to “girl/girlie power” are, not surprisingly, young women. Embracing sexual play around gender, Third Wave theorists emphasize the power of sex and agency women individually expect to battle AIDS, racism, and poverty (Lorber, 2005). At the same time, Gauntlett (2002) pointed out that “femininity . . . is not necessarily seen as the state of ‘being a woman’; instead, it’s perceived more as a stereotype of a woman’s role from the past” (Gauntlett, 2002, p. 10).

Ironically, the generational emphasis on girlie attitudes as well as fashions exists in a political environment that reinforces patriarchal restraint and control of female sexuality. As outlined in Chapter 1, state and national legislative attacks against welfare, abortion rights,
and reproductive services launched since the 1980s have now become the centerpiece of Conservative domestic policy (AAUW, 2012; NOW, 2011). The political and social hostility to feminism has reduced women’s inclination to refer to themselves as feminists even though they oppose reproductive restrictions and acknowledge that they still do not enjoy complete equality with men. Such concerns have led to new strands of thinking described as “Third Wave” feminism and Post-Feminism (Lorber, 2005). In fact, some women have preferred to set aside the term “feminist” altogether in favor of personal self-descriptions such as “gender equity activist” (Christina, 2011), signaling their desire for freedom from cultural norms on behalf of both sexes.

The emphasis placed on taking control of vocabulary to describe one’s gender or strength is an effort to disrupt a well-trod path. Traditionally, language has been the tool of men in power who defined members of particular groups, ranked the importance of the group in hierarchical terms, and then labeled the groups with distinctive names (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1988), a practice which accounts for the lasting impact of gender definitions that ascribed superiority to men and corresponding inferiority to women. Post feminists have asserted that feminist theories addressed only to the lives of women perpetuate inequality across a broad spectrum of both men and women stratified within complex social orders. The rise of a new gay culture, where the term “queer” has been proudly claimed and popularized, is one example. Connections among people who share categories of race, ethnicity, religion, social class, or sexual orientation are held to be more powerful than their sex category of “male” or “female” (Doty, 1993; Lorber, 2005).

However, none of the Third Wave versions of feminism from the end of the 20th century have resolved issues of inequality between men and women, nor have they altered
the percentages of representational leadership significantly in the last decade (Lorber, 2005). Messages conveying the appropriate roles for women within today’s society remain suspect depending on the source. The varied forms of mass media, described as “key institutions” (Biagi, 2012, p. 11) globally, bombard readers daily with commercials, entertainment, and other messages affecting culture, buying habits, politics, and social structures. The impact of mass media on the societal roles women play will be examined further in the section entitled “Media Feminism.”

**Female Leadership Style and Policy Interests**

At the time Gilligan first published the book *In a Different Voice*, only two women had been elected to the governor’s office: Ella Grasso of Connecticut served from 1975-1980, and Dixy Lee Ray of Washington served from 1977-1981. Women in high elected office were regarded as a novelty, a response to female leaders that continues to be in play even as more women enter the electoral arena. Cantor, Bernay, and Stoess (1992) put it this way:

Clearly, politics and political behavior are seen as masculine endeavors. Political behavior, as we define it, includes autonomy, independent opinions, and aggressive action. By definition, in our society women who are aggressive and autonomous have been seen as deviant and have been considered unacceptable and undesirable as women. (p. 7)

Despite challenges to Gilligan’s essentialist positions, her work transformed the discussion about elected or appointed female leadership. She provided a new frame that refuted female leadership as a sign of deviance while examining gender differences in areas of leadership and policy development. In fact, Gilligan’s work suggested that female leaders
would bring a kinder, gentler focus to the job. Early observers of women leaders concluded that women tended to lead from a more “contextual viewpoint” (Kathlene, 2001, p. 28), seeing people’s lives as connected and interdependent, concerned with the quality of their relationships with others and meeting the interrelated needs of people (Swers, 2002a). The possibility of an omission that could hurt or damage another was described as serious concern to women (Kohn, 1992). Men, on the other hand, tended to operate inside a competitively hierarchical structure based on respect for and defense of individual rights that often precluded care for others (Kathlene, 2001, pp. 25-28). Nevertheless, equality feminist Katha Pollitt argued that supporters of such viewpoints “are looking backward, not forward” (Pollitt, 2005, p. 151), predicting that as women continued their climb to prominence in careers and other leadership roles, they would evidence the same weaknesses (and strengths) of the men with whom they shared a common humanity.

Female governors did not abound for research purposes either in the 1980s or today to determine whether their experiences correlated to leadership assumptions based on Gilligan’s, Cantor’s, or Pollitt’s theories. To date, very little research has been done to determine the impact of women governors on policy or leadership. Many researchers instead have examined female leaders in legislative bodies as well as other fields including business and education. In this section, I will review findings to date on the difference women make in the various systems within which they lead.

**Political leadership.** When examining women legislative leaders, important differences in the environments within which legislators and governors operate must be kept in mind. Most notably, even Congressional-level legislators such as the powerful former Speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi, are responsible for a much narrower policy agenda and
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are accountable primarily to their party leadership as well as citizens within their legislative district. Governors, on the other hand, lead in a much more complex universe. Like US presidents, governors must coalesce a variety of competing interests at the state and national levels while serving, at the same time, as the head of their particular political party (Beyle, 1996). All of these responsibilities inherently conflict. Add a woman to the mix, especially a first-time female governor; and the complexities of the executive job are further deepened.

Examining the impact of increased female membership in state legislatures during the 1980s, Jewell and Whicker (1993) identified the following three dominant leadership types evidenced by both men and women in the US political culture: 1) Command, a predominantly male type, displayed by a high need to control others; 2) Coordinating, a characteristic of both men and women who evidence a moderate need to control others but who build coalitions to achieve policy goals; and 3) Consensus, identified as predominantly a female leader with a low need to control others, who will assume a variety of roles to accommodate conflict in pursuit of harmony and the wellbeing of fellow legislators (Jewell & Whicker, 1993). Jewell and Whicker (1993) also claimed that the increased numbers of women members had resulted in “the feminization” (p. 710) of state legislative leaders. As the number of women elected to office grew, men tended to adopt consensus behaviors rather than the control-and-command styles driven by narrow personal ambitions, a conclusion probed by the researchers. “Nor did most of the leaders we interviewed necessarily think that this ‘feminization’ of leadership resulted in weaker leaders, but rather as a necessary trend given underlying shifts in the natures of state legislatures” (Jewell & Whicker, 1993, p. 711).

Also important to the discussion of difference between male and female leaders is the question of aim. According to Rosenthal (1998), access to power motivates men and women
differently. “Women are much more likely to share power and to use it to promote change, where men use power based on position or ability to reward, punish, or have influence over others” (Rosenthal, 1998, p. 57). Women in powerful executive positions have typically discussed power in the context of a tool that is used to “getting things done” (Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2010, p. 311) rather than a goal in itself.

Until recently, when highly conservative women began to appear on the political frontlines, research about women politicians indicated certain liberal trends. For example, as a result of their broader interpretations of the value of power, women in public office exhibited a leadership style that encouraged the inclusion of other perspectives (Kathlene, 2001). Women were also held more likely to emphasize and attempt to increase citizen participation in the policy-making process, particularly involvement of formerly excluded or underrepresented groups such as women and minorities (CAWP, 1991). Female elected officials at the local level also tended to make special efforts to hire women and to recruit them as candidates for public office (Conway et al., 1997).

However, more recent research (Carroll, 2003a; Evans, 2005; Riccucci & Saidel, 2001; Swers, 2002b; Thomas & Welch, 2001) has indicated that other contextual factors such as the political party to which female legislators belong and the make-up of the districts they represent are more likely to constrain their behavior and influence their policy decisions than their gender. Interestingly, researchers have suggested that women legislators at the state and federal levels are less liberal today than they were a decade ago (Carroll, 2003a; Evans, 2005; Swers, 2002b).

Meanwhile, US Presidents have been setting a new standard for non-White, female appointments. While some male leaders, in particular Presidents Bill Clinton and George
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Bush, have been known to make efforts to diversify office appointments outside traditionally preferred White males, none approached a 50-50 balance between male and female appointments. The exception has been President Barack Obama. Although the most powerful Obama aides are White men, only 9 of the 22 members of the Obama Cabinet are White men (Barnes, 2011). President Obama is also the first American President in history to appoint a majority (70%) of women or minorities to the federal bench. Former President George W. Bush had a non-traditional appointment rate of only 32.9%. Bill Clinton’s minority appointments totaled 48.1% (Stodghill, 2011).

Conservative national trends. At the Congressional level, especially in the US House, women have become more conservative and less committed to representing the interests of women in public policy (Evans, 2005; Potts, 2010; Swers, 2002b). Congresswoman Michelle Bachman, a Minnesota Republican and a recent presidential candidate was recently named to the Top 10 List of Most Conservative Republicans in Congress by the conservative think-tank Heritage Foundation (Stewart, 2011). Core Republican constituencies such as Christian conservatives strongly opposed liberal positions on women’s issues, especially reproductive rights (Carroll, 2003a; Swers, 2002b). Moderate Republican women with voting records that reflected past concerns for women’s issues or who represented districts with a moderate ideological stance became disadvantaged when competing for legislative leadership.

The new conservative policy commitment had an immediate effect. Support for liberal positions on “women’s issues” votes among Republican men dropped an average of 26%. However, Republican women reduced their support for liberal positions on women’s issues by an average of almost 50% (Swers, 2002b). In 2010, a record eight new Republican
women were elected to the House and one new Republican woman was elected to the Senate (Bash, 2010).

**Gender equality in gendered systems.** As Norton (1995) pointed out, female legislators face a major obstacle because of the formal and informal institutional arrangements in place for crafting public policy. Legislative committee systems require years of seniority, which keep intact the power of the incumbent male committee leaders. Changes in legislative trends, such as the feminization of state legislatures, do not necessarily indicate changes in power structures or in policy emphasis. According to Billing and Alvesson (2000), attributing leadership trends to increased female participation tends to reinforce stereotypes by actually bolstering traditional gender-based divisions of labor that assign the “tough” jobs to men. Such a practice seems to exist in the case of Congress, where different committees have various levels of prestige representing the most impact; the most important committees in the US Senate are Appropriations, Finance, and Foreign Policy (Burrell, 2004). In the House, the Rules Committee carries the highest import (Burrell, 2004) along with the Commerce Committee (Swers, 2002a), the Ways and Means Committee, and Appropriations because these committees most “influence the broad House policy agenda” (Frisch & Kelly, 2003, p. 7). Despite the fact that Senators Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein have both served for 20 years, their seniority has not provided them with access to chair any of the prestigious Congressional committees (White, 2011), all of which are chaired by men (CAWP, 2007; Office of the Clerk, 2012).

In other words, a gendered structure exists within governing bodies that support masculine behaviors and norms while rejecting feminine leadership and, thereby, female policy interests (Duerst-Lahti & Kelly, 1995; Evans, 2005; King, 1995; Norton, 1995; Palmer
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& Simon, 2006; Rosenthal, 1998). As a result, the impact of the increasing numbers of conservative women currently serving in Congress is still largely unknown due to their freshman status (Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2010).

Outside America. Researchers have noted that global examples of female leadership are not assumed to favor consensus-building leadership styles nor are they expected to support overt concern for family-friendly policy. For example, Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of Great Britain from 1979 to 1990, and current German Chancellor Angela Merkel are typically described as tough and demanding; and the political environments in which they lead are depicted equally so. In Thatcher’s case, Britain was beset by strikes, low employment, and severe cuts to social welfare benefits under Tory party leadership. Margaret Thatcher cut personal income tax rates to 40%, reduced or ended subsidies, generated economic growth, and dispatched the British military to reclaim the Falkland Islands which Argentinians had illegally seized (Black, 2011). Thatcher earned the moniker the “Iron Lady” (Sykes, 2008a) with her femininity expressed largely through hats and handbags. Her conservative policies, however, were articulated in “the confrontational, combative language of ‘conviction politics’” (Sykes, 2008b, p. 761).

Chancellor Merkel has controlled efforts to recover from the current European debt crisis by doing exactly the opposite of the Obama administration, which had attempted to soften the blow of the Great Recession. The impact of financial obligations Merkel has imposed on Greece and other debt-ridden members of the European Union have been termed “severe” (Black, 2011); but Merkel has won praise for standing firm on her policies. She has also created a great deal of personal outrage among constituents resulting from rising retirement ages and has earned her own moniker, “Frau Nein” or “Madam No” (Angela
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Merkel, *New York Times*, 2011). While neither Thatcher nor Merkel inspires great affection, even their detractors admit that the two are examples of effective leaders and that toughness is part of the package (Black, 2011; Hill, 2010).

**Back in the USA.** The reality of governing on a national scale may disadvantage women running for US President because policy priorities such as economics or defense dominate the contest. Sykes (2008b) argued that the very institution of the US presidency is “predominantly masculinist” (Sykes, 2008b, p. 761), privileging the historically male model of leadership that has its origins in British tradition. Even Britain’s female Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher demonstrated a masculinist style emphasizing “rugged individualism” (Sykes, 2008b, p. 761) as she cut social programs. At the same time, Sykes contended that the US election of 2008 was an example of a “political time” (Sykes, 2008b, p. 761) when the American people, tired of eight years of Middle East warfare and aggressive neoconservative political actions, were shifting toward more interest in domestic concerns. The Bush administration’s poor handling of the 2005 Hurricane Katrina crisis in New Orleans underscored a new demand for federal response to homeland concerns (Tesler & Sears, 2010). The public desire for consensus-building and collective engagement typically favors stereotypical female traits, which partially explains the unique gender make-up of the 2008 presidential race (Sykes, 2008b).

However, significant disagreement exists about what characteristics a woman candidate for the highest executive office must exhibit. Kornblut (Norris & Kornblut, 2010) asserted that voters in 2008 were very uncertain about just who Hillary Clinton was (i.e., a woman first, leader second?). Interestingly, Clinton’s campaign could not seem to clarify the answer. For example, Clinton was pro-choice; and she interpreted women’s rights within the
broader frame of human rights (Goldstein, 2008). She also added a distinctive feminist slant to the Democratic platform, including support for the ERA, reproductive rights, equal pay, and work-family balance as well as opposition to sexism and to violence against women. She had championed a comprehensive national healthcare plan in her husband’s administration where she often stressed the needs of women and children. Yet, she tried to downplay her gender entirely, spending much of her time campaigning to prove her toughness.

Understanding the masculinist nature of the presidency, Clinton focused on portraying herself as strong as well as decisive and able to stand up to terrorists, in the Thatcher mode of feminine leadership. While many admired Clinton’s intellect and abilities, her strategy left even supporters feeling disconnected to her as a person (Sykes, 2008b; Norris & Kornblut, 2010). Facing comparisons between herself and an older McCain, as well as with the younger, charismatic candidates Obama and Palin, “Clinton found herself caught in a classic double bind: When she appeared tough, she seemed insensitive, when she expressed emotion and compassion she conveyed weakness” (Sykes, 2008b, p. 762).

Sykes (2008b) argued that Clinton’s primary challenger, Senator Barack Obama, benefitted from his gender because of the masculinist nature of the US President’s office. Although he never had to turn the conversation from his wardrobe or his cleavage to focus on the welfare of the nation, Obama’s campaign was considerably challenged by his race. From the start, Obama’s right to run for office was challenged by the so-called “birthers” who claimed he was not an American citizen because his father was a citizen of Kenya. Members of the radical right claimed Obama’s middle name “Hussein” was proof that he was Muslim and/or Arab, suggesting that Obama was a terrorist mole. Prominent Americans like Donald Trump pursued the issue even after Obama was inaugurated, forcing the release of Obama’s
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Hawaiian birth certificate in 2011. During the 2012 presidential campaign, the rumbles started again of an Obama administration conspiracy to fake his birth certificate (Hamby, 2012). Even in 2012, claims that Obama is a secret Muslim continue to fuel commentary on the Fox News channel (Christopher, 2012, March 20). However, in 2008, Obama’s campaign promoted openness and optimism; he invited Americans to join together to improve the nation; his campaign took advantage of the national desire to move past warfare and embrace the new American future he seemed to represent – and he won (Iff, 2009).

**Female leadership in business.** Given the limited numbers of female elected leaders, researchers have continued to explore the impact of female leadership in other fields. Study results about gender equality for women in leadership in the professions of business and education support the research available about elected women leaders: 1) Women business leaders are credited with a different leadership style than men; and 2) attaining a position of power whether through advancement or through an elected leadership role is insufficient to achieve gender equality (Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2010; Duerst-Lahti & Kelly, 1995). In fact, many women are barred from leadership positions due to gender inequity. In an online discussion coordinated by the United Nations’ Division for the Advancement of Women, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2007), participants from the United States expressed concern that gender discrimination, sexual harassment and employment inequity were problems still largely unaddressed in the American workplace (WomenWatch, 2007). Equality feminists like Katha Pollitt have argued that difference feminists including Gilligan have contributed to the current discriminatory workplace practices women encounter.

Although it is couched in the language of praise, difference feminism is demeaning to
women. It asks that women be admitted into public life and public discourse not because they have a right to be there, but because it will improve them. (Pollitt, 2005, p. 153)

Pollitt contended that “difference feminism” has provided men with a convenient way to respect “female” values and behavior while holding onto power - after all, real women do not want it. That social construct may reinforce the power status of women as second class citizens, but the numbers of women entering the workforce continue toward balance with those of men. Interestingly, analysis (Lam, 2012) indicated that gains for women were influenced by broader job shifts in the economy. For example, women are predominant in health and education jobs just as they were 30 years ago and more. However, the number of US jobs in these fields has more than doubled — from 7% in 1972 to 15% today. At the same time, the total number of manufacturing jobs has fallen sharply in the US — from 24% in 1972, to 9% today, a field where men have traditionally held the most jobs and still do (Lam, 2012, para. 7-10). Over time, women have moved into managerial positions, attracting the notice of researchers interested in the impact women make, once again looking for difference.

**Women become “transformational”**. In the mid- to late-1980s the term *transformational leadership* (Bass, 1985) was applied to leaders who set aside self-interest for the good of the group, a style considered ultimately most satisfying to both managers and employees. Transformational leaders were distinguished from *transactional leaders* meaning those who rewarded outstanding performance, or “contingent behaviors,” but were not otherwise involved with employees. The least successful leaders practiced *laissez-faire leadership*, defined as providing little or no attention to workers or their concerns (Bass,
The transformational leadership style also produced measurable results (Bass, 1990).

Other researchers including O’Toole (1995) emphasized the importance of a leader’s values and morality to energize followers in the pursuit of goals they may have previously thought impossible to reach and to engage enthusiastically in the process. However, O’Toole went beyond Bass’s ideas to ascribe positive elements of transformational leadership as characteristics often displayed by women; O’Toole described feminine leadership as a benefit to large and complex organizations:

The key to the success of “feminine” leadership is the inclusion of the followers in the process of leading change. People become energized when they are included because they feel respected. In contrast, when they are ordered to do something, they become angry because they are being treated as inferiors. (O’Toole, 1995, p. 138)

According to O’Toole, when a leader treats followers as inferiors, people begrudgingly comply with the leader’s command and, in fact, potentially withdraw their cooperation altogether, further supporting Bass’s contention of positive results from transformational leaders.

Other researchers built on Gilligan’s gender-based research to define distinctions of leadership (Burrell, 2004; Cantor et al., 1992; Jewell & Whicker, 1993; O’Toole, 1995; Rosenthal, 1998) predicated on the ways men and women interpret power and leadership. Eagly and Johnson (1990) pointed out that “women's social skills might enable them to perform managerial roles differently than men. Interpersonal behavior that is skillful (e.g., in terms of understanding others' feelings and intentions) should facilitate a managerial style that is democratic and participative” (Eagly & Johnson, 1990, p. 248). In an article published
in an issue of *Bloomberg Business Week*, Sharpe (2000) boldly stated the positive results from hiring women executives: “After years of analyzing what makes leaders most effective and figuring out who’s got the Right Stuff, management gurus now know how to boost the odds of getting a great executive: Hire a female” (para. 1). Yet a scant half-page later, the natural question was posed: “If women are so great, why aren’t more of them running big companies?” (Sharpe, 2000, para. 6). Eagly and Karau (2002) pointed out that despite enthusiastic claims about improved results, women faced male objections to their leadership. The female gender role is more likely to be incongruent with leader roles than is the male gender role, producing a greater potential for prejudice against female leaders.

In 2003, Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen conducted a meta-analysis of 45 studies of leadership styles and found that female leaders were more transformational than male leaders and also engaged in more contingent reward behaviors that are a component of transactional leadership. Male leaders were generally more likely to practice transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership, the least effective or least satisfying form of leadership (Bass, 1997, p. 137). Such differences between men and women managers were considered to be small but encouraging signs that demand for female leaders will grow (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). However, the researchers cautioned that the causes of female effectiveness in leadership roles could not be determined from this study. In other words, the “nature-versus-nurturing” debate was not resolved; but the competence and the effectiveness of female managers was underscored.

Despite connections made between women leaders and positive results in the workplace, gendered systems within the corporate world still act to limit women’s access to the boardrooms. The most recent statistics indicate that women remain far from attaining
significant leadership roles in corporate America, particularly in Fortune 500 companies, a number that has increased by less than 1% over the last three years (see Figure 5).


The numbers are even lower for Black women. A report issued in 2008 by the Executive Leadership Council noted that Black women corporate executives make up only 1.1% of US corporate officers. The Black Women Executives Research Initiative revealed that 90% of Black women feel they have a good working relationship with their White male chief executive officers (CEOs), but those same White men feel exactly the opposite; further, the White CEOs felt it was up to the Black women executives to work on improving the relationship (The Executive Leadership Council, 2008). Female executives, regardless of racial or ethnic background, continue to report cultural barriers to advancement that men do not face including stereotypes, lack of access to informal networks, and an unwelcoming corporate culture.
Such circumstances suggest that gendered corporate systems favoring male executives have not improved over time (Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2010) and are not likely to change in the foreseeable future. Hyde (2005) argued that, at least in part, wide acceptance of difference theory may have contributed to the slow assimilation of women into leadership positions.

For women, the cost in the workplace can be enormous. Women who violate the stereotype of being nurturant and nice can be penalized in hiring and evaluations.

. . . . Women must present themselves as competent and agentic to be hired, but they may then be viewed as interpersonally deficient and uncaring and receive biased work evaluations because of their violation of the female nurturance stereotype. (Hyde, 2005, p. 590)

**Female leadership in education.** A field that could be considered defined by the female stereotype of nurturance and caring for children is public education. Since the beginning of the 20th century, women have gradually replaced men in the classroom until their numbers now dominate (Wyman, 2000). In 2010, 81.8% of the 2,813,000 elementary and middle school teachers were female; at the secondary level, 57% of the 1,221,000 teachers were women; and women also held 62.6% of the 830,000 education administrator positions in American schools (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010).

However, according to the *Digest of Education Statistics* (Snyder & Dillow, 2011), women and minorities in higher education faculty positions continued to lag behind White males. About 79% of all faculty were White; 42% males, 37% females; approximately 18% were people of color. The average salary for males in 2009-10 ($80,885) was higher than the average salary for females ($66,653). At institutions with tenure systems in 2009 to 2010,
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55% of male faculty members had tenure compared with 41% of females (Snyder & Dillow, 2011).

According to Gupton (2009), based on a 2009 survey of the status of women in educational leadership in the United States conducted by the Forum on Public Policy, many women in higher education reported that they continued to be penalized for time away from their careers spent while rearing children. The author of the report concluded that gendered systems must be made flexible to accommodate the requirements of family “if true ‘equity’ in the workplace is ever to emerge” (p. 16); she added, “Unfortunately, the two paths for many women are mutually exclusive choices” (Gupton, 2009, p. 16).

Male leadership also remained dominant in district superintendencies. According to a survey by the American Association of School Superintendents (AASA), women led in 24.1% of the school districts surveyed, up from only 13.2% in 1992 (AASA, 2010). When compared to 2006, however, when 21.7% of the districts were led by women, the increase is less dramatic. Additionally, in the AASA 2006 survey report, 29% of women superintendents said a glass ceiling existed that hurt women’s chances of being selected for the job. In 2010, only 11.1% of superintendencies were held by African Americans, both male and female. In 2007, the AASA surveyed further to discover that minority group respondents were more than twice as likely as their peers in the non-minority group to report that they had encountered discrimination in their pursuit of the superintendency (AASA, 2007). While the number of female superintendents is on the rise, at the current rate of change the 10-year study concluded that parity with men in the superintendent ranks would take women more than three decades to achieve. Gender disparity is even more pronounced considering the fact that the vast majority of the public education work force is female (AASA, 2010).
An earlier RAND Education (2004) report noted that tracking data about male-female leadership and race is important in order to ensure equality and diversity; but even more importantly is the question that remains unanswered in this era of accountability, to wit: What are “the characteristics of administrators that promote improved student achievement?” (RAND Education, 2004, p. 1). Indeed, the determination that women actually lead or emphasize policy in unique ways to enhance student performance would potentially incite an impact revolutionary in nature. However, consideration of the inconsistent standards by which success is measured across the nation ensures that issues of gender performance or policy impact will go unanswered for the foreseeable future.

**Public Education Policy Context**

Unlike many major nations in the world, and despite national measurements of student achievement such as the National Center for Educational Statistics, the United States does not have a legislatively imposed national education curriculum or one standard by which to measure the success of education policy (Burke, 1990) and perhaps deliberately so. The American education system was entrusted to the states by intentional default (Alexander & Alexander, 2001). The Founding Fathers feared the power to educate might become corrupted to no more than a propagandist tool at the national level; another fear was that local schools, which, at that time, existed primarily to provide parochial religious training, might be forced to follow a national religion (Alexander & Alexander, 2001, Cohen & Spillane 1993). According to the Tenth Amendment, any powers not specifically designated to the federal government are within the purview of the states (Alexander & Alexander, 2001; Burke 1990; Fuhrman, 1993). The Tenth Amendment has been interpreted as intentionally
leaving matters of education to the states since its ratification in 1791 as part of the Bill of Rights (Lewis & Maruna, 1996).

**The impact of the Founding Fathers.** The Founding Fathers’ decisions ensured that, today, officials in 50 states fund and supervise a myriad of locally directed systems in America for over 48 million students attending approximately 14,000 school districts in more than 98,000 schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). However, this situation does not mean that federal government officials are indifferent to education or never take action to influence education policy. On the contrary, officials at the federal government level have taken a highly active role in stimulating state leaders to move in one direction or another, primarily through the influence of regulations passed by Congress (Alexander & Alexander, 2001). As a result of the federal government's "carrot-and-stick" (Alexander & Alexander, 2001, p. 63) approach to the states, education policy reflects the inherent sovereignty of the individual states, shaped within the framework of Constitutional principles.

**The governors’ powers.** Given the requirements of designing and implementing education policy across the individual interests of many stakeholders, the leadership capacity of the governor is crucial (Herzik, 1991). A governor’s relationships with legislators often determine the success of his or her administration (Beyle, 1996). Any governor, male or female, who takes office today must contend with the deep polarization between the two primary parties, Republicans and Democrats, which currently make up the political landscape. State legislatures are often nearly evenly divided, making consensus about policy decisions difficult to reach, particularly when dealing with taxes, welfare, education, and the environment – all issues that reflect different ideological expressions. Even if the legislature
reflects a clear party majority, philosophical differences exist within particular parties. Plus, society-at-large remains divided nearly evenly (Brownstein, 2007). Nearly 20 years ago, Fuhrman and Elmore (1994) contended that governors were particularly well suited to exert influence and lead their states toward more streamlined, coherent policies that promoted challenging outcomes for students. Today, arriving at any outcome other than gridlock or polarized debate seems noteworthy. Thus, the governor must proceed toward policy goals with a deep understanding of the competing forces in play for resource allocation (Fowler, 2000).

However, despite legislative divisions, governors have powerful tools at their disposal (e.g., state-wide electoral constituencies); governors have a broader perspective on the diverse interests of the people they serve; governors can craft broad policy initiatives and can energize citizens around a common vision (Herzik, 1991). They can convene representatives of different interests and build coalitions through structures like commissions or interagency task forces and through public outreach as well as rhetoric (Gross, 1991; Lewis & Maruna, 1996). Because of their overarching responsibility for elementary, secondary, and higher education, governors have a legitimate role in assembling the varied constituencies needed to contribute to broad solutions (Beyle, 1996; Fuhrman & Elmore, 1994). Not that the governor must initiate policies such as new curriculum frameworks, but he or she is the best point of origin for a statewide effort to coordinate education policy so the specific elements fit together (Mazzoni, 1994), a process that is discussed in more detail in the next section.

**Public policy priorities.** Policies governing the operation of public schools have been the focus of state attention and budgets since the early 1800s (Spring, 1990) with thousands of educational policies, comparisons among them, and results tracked since the
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late 1960s (Education Commission of the States, 2012). Any number of issues can be considered worthy of a public policy, but only a few will be identified as worthy of government attention. Key to whether an issue becomes a public policy is the manner in which the issue is presented or framed. Issues that are presented as having the most important impact on the public have the best chance of garnering a political response (Fowler, 2000; Herzik, 1991). However, equally complex is determining the appropriate political response once an issue has attracted governmental attention (Stetson, 2000). The federal government and its agents also reflect a particular political philosophy that directly influences state policy choices—one that the governor and legislature may or may not favor (Beyle, 1996).

Opposing worldviews often make policy decisions excruciatingly difficult (Kunin, 2008; Whitman, 2005). However, sometimes a change in worldview at the state level is critical in order to satisfy US Constitutional law.

In 1954, the Supreme Court ruling Brown vs. the Board of Education (1954) outlawed the concept of “separate-but-equal,” segregated schools in America (Alexander & Alexander, 2001). During the highly activist decades of the 1960s through the 1970s, federal government officials took aggressive action to attack America’s social problems including school segregation, poverty, and women’s equality (Burke, 1990; Cohen & Spillane, 1993). During this period, the federal government preferred to keep governors and their educational experts at arm’s length, rarely inviting them to submit their viewpoints during federal policy conferences (Kaplan & O’Brien, 1991). In large part, federal officials had lost trust in the willingness or capacity of local administrators to represent impartially the needs of their district’s students; violent conflicts surrounding school desegregation actually required federal intervention to resolve the issues (Lewis & Maruna, 1996).
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In the 1980s, members of the Reagan administration began to push greater responsibility for the welfare of citizens back onto the states. By default, the Reagan administration’s budget cutbacks pushed state governors to the forefront of policy making, particularly in areas of education and other social welfare programs (Burke, 1990; Fowler, 2000; Furman & Elmore, 1994; Kaplan & O’Brien, 1991). Ironically, after first claiming the Department of Education would be eliminated under his administration, President Reagan ensured attention that remained focused on US education efforts through the start of the 21st century. In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) issued a report called *A Nation at Risk*, which sounded an alarm about the mediocre quality of American public schools (Mazzoni, 1994), claiming “if an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre education performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 1). Although school accountability had been a topic high on many state agendas since the 1970s (Mazzoni, 1994), Fowler (2000) claimed that, for the first time after the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, American citizens lost a great deal of respect as well as trust for their schools and for public school teachers. As a result of such factors, state policy makers were called to take action as the level of government charged with responsibility for education.

Central to the reform movements in the states was the “... ‘new breed’ of state governors who were hailed by the media and depicted by scholars as pivotal actors in promoting education reforms” (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 58). The education reform movement gave the nation’s governors the opportunity and the incentive to generate broad-based support for innovative legislation. Many engaged in high-powered issue campaigns and, in so doing,
pushed state government action deep into the territory traditionally held by local school district administrators. By the end of the 1980s, legislators in 39 states had passed bills requiring minimum competency testing (Mazzoni, 1994). By the end of the 1990s, the number of states either testing or requiring district personnel to test elementary and secondary students had increased to 47 (Fuhrman, 1993). Legislators in several states had also passed state take-over legislation that allowed state officials to assume operation of schools considered deficient (Fowler, 2000). “By 1990, all 50 governors had projected their collective power on education issues into national as well as state policy arenas, an expression of influence that would have been unthinkable at the decade’s outset” (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 66). The consensus-building leaders of the National Governor’s Association (NGA) placed the responsibility for the enactment of new policy ideas squarely with the governors and granted them widespread political legitimacy (Fuhrman & Elmore, 1994).

**Gender equity issues.** While the pressure built for schools to improve student performance, data analysis revealed just who was having the greatest difficulty in American classrooms. In 1991, The American Association of University Women (AAUW) introduced results of a poll entitled *Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America* (AAUW, 1991, 1994), the first national survey to link to classroom experiences a decline in the self-esteem of pre-adolescent and adolescent American girls, reprinted in 1994. The AAUW Educational Foundation released a follow-up study in 1992 that went further. The report, *How Schools Shortchange Girls*, synthesized more than 1,300 published studies on girls in school to reveal these results: Girls received significantly less attention from their teachers than their male classmates; cases of sexual harassment and assault on girls were increasing; and girls were less likely to pursue scientific or technological careers even if they did well in related courses.
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(AAUW, 1992). The AAUW report was buttressed by the commission of an anecdotal yet well-researched book School Girls: Young Women, Self-Esteem, and the Confidence Gap by Peggy Orenstein (1994). Orenstein (1994) concluded that schools did, in fact, have a hidden agenda, at times unrecognized by school personnel, that reinforced girls’ second-class citizenship early on. This second-class status emphasized their vulnerability and dependence on the good nature of boys and men, thereby reducing their self-confidence in their ability to assert or to realize their own desires.

In the end, the push to provide equal opportunities and protections for girls in schools inspired Congress to renew funding in 2001 for the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA), originally passed in 1974 to fund Title IX fully. The Act provided funding for model programs promoting gender equity in education. However, funding for the program reached a high in 1980 of $10 million, decreased after 1987 to less than $4 million annually until reaching a new low of $2.4 million in 2009 (Feminist Majority Foundation, 2010).

Interestingly, research conducted nearly 20 years after the AAUW study challenged the claims that girls’ loss of self-esteem led to poor academic performance. According to Hyde (2005), gender meta-analysis studies supported the notion that self-esteem was roughly as much a problem for adolescent boys as it was for adolescent girls. Hyde conducted a meta-analysis of 45 studies from 1985 to 2004 examining a variety of so-called differences in gender characteristics; he concluded that “78% of gender differences are small or close to zero” (Hyde, 2005, pp. 582-583). His analysis confirmed that girls and boys had slight advantages over each other depending on age and grade, suggesting that when gender differences occur, they may shift with age and maturity and are not fixed. Importantly, Hyde’s results challenged Gilligan’s difference theory claims, which Hyde pronounced
“overinflated” (Hyde, 2005, p. 590). Hyde asserted studies showing that distinct gender behaviors were prompted by contexts considered part of the male role (i.e., helping that is heroic or chivalrous) or part of the female role (helping that is nurturant and caring, such as caring for children). Hyde concluded, “The magnitude and even the direction of gender differences depends [sic] on the context. These findings provide strong evidence against the differences model and its notions that psychological gender differences are large and stable” (Hyde, 2005, p. 590).

Findings of this sort have supported the action of groups such as the Heritage Foundation that have continued to call for the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) to be eliminated entirely, claiming that the need no longer exists to improve scholastic gains for girls (Lips, 2007). However, Hyde’s results did not challenge the claims of others who continued to point out the areas where girls are far from equal to boys in school (e.g., access to athletics and certain academic programs and increasing cases of sexual harassment) (Thorius, 2010). Thus, while academics may no longer be considered a domain where girls are out-performed by boys, the concerns for gender equality appear to have shifted to the area of relationships, influenced by male aggression. Indeed, one must ask why young women, who are apparently highly successful academically, do not pursue or fare better in leadership positions as a result.

**Leadership issues.** By the end of the 1990s, however, the problems of student performance, whether boys’ or girls’, still had not been resolved when measured by the failure to produce a significant increase in overall test scores in mathematics and reading. At the turn of the 21st century, no significant progress had been made to move American schools out of crisis (Lewis, 2007). Additionally, financial emergencies continued to plague many
school districts. Central to resolving the numerous issues facing American schools is the question of who is in charge? Who is defining the problem, and how are stakeholders working together to resolve commonly-agreed-upon goals? Unfortunately, these questions are not new, and the answers have often been described as “tangled” (Epstein, 2004). What is clear, however, is that the deadlock between Republicans and Democrats has grown ever stronger.

**The impact of educational ideology.** American public schools have been the prize in a fierce tug-of-war between progressives and free-market conservatives for a number of years. In the aftermath of the Reagan administration’s release of *A Nation at Risk*, two opposing philosophies about the purpose of American schools became obvious. The following discussion of the differences was informed by Smith’s (2003) analysis in *The Ideology of Education: The Commonwealth, the Market and America’s Schools*.

Conservative Republican think tanks, business and religious groups, and market theorists attack public education as “rigid and bureaucratic, rule-bound and unaccountable, and mired in mediocrity” (Smith, 2003, p. 1). Free marketers support school systems that prepare students for the world-of-work, operating with maximum efficiency and low cost along the lines of any successful business. In market theory, the schools have no purpose beyond the technical tasks of skill building. Free marketers adhere to “public choice theory,” the notion that the market can produce similar results when citizens become consumers within the public sector; public goods and services, including education, are delivered by competitive agencies. Choice, charters, vouchers, and privatization are seen as ideal reforms to the system.
The opposing group consists of the public school “establishment” (i.e., teacher unions, school boards and administrators, progressive academics, liberal foundations, and policy advocates) that believes “market-based reforms misperceive the problems of education and threaten the democratic values that justify its existence” (Smith, 2003, p. 1).

Progressives see schools as institutions in which are enshrined the nation’s democratic values, where students learn self-governance and the collective commitment to the public good. These two models are inherently conflictive (Smith 2003).

Free markets emphasize the importance of the individual; they are by nature competitive and divisive. In contrast, the democratic process demands that individuals look to the larger good of the public interest. Public education systems have been charged with many tasks deemed important to a democratic collective, such as educating all students even those with special needs, desegregation efforts, anti-bullying and anti-drug programs, and many others. Such tasks are inherently less productive and inefficient. However, in the past, efficiency was considered secondary in favor of a strong emphasis on democratic values (Smith, 2003).

Neoliberal free marketers agree that a stable and democratic society is impossible without literacy, knowledge, and acceptance of common values. As Smith (2003) noted, “Market supporters are silent about how common values will be produced by a market system that caters to individual preference” (p. 10) and, therein, lies the rub. Free-market proponents have been charged with the intended destruction of the American public school system amid the rhetoric to keep the American economy “strong.” According to political consultants and analysts Lakoff, Ettlinger, and Ferguson (2006) of the Rockridge Institute:
The issue that arises every day is which philosophy of governing should shape our country. It is the issue of our times. Unless conservative philosophy itself is discredited, conservatives will continue their domination of public discourse and with it, will continue their domination of politics. (p. 5)

In 2012, a review of Progressive websites suggested at least in part why market theorists may be dominating the battlefield.

**The Conservative edge.** The Conservative political position has been articulated with enviable precision. As Lakoff (1995) asserted, “Conservatives understand that morality and the family are at the heart of their politics, as they are at the heart of most politics. What is sad is that liberals have not reached a similar level of political sophistication” (Lakoff, 1995, p. 12). As proof of the Conservative expertise in swaying the body politic, a glance at the Conservative Heritage Foundation Candidate Briefing Book (The Heritage Foundation, 2012), an on-line website, demonstrated the point. The Briefing Book site is aimed at political debate, presenting a coherent and concise summary of the Conservative viewpoint (i.e., that American education is in crisis). Several examples are cited, including low graduation rates for minority students and the high cost of failure that “imperils our national security” (The Heritage Foundation, 2012, para. 1). The Conservative solution to these problems is also simply stated: Families must have greater financial control so they can choose safe and effective schools for their children; in other words, educational control must be moved out of Washington DC and back to families as well as local communities. A checklist of policy points provided a political guide that was easy to follow: 1) Allow states to opt out of No Child Left Behind (NCLB); 2) expand private school choice and charter schools; 3) expand scholarships, vouchers, and education tax credits for tuition or scholarship
donations, or education savings accounts; and 4) protect home schooling and empower more families to home school. (The Heritage Foundation, 2012).

In contrast, a recent Google search for a Progressive Briefing Book revealed nothing current despite 2012 being a presidential election year. Moreover, not all liberal or Progressive think-tanks consider education to be an important issue. The Democratic Underground, Public Citizen, and Roosevelt Institution, for example, have no research or policy stance posted on public education issues.

However, think tanks that do have policy presentations on public education present a number of briefing papers and video lectures on various aspects of crisis and reform. To add to the confusion, some groups appear to have co-opted the Progressive label for Conservative ends. For example, the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI), champions “public charter schools, which have expanded choice and educational opportunities for hundreds of thousands of poor families” (Progressive Policy Institute, 2012, p. 1). The Brookings Institution sponsors the Brown Center on Education Policy aligned with the Hoover Foundation, a Conservative think tank that promotes vouchers and charter schools; equity is measured against outcome objectives (The Koret Task Force, 2012). A Progressive advocate, including political candidates, would find it time consuming and confusing to sort through the myriad opinions on a variety of issues to form a cohesive platform with cogent policy planks.

**The Conservative experiment.** From the Reagan administration forward, Conservative political leaders defined educators, especially public school teachers, as part of “the problem” (Fowler, 2000, p. 3) rather than as professionals qualified to offer solutions. That assessment left decisions about pedagogy in the hands of those same politicians, especially after the election of President George W. Bush, who introduced The No Child Left
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Behind Act (NCLB) (No Child Left Behind Act, The New York Times, 2011, September 21). Despite some Democratic skepticism, the bill passed with a remarkable degree of bipartisan support (Hess & Rotherham, 2007). Conservative policies were enacted on a grand scale including required testing programs that used student scores to reward or close schools, new choice attendance options for parents, and new accountability for educators (Hess, 2006).

Despite the political fervor that launched the legislation, results to date have been mixed. Some test scores have risen but so have dropout rates. Efforts to address NCLB problems have gained little traction in Congress, where several attempts since 2007 to rewrite the sprawling law have failed (Webley, 2012). Because the law demanded progress only in reading and mathematics, schools were incentivized to show gains merely on those subjects. Hundreds of millions of dollars were invested in test-preparation materials rather than in student services or professional development of teaching staff. Earlier supporters, like Diane Ravitch, assistant secretary of education in the administration of George H.W. Bush, have reversed their support. States have been accused of “dumbing down” (Ravitch, 2010, para. 8) standards in order to claim 80%-90% student proficiency, numbers that don’t hold up when compared to results from the federally sponsored National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). According to latest 2011 figures, 31,737 of the 98,916 schools missed the NCLB’s testing goals in 2009 (No Child Left Behind Act, The New York Times, 2011, September 21).

Ironically, despite the fact that NCLB has been such a colossal failure that even a largely Republican House would not support it any longer, President Obama set aside Progressive philosophy once again when crafting education initiatives. Conservative rhetoric has proven far more successful than actual policies. According to Thomas (2012), the NCLB
focus on reducing the achievement gap provides a way for those who support the accountability reform movement “to discount the influence of poverty on the lives of children and their learning” (Thomas, 2012, para. 10). By emphasizing test scores and the performance of each individual student, rather than the social forces that impair student performance, public schools have been identified as failing, with the responsible culprits identified as teachers (Thomas, 2012).

The governor’s dilemma. In 1993, Fuhrman identified the importance of educational policy leadership at the state level, which is personified in the governor’s role. Given the challenges awaiting the coherent design of education policy at the federal level coupled with the state’s immediate need to educate its student population, Fuhrman’s insight about the importance of the governor’s role is perhaps more valuable now than ever.

Finding a way to make policy leadership possible, to break the patterns of avoidance of goal consensus and the focus on minimal standards becomes then a question of utmost important for the entire education system . . . . The alternatives may be grim: a few excellent schools amid a failing system or even abandonment of the public system and the privatization of schooling. (Fuhrman, 1993, p. 6)

Fuhrman’s grim alternatives may be closer than ever. From the Conservative point of view, however, success may finally lie near to hand.

Media Feminism

The challenges of entrenched political and social antagonisms that currently face elected leaders demand skills in compromise, empathy, and motivation; skills that have already been attributed to female leadership in the business and educational worlds as earlier
discussed at length. Thus, the paradox of the successful reality of women leaders versus how women are portrayed as leaders in various forms of media must be confronted.

The feminist study of media to discern the impact of the portrayal of women in various media forms has evolved since the early 1960s and the beginnings of Second Wave feminism. The mass media, more so than any other type of organizational system, has shaped the public response to leadership (Klenke, 1996, p. 115). The first feminist challenges to the mass media portrayals of women came after Friedan published *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963. Her book identified magazines articles and advertising as the sources for much of the framing of women as “Happy Housewife” (Friedan, 1963, p. 9). Feminists launched protests against such portrayals, expanding complaints through the 1970s and 1980s to include misrepresentations of women on television (van Zoonen, 1994).

As representatives of the mass media have become more prolific and technologically sophisticated, feminist thought and debate have focused primarily on these three themes: Stereotypes, pornography, and ideology (van Zoonen, 1994). Various forms of feminism have identified with particular issues of concern. For example, radical feminism has a strong interest in pornography; liberal feminists focus in part on stereotypes and gender while Marxist and socialist feminism focuses on the connections among gender, class, and ideology. This researcher will not address all aspects of each theme. My primary focus relates to the news media’s influence on female leadership as well as cultural messages about women and gender that have shaped the leadership experiences of the seven women governors in this study.

**Media power.** In a nation the size of the United States, it is wise to respect the power and impact of mass media support for candidates and elected officials, male or female,
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because most people do not meet directly with their leaders (Bystrom, 2006; Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2007). Instead, members of the public perceive the strength of certain leaders as well as the importance of certain issues and events based on messages sent through various forms of mass media (Aday & Devitt, 2000; Dalton, Beck, & Huckfeldt, 1998; Dolan, Deckman & Swers, 2010; Kahn, 1994; Whitaker, 1997). Such powerful media impacts may be accused of contributing to lessening the integrity of the political process.

Many candidates and elected leaders have learned to manipulate the forms of mass media, promoting stereotypical portrayals of themselves when the situation is perceived to be advantageous to do so (Kahn & Gordon, 1997). Not only the message but the medium on which the message is delivered makes an impact on the recipient. Television broadcast news, with typical stories under a minute in length, is likely to avoid complicated issues or to give cursory coverage to complex topics at best (Braden, 1996; Kaplan, Goldstein, & Hale, 2005), thereby at times frustrating a governor’s attempts to communicate clearly with constituents.

Women historically have been denied access to leadership roles in the public world of political leadership and “media messages suggest that women do not belong in politics” (Loke, Harp, & Bachman, 2010, p. 208). Researchers have concluded that the quantity and quality of mass media coverage can undermine the viability of women candidates and female elected leaders with members of the public (Carroll & Schreiber, 1997; Conway, 2000a; Devitt, 1999; Harrison, 2003; Kahn, 2003; Niven & Zilber, 2001b). Negative reports about a woman governor’s leadership capacity or policy initiatives can limit her chances for election, effective leadership, or for future political career options (Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2010), a circumstance that is much more critical for women than for men in similar situations. According to a recent study, women candidates receive a “virtue advantage” (Barbara Lee
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Family Foundation, 2011, June, p. 35), meaning that voters see women as more honest and ethical than men and are more likely to support a woman candidate they trust. The context for this public assumption rests on the historically based belief that women are morally superior to men (Tronto, 1994). However, that advantage can be rapidly reversed if voters, especially women voters, believe that a woman has been dishonest, acted unethically, or in some way has broken the bond of trust.

The cost of an ethical infraction is actually higher for women (Barbara Lee Family Foundation, 2011, June). For example, when Presidential candidate Hillary Clinton claimed she had dodged sniper fire on a 1996 visit to Bosnia, the resulting proof to the contrary was “especially damaging” (Sykes, 2008b, p. 762). News footage shot on the occasion showed her being received warmly and handed flowers, and “phony” (Sykes, 2008b, p. 762) was added to the long list of pejoratives tagged to her name. Yet, many male survivors of sexual scandal, perjury, and ethical censure by Congress continue their public careers – the most famous examples being Hillary Clinton’s husband, President Bill Clinton, and early 2012 presidential candidate Newt Gingrich (Grier, 2011). Therefore, although some women hurt themselves in the fervor of a campaign, the cost is much higher; and women who are subjected to unfair or unequal media coverage can, in fact, unjustly suffer reduced careers or be denied opportunities for effective leadership altogether (Devitt, 1999; Kahn, 2003), a threat that men do not face to the same degree.

Mass media and women governors. In 2009 Kahn prepared a report issued by The International Federation of Journalists (IFJ) in cooperation with the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in which the various media outlets were shown to exhibit female stereotypes that limit the power of women in society.
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For example, women were still more likely to be featured in “soft” stories, dealing with topics such as celebrity and the arts, although even in those stories they made up only 28% of news subjects. Women were least likely to be found in “hard” (Kahn, 2009, p. 15), news stories about politics, government, and the economy, a problem that contributes to the lessening of female leaders’ credibility. Although reporters have attempted to minimize sexist reporting (Bystrom, Robertson, & Banwart, 2001; Jalalzai, 2006; Smith, 1997), simply no way exists cleanly to sweep away the gender-based beliefs and assumptions that continue to hold sway in American culture and inevitably influence journalists (Braden, 1996; Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). Women running for office clearly start at a disadvantage termed an “image deficit” (Niven & Zilber, 2001b, p. 159) in media portrayal.

However, once a candidate is elected governor, his or her relationship with members working within the mass media shifts importantly in ways that have little to do with the governor’s gender (Kahn, 1996). The members of the press take on a more adversarial approach, measuring the governor’s performance not only against the campaign promises but against the accomplishments of other governors as well as the needs of the state. Reporters also assume an investigative demeanor regarding any possible breach of law, whether promulgated by the governor or members of the administrative staff (Beyle, 1996). Kaplan and O’Brien (1991) characterized the relationship between governors and representatives of the media as “love/hate” (p. 121), stating that most governors felt reporters were more interested in covering conflict than understanding the context of challenging issues. All governors are generally sensitive to the impact and importance of successful relations with media personnel (Beyle, 1996). A poor relationship with members of the media will not likely enhance anyone’s hopes for elective office. However, members of the mass media are
human beings influenced by their own emotional responses to candidates and issues, a fact that is never clearer than during an election campaign.

The “isms” surface in the mass media. During and after the historic presidential election of 2008, the American public confronted anew the meaning of racism, ageism, and sexism as candidates were covered in national and local mass media outlets. The cultural narratives that surfaced were illustrative of American voters’ abiding conflicts over age, race, and sex in national politics, subjects that have already inspired countless articles, blogs, and books.

In 2007, a 61-year-old White woman, Senator Hillary Clinton, announced her run for the Democratic nomination for the US Presidency. She fought a younger man-of-color, 47-year-old Senator Barack Obama, who eventually bested Clinton for the nomination. Over the course of the primary campaign, American sexism became glaringly obvious. “Iron my shirt,” (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009, p. 332) was a typical sign held up by a man at one of Clinton’s rallies. Media commentators complained that Clinton was confrontational in her debates with Obama or that she played the “gender card.” In January 2008, Jason Horowitz published an article in GQ magazine recounting his search to determine the source and the cause of “Hillary Haters” (Horowitz, 2008, para 1), citing websites, films, books, and even a Voodoo kit aimed at killing Hillary Clinton, as well as her chances for the nomination. Particularly illustrative was the fact that her opponents based their opposition on emotional responses to her, not her policies (e.g., Hillary was mean, scary, a liar, a lesbian, a terrible mother, a cold fish wife, and so on). Carroll (2009) pointed out that Clinton defied public stereotypes by emphasizing herself more as a competent professional rather than “nice” and, thus, encountered the classic double bind for female leaders.
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Women are perceived as “communal” — as warm and selfless, for example — but not very “agentic” — assertive and instrumental, for example — while men are perceived as the opposite . . . . This line between agentic and communal, masculine and feminine, is a very fine line and a difficult one to walk, and it is perhaps a line that Hillary Clinton’s campaign did not walk well enough. (Carroll, 2009, pp. 5-6)

Stanley Fish, writing in *The New York Times*, claimed Hillary hating “has already made its way into mainstream media” (Fish, 2008, para. 7), unleashing similar editorials in major newspapers. Writing in *The Washington Post*, Erica Jong decried the mockery of a woman whose “pro bono work has been for mothers and children. And mothers and children -- of all colors -- are the most oppressed group in our country” (Jong, 2008, p. 2). Gloria Steinem agreed (Kohn & Steinem, 2008), touching off a debate over the ranking of oppression; in other words, was racism worse than sexism? In a CNN poll of Columbus, Ohio’s Junior League members, one responder agreed that "Sexism of the nature Hillary Clinton is experiencing has been around as kind of an acceptable joke for years. As far as racism, it's definitely not politically correct or acceptable" (Kaye, 2008, para. 3).

Commentators took aim at Hillary’s age, figure, and face. Conservative commentator Rush Limbaugh wondered if America could handle watching a woman age in office (Abrams, 2007). ABC News Senior White House Correspondent Jake Tapper reported that candidate Obama occasionally employed a few sexist terms himself, referring to Clinton’s “claws” (Nuss, 2008; Tapper, 2008) or his reference to Clinton’s attacks on him when she was “feeling down” (Nuss, 2008), a not-so-veiled reference to female emotionalism.

Yet critical commentary about the issues of age, sex, and race were strangely muted to non-existent. “The contest elevated, yet simultaneously sublimated, Americans’ struggle
with race, gender, religion and national origin” (Nelson, 2009, para 1). *Time* magazine’s editor-at-large and senior political analyst Mark Halperin went so far as to criticize reporters for media favoritism, in effect, anointing Obama as a winner months ahead of the election (Burns, 2008). Nelson (2009) dubbed the racial paradox as follows: “Obama as a balm for what ails us” (para 1).

Clinton concentrated on her professional experience as a leader which tied her to the past. In contrast, Obama focused on change for the future. While both Clinton and Obama represented obvious departures from past leadership, Obama’s oratory and emphasis on possibility made him an inspiring figure. Often noted was Obama’s striking contrast to earlier African American contenders for the presidency (e.g., polished, Harvard-educated, and born of mixed-race parents), Obama presented an unusual and compelling figure. In an unexpected reversal of racist politics, the election of a Black man to the presidency was often portrayed as the concluding chapter on America’s long history of social injustice (Tesler & Sears, 2010). Black reporter Gwen Ifill described the night in Denver when Barack Obama accepted the Democratic nomination for the US presidency; a night when the crowd seemed to regard Obama’s nomination as the first sign of healing the American racial schism.

Before my eyes, I was able to witness the romance and achievement of 1960s civil rights marches bearing fruit, as the lion of the movement mingled with the up and comers. Some had been slow to embrace Barack Obama. Some had been quick. But this night, all wanted to bear witness. (Ifill, 2009, p. 15)

After capturing the Democratic nomination, Obama faced an opposing Republican ticket led by a much older White man, 70-year-old Senator John McCain, paired with a
young, attractive, White woman, 44-year-old Sarah Palin, Governor of Alaska. Republican candidate Sarah Palin’s physical appearance was a source of close media attention (Pozner, 2009). A former beauty queen winner, Palin presented herself as polished and professional, which she modified with a girly wink (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). Palin’s policy stands rapidly became less of an issue than her missteps with the press. Palin complained that members of the media press corps were disrespectful of her, a sign to many of her lack of preparation for a national campaign and her naiveté about the watchdog role of the free press in democratic America (Pozner, 2009).

The feminist dilemma. Palin faced questions about her family and accommodating her children’s needs (Norris & Kornblut, 2010). She supported the McCain pro-life platform, argued against climate change, and was blasted by feminist groups who urged Americans to vote based on issues and not gender (Wolfe, 2012). She also faced painful moments with reporters who challenged her contention that she was prepared, smart enough, or tough enough to handle the job of Vice President or, if need be, President. After McCain’s presidential loss to Barack Obama, Palin resigned her Alaska governorship, a move widely seen as freeing her to campaign for the presidency on her own (Kovaleski & Becker, 2009).

To the surprise of many, Palin decided not to enter the presidential race in 2012. Instead, conservative Minnesota Republican Congresswoman Michelle Bachman jumped into the primary (Shear, 2011). Like Republican men running for the nomination, Bachman declared herself pro-family, pro-religion in schools, and anti-government. A Tea Party founder, Bachmann promised to eliminate the Environmental Protection Agency and repeal “Obama-care” without explaining how she would help American families, especially the unemployed, manage medical expenses for their kids. Further, Bachmann’s gaffes and
misstatements led even Fox conservative commentator Leslie Marshall to call for Bachmann to get her facts straight or exit the presidential race (Marshall, 2011).

Clearly, neither Palin nor Bachmann provided policy initiatives that indicated special concerns for women’s issues, at least in the traditional sense of health, welfare, and education. In fact, Bachmann advocated closing Planned Parenthood, a primary health care service for poor women across the nation.

Conservative commentators ignored Palin’s faux pas in favor of praising her brand of self-declared feminism of the “girlie power” variety. CNBC’s host of the show “The Big Idea with Donny Deutsch” announced that Palin had discovered a way to “package” strong womanhood. In a clip that was captured and posted on You Tube, Duetsch cohosts are shown grimacing in embarrassment as Deutsch announces that “Women want to be her, men want to mate with her,” adding, “I want her lying next to me in bed” (Duetsch, 2008; Lowen, 2008, September 11). Palin was also questioned constantly about the challenge of having a new baby with Down syndrome and four other children, including a pregnant daughter. While commentators were careful to avoid suggesting her family circumstances made her unsuitable as a candidate, plenty of questions were asked about how she planned to handle her maternal responsibilities (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). Palin’s claim to be a true feminist, although rejecting abortion as an option even if her own daughter were raped (Stein, 2008), made for conflict with major women’s groups. After talk show host Bill Maher used a vulgar term to refer to Palin’s intelligence, the National Organization for Women (NOW) issued a complaint that criticism be directed at issues, not gender (May, 2011). Palin later rejected the NOW call for gender-neutral language saying she did not want NOW to defend her (Gray, 2011). NOW spokespeople explained that Palin missed the
point – the organization did not defend her except within the larger context of her gender (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009).

Such dustups among women’s groups and women candidates proved problematic to shaping the nation’s response to women running for office. Neither Palin nor Clinton ever fully addressed the sexist remarks made about them, nor did either of them ever address the nation about sexism the way Obama addressed the American history of racism (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). Thus, the issue of sexism gained no clarification through the campaigns of two women running at a national level, except to demonstrate with certainty, particularly within the mass media, that sexism exists.

Undoubtedly, the ideology of Democrat versus Republican is the source of the differences among Palin, Bachmann, and Clinton; one could not claim that Clinton was more of a woman than Palin or Bachman, especially after Clinton tried so hard to play down her gender. Although seeing a female candidate run for the US presidency is no longer a visual shock to voters, nor for that matter is a person-of-color, one can no longer expect, if one ever could, that a female candidate stands for policies that evidence special concerns for women, children, and families.

**Fantasies of power.** Media feminists have attempted to reconcile the Postmodern/Third Wave feminist rejection of traditional views of female oppression with the very real inequalities that still exist between men and women. Thornham (2007) noted that young women have celebrated the various lifestyle, career, and sexual choices they enjoyed, while ignoring gender-based inequities still reflected in media portrayals of women’s issues including the following: domestic violence (Renzetti & Bergen, 2005); unequal representation in political bodies (CAWP, 2011); unequal pay (Cotter, Hermsen &
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Vanneman, 2005); disproportionate poverty levels of single-parent households headed by women (Polakow, 2007); and mass media trends in news as well as advertising that sexualize and objectify women (Gauntlett, 2002). Specifically, the news media’s lessening concerns about social disparities facing women mean reduced issue coverage (Schreiber, 2010), while the backlash against the women’s movement has led to increasing depictions of violence against women in the entertainment media (Faludi, 1991; van Zoonen, 1994). Dominant White television entertainment programming also typically frames the experiences of people of color, underscoring the importance of the mass media in shaping cultural discourse about matters of gender and race (hooks, 1990).

Susan Douglas (2010) has written extensively about media portrayals of women, especially since the early 1990s. She argued that as news departments shrink, coverage diminishes of women’s poverty or domestic violence issues; but mass media entertainment programs and advertising have presented women as professionals enjoying financial success running everything from police departments to their own companies and their own lavishly furnished households. Simultaneously, young women are depicted as empowered by the desire to show off their barely covered or boldly exposed breasts in mass media forms of entertainment. The unspoken message is that women are actually more than sexual equals to men, “because now they had chosen to be sex objects and men were supposedly nothing more than their helpless, ogling, crotch-driven slaves” (Douglas, 2010, para 6). Douglas called media depictions of women “fantasies of power” (Douglas, 2010, para 7) that reassure girls and women they can do and be anything they want to be, will rise to positions of power, and make more money than men, when in fact, all signs point to the contrary.
Douglas pointed out that when women experience obstacles that keep them from realizing the fantasy of ascension into powerful leadership roles, the comforting antidote is portrayed as shopping. All the great things women in entertainment programs seem to own, otherwise known as product placement, require no formal advertisements to pop up between programs to entice the potential buyer. The act of shopping offers easier access to immediate gratification and a sense of power through buying (Gauntlett, 2002), at least to those who can afford to do so.

**Gender and the cultural narrative.** While little doubt exists that man has dominated woman for centuries, merely identifying such a fact has done little to change social systems that continue to favor male leadership. Additionally, the male model of domination fails to acknowledge that system changes such as suffrage would never have occurred without some degree of male support. Not every man supports a patriarchal approach to male-female relationships, which complicates the dynamic in every aspect of political exchange. A woman must first struggle to understand the challenges she faces and how they reflect the cultural mores she must then overcome. Central to that quest is feminist theory, a way of thinking that has evolved from early 19th century demands for “woman’s rights,” equal to the natural and inalienable rights men claimed for themselves, to sophisticated analysis of institutional systems that are open to several interpretations.

Particularly important to shaping women and men are the cultural narratives communicated through boundless expressions of different mass media forms. Accepting that gender designations can be fluid while identifying certain commonalities that accrue to the physical embodiments “male” or “female” helps ground identities into the social structure. Individuals interpret, dispute, agree with, or discard cultural narratives in order to “constitute
our identities . . . the stories we tell of ourselves: on telling them - to others and to ourselves – we produce our sense of self” (Thornham, 2007, p. 19). Clearly, many unique ways are available to express identity, but no one way escapes influence from the numerous symbols, images, words, and experiences of culture. Narratives of history and culture are powerful precisely because individuals are largely unaware of their influence. Feminist theory remains relevant to the discussion of gender in American society as the frame that helps men and women understand why their roles and their choices appear to them as they do.

Feminism as agency. Thus, those who reject feminist theorizing as no longer relevant fail to grasp the fact that feminist theory and, indeed, feminism grant agency to individuals. Analysis of the female image and life as portrayed in various forms of mass media further empowers individual understanding and, therefore, agency of action. The emphasis on cultural narrative analysis, particularly as expressed within different forms of media, rejects the assertion that feminism is “redundant” while at the same time counters “fantasies of ‘post-feminist’ choice and freedom, which have characterized some recent writing” (Thornham, 2007, p. 20).

Despite the passage of centuries and a few male crossover feminists, little effort has been expended to mentor women into positions where they can participate fully as equal partners with men in every aspect of life. One can either attribute that fact to natural differences or to simple human inability to determine a solution to inequalities that people rarely understand and, therefore, do not own. The fact that women are as electable as men or, in some cases, are more effective managers is not evident based on the real world people see around them every day where men dominate in leadership roles. Feminist theorists have
stepped into the breach to explain how the cultural narratives of the past have shaped the present. Now women are demanding answers for the future.

This study of is one of the first to date to ask female governors themselves to describe the relevance of their gender to their policy agendas and leadership strategies as well as their perceptions about their press coverage. What do the female former governors say about themselves during their tenure in office? How did they lead, and how did their press coverage influence their policy priorities?

The seven women governors who participated in this study shared their views about the impact of their gender on their leadership experiences, policy agendas, and the focus of the stories written about them by members of the mass media. Their reflections are, therefore, of great interest to the “real world,” a world we can access only by visiting the women who lived at that time and in that place.
Chapter 3: Methodology

In 2006, when I began the process of determining a research methodology for this study, I was guided by my interest in the leadership experiences shared by female governors. Based on my passion for women’s history and the battle for women’s equality in America, I wanted to explore whether gender made a difference in the leadership experiences of women governors, simply because they were women. As I began reading and thinking about this project, I learned that researchers traditionally have utilized quantitative methods to study the impact of women in elected office over the last 50 years. Thus, we know a number of facts about women elected to state and national legislatures. For example, the more women elected, the more “women-friendly” legislation results to benefit the welfare of children and families, women’s rights, health care, and education (Caiazza, 2002; Carroll, 2000).

Researchers also have employed positivist methods to clarify broad areas of inquiry such as the reasons why women do not run for office (Lawless & Fox, 2005) and the reasons why they do (Conway, 2000b). Quantifiable data have provided evidence of gender-bias toward women in the mass media news coverage of women leaders (Byerly & Ross, 2006; Norris, 1997) and in political bodies such as the US Congress (Arnold & King, 2002). In other words, quantitative research has been critical in providing an understanding of the forces that influence women either to seek or shun elected office as well as the difference they make once they arrive.

However, one searches in vain for a trove of studies that explore the leadership experiences of women once elected, particularly those women who have attained the highest executive office in the US short of President, that of Governor. I found 14 studies from the last 20 years that were based on or included the perspectives of female governors related to their
experiences as elected executive leaders (see Table 1). Every one of the studies up to 2002 was conducted by a woman or several women researchers. The dearth of qualitative information about women governors may be a reflection, not only of their rarity, but of how little importance was assigned to their contributions as leaders; especially telling is the fact that only one male author was identified in the studies cited in Table 1. As Denzin and Lincoln (2008) wrote, “Many agree that all inquiry is moral and political” (p. viii). Clearly, men were not as interested in this research topic as women, who have assigned obvious merit and social benefit to their explorations. It is my fervent hope that by selecting a qualitative approach for this study I can redress in some way the lack of respect that already has consigned many women governors’ experiences to history, and a dusty one at that, before recording them.

The Research Design

I approached the choice of research design from the viewpoint of desired outcomes. By the nature of the outcomes I sought, I quickly rejected any approach that would restrain or quantify the highly individualized experiences of my subjects. Instead, I chose to “focus on in-depth, long-term interaction with relevant people” (Glesne, 1999, p. 5). I wanted to hear how the women in my study interpreted their leadership experiences in response to each of their unique circumstances. Such descriptions would be best called forth in conversation, which led me to focus on the interview as a primary research tool. I knew my subjects’ narratives would reflect a world nuanced in the telling – not necessarily the one they had lived, but the one reconstructed in their memories. As Silverman (2005) pointed out, a focus on interviews would provide my subjects with the opportunity to “document their past . . . highlighting certain features and downplaying others . . . in other words, a retrospective
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Study Focus</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td><em>Women in Power: The Secrets of Leadership</em></td>
<td>Dorothy Cantor, Toni Bernay, &amp; Jean Stoess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>‘Feminine Styles’ and Political Judgments in the Rhetoric of Ann Richards</td>
<td>Bonnie Dow &amp; Mari Tonn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td><em>Living a Political Life</em></td>
<td>Madeleine Kunin (memoir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td><em>Feminism, Femininity, and Power: Nellie Taylor Ross</em></td>
<td>Virginia Scharf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td><em>Growing Up Republican: Christine Whitman: The Politics of Character</em></td>
<td>Patricia Beard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td><em>Women Politicians and the Media</em></td>
<td>Maria Braden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td><em>The Feminist Face of State Executive Leadership: Women as Governors</em></td>
<td>Sara Weir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Re-visionsing and Re-framing Political Boundaries: Barbara Roberts</td>
<td>Molly Mayhead &amp; Brenda Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td><em>Christine Todd Whitman and the Ideology of the New Jersey Governorship</em></td>
<td>Krista Sheeler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td><em>Keys to the Governor’s Office: Unlock the Door</em></td>
<td>Barbara Lee Family Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td><em>Gender and Gubernatorial Personality</em></td>
<td>Jay Barth &amp; Margaret Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td><em>It’s My Party, Too</em></td>
<td>Christine Todd Whitman (memoir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td><em>Developing Leadership: Learning from the Experiences of Women Governors</em></td>
<td>Susan Madsen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Adapted from various sources including data banks and related reference lists assembled by other authors.
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rewriting of history (Silverman, 2005, p. 8). What better way to determine how women former governors characterized their leadership experiences?

Qualitative research appeared uniquely suited to my interests. My inclination toward a qualitative study also was buttressed by the fact that so little research had been done with female governors. I was intrigued by Stake’s (1994) claim that the most distinctive characteristic of qualitative research is its emphasis on interpretation by the researcher. I was stimulated by the thought that my role would take on historical significance because of the subject of my study, and that the leadership challenges women governors face would be acknowledged as worthy of exploration.

Thus, I approached this question as qualitative Feminist Ethnography, a method, which, as Glesne stated, carries “an underlying assumption . . . that women experience oppression and exploitation and that this experience varies, considering the multiple identities of race, class, culture, ethnicity, sexual preference, age, and physical abilities” (Glesne, 1999, p. 12). To Glesne’s list, I chose to add the identity of women as elected political leaders. My research questions were all designed to determine whether the governors themselves believed that influential patriarchal forces and cultural assumptions about the appropriate roles for women could have affected their abilities to exercise fully the power of elected executive office or to implement fully their policy initiatives. I also sought to determine how the governors viewed the influence of gender on their leadership styles as expressed through their relationships with staff and legislators as well as the coverage they received from members of the mass media press corps.

I initially approached my study thinking I would interview a number of female governors and choose two of them for in-depth case studies. I found Creswell’s (1998)
approach to case study to be instructive, whereby I would select cases “that show different
perspectives on the problem, process, or event” (Creswell, 1998, p. 62) that I wanted to
explore, namely female governor leadership issues. I thought choosing one Democrat and
one Republican would allow me to compare the reflections of the women from an ideological
perspective concerning their experiences in office. I planned to travel to Capitol buildings to
conduct observations and interviews, capture a sense of the governors’ daily lives, and later
focus on one or two key incidents for thematic analysis. Given the scope of the project and
the uncertainty of who would become study participants, my committee members and I felt
that circumstances surrounding my study would likely alter as my research moved forward.
A fluid structure was seen as critical to supporting the course of research by avoiding
limitations based on early expectations. I committed early on to the use of “emergent design”
(Schram, 2003, p. 21) to allow me to remain open to changing strategies as the research plan
unfolded.

**Narrative inquiry.** Narrative inquiry is well-suited to qualitative research
(Clandinin, 2007), particularly when in-depth interviews are the critical primary tool for
collecting data. Since the 1990s, the use of interviews in narrative inquiry has gained impetus
as a method of qualitative research in the United States (Webster & Mertova, 2007).
Narrative inquiry supported the experience I wanted to achieve as a researcher
(i. e., informality and rapport with the women governors was emphasized). Such a process
also called for the most authentic voice of the participants in the verbatim transcripts
(Moustakas, 1994). The interview settings became conversations between each of the
governors and me. The stories elicited from them about their personal leadership experiences
presented unique opportunities for deeper understanding of their lives; such insights would
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have been otherwise inaccessible (Hones, 1998). Interviews were also vehicles to access the richness of thick descriptions (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008) that made their narratives come alive for the reader. I knew a wall would be and should be developed between us as “researcher” and “subject” in order for me to listen beyond the privileged intimacy of the experience for patterns and themes; but I wanted the wall between us to be more like “gossamer” (Doucet, 2008, p. 1). Thus, I embraced qualitative methodology in my quest to establish a relationship with the women governors that was a far cry from the rigid boundaries established by the positivist regimens of quantitative research.

**Feminist theory.** Based on my interest in women’s history in America, I had read a great deal about, and was familiar with, the underlying assumption of feminist theory (i.e., the belief that women experience oppression as a result of male systems of dominance designed by men to benefit men [Lorber, 2005]). Oppression and exploitation can be experienced in various ways, depending on unique identities of sex, race, religion, age, class, ethnicity, and physical ability (Frye, 1983). One category not typically considered is political office, probably because so few women pursue or attain elective leadership. I was intrigued by the irony suggested by my study: That given the underlying assumptions of feminist theory, seven women who had attained the highest elected executive office possible in their states might somehow still have experienced asymmetrical power relationships that favored men. Yet, these women were the most powerful elected leaders in their states. They somehow must have beaten the male-dominated systems that controlled every other political body or had they? Only the depth of the narratives the women were willing to share with me would honor the complexity of their unique social experiences. I was eager to prospect inside
this paradox. Case selection based on my personal interest in the impact of gender on female political leadership was predicated on purposive sampling (Silverman, 2005).

**Research participants.** Because very few women have ever held the governor’s office, my options for selecting participants were proscribed. As I reviewed the characteristics of the women who were in office in 2006, I noted that they were all Caucasian ranging in age from 47 to 60 and representative of different regions across the US (see Table 2).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Janet Napolitano</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>2003 - 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>M. Jodi Rell</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>2004 - 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Linda Lingle</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>2002 - 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Kathleen Sebelius</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>2003 - 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Kathleen Blanco</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>2003 - 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Christine Gregoire</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>2004 - present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


I telephoned the offices of the governors who were serving at the time, as noted in Table 2, to determine which of the governors would be willing to participate in my study. My initial contacts to the first-choice candidates were immediately rebuffed by the governors’ staff schedulers, who frankly were astonished at my request for a lengthy two-hour interview and access to the governors’ daily calendar of meetings. They conceded that 20 minutes might be possible, on a one-time basis only. With some consternation after this initial rejection, I discussed the situation with my Dissertation Committee members. The recommendation was made to confine the study to former female governors, presuming that they would have fewer scheduling conflicts. Upon reflection, my committee members and I
concluded that the enforced selection of former governors was fortuitous: The former
governors were likely to be more candid since they were not in office and no longer under
intense public scrutiny. I was encouraged to explore the scheduling options with former
governors only.

The research study was conducted in four phases (i.e., Phase 1: Preparation; Phase 2:
Contacting potential participants; Phase 3: Data collection in two stages; and Phase 4:
Analysis and synthesis of data). Each phase will be described in the narrative that follows.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Former Governor</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984 - 1987</td>
<td>Martha Layne Collins</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985 - 1991</td>
<td>Madeleine Kunin</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987 - 1991</td>
<td>Kay Orr</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988 - 1991</td>
<td>Rose Mofford</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 - 1995</td>
<td>Barbara Roberts</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 - 1999</td>
<td>Nancy Hollister</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 - 2001</td>
<td>Christine Whitman</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 – 2003</td>
<td>Jeanne Shaheen</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 – 2003</td>
<td>Jane Dee Hull</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 - 2003</td>
<td>Jane Swift</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 – 2005</td>
<td>Judy Martz</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 – 2005</td>
<td>Olene Walker</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Phase 1: Preparation.** The Phase 1 process included the preparation of
correspondence to each former governor and creation of the Interview Guide. Because I
wanted to determine whether the women governors felt their gender influenced them in any
way when making decisions regarding policy interests, I considered the following policy
arenas traditionally ascribed as compelling topics to women: health, family welfare, and education. As a former high school teacher, I decided to focus their reflections on the field of public education, also an area of interest to me. Thus, the following broad selection criteria were defined for the potential study participants: 1) evidence of introduction or implementation of public education policy initiatives during the governor’s term in office; and 2) party affiliation defined as Republican or Democrat to present a balanced ideological sampling. I also began to research contact information for all living female former governors, and developed criteria for selection of study participants (Table 3).

**Rationale for rejection from the study.** Two of the former governors were found to be less desirable participants for the study. My selection of public education as a policy arena of interest led to the exclusion of former Governor Mofford, who was found to have focused minimally on public education initiatives. Governor Hollister served an extremely short term as an interim governor with no policy impact. One of the former governors (Kay Orr, Nebraska, Republican, 1987 – 1991) declined to participate in the study. Repeated attempts to arrange an interview with former Democratic Governor Jean Shaheen of New Hampshire (Democrat, 1997 – 2003) were hampered by her campaign for the US Senate at that time, which, according to her staff, precluded lengthy interview commitments. The hoped-for balance of evenly distributed party representation from three Republicans and three Democrats was not materializing. Therefore, Governor Jane Hull, Republican, was eliminated from the study. The resulting totals yielded seven former women governors identified in Table 4. The final total remained slightly off-balance, but all of the women were strong proponents of public education; and I, therefore, wanted to include them all in the first round of the study.
The interviews. To determine detailed responses from these women about their experiences as governors, open-ended interview questions were developed under each guiding research question. The interview questions were refined a number of times to draw in-depth responses. The women were asked to share their leadership experiences as well as their perceptions about the incidents they encountered, an approach suggested by Glesne (1999). They were also asked to reflect on the impact of their gender on their tenures in office, their policy initiatives, and their relationships with members of the mass media. All of the interviews were conducted with the governors in person and were audiotaped for accuracy as well as to allow me to concentrate on the conversation rather than on extensive note-taking.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Governor</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Party Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martha Layne Collins</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1984 – 1987</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine Kunin</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1985 – 1991</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Roberts</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1991 – 1995</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Whitman</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1994 – 2001</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Swift</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>2001 – 2003</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Martz</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2001 – 2005</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olene Walker</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2003 – 2005</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


I started each interview by asking the governors about their early lives. I was not seeking a direct cause-and-effect correlation between incidents from their pasts and their attainment of elected office. However, I wanted to provide background on their lives that would illuminate their points of view about the influences of gender on their personal,
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professional, and political lives. I expected the questions to evolve as more of the information was processed about each of the former governors and the state where she led.

In September 2007, the study was submitted to the Eastern Michigan University Human Subjects Review Committee for approval. In October 2007, approval was granted. Upon receiving approval for the research study, Phase 2 of the research process began.

Phase 2: Contacting potential participants. Pressure began to build to acquire contact information for each of seven former governors (see Table 4) who met the criteria for participating in the research project. I was surprised at how difficult locating information about these women was despite their historical significance. Numerous resources were examined including autobiographies (Kunin), biographies (Whitman), and websites, when available (Whitman, Swift, and Walker). I queried the state-level offices of the Democratic and Republican Parties; secretaries and support personnel within governmental state executive offices, state historical societies; and completed broad searches via the Internet querying White Pages, business contacts mentioned in old newspaper articles as well as former and current secretaries in university offices. I also extensively reviewed background information on all former female governors and began filing materials for future reference.

The initial contact letter notified each prospective participant of the purpose of the interviews and the intended use of their comments, described the purpose of the research and requested each governor’s involvement in the study. Each subject was told that she would have the chance to review the transcript of the interview to correct or elaborate on the information she shared.

Each participant was notified in writing of my intention to identify them by name. Subjects were asked to sign an approved written consent form that indicated they had
received and understood all elements of the research project and agreed to participate. By June 2008, all of the female former governors invited to participate had responded positively. The respondents agreed to set aside confidentiality in order to contribute to their individual historical records and to share their insights about elected leadership with other women considering or seeking leadership positions, elected or otherwise.

After my first contacts with all seven of the former governors, I became determined to include all of the women in the study. Thus, I abandoned my original commitment to a limited case study focused on just two of the participants in favor of presenting a series of smaller case studies devoted to all of the women. My approach emphasized their oral histories reported within a frame that acknowledged the storytelling aspect of narrative: That is to say, I approached my interviews with each governor accepting that reality exists differently for each individual. I embraced Truth with a small “t,” comfortable with my only certainty: that the past would come to life as the participants defined it. I embraced their memories, knowing that they likely would be considered incomplete if held to a comparison with the memories of others who stood next to them during the same events of their tenures; yet, at the same time, each memory was rich when examined for the nuggets of their lives that they remembered and were willing to share as well as for those they may have “forgotten” (see Denzin, 1997). Indeed, I knew certain details about their lives, such as low public approval ratings or a scathing headline and wondered if they would mention a subject that might have embarrassed them greatly. If they did not volunteer, on their own, to share deeply I did not challenge beyond probing with a light touch. Thus, my interviews were a delicate dance, more often like a gavotte than a waltz, whereby my embrace of their
memories was formal and somewhat distant; yet I was exhilarated by the permitted intimacy of the questions and the dance.

After the participation of qualified participants was secured, plans for data collection began in Phase 3. This study was conducted in seven different states over a period of three years, from 2007 to 2009, in order to interview the governors twice. One governor, Martha Layne Collins of Kentucky, was interviewed only once. However, her comments were considered to have sufficient merit for inclusion in this study.

**Phase 3: Data collection in two stages.** The research design of Phase 3 included the following: 1) Methods of data collection and preparation; 2) plans for travel; and 3) data storage. In-depth onsite interviews with the former governors were planned in two stages.

**Stage A.** Seven general questions (See Appendix E) were posed to the participants in order to explore areas such as their insights into women’s political leadership, their experiences as the subjects of scrutiny from news reporters, the role of gender in executing the office of governor, and so on.

Stage A interviews, in-depth, onsite, and semi-structured, were conducted with five participants from November 2007 through March 2009, the former governors who were immediately accessible geographically. In November 2007, I traveled on the road for a week via rented van to conduct the first-round of interviews with these three former governors from the New England region of the United States: Vermont’s Madeleine Kunin, (Democrat, 1985 – 1991), Jane Swift, Massachusetts (Republican, 2001 – 2003), and Christine Whitman, New Jersey (Republican, 1994 – 2001). Another first-round interview was conducted nearly a year later with former governor Martha Layne Collins of Kentucky (Democrat, 1984 – 1987) in December 2008. The final first-round interview occurred with former Governor
Barbara Roberts (Democrat, 1991 – 1995) on March 31, 2009, in Portland, Oregon. In order to complete two rounds of interviews with Governors Olene Walker of Utah and Governor Judy Martz of Montana, I arranged to spend two days with each of them. I interviewed Governor Martz on November 10 and 11, 2009 in Butte, Montana. I met with Governor Walker on November 12 and 13, 2009 in St. George, Utah. I then traveled on to complete a second round interview with Governor Roberts in Portland, Oregon on November 13, 2009. I took notes throughout the process to clarify the details that struck me as relevant, which helped me track areas for follow-up questions. At the conclusion of those interviews, my adviser and I reviewed the results of the Stage A interviews. All participants were considered excellent subjects for in-depth analysis of their leadership experiences.

**Stage B.** Second round follow-up questions were more focused on the particular areas of gender, leadership, and public education policy interests. I needed to be prepared as much as possible to understand the broad issues that were facing the state and the governor at the time she was in office. I had investigated wherever possible the historical record of the state to determine education issues as well as other matters that may have been pressing for the former governor during her time in office. These historical guideposts helped me structure the interview so specific incidents, such as a governor’s encounter with a reporter or legislator, could lead to discussion of abstract concepts, such as gender bias in mass media news coverage of elected women leaders, or conflicts with “Good Old Boy” informal power systems (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995, p. 46). Second-round interviews were conducted in a weeklong tour that concluded in November 2009.

At the conclusion of the first-round of Phase 3 data collection, I had gathered approximately 10 hours of first-round Stage A interview data with seven former governors.
At the conclusion of second-round Stage B interviews, an additional four hours of interview data were obtained from the former governor study participants. Archival data had been collected for each former governor in the form of the newspaper coverage of her tenure in office, her policy statements on public education, and detailed biographical descriptions of her life.

**Data management.** Transcription of the interviews recorded on audio tape was ongoing during this time. I transcribed all interviews verbatim. The transcripts were read over while listening to the original taped interviews to ensure accuracy. Transcripts were forwarded to the interview subjects for their review. A statement included with the transcripts indicated my willingness to correct any error or clarify intended usage (see Appendix G). Some errors in the transcripts were noted by the participants in their responses, and those corrections were incorporated into the original bodies of the transcripts for final use in the dissertation. After the participants reviewed and confirmed the accuracy of the transcripts of their individual interviews, I analyzed the respondents’ narratives to determine the overall findings of the study. Triangulation to establish validity of data was achieved through consultation with the participants to affirm the accuracy of the transcripts as well as by comparison with confirming archival documents (Eisner, 1991). Original tapes and transcriptions were kept in a secure storage site under lock and key and will be destroyed upon completion of the research project.

**Phase 4: Analysis and synthesis of data.** The timeframe for interview data was based on the former governors’ experiences during their campaigns for executive office, after their election, and during the terms of their administration, as specifically related to the issues of their leadership experiences. As I began the process of synthesizing and reducing the huge
volume of information I had collected, I referenced my Conceptual Framework for initial categories within which to sort data in order to assign codes. As Charmaz (2006) has noted in *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*, the process of categorizing data through coding facilitates the discernment of patterns within data; further, comparisons among different data streams become possible, an important source for constructing theory “‘grounded’ in the data themselves” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 2). The framework provided the following focus points that referenced my research questions and produced a body of responses from the female governors:

- Their leadership style and relationships with staff as well as legislative colleagues as applied to the pursuit of administrative goals;
- Their perceptions about the coverage they received from members of the mass media press corps and how their decisions and actions in their leadership roles were influenced as a result;
- Factors they considered when generating and implementing education policy;
- How they perceived that gender influenced their decisions and leadership functions overall.

After sorting interview data into categories, the pertinent interview segments were separated into individual data packets for each governor. A colored coding system was used to identify and classify the participant responses. Data summary tables were developed and used to track similar or divergent responses that were related to each category (See Table 5; also Appendix J which includes Tables 6 – 8). I also used secondary sources to enhance coding including artifacts such as biographical articles, newspaper articles, and other research publications as well as materials in which the governors were quoted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of Media Relationships</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Collins</th>
<th>Kunin</th>
<th>Martz</th>
<th>Roberts</th>
<th>Swift</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>Whitman</th>
<th>Tally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Looks&quot; count (clothing, appearance, hair, etc.)</td>
<td>MR1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame responses to protect/promote female leadership</td>
<td>MR5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media displays gender bias</td>
<td>MR2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public speaking must be shaped for media</td>
<td>MR3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media oversimplify, misrepresent, prefer conflict</td>
<td>MR6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage incites governor distrust, anxiety</td>
<td>MR7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media can be fair, friendly, civil, respectful</td>
<td>MR8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty is the best policy with media</td>
<td>MR4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media portrayals cause pain, distress</td>
<td>MR10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media portrayals viewed as caricature, unrealistic</td>
<td>MR9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame issues to influence (positive) media coverage</td>
<td>MR14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for media impact on family/friends</td>
<td>MR11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media less interested in good news about education</td>
<td>MR13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on getting results rather than press image</td>
<td>MR12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* “MR” coding refers to cataloging Former Governors Perceived “Media Response.”
Governors Kunin and Whitman had published memoirs which were very useful in analyzing their emotional and philosophical responses to their experiences in office, largely because the memoirs contained more detail than was possible to capture in the interviews.
Thematic analysis began in the spring of 2011. Studying the responses in such detail forced me to pay attention to the specific words and phrases the governors had chosen in

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of Media Relationships</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Collins</th>
<th>Kunin</th>
<th>Martz</th>
<th>Roberts</th>
<th>Swift</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>Whitman</th>
<th>Tally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Looks&quot; count (clothing, appearance, hair, etc.)</td>
<td>MR1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame responses to protect/promote female leadership</td>
<td>MR5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media displays gender bias</td>
<td>MR2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public speaking must be shaped for media</td>
<td>MR3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media oversimplify, misrepresent, prefer conflict</td>
<td>MR6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage incites governor distrust, anxiety</td>
<td>MR7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media can be fair, friendly, civil, respectful</td>
<td>MR8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty is the best policy with media</td>
<td>MR4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media portrays cause pain, distress</td>
<td>MR10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media portrays viewed as caricature, unrealistic</td>
<td>MR9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame issues to influence (positive) media coverage</td>
<td>MR14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for media impact on family/friends</td>
<td>MR11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media less interested in good news about education</td>
<td>MR13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on getting results rather than press image</td>
<td>MR12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. "MR" coding refers to cataloging Former Governors Perceived "Media Response."*
their responses, which were very revealing. Certain patterns were discovered including the governors’ use of similar phrases or word choices across the cohort to describe particular emotions resulting from “like experiences.”

The patterns revealed within all of the data sources were the building blocks that focused the re-synthesizing of all the separate pieces into coherent themes. The power of such discoveries was demonstrated to me when one source, in particular, helped me to look at my data in a fresh and exciting way.

I was thinking about the cultural narratives that grant dominance to male leadership and are often celebrated in classical tales of the hero’s journey (Campbell, 1990). In Kunin’s autobiography, I noted an actual reference to her personal quest, which was very different from the heroic male quest for power or glory. Kunin literally used the word “quest” to describe the way she sought to serve uniquely as a woman, which, to her, meant serving not for her personal glory, but for the greater good (Kunin, 1994, p. 13). The Kunin passage generated an exploration of data I had already categorized that indicated all of the women were motivated to seek the governor’s office by their desire to make a positive difference through their service.

While men also may characterize their motivating desire to run for office as one of public service, the obstacles that women must overcome in order to participate in politics involve greater challenges, including child-care requirements, lack of significant role models or mentors, and insecurities about their potential for leadership in a field dominated by men (Dolan, 2006; Lawless & Fox, 2008; Palmer & Simon, 2006). The data search and
comparison sparked the concept of a new kind of quest and a new sort of heroine who yearns
to serve and summons great courage to overcome all barriers to do so. Later this concept
provided a frame for my analytic writing about the desire of the women governors to make a
positive difference through their leadership, rather than merely to accrue power for
themselves.

Once I had conducted the analysis and synthesis of data, I began to think about the
theoretical implications of this study. Background materials used included literature about the
influence of gender on the following: 1) Public education policy priorities; 2) understanding
and analysis of leadership styles; 3) coverage of female candidates for legislative elected
office by representatives of the mass media; and 4) historical accounts as well as past
analyses of American women in elected leadership roles.

**Ethical Considerations**

Because I wanted to publish the names of my subjects in an effort to contribute to the
historical record of their service, I was and am concerned about protecting their privacy. I am
conscious that I am one of the few who has been granted the privilege of interviewing them,
or perhaps one of the few who has asked. While I was aware at the beginning of my meetings
with them that some had undergone various “scandals” while in office, or had experienced
certain anxieties about being the first women to serve in such high profile positions, I was not
aware of the pain they had experienced as a result. Scandalous topics were not the focus of
my study and were related initially only within the explored area of news coverage by
members of the mass media that had influenced their policy implementation. Only after
reviewing their transcripts in the detail that forced attention to such matters did the impact of
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their emotions strike me full force – in part, because they are political pros who do not expose their pain in public and who only briefly mention their feelings in passing.

All of the women governors in the study have reviewed their transcripts and have given me permission to use their statements, which satisfied the technical responsibility for informing and protecting them (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008). While I am not revealing any secret about their administrations that has not been highly publicized, at times, I have been concerned that my study will reveal to them the consequences of their own “unexamined assumptions” (Glesne, 1999, p. 12). Am I overstating the importance of my research to think that what I have learned may have made a difference to them and the success of their administrations? Such insights may frequently take place when narratives or life histories are organized, examined, and analyzed thematically.

Issues of Validity

The quest for validity in studies based on narrative inquiry has prompted close examination of the value of primary interviews. Silverman (2005) cautioned that in the 21st century, western cultures, awash with broadcast and print interviews of a vast number of celebrities, politicos, experts, and antagonists from a variety of domestic crises, may influence the researcher to select primary interviews as the qualitative technique of choice when, in fact, an observation in the field might be more appropriate to the topic of study. The temptation to use the primary interview as the linchpin of any research project will produce results that lack precision if the constructive nature of storytelling, one that invites a possible “rewriting of history” (Silverman, 2005, p. 8), is ignored. However, in this research project, field observations were not possible, nor were they considered relevant. The focus of this study was to explore the perceptions of the seven former governors, which I acknowledged
early on, were likely to be shaped by factors of time and distance from the actual events, my presence and participation in the semi-structured conversation, as well as the questions I asked (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995).

Webster and Mertova (2007) contended that the concept of validity has been narrowed by traditional empirical research methods to exclude, at times, analyses of complex problems or human issues. They maintained that validity should be considered more broadly, stating that in quantitative research “‘reliability’ refers to the consistency and stability of the measuring instruments, whereas in narrative research attention is directed to the ‘trustworthiness’ of field notes and transcripts of the interviews” (p. 5). Their view is supported by Polkinghorne (1988), who pointed out that statistical results are often interpreted as important although a high probability exists of less meaningful application of the knowledge gained. “‘Validity’ has been redefined by formal science . . . confused by the narrowing of the concept to refer to test or measuring instruments. In narrative research, ‘valid’ retains its ordinary meaning of well-grounded and supportable” (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 175).

Denzin (1997) called the matter of validity into question entirely, referring to narratives constructed from interpretive interview excerpts as “messy texts” (p. 8). Since the research process is not perfect, respondents are not completely reliable; and the researcher as well as the instrument are imperfect at best. Denzin contended that claims for validity are shallow and illusory because only a thinly sliced version of reality can ever be presented. Only some sense of truth can be gleaned from an interpretive narrative, rather than an absolute. However, if the writer conveys a sense of reality about the subject’s life that reads
as truth, the writer has succeeded in transmitting an important bit of the subject’s life; and “little more can be sought” (Denzin, 1997, p. 13).

Eisner (1991) provided more structure for determining validity by declaring that the process of triangulation was satisfactory when containing multiple types of data. Eisner’s model presented these three categories of criteria: 1) Structural Corroboration; 2) Consensual Validation; and 3) Referential Adequacy. Each of these categories will be discussed briefly.

*Structural corroboration* is obtained by presenting “a confluence of evidence that breeds credibility” (Eisner, 1991, p. 110); this study contains not only a description of the governors’ experiences as reported verbatim from their interviews but also the substantiation of events I provided through a number of related data sources such as newspapers, published websites, or autobiographical as well as biographical publications such that “the weight of evidence becomes persuasive” (Eisner, 1991, p. 111). The strength of the evidence was augmented by providing thick, rich description of the governors’ experiences when dealing with legislators, their family members, and their spouses as well as members of the mass media press corps.

Thus, the process of establishing structural corroboration contributed to *consensual validation*, that is, accurately interpreting materials to reach appropriate conclusions. My aim was to create an authentic voice from related data sources as well as the interview verbatim that conveyed the world of the governors to my readers, including members of my committee, so that the resulting narrative expressed the strong sense that of “trustworthiness” (Webster & Mertova, 2007, p. 5). The fact that seven women governors participated in this study and often reported remarkably similar leadership experiences contributed to consensual validation as well. Shared themes were traceable throughout their recollections. However, as
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Geertz (1973) would have us hasten to note that rich narrative “does not mean . . . that such descriptions are themselves . . . part of the reality they are ostensibly describing” (Geertz, 1973, para. 32). Nonetheless, the perceptions that each governor recounted of her remembered life created a complex and absorbing illumination of her life’s reality that shared many similarities with the other women governors in this study.

I then needed to transfer my perceptions of their experiential understandings to the readers of this study in order to provide referential adequacy, so the “readers are able to see what they would have missed without the critic’s observations” (Eisner, 1991, p. 114). In order to provide observations of value, many critical references in women’s leadership, feminist media theory, and qualitative methodology were discussed in the literature review and were furthered used in the analysis/concluding chapters to support as well as challenge my interpretations within the context of this study.

Limitations of the Study

The most important limitation to this study was that I was unable to observe the women governors “in action” due to the fact that they were no longer serving in office. Also, the sample was extremely limited. Although the study provided rich and detailed information about the experiences of former governors, one cannot assumed that the descriptions contained in this study are representative of all female governors. Although these assessments were self-reported and, therefore, are quite likely self-edited by the governors’ desires to present themselves in a more positive manner (Rosenthal, 1998), consensus across the cohort suggested validity to the experiences overall. Moreover, such limitations do not diminish the import of the study. My intention in conducting the research was to determine the perceptions of the participants based on their unique experiences as female elected
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leaders, which is why I chose a qualitative methodology as explained earlier. The very nature of qualitative research demanded that I describe in thick and rich detail (Geertz, 1973) the experiences of each woman within a narrative structure that flowed with the current of her life. Not every detail of the former women governors’ experiences is the same, nor can I foretell the future of other female governors as a result of this study, especially as the cultural and societal narratives about the appropriate roles of American women continue to evolve.

The governors’ narratives in Chapters 4 – 6 revealed similarities in themes despite the variation of background, education levels, and region. Although generalizing from data is not a goal in qualitative studies, the themes from this study could be examined by the reader, particularly when placed in the context of other studies of female leadership, to provide depth and understanding of the life experiences of other high profile women leaders as well as female governors. This study is, in some ways, comparable to a scrapbook of souvenirs and snapshots of the seven women who went back through time via their memories to share what remained of importance to them about the topics at hand.
Chapter 4: The Vision Fulfilled

A substantial body of research concerning the impact of female legislators at both the state and national levels has demonstrated that elected female leaders have generally influenced public policy in areas affecting the interests of women, children, and families well beyond that of male leaders, whether Republican or Democrat (Burrell, 2004; Conway, Steuernagel, & Ahern, 1997; Darcy, Welch, & Clark, 1994; Elder, 2004; Green, 2003; Harrison, 2003; Witt, Paget, & Matthews, 1995). As more women attain full-term governorships, they become responsible for leading their states in the development and implementation of public education policy (Mazzoni, 1994). However, little is known about the impact of female governors on policy generally, much less public education policy (Shafer & Herrera, 2010).

In the following narrative, the leadership experiences of two women governors (Collins and Kunin) are explored. Both served in the early to mid-1980s when women governors were definitely anomalies on the political landscape. Duerst-Lahti and Kelly (1995) maintained that “politics has historically borne an explicitly masculine identity . . . more exclusively . . . than any other realm of endeavor” (p. 24). In other words, female governors epitomize a position completely contrary to traditional female roles, one that feminists have typically classified as second-class citizenship (Lorber, 2005). The women who participated in this research study successfully navigated the challenges of their terms in office despite struggles to define themselves as credible first-time female executive leaders in their states and confrontations with members of the mass media. Yet both effectively introduced education policy reform agendas that were implemented by members of their legislatures.
Martha Layne Collins: Southern Steel

Martha Layne (Hall) Collins was born December 7, 1936, in Bagdad, Kentucky. When elected to executive office, Collins was the only female governor in the nation. She was the first woman governor in Kentucky and first in the South elected in her own right. In 1984, she was the first woman to chair the Democratic National Convention. Despite her obvious success as a leader, her political career suffered collateral damage within a few years of leaving office, thanks to her husband’s prosecution and conviction for influence peddling. Her future political life was snuffed out in the process, although she was never charged with criminal activity.

Collins started life as a small-town girl in a small family; she was the only child. Collins credited her path to the governor’s office to lessons she learned early on from her childhood; “you’re put on earth to make a contribution, and you better be able to answer for your time here. And two, do the best you can at whatever you’re doing, and the future will take care of itself.” She believed that whatever one lacked in financial resources could be compensated for through hard work, sacrifices, good ideas, and persistence. Although she graduated from the University of Kentucky in 1959 with a degree that prepared her to teach home economics, she rapidly took on community leadership in addition to job and family. As a successful dentist, her husband Bill joined the Jaycees; and Martha started a women’s auxiliary, the Jaycee-ettes, to support her husband’s activities.

Well known in the community, some friends encouraged Collins to help with various political campaigns. In 1971, she agreed to become the Central Kentucky coordinator of women’s activities for fellow Jaycee member, Wendell Ford, who was running for governor.
Collins took her children, Marla, 6, and Steven, 9, on the campaign trail with her as she stumped for Ford. She found that she enjoyed the experience. She was so successful directing campaigns that she left the classroom in 1970 to continue her political fieldwork.

After a request that she chair yet another candidate’s run for office, her husband suggested that she had “put in enough miles and . . . put in enough hours, that I think you ought to either run yourself or come home.” Bill Collins was not the only one who thought her candidacy would be a good idea. Several of her friends suggested that she run for office herself. However, Collins’ political interests often collided with her commitments as wife and mother. She frequently juggled telephone calls while preparing meals or doing housework and worried that her children would suffer as a result of her time spent elsewhere.

I was always concerned about whether or not I would live to regret being so involved . . . . The demands are so great and the timing is so important that you can’t always go to your kids’ activities . . . I worried about that, thinking that when I got to be 90 in my rocking chair, I’d regret what I’d done.

Reassured by her husband’s support, at 39 years of age she successfully entered politics with her election to clerk of the Kentucky Court of Appeals. In 1979, she was elected lieutenant governor on a ticket led by gubernatorial candidate John Brown (Smith, 1991). She defeated five men in the Democratic primary before going on to win the election. She served until 1983 as lieutenant governor, and she loved the job. She spent 25% of her time as acting governor, during the 500 days of her term when Brown was out-of-state (Harrison & Klotter, 1997). She traveled the state during her 4-year term attending to all the ceremonial duties such as ribbon cuttings and speech-making that Governor Brown did not
care for (Harrison & Klotter, 1997). She visited every Kentucky county, exploring her state from the depths of its coalmines to senior citizen homes, eager to learn about the lives of Kentucky residents and any needed changes that she could make. Collins not only gained experience to from the state’s highest office but also built her political strategy at the same time. Moreover, she became the first woman to chair the National Conference of Lieutenant Governors (Schenken, 1999).

Halfway through her term as lieutenant governor, she decided she would run for governor, inspired by what she perceived as great opportunities to move her state forward. As a former schoolteacher, Collins relished the chance to tackle challenges she felt Kentucky faced in education. When the time came to run, Collins had wide spread support and “record campaign funds” (Kleber, 2001, p. 211). During her early campaigns for office, she began to adapt to the kind of exposure necessary to win office and maintain a public image. Despite her years as a competitor and winner of several beauty pageants, Collins started out cringing at her image on public advertising.

My husband said, “Well, your billboard’s up. You want to go see one?” and . . . here I see this . . . big billboard with my picture on it. Well, I nearly died! You know; I’m thinking, “Take that down; I can’t stand that!”

Ironically, Collins also found herself unpleasantly confronted by the expectations women’s groups placed upon her as a female candidate, some of which conflicted with her personal convictions. For example, according to Collins, women can be perceived to be their own worst enemies in the workplace, particularly if they cannot organize their personal lives to avoid conflict with professional responsibilities. She pointed out that the women who use their children or their biology as excuses for less than top-notch performance do much to
harm the willingness of men to share leadership roles. Collins also supported abortion rights only in cases of rape or incest. When she received surveys from the National Organization for Women (NOW) and Emily’s List as a prelude to providing funding for her campaign, she found her gender less important than her politics. “So I would fill out my forms; and apparently I didn’t say exactly what they wanted me to say, and so I didn’t get any money.” Collins widened the breach between herself and feminist groups after her election to office. “When I got elected governor, I got money. So I sent it back.”

Collins was elected Governor of Kentucky in 1983 at the age of 46. Constitutionally limited to just one term, she served four years (Commonwealth of Kentucky, 2004). The only female governor in the US at the time, Collins occupied a brightly spot-lit stage. Despite the fact that more opportunities were available for female leadership in the 1980s, Collins felt that women leaders faced a double standard. At times, she was aware that her gender was either a problem or a plus; but she was usually focused on issues rather than on her personal status.

When I would walk from the mansion to the Capitol to go to my office, which was right up the street, I didn’t walk carrying my briefcase saying, “Well, I’m a woman governor; and I’m going to work.” I had to go to work and make the same decisions that a man did . . . [The work is] the same.”

Leadership style. Collins described herself as an “intuitive” person who followed her instincts in regard to her leadership style. “I don’t ever recall sitting down in a chair and saying, ‘OK, now I’m a leader; and what kind of leader am I going to be, how am I going to do this?’” Instead, Collins actualized her belief that the role of a leader was to create a “steady situation” for people, whether employees or citizens of the state. For Collins,
steadiness meant a smooth, indiscernible transition from male leadership to female; the business of the state continued as usual.

If you make it [leadership] a female thing, then everybody else is going to. Frankly, I tried to play it down. As I say, you use it [your gender] as an advantage at times; and it’s a disadvantage at times.

If Collins was truly concerned that her administration might be typified as a “female thing,” then her approach to applying her new authority was truly ironic. She immediately rejected the authoritarian habits of her male predecessors, not entirely because those habits offended her sensibilities about the application of power, but at least in part because she thought she could not get away with behaving as the men had.

In the past, the governor of Kentucky was very strong; and you could pick up the phone and say “This is Governor Collins; and I want this [directive] done, and I want it done by noon.” Well, being the first woman governor, that [compliance] wasn’t apt to happen . . . being the first woman governor, there were people who probably wouldn’t follow me if I just said, “Do it.”

Collins obviously felt more comfortable building warm relationships with members of the legislature and her staff than issuing tyrannical directives over an impersonal telephone line. For example, Collins was firm on the point that she would never ask her staff members to do anything that she was unwilling to do herself. She underscored that everyone’s best effort was critical and that only the job descriptions were different; she emphasized that her roles and responsibilities made her no “better” than the rest of her staff. At times, she surprised her staff members by arriving before they did and making coffee for
the office personnel. At the same time, she made the point that she valued all of her staff relationships.

Collins also was no exception to the tendency of women leaders to appoint other women (Kunin, 1994; Whitman, 2005) to administrative positions. Half of the eight appointed constitutional officers in her administration were female. “I tried to have women in positions . . . in order to show that they could handle it, that they were capable, and that it [the job] could be done by a female.” Intuitive leader or not, Collins insisted on careful planning in her administration and invited the contributions of stakeholders in her policy goals noting, “I would rather take the time to involve people than to mend fences or to go back and clean up a mess; to me that’s a waste of time.”

Instead, Collins perfected a process whereby she introduced policy directions “up from the bottom,” utilizing what might be described as a Socratic-approach with her staff, particularly her younger staff members and state employees. She described this process as one that usually began with her recounting a conversation she had had with someone who had introduced an idea or a need for a particular policy. Then, she would simply ask her staffers what they thought of the notion. “And pretty soon, within 30 minutes, 45 minutes, you’ve got them thinking it was their idea . . . and then you just send them out to make it happen.” Collins always made sure to credit her staff members and state employees when they reached administrative goals, pointing out, “I didn’t do it [reach the goal] myself.” She also made sure to celebrate realized goals. In one instance, when Commerce Department staff members succeeded in creating a certain number of new jobs, Collins attended an employee potluck dinner where congratulatory tee-shirts were distributed.
“Sheep Dog” leadership. Collins also knew that to realize her policy agenda she had to work effectively with state legislators. When she first entered office, she immediately set about improving the state’s economic and education systems, which she believed were inextricably linked. Kentucky had a long history of dependence on the coal industry, and Collins felt that the state needed to diversify its economy by developing a culture of highly skilled labor for manufacturing jobs. She saw a strong relationship between a well-educated work force and her state’s economic future, pointing out that “companies will come to states where they feel like you’re investing in your people and that you’ve got a trained workforce.”

Between her election and her inauguration, Collins prepared the legislation she envisioned for reforms to Kentucky’s education system. She called each of the legislators to seek their support immediately upon taking office. However, the political system was not as responsive as she had hoped. She found that all of the legislators claimed to be supportive of public education, but two major obstacles existed. Thus, Collins began a process of herding her legislators toward her goal, which also involved protecting their flanks. One hurdle was legislators’ requests in exchange for their supportive votes. The other barrier was the timing of the $300 million appropriation that Collins wanted. Kentucky was facing a recession, and legislators were not inclined to provide financial support.

Members of the House and Senate have to run [for election] again in May . . . . And they were afraid that if they voted for it [the appropriation], they would be defeated. Well, the more I thought about it, I thought, “Well, it would be crazy for me to go ahead and . . . try to make it go through, get it defeated, and then all my friends, the ones who really wanted to help me, get defeated in their campaigns and [then] I’ve
got all these new people coming in. So I waited.”

Collins withdrew her legislation despite an immediate backlash from media representatives who reported her action as a lack of legislative savvy (Harrison & Klotter, 1997).

Undeterred, Collins went on the road throughout the spring taking with her an assortment of business people, educators, and legislators who supported her drive to reform education in Kentucky. They spoke to community members to explain what her program was about and why the state of Kentucky needed to take decisive action. That July, she called a special session of the legislature to consider the education package she had withdrawn earlier, noting with a laugh that, “[It] didn’t take us but 4 days to get it passed.”

Collins lined up business community support for a corporate license tax to pay for the reforms she wanted. Ultimately, her reform package included increased salaries and longevity bonuses for teachers; reduced class sizes in lower grades; mandated kindergarten; testing and internships for new teachers; academic receivership for schools failing to perform; and remedial programs for early grades. Teacher pay was tied to student performance. She wanted to reward those teachers whom she knew from personal experience worked hard. “Those who didn’t work so hard would not get the same reward, because I don’t believe that’s right.”

Collins had discovered the process that worked for her in getting her policy initiatives into law. She provided strategic cover for her supporters and enlisted business community alliances. Building on her educational initiatives to prepare highly-skilled workers, her entrepreneurial vision led next to introducing Kentucky to Japan. She was the first governor to use economic incentives to court Japanese automobile executives on their own turf. Traveling more than once to Japan with a team of legislators and other stakeholders, by
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1986 she had negotiated and won a new Toyota automobile plant that opened in Georgetown, Kentucky, in 1988 (Toyota, 2010). Toyota continued to invest heavily in Kentucky, and the state experienced record economic growth under Governor Collins’ leadership (Harrison & Klotter, 1997; Ryan & Fraas, 2004). Once again savvy to the impact of her gender before meeting with members of the male-dominated automobile industry in Japan, Collins educated herself about accepted female protocol, which included avoiding direct eye contact with Japanese men. However, after she had opened the economic door to Japan through which other governors followed, she did see one advantage to her gender; “at that time, I was the only female governor [in the United States]. They didn’t forget my name.”

**Playing with sharks.** Collins’ dust-up at the beginning of her administration with the members of the press corps over how they covered her education reform initiatives was not the first of her tussles. Unhappy with the coverage she had received during her election campaigns, Collins held most members of the 4th Estate in low esteem. She did not count the columns in newspaper stories that reported on her campaign, but she consistently had the feeling that reporters gave her less space because they doubted her viability as a candidate. “It’s very hard to be objective sometimes, but I don’t think I got as much publicity as they [her male opponents] got.” After her election, members of the press began to cover Governor Collins more regularly. However, the reporters for the *Louisville Courier-Journal* seemed to have difficulty conferring her an executive title. After Governor Collins took office, she found herself still referred to as “Mrs. Collins” in newspaper articles. Collins’ press officer personally requested that her title as Governor be included in articles that featured information about her official actions (Braden, 1996, p. 99). A former schoolteacher, Collins
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had difficulty adapting to the press conference rituals where she was pushed to answer questions. Collins asserted that they were “trying to get my goat. They were trying to get under my skin.” She tended to treat reporters who insisted on probing her statements as if they were recalcitrant students who had thrown a paper wad while she explained herself the first time, telling them they had to “learn to listen.” In a press conference where she was not prepared to release information in response to a reporter’s question, the reporter took a sort of revenge in printing exactly the words she used.

I was trying to explain it . . . and there were a lot of “Uh’s” . . . because I was trying to think, not lie to them and say this is not going to happen . . . So, of course, they got cute, put it in the newspaper . . . It was awful, absolutely awful.

Certain reporters, in her judgment, were “sensationalists who . . . don’t want a fact to get in the way of a good story.” As a result, Collins did not develop close relationships with members of the mass media press corps, saying, “If you played favorites with one, it made the others even more sharks in the water; and I just didn’t do that.” Yet despite her unhappiness with certain reporters or certain stories, Collins viewed her tenure with the members of the press as a learning experience. “There was a mutual respect by the end of my term. Maybe I helped them grow; they helped me grow” (Braden, 1996, p. 99).

Life after elections. In 1984, Collins’ term was coming to an end. She was hopeful that her political career would continue. She was selected to chair the Democratic National Convention in San Francisco, California (University of Kentucky Alumni Association, 2009), the first woman to do so. At that time, she was also considered as a Vice Presidential running mate with Walter Mondale, but Geraldine Ferraro was chosen instead. Collins speculated that her inability to influence women and unions might have influenced
Mondale’s choice. Collins’ refusal to promote feminist causes such as abortion rights beyond pregnancies caused by rape or incest meant that she had little influence to pull organized women’s groups and other natural supporters of the Party base to the Democratic ticket.

Collins might have been considered for political roles later during the Clinton administration, but her political future ended in 1993 with her husband’s conviction on an influence peddling charge (Ryan & Fraas, 2004). Collins was called to testify, although no charges were brought against her. Despite her claims of her husband’s innocence, prosecutors were able to prove that Bill Collins had promised favors and influence with his wife to bond company investors. He also faced charges on a drunken driving arrest and a federal court trial for attempting to influence a grand jury investigation (Wolfe, 1993). Three years later the US Supreme Court let stand the conspiracy convictions without comment (Associated Press, 1996). Despite the years that have passed since her husband’s financial troubles, Martha Layne eschewed any consideration of a return to political life. She was recently asked to run for Mayor of Lexington but demurred.

After leaving the governor’s office, Collins returned to her first career love, education. She was president of Saint Catherine College for six years (National Governors Association, 2012a) and, after 14 years of service as executive scholar in residence, retired in 2012 from Georgetown College (Durham, 2012). On August 16, 2010, Shelby County christened the new state-of-the-art Martha Layne Collins (MLC) High School (Brammer, 2010). Martha Layne Collins was on the field to give the coin toss that night. No doubt inspired by her presence, the MLC High School Titans won the game. Today, Martha Layne Collins remains active in the political and financial world. She is recognized throughout the
country as a leading expert in international business, especially in the area of Japanese-American business relations (Stennis Center for Public Service, 2007). She currently serves on the board of directors for the Kentucky World Trade Center in Lexington, Kentucky (Durham, 2012).

**Madeleine Kunin: Most Unlikely to Succeed**

Madeleine (May) Kunin was born into a Jewish family on September 28, 1933, in Zurich, Switzerland, the year Hitler rose to power. Madeleine’s father suffered serious depression and was hospitalized in June of 1936. A month later, he took his own life, leaving his wife, Renee, a widow at age 36 and Madeleine with no memories at all of her father as well as a lie about his death. Renee told her daughter that her father had died of a heart attack. Madeleine’s mother decided to leave for America, spurred by “a limitless dream of what this country could offer her and her children” (Kunin, 1994, p. 326).

Madeleine May Kunin was six years old when she first stepped into America in 1940; her brother, Edgar, was 10. Over 50 years later, Kunin (1994) wrote:

This was the source of my political courage. I could do what the (Holocaust) victims could not: Oppose evil when I recognized it. The United States of America would protect me. I lived in a time and place where it was safe for a Jew to be a political person, to speak, to oppose, to stand up. (p. 334)

However, despite Renee’s optimism about the possibilities of life in America, Madeleine’s childhood showed little promise. She struggled to learn to speak English and to overcome shyness as well as poverty. The family barely survived as Madeleine’s mother tried to generate an income on a fine arts degree from the University of Zurich that was more appropriate for an appreciation of culture than capitalism. Madeleine attended public
school in New York City until 1950. At that time, Renee moved her children to
Massachusetts to be near cousins and what she hoped would be an easier life. Graduating
from high school in Massachusetts, Madeleine was uncertain of her future. Madeleine
received no encouragement beyond attending high school, but a $100 scholarship from a
local business group paid her tuition at the University of Massachusetts where she graduated
cum laude with a B.S. degree (Kunin, 2010). She was surprised at the time to learn she had
been selected “Woman of the Year” by her classmates (Madsen, 2009).

While in college, Madeleine learned the truth about her father’s death. For the first
time, Madeleine understood the guilt and grief that had driven her mother to leave their
homeland for the uprooted life they had lived in America (Kunin, 1994). Another
scholarship allowed her to attend the prestigious Columbia University School of Journalism
(Madsen, 2009). After obtaining her M.S. degree from Columbia, Kunin faced the challenge
of finding a reporter’s job, rare for a woman in 1956. When the Burlington Sun and Free
Press offered her a position that focused on news topics other than weddings and recipes,
she decided to move to Vermont for the experience. She became a beat reporter at the age of
24. She planned to apply at the New York Times within a year or two and to move back to
the city she loved (Madsen, 2009). However, by 1959, Madeleine had married Arthur
Kunin, the son of another Jewish emigrant, studying to become a doctor. She spent the next
10 years at home, although she worked part-time writing and teaching while rearing her four
children. Along the way, she studied English literature at the University of Vermont,
receiving a second Master’s degree in 1967 for sheer pleasure (Madsen, 2009).

Her escape from the Holocaust inspired her. She felt “a survivor’s responsibility” to
make a difference in the world because her life had been spared. When her husband entered
professional life as a doctor, Madeleine confronted community issues such as historical preservation and the installation of safety lights at a railroad crossing on the route her children walked to school every day, actions that Kunin would later identify as laying “the groundwork for living a political life. The belief that as an individual I could have an effect on an impersonal political system . . . made me believe that I could change the world.” She stepped onto the political stage at age 39, drawn by the environmental and women’s movements in the 1970s, both of which she says were critical in shaping her participation. “The women’s movement sent us the message, ‘Get involved. Do something. Don’t just stand there and watch the world go by.’”

In 1972, Kunin was an unfamiliar sight in politics – a woman with young children at home running for the Burlington Board of Aldermen. In her first caucus interview, she was asked how she could do the job with young children to manage. She responded by drawing a parallel between herself and the men on the board who were employed at full-time jobs: Her full-time job just happened to be rearing a family. She noted that she, like other board members, would simply be “taking a second job” (Kunin, 1994, p. 57). She lost that race in February, but the experience gave her insight into her own capacity to handle the challenges of a campaign. Kunin entered her name for the Vermont legislature shortly after her loss in the alderman race. Her husband took over many of the household tasks she abandoned telling her early in her first race, “I feel positively about it, and I don’t feel threatened in any way” (Kunin, 1994, p. 47).

Kunin was elected to the Vermont legislature in 1972 and served three terms. In 1974, she was elected House Minority Whip, the first woman to serve in a legislative leadership position in Vermont. During her third term in 1976, she was appointed Chairwoman of the
Appropriations Committee, the first woman to assume this position. She was elected to the first of two terms as lieutenant governor of Vermont in 1978, running on a separate ticket from the Republican governor. She realized that she “knew as much as he did” (Madsen, 2009) and decided to run for the executive seat. Kunin lost her first bid for governor in 1982. At the age of 51, Kunin ran again and was elected to the first of three terms as governor. Her success is even more significant given the nature of her circumstances.

I was a very unlikely person to be in politics . . . . I’m an emigrant; I came here as a child, six and a half; [I] didn’t speak English; I obviously am a woman, and there were very few women doing these things . . . and I wasn’t what you’d call a natural born leader . . . . I was more of what you call, in those days, an “egghead.” You know — people who read books.

Yet Kunin won. Elected governor in 1984, Kunin was only the second woman to assume the state’s highest office since Ella Grasso of Connecticut, who had been elected in 1974. Martha Layne Collins was serving her term in Kentucky as Kunin entered hers, and a great deal of curiosity existed about the only two female governors in the US. Kunin remembered many articles in the press discussing differences between her and the former governor, Dick Snelling, “an old-fashioned chief executive officer (CEO), really hierarchical, command-and-control; and I was a big contrast.”

**Better leadership through chemistry.** Most of the differences between Kunin and her male predecessor came from one major commitment Kunin made early on. In contrast to Collins, who wanted to minimize the appearance of gender differences between herself and her predecessor, Kunin entered office determined to “lead as a woman” (Kunin, 1994, p. 13). Kunin recognized quickly that her own experience of having four children gave her a unique
relationship with her female constituents, one that influenced her own policy priorities for providing good childcare to Vermonters. Governor Kunin most eloquently described the phenomenon of “difference” as experienced during her tenure as the first woman governor of Vermont. She wrote movingly of that time in her first book *Living a Political Life*.

> [Our] traditional political bonding was magnified by the knowledge that we women were doing it differently; we were inventing ourselves, gazing out on a vast political landscape with the curiosity of explorers. Always, in the backs of our minds, we were sobered by knowing that, whatever we did, our deeds would be silhouetted up against the wall of history, and our shadows would outline the shape of things to come for other women. (Kunin, 1994, p. 10)

Kunin embraced feminine networks that differed from traditional college and business or professional associations from which she chose appointees. Because her life experiences were similar to other women’s, she considered different criteria for filling positions in contrast to her male counterparts.

When a woman applied for a job and said . . . she took 10 years off before she went to law school and apologized for it, I said, “I understand that [the 10-year gap in employment].” And that was to me a plus, not a minus. Whereas to somebody else, it might be, “Well, what were you doing with all that time?”

Time also became an issue during Kunin’s selection process for appointees. She was accused early in her administration of taking too long to make appointments. However, she regarded her appointments as great opportunities to bring new people into government and finding the right “chemistry” of skill and compatibility within her team was important to
her. As a result of her careful mixing of basic elements, she asserted that her administration was made up of “a wonderful group of people” who felt connected and close.

**Policy initiatives regarding public education.** One of the big differences in the Kunin administration was her concern for early childhood education, an area she claimed had been neglected by earlier administrations. “I realized the obvious, which everybody realizes but doesn’t necessarily do anything about: that early childhood education is the key [to success in school].” She believed that children would benefit if they learned language and social skills early on that might not be present in their family homes. Kunin entered her second term determined to build on what she had come to understand about the importance of public education policy during her first term. She had worked hard to develop a process for affecting the largest number of Vermonter in the most efficient way possible, at least “efficient” as far as state bureaucracies were concerned. “Education just seemed to me the most broad-based approach . . . . When you affect every child, every family, you realize you have the greatest impact.” Her second term reflected Kunin’s bold goal: to equalize the quality of education throughout the state of Vermont. She knew the state would have to provide a new system of more equal funding. She followed through on her vision boldly. She devoted the entire contents of her second State-of-the-State speech to her public education policy initiatives to focus attention on the importance of education.

**Trust and a wide net.** Kunin’s legislative initiatives were founded on her relationships with legislators aimed at building their trust. She achieved her goals largely by keeping the legislators informed of her plans and progress, aided by the Democratic Speaker of the House who was a strong ally. She also stepped outside the Capitol bubble to focus on cultivating the support of state residents. “You have to work within the legislative body; but
you also have to work much more broadly, so they [the legislators] hear from their constituents that ‘We want this.’” Constituent support was especially important to curb maverick legislators, even Democrats, “who had to flex their muscles, too. There’s a real sense of rivalry, I suppose in most states, between the legislature and the governor.” Kunin also relied on the “good people” she had appointed to cabinet and staff positions. Kunin’s determination to lead differently meant she encouraged her staff to think creatively and try new approaches to old policy challenges. As Kunin said, “You don’t always get it right . . . but the net result was I got most of my legislation through.”

In 1985, Vermont was ranked as one of the states offering the lowest teacher pay. The state ended up above the median by the time she left office in 1991. Although she was criticized for spending so much money on education, “schools did improve and salaries did increase . . . . We tried to ease property taxes so that the amount of money given from the state placed less of a burden on the town.” Ultimately, Kunin did not get everything she wanted because she had to compromise. Despite the fact that many people consider compromise to be “selling out,” Kunin believed it was essential to the political process. Another outcome of embracing compromise is the necessity to temper one’s emotions. Kunin acknowledged that leaders may become emotionally invested in policy initiatives; and, in fact, a certain amount of passion is necessary to stimulate one’s work. Kunin cautioned that no one has the luxury of dismissing an opponent from one’s cooperative working circle. “The person you vehemently disagree with on an issue one day, you might find you’re aligned [with] the next day on a different issue. Whether you want to or not, you’re going to speak to that person again.”
Reporter paranoia. As a former reporter herself, Kunin understood quite well the power of the press to amplify her voice. “The best part of being governor is that you have that wonderful high-tech instrument called the ‘bully-pulpit,’ and the bully-pulpit does give you a voice, a voice which is heard.” Kunin felt that overall, members of the mass media “treated her well” during her tenure in office, although she confessed to a sense of “paranoia” because not all of her encounters with reporters were positive, especially during her early campaign for office. Governor Kunin believed her gender had worked against her with Vermont residents and the press during her pioneer run in the early 1970s. Unfortunately, she complained about gender bias to a reporter. “Kunin Says Sexism Played Role in Her Defeat” was the next day’s headline (Kunin, 1994, p. 278). The headline was a caution to Kunin, who continued throughout her career to refrain from expressing a gendered viewpoint to members of the press and, thereby, to the public, a viewpoint “dangerous because misunderstood” (Kunin, 1994, p. 281) and likely to create an appearance of victimization rather than to expand understanding among her constituents. When she finally ran for governor in the early 1980s, Kunin’s campaigns were organized to prove that the question “Are we ready for a woman?” need not even be asked. Polls revealed that voters were not sure she had the experience necessary to lead the state. “Thousands of years of history had made maleness synonymous with leadership. We had to stamp that image with an alternative in freshly inked black letters that spelled ‘woman’” (Kunin, 1994, p. 292). Her credentials became the focus of her advertising. In fact, they were listed first in her television spots, with her picture coming up only after a simple but impressive list of her accomplishments after 10 years of service in state government.
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She also worked to craft an image of “being gubernatorial” (Kunin, 1994, p. 292). She realized she “would be held to a different standard . . . because of gender assumptions” (Kunin, 1994, p. 292). She was well aware of the importance of how she dressed and styled her hair. Part of her transformation included a crash course in media training for television. She squeezed in a session of about an hour that covered how to stand at the podium and how to look straight at the camera. “I didn’t get a lot of coaching. I probably could have benefited from it, but we just didn’t have time (laughs).” Probably more critical were her practice sessions in preparation for her debate in pursuit of a second term in the governor’s office. By the time she faced her opponent, Kunin had answers at her fingertips, a poised and confident delivery, and had indeed become “gubernatorial.” “I did not search for the right word, tone, or position; I knew it. No longer did I debate whether to be passive or aggressive, cautious or decisive. I had found my stance, my voice, myself,” (Kunin, 1994, p. 318). Nevertheless, Kunin’s confidence in finding her voice and her stance as governor never made her confrontations with the press feel like social occasions. In fact, only when she completed her term did her relationship with reporters change. “By the time I left as governor, I had wonderful editorials . . . so I guess when you’re moving on, they like you. And maybe when you’re moving in, they like you; but while you’re there [it’s a different story].” Kunin stated that she now finds exchanges with reporters to be “a piece of cake (laughter); when you’re being grilled about something, it’s a lot harder.” Overall, Kunin declared that competence at the job was the bedrock of her confidence. She felt that women tend to work hard and that characteristic alone will serve every woman well who attains the governor’s office.

Life after elections. Kunin declined to seek reelection in 1990. She did not face political challengers or particularly low poll numbers but rather budget cuts in social
programs and the necessity of convincing voters to approve a proposed 3% income tax hike. She blamed Washington for "telling the American public that they can have it both ways (i.e., no tax increases and increased social services). Unfortunately, governors can't play by these rules" (“Governors Heading for the Exit,” 1990, April 16). Later, she reflected on her personal motivation for leaving office. “My decision, which might seem like a withdrawal from risk, was, in fact, the opposite; I was rejecting the near certainty of a known identity in order to discover who else I might become” (Kunin, 1994, p. 30).

After Kunin left office in Vermont, she served as a US Deputy Secretary of Education in the Clinton administration from 1993 until 1997, when she became the ambassador to her native Switzerland as well as to Liechtenstein. She is the author of the book *Living a Political Life*, which chronicles her career prior to joining the US Department of Education.

Kunin continues to exercise her intellect through her many commitments to teach, speak, and advocate for women in office, sustainable global practices, and education. As a Marsh Scholar Professor-at-Large at the University of Vermont in Burlington, she lectures in a number of departments, including history and women's studies. In 1991, she founded the Institute for Sustainable Communities (ISC) and continues to serve as President of the board. After leaving office, she was a Fellow of The Institute of Politics, Kennedy School, Harvard University and a Fellow at Harvard’s Bunting Institute. She is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and has received more than 20 honorary degrees. She is also an accomplished writer and speaker. She is a regular commentator on Vermont Public Radio. Her most recent book, *Politics, Pearls and Power*, was published in April, 2010.
The Golden Age of Politics?

However remarkable the vision and leadership skills Collins and Kunin possessed, they were fortunate, indeed, to govern during the later decades of the 20th century when compromise was still considered a routine part of the political process. Despite differences, they were able to work cooperatively with their legislative members to produce progress on behalf of their states.

With the election of Ronald Reagan, the Republican party began a two-decades long march toward increasing popularity among American voters fueled by an attitude of “No Compromise” on principles that included family values, cutting taxes, and increasing the Pentagon’s budget, an ideology that had little basis in reality (Stockman, 1986). Despite the fact that Reagan did eventually compromise on a tax increase, inevitably, the success of his message inspired politicians at the state and local levels of elected office to follow suit (Tibbetts, 2011). From 1980 – 2008, a span of 28 years, Republican presidents held sway in the White House, interrupted for eight years along the way by the election of Bill Clinton. However, even the Clinton administration bore the challenge of battling the Republican Revolution led by Newt Gingrich in 1994 (Evans, 2005). Today’s political contentiousness has reached levels unparalleled in most people’s lifetimes as some members of opposite parties have embraced ideological stands that brook no compromise whatsoever in terms of their impact on local, state, or national political systems (Brownstein, 2007). The absence of such forces during the Collins and Kunin administrations, no doubt, contributed to their policy successes.
Chapter 5: The Impact of Crises

In this chapter, the narratives are presented of three women governors who endured personal crises in office that were interpreted and magnified by coverage in the mass media with devastating results. Two governors, Martz and Swift, confronted powerful media messages that arose from circumstances unique to their sex (i.e., the physical or emotional expressions of motherhood). In both cases, actions that may have seemed perfectly reasonable in situations outside a governor’s office served to undermine their legitimacy as leaders and effectively to end their political careers.

Governor Whitman faced a crisis that challenged her right to her victory within a week of winning election. However, Whitman was able to master the media tidal wave that literally threatened to overwhelm her first hours in office. On the one hand, she survived and thrived through her first term. On the other hand, Whitman has been faulted for actions she took to cut public education costs that have been blamed for causing financial crisis in New Jersey to this day. Additionally, she was haunted by the impact of the 9/11 attack on New York City’s Twin Towers Trade Center. As the head of the Environmental Protection Agency in the Bush administration, she gave the controversial “all-clear” signal for entering Ground Zero, which was later found to be premature, causing severe health problems and even the early deaths of New York residents and early responders.

A summary of the backgrounds of each of the women is presented in this chapter with a narrative that provides the circumstances of the crises each of them faced. The individual narratives are followed by a brief discussion of their crisis experiences. The narratives in this chapter are presented in the following order: 1) Judy Martz; 2) Jane Swift; and 3) Christine Whitman.
Judy Martz: Undone by Maternal Instinct

Judy (Morstein) Martz traces her Montana roots back five generations to 1872 when her emigrant Czechoslovakian grandfather first homesteaded the state. Her father raised Hereford cattle on the outskirts of a nearby town called Big Timber, populated by fewer than 5,000 people. Martz was born there on July 28, 1943, the fourth of six children. Martz’s mother was a homemaker with “healing hands.” She bought used dresses from a neighbor and tailored them to fit her daughters. Martz never considered her family poor, but hard work was expected from so we could get our Social Security number so we could work (laughs). But I love that, that they taught us nothing is free. You’re going to work for everything you get. I think that’s missing today.each child. She remembers that she and her siblings claimed to be older than they were “….” Martz’s parents were also strict taskmasters. Yet, in that remote territory, the family was close; and the sibling bonds were powerful despite typical squabbles. In later years, Judy would donate a kidney to her older sister, prolonging her life for some 20 years.

From early childhood, Martz’s life was extremely athletic and physical. She grew up on the back of a horse and loved to “rodeo” (e.g., barrel racing, break-away calf roping, and cow cutting). She liked school; but after a brief stint on the high school honor roll, she decided, “Well, I’ve been there and done that. I don’t want to do that anymore.” She began to test herself as a risk-taker in more mature games. She graduated from Butte High School in 1961 and was crowned “Miss Rodeo Montana” for 1961-62, based on “personality, appearance and horsemanship” (Miss Rodeo Montana, 2010). One of her best friends was a national champion speed skater, who recognized Martz’s natural talent. Martz joined the 1963 US World Speed Skating Team and competed in the 1964 Olympic Games held in
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Japan. During her competitive event she realized she was in first place, took her eyes off her goal, and fell down, finishing in 15th place. The experience gave her a philosophical attitude about what is important in life, which was not always winning: “So don’t get all blown up about things you do, or who you think you are. Just keep doing the right thing.”

Martz was attending Eastern Montana College on track to become a physical therapist when her boyfriend was killed. He had stopped to help at the scene of a fatal collision when he was struck by a live wire and electrocuted. His death “changed the focus of my life totally. I wanted to help people. I did not want to be an athlete any longer. It was like I’d been there. I did the best I could, move on.” She left college after completing her first year. In 1965, her first love, Harry Martz, returned to Montana from Army basic training. They had dated all through high school. About to be shipped overseas to Germany as a heavy equipment mechanic, he was home on a short leave. He and Judy immediately reconnected and were married just before he left. Harry returned from the service and together they opened a commercial garbage hauling business in Butte. She worked there for 13 years doing the books, driving the trucks, and eventually leading the business community as president of the Chamber of Commerce.

Highly motivated to serve others, Martz began helping out on political campaigns. Martz’s parents had never displayed any particular political affiliation, but their conservative practices convinced her they were Republicans. In 1970, Martz was inspired by her brother to begin a deeply religious journey to a new relationship with her faith and Jesus Christ. She began to search for a way to be of service more broadly. In 1989, she left full-time work with her husband’s waste-hauling business for a job with Senator Conrad Burns. For six years, she headed up Constituent Services in the Butte area. In 1994, gubernatorial
candidate Mark Racicot (pronounced, “Roscoe”) needed a running mate as lieutenant governor. The former candidate for that seat had decided to run for the US Senate. Her opportunity for political leadership arrived signaled by circumstances she had learned to respect.

Three different people at three different times from three different parts of the state came in and said to me, “You should ask the governor to consider you to be lieutenant governor” . . . . When things happen to me in threes, I really listen . . . because it seems almost a signature of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

After weeks of prayer and discussion with her family, Martz was certain. She asked Racicot to put her on his ticket. Her two children, Justin and Stacey, were both in their 20s when their mother launched her own political career. Despite Racicot’s popularity and the near certainty of his election, Martz worked hard to prove she had “earned the right to be lieutenant governor.” She drove 200,000 miles around the state of Montana to campaign; and in 1996, the Republican team won. She moved into the lieutenant governor’s office in Helena. It was the beginning of 10 years away from her husband and family, except weekends, and a four-year political honeymoon. Left largely to her own devices, Judy created a program called, “I Care a Ton,” to solicit donations of hay from neighboring states after a fire devastated much of Montana’s crop. She enjoyed a good relationship with Governor Racicot, and loved going to work.

The only thing you really have to concentrate on being lieutenant governor . . . . I say this jokingly, is don’t get the governor in trouble, especially when you’re on the same ticket (laughs). I never did, and it was a great job.
Governor Martz encountered open skepticism about her capacity to lead during her early days as lieutenant governor. An influential legislator from her own party remarked to her openly that no one would ever think of her as governor. “I don’t think he had any clue who he was talking to or what kind of an attitude I had, because it [the insult] was like saying “sic ’em” to a dog. It made me very angry.” Two and a half years into her term, she decided, “I was going to be Governor.” She assembled a team of key consultants, guided by her chief policy adviser, Shane Hedges, a young policy wunderkind. She said she wanted to make Montana "open for business" (*National Journal Magazine*, 2004); she ran on a platform of cutting taxes and increasing money for education as well as health care. “I could get some things done that I thought really needed to be done in a conservative manner. So I thought, yes, I’ll run.” In November 2000, Hedges helped Martz prove she was a force to be reckoned with when she took on Democratic millionaire businessman Mark O'Keefe, who held a master's degree in environmental science from the University of Montana. O'Keefe used $2 million of his own fortune and received out-of-state contributions from national environmental groups. He outspent Martz three to one and still lost (Croke, 2002). Martz took office as the state’s first female governor, winning 51%-47%, and carrying most of the state's counties (*National Journal Magazine*, 2004).

After her election, Shane Hedges became chief policy adviser to the Montana governor heading up her 13-member cabinet at age 27 (Hedges, 2012). Hedges, who had managed her gubernatorial campaign so brilliantly, continued to generate political magic. Martz was careful to convey strength in her first encounters with legislators as she and Hedges made headway. “I think they test you at first to see if you’re going to crumble and let them walk all over you.” Martz was in the driver’s seat as Hedges orchestrated Martz’s
promises to reduce taxes and reverse a budget deficit of $240 million that faced her administration on election day. By the end of her first year in office a $174 million budget surplus had been attained and financial reports noted, “the personal income of Montanans outpaced most of the nation during the third quarter of 2001 and rose faster than inflation” (Greene & Laslovich, 2001).

Martz and her husband Harry enjoyed a heady time that spring. They attended the Inaugural Ball in honor of the election of President George W. Bush, which began with dinner at the White House. She sat next to then-Vice President Dick Cheney. As the year progressed, Martz was selected by her fellow governors to chair the Western Governors’ Association. In that office, she was invited aboard Air Force 1 when the president later visited Oregon. Her expertise about wildfire, earned during her “Care a Ton” campaign as lieutenant governor, made her an influential voice in addressing a similar crisis in Oregon. She found herself wondering, “How did this garbage woman from Butte, Montana, get on Air Force 1?” Unfortunately, her good fortune began to unravel after the first six months in office.

**The mass media buzz saw.** Martz expected no major problems from the members of the press. She prided herself on her honesty and a spotless reputation. Her first inkling that politics might trump her integrity came with her hometown newspaper’s response to her election to the governor’s office. She was the first woman ever to be elected to the state’s highest office. The election of the 21st governor was a fact in itself that, on the face of it, would seem to invite front-page headlines. But Butte, Montana, as Martz noted, was “a very liberal town;” and Martz’ election was posted in the mid-section of the regional newspaper.

It’s a big deal! Being the 21st Governor of the State of Montana in our history is a big
deal . . . You’d think the front-page story would be “Butte Woman Becomes Governor of the State of Montana.” No, it’s like three or four pages back.

Initially, Martz was stung by what seemed to be a slap in the face from a liberal newspaper; but Martz had suffered greater losses in her past than a third-page headline, and she vowed to take the insult in stride.

It’s . . . like water, after you throw a rock in a bucket; pretty soon it just settles down. And I’ve had to learn that. I’ve had to settle down, because it doesn’t hurt anybody; it just hurts me, and it hurts my family; so I don’t want to be bitter in any way, shape, or form.

Martz noted that headlines could be completely misleading and even negate the content of her interviews. She cited one example where she had granted an interview with a woman newspaper reporter.

She [The reporter] said, “Some people perceive you to be a lapdog for business, for industry.” And I cared about business; that’s how the economy runs. And I still do. And I said to her, “Well, I’m not a lapdog for anybody. But if that means that I will work with a business that has 2 people, 5 people, 500 people, 1,000 people, will I work with them to make business better and make our economy better? If they perceive me to be a lapdog because I do that, then, so be it.” So the next day, the paper says, “Governor Martz is a Lapdog for Industry.”

Martz eventually went so far as to refuse to answer any questions, from two print reporters in particular, unless they were written in advance to control the content that was printed.

Unfortunately, news reporters soon had a lot more to cover than Martz’s business philosophy. Her political fortunes sagged when her policy adviser Shane Hedges’ initiated a
devastating scandal that rocked the Martz administration less than a year into office. On
August 15, 2001, Hedges killed his best friend, House Majority Leader Paul Sliter, in a
drunken driving accident outside the state capitol of Helena. Amid charges of an attempted
cover-up aimed at Martz administration officials at the scene, Martz compounded the
problem when she brought Hedges to her home after the accident. “He said, ‘I can’t go
back,’ to his house because Paul had stayed there the night before. He just couldn’t go back
and see his things. Paul was his best friend. So I took him home with me,” Martz explained.
Her act of compassion was compromised in the eyes of local reporters after the third day
Hedges stayed in her home. Authorities asked for Hedges’ clothing as evidence, only to
discover that Martz had laundered the items.

I said, “Shane, you’re going to be here, just put your dirty clothes that were in that
bag and your clothes (he came home from the hospital); I’ll give you some of Harry’s
clothes to wear - put them outside door of the bedroom and I’ll wash them.” And I
washed them up. Then I got accused of . . . tampering with evidence.

Martz later stated that she was simply acting on “a mother's instinct” (Sink, 2002) to
wash the clothes and that she had not realized the items were evidence. Hedges was
sentenced to six months in a halfway house for negligent homicide. Martz was eventually
cleared of any illegal intent or action, but the story refused to go away.

It was all a lie . . . . They said I took home his bloody clothes. There wasn’t blood on
them; there was nothing on them. It was a little tiny cut. The police ultimately came
out and said, “We didn’t need those clothes . . . we let her take them.” And the
County Attorney said that, too; but the media never ever let it go.
The Martz administration struggled through and was eventually cleared of attempted cover-up charges. Lewis and Clark County Attorney Leo Gallagher confirmed that laundering the clothes “did not destroy evidence,” adding . . . “People make poor decisions all the time, and this was probably one . . . Whether someone should be charged with a felony for making a poor decision is another matter” (Anez, 2002). However, the administration never fully recovered the initial good will Hedges had brought to the governor’s office; and the scandal dealt a serious blow to Martz’s popularity. Unable to get control of the story, she watched it assume a life of its own. “It’s turning things that aren’t reality into something [real]. And they [reporters] keep pushing on it. You show someone something at least five times; it becomes reality.” She also faced an ethics charge over a land deal, which was later dismissed.

A month after the Hedges scandal, she came under fire to authorize Superfund fast-track status to clean up contamination of asbestos mining sites in Libby, Montana (“EPA announces public health emergency,” 2009, June 17). Martz, who had near-veto power over any Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposal to put Libby and surrounding mine sites on the Superfund National Priorities List (NPL), flatly refused the first requests (Latham, 2001, December 26) because the state of Montana would be expected to pay 10% of the clean-up costs. Martz was fearful that further terrorist attacks after 9/11 might threaten Montana’s environmental health, requiring extensive clean-up (Latham, 2001, December 26). She insisted that the mining company should be legally responsible for paying the costs. The mining company threatened bankruptcy and could not be held fiscally liable for any damages related to the incident (Morris, 2001). In tearful meetings, Martz reiterated her commitment to help the people of Libby, but months dragged by with no action (Latham, 2001, August...
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15; McLaughlin, 2001, August 8). In fact, in 2009, Secretary of Health Kathleen Sibelius acted in conjunction with EPA official Lisa Jackson to assist Libby residents with additional health services described as “long overdue” (“EPA announces public health emergency,” 2009, June 17, para. 8).

In 2002, more bad news was announced. The state economy had not rebounded as hoped, and the budget again faced a shortfall. Martz had vowed no tax cuts and instead proposed to withdraw $40 million from the state’s Coal Tax Trust Fund, a rainy-day account that totaled over $600 million (Burton, 2001, March 8). Martz guaranteed she would present a new funding mechanism for schools before the 2003 legislative session. Martz also proposed a financial plan she hoped would be a long-term solution to avoid an insolvent state pension fund that gave automatic increases (3% a year) to state workers. Although the US economy was beginning to experience the first tremors of recession after the 9/11 attacks, the plan assumed that the stock market would continue to increase. However, the Coal Tax Trust Fund was one of Montana’s “sacred cattle”; interest funded several state services, and Martz lost the battle to cut into it despite Republican majorities in both houses. Democrats killed the initiative that required a two-thirds majority vote. Martz’ powerbase began to unravel (Greene & Laslovich, 2001).

By mid-2002, the Martz administration was clearly under fire. The Democratic party charged Martz with an ethics violation over land she had purchased adjacent to her family’s ranch when she was still lieutenant governor (Associated Press, 2002, June 17). Although she was later cleared of the charge (Vaughey, 2002), her relationship with members of the opposition was fractured beyond repair.

I don’t remember fully arguing with any legislator. With Democratic leadership, I
may have had heated discussions; but they were discussions nonetheless . . . and then they would go out to the media and lie, straight up lie, about what we talked about in that room three or four minutes before.

Martz tried to be philosophical about her inability to work with some of the legislators. However, her frustration with the situation was clear.

You don’t spend a lot of time with those people you just are not going to convince, because they’re not truthful. You don’t know where they’re going to be day-to-day. They’re all running for something . . . for the Senate seat, or they’re running for Congress.

State revenues later plunged as the US recession hit Montana. Martz’s promises to have the budget prepared for the 2003 Legislature could not overcome a $232 million projected general fund deficit. She had to call a special session of the legislature and broke into tears as she announced her decision, as reported in the *Helena Independent Record*:

While making her announcement, the governor began to cry, stopped reading her speech and said, “God, I hate this. You have no idea — I had no idea — how badly I hate to call a special session,” Martz said. “But it is absolutely necessary . . . . I never thought we’d be facing this, and I never thought I’d feel that until I said it.” (Smith, 2002, June 29, paras 5-6)

Her tenure in the governor’s office was marked by the increasing rancor of polarized political parties, a phenomenon experienced nationally at that time (Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, 2010). As challenges mounted, Martz was criticized for lacking a college education; critics charged she was not smart enough to fix the state’s financial problems (Croke, 2002, October 18), many of which occurred as environmental regulations
reduced the timber and mining industries, once economic backbones of the state. Her stand on loosening regulations infuriated environmentalists who could not understand how she had defeated a highly educated and wealthy Democratic opponent.

The endlessly preening verbiage that Governor Martz endures in the Montana press is primarily the result of her inexperience (serving one term as lieutenant governor, before that jobs in the private sector) and lack of education, the latter a cardinal sin in the New Montana. Rarely does an editorial or op-ed appear that doesn't mention either of these perceived faults. (Croke, 2002, October 18, para 5)

Interestingly, research (Hamman, 2004) has confirmed that governors who have prior experience serving in administrative and statewide executive branch offices such as secretary of state or state attorney general, law enforcement, and local elective office actually receive higher job performance ratings from the public. Martz was truly handicapped, particularly in the eyes of many of those who had earned educational credentials, even though some contended she was originally elected as a result of her strong populist appeal (Croke, 2002, October 18).

Even worse was the emotional drubbing she experienced as a result of the press coverage. The source of her strength when confronting the pain of what she saw and read about herself began with her womanhood.

I thought to myself, “They picked the wrong woman. I’ve had children. That hurts” . . . Being in business 37 years, it hurts; it’s a struggle; being on the Olympic team was painful to get that far. You know, your body would ache; you hurt yourself mentally. It was a struggle, and I didn’t quit. I never once quit . . . . It’s not always a joyful thing, but you stick with it. You do what you think is right, and you pray . . . [things]
Martz felt that the coverage she received from television reporters was generally more positive because viewers could see for themselves her responses to questions; but eventually, Martz decided she could not win a battle with the members of the press. She turned to re-focus on her agenda of lowering taxes, increasing funds to education, and building jobs as well as highways. She had plenty to do on the way to meeting her goals. “You work 12 to 16 hours . . . back to back to back, and there’s not a lot of time in a day to try to protect your backside.” She was forced to cut spending, more than she wanted because Democratic lawmakers rejected her plan to borrow $90 million from the Coal Tax Trust Fund and pay it back with interest. She was forced to cut $110 million over four years. Still, she could not shake the disappointment of her public image in the press, especially in newspapers. She acknowledged her confusion and sense of helplessness when confronting the media version of her administration, which was so foreign to her self-image.

You go into office expecting that maybe they treated someone else terribly, but they won’t do that to you because you’re honest, you’re morally right, you have no background that’s shaded. I had nothing to hide – why would they beat you up?

As negative coverage increased, her popularity began to sink with poll numbers indicating less than 25% approval (National Journal Magazine, 2004). By the time Governor Martz was eligible for re-election in 2005, her approval ratings were at 20% or lower (Johnson, 2003, May 25); and she was in danger of losing the primary to a male challenger from her own party (Nuss, 2002). Despite her natural competitiveness, she decided not to run again. She looked forward to returning home, and many in Montana seemed to share her anticipation.
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Few if any Montanans doubted Martz's sincerity and work ethic on the job. She has been a gracious governor who, perhaps, learned the art of political compromise too late. But her main trouble was that too many Montanans became concerned early on that even in the relatively small pond of Montana politics, Martz too often had trouble keeping her head above water. (Editorial, 2003, August 13)

**Life after elections.** Martz finished her term in office campaigning for President Bush in swing states during the 2004 election. She also had a contentious transition from office, arguing with incoming Democratic Governor Brian Schweitzer “about truthfulness and his trying to run my administration before I was out of there.” Republican Governor Martz administration faced many challenges; but by the time she left office, a projected general fund surplus of $191 million was expected by mid-2007 (Johnson, 2004, December 13). No one saw the Great Recession coming along with the traumatic market crash of 2008. Suddenly Montana’s pension fund was facing a funding gap estimated to be at least $3.9 billion. Democratic Governor Brian Schweitzer criticized Republicans whom he blamed for passing a measure in 2001, signed by Martz, that gave state pension beneficiaries a 3% annual cost-of-living raise. Republicans noted that the bill passed with nearly unanimous approval, the only three dissenting votes being cast by Republicans (Hurst, 2012).

In 2009, she had mixed feelings remembering her experiences as governor. On one side of the equation was the honor of serving as the first woman governor of Montana. Still, despite the speeches Martz gives today to encourage women to “pull up their chair to the table,” to take on political leadership, she is clear that for her, the political party is over. “Now that I’m out of office, there’s not a day that someone doesn’t spot me somewhere and say, ‘Oh, I wish you were still in office. Would you run again?’ And my answer is, ‘Why?’”
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Today, former Governor Judy Martz lives just outside Butte, Montana, in a small suburban community romantically named Silver Bow. She spends a great deal of time with her husband, children, and grandchildren. She occasionally accepts professional speaking engagements.

**Jane Maria Swift: The Motherhood Crisis**

Jane Swift was born February 24, 1965, destined to add her name to the rich political history of Massachusetts. Norfolk County, called “County of Presidents,” is the birthplace of John F. Kennedy, John Adams, John Quincy Adams, and George Herbert Walker Bush (Norfolk County Commissioners, 2010). Swift was born just five miles north of Susan B. Anthony’s birthplace, certainly the most notable female leader in American history. Unfortunately, Jane Swift’s experience connotes a different example of “notable.”

Swift was the second of three children, reared by parents whose values strongly encouraged public service. Her mother, Jean, had graduated from college with an education degree but chose to stay home to rear her young children. She was a strong practicing Roman Catholic, who later taught in a Catholic school. Swift’s father, Jack, held a two-year degree in architecture, but joined the family business as a plumbing contractor in Adams, Massachusetts. He served on the North Adams Housing Authority. There he developed strong political ties with the state GOP, and Jane remembered that family meals were always the site for passionate discussions about current issues. He also loved politicking and campaigns.

He would take us along. And grass roots campaigning is very labor intensive, and apparently child labor laws don’t apply (laughter); and so I not only marched and did cartwheels in parades to draw attention to whatever candidate he was working for, but
Swift’s father managed the winning 1976 campaign for Massachusetts State Senator Jack Fitzpatrick, his close friend and owner of the historic Red Lion Inn in Stockbridge. When Fitzpatrick stepped down in 1980, Jane interned for his successor, Peter Webber, and eventually became Webber’s chief of staff. When Webber decided not to run for re-election to the State Senate, he encouraged Jane at the tender age of 25 to run for the office, throwing his considerable political capital to her support. (Gitell, 2000, January 20-27). She ran, and she won. Her career was on an unexpected trajectory for a woman with little political experience in a state traditionally run by liberal Democrats. Jane Swift began her legislative career in 1990 as the youngest woman ever elected to the Massachusetts State Senate.

Up to that point, Swift managed her personal life without a hitch despite the challenges of serving as a state senator. Her first win was part of a public groundswell of support for the Republican party headed at that time by Governor William Weld. She and the governor worked well together. The pair benefited from the national Republican juggernaut headed for Congress in 1994 that came to be known as the Republican Revolution. Locally, Swift became a popular member of her party and stood out in a membership body of 40, where she was often asked to represent as well as articulate stands on behalf of Republican policy issues.

Swift unobtrusively broke up with her boyfriend shortly after election to her first two-year term and started dating her husband-to-be, Charles Hunt, a farmer and equipment operator. He helped her campaign during her unopposed run for re-election in 1993, and they both enjoyed the process. They married on a legislative break in February 1994. Swift lost a bid for Congress in 1996, a mere two years after the Republican Revolution had
foundered. Swift attributed her loss to the national Republican Party leadership with the comment, “Newt Gingrich was despised.” She was appointed Director of Regional Airport Development at Massport and later to the Office of Consumer Affairs and Business Regulation, a position in Acting Governor Paul Cellucci’s administration that involved no campaigning. Eight years after her first election to state office, the timing seemed perfect to try for a pregnancy. Swift learned she was pregnant in 1998, shortly after accepting the invitation to run on Cellucci’s ticket as lieutenant governor. Swift was determined that her pregnancy, birthing, and motherhood would not interfere with the unique opportunity she had been given to become only the second female lieutenant governor in Massachusetts history. Her first daughter was born by Cesarean operation two weeks before the election on October 16, 1998. Swift was back on the campaign trail four days before ballots were cast in early November.

Swift and Cellucci emerged as winners and began a four-year term together in 1999. She was thrilled at the prospect to serve as lieutenant governor, a seemingly less stressful job than that of the governor. However, she soon learned she had not anticipated every negative to the situation. As a first-time mother and lieutenant governor, her life changed dramatically. Her husband sold his business, and they all moved to Boston; but with supportive family members far away and a low-paying government job, life in Boston “just caused stress in a million ways. But I loved the job.” At least part of her stress could be traced to events arising from her new duties as a mother, some of which appeared to conflict with her role as a state official. During her tenure as lieutenant governor, she had been fined $1,250 by an ethics panel for her use of Massachusetts State House aides to baby-sit for her daughter Elizabeth (Frank, 2002). She had also been criticized for “perceived abuses” of her governmental
powers, namely using a Massachusetts State Police helicopter to return from Boston in 1999 to her home in North Adams when both her husband and her daughter were suffering from pneumonia. The ethics panel had dismissed the abuse of power charge.

In 2000, she discovered that she was again pregnant, this time with twins. Anticipating another two years in the largely ceremonial role as lieutenant governor, Swift had no idea she was about to become governor at the age of 36. However, when George W. Bush was elected President in November, Governor Cellucci was quickly tapped for appointment as Ambassador to Canada.

So I spent most of my twin pregnancy . . . just trying to get through every day . . . living a sort of political limbo, knowing there was a good chance that I was going to be governor.

**Press coverage from members of the mass media.** Reporters continued to focus the public eye on her pregnancy as well as her past charges of ethics violations. In one instance, Swift had paid a fine as a consequence of a charge that she created an appearance of an ethics violation when aides babysat for her daughter. In a second incident, the Massachusetts ethics committee had ruled permissible service on Swift’s usage of the state helicopter to fly home when her child was ill. In February 2001, Carey Goldberg wrote an article for *The New York Times* headlined “2 [sic] New Jobs for Massachusetts Official: Acting Governor and Mother of Twins.” The article included in the first paragraph the fact that during the previous year as lieutenant governor, Swift had “faced fire for ethical lapses that included asking aides to baby-sit for her little daughter” (Goldberg, 2001, February 15, para. 1), although he did not mention that the second charge regarding her use of the state helicopter had been dismissed. Swift was said to have made her position more difficult by defending herself “vehemently”
(Goldberg, 2001, February 15, para. 14) against ethics abuse charges rather than admitting her mistakes and apologizing right away. Deeper in the Goldberg article, the reporter quoted Elizabeth A. Sherman, director of the graduate program for women in politics and government at the University of Massachusetts. “‘People are going to be asking,’” Ms. Sherman said, “‘Can Jane Swift fulfill her responsibilities to the public and still be a good mother?’” (Goldberg, 2001, February 15, paras. 4-5).

On occasion, after listing all of Swift’s ethical sins in editorials written about her, reporters might patch in a comment from someone who painted a positive picture of the governor, only to dismiss the compliment. In 2000, Gitell wrote that Swift’s state senate colleagues had praised her for being smart and articulate as well as for doing her homework on legislative policy, to which the reporter responded, “But isn’t that the way public servants are supposed to be? The praise . . . sounds . . . like the praise mediocre students get for having perfect attendance” (Gitell, 2000, January, 20-27, p. 8).

On April 10, Cellucci resigned from the governor’s office; and on April 11, 2001, Jane Swift was sworn in. She entered the governor’s office with a major handicap: A 17% public approval rating (Collins, 2001, February 16). She was approximately seven months pregnant when she became governor of Massachusetts. Representatives of the Associated Press wrote, “Massachusetts’ first female governor takes office, under heavy statewide scrutiny,” warning that Swift would “be watched closely for how she balances career and family” (Associated Press, 2001, April 11, para. 1). The body of the article reviewed the ethics panel ruling that “she created an ‘appearance of impropriety’ by allowing aides to baby-sit her daughter and fined her $1,250” (Associated Press, 2001, April 11, para. 15. The
reporter also noted briefly that the ethics commission “did not fault her” (Associated Press, 2001, April 11, para. 15) for use of the state helicopter.

Thrust into the spotlight very pregnant with twins, Swift already felt insecure about her looks. The press coverage she received at the time ruthlessly emphasized her body. Swift was caricatured in a cartoon published in The Boston Phoenix shortly after her likely move into the governor’s office became known. She was depicted with her face bloated; she held a baby bottle in one hand and boxes of diapers trailed behind her. With her other hand, she dangled from a rope ladder to a helicopter that was pulling her from the governor’s podium (Gitell, 2000, January 20-27, p. 1).

Ten years earlier, Jane Swift had been a rising star in Massachusetts’ politics, partly because of her role in developing the Massachusetts Educational Reform Act in 1993 that became a national model for education reform. She was pretty, poised, and popular during her years as a state senator, often chosen by her Republican colleagues to speak to their issues. “I was very good at public speaking, and I could give great speeches on the floor of the Senate,” said Swift, which was one of the reasons she was propelled upward so quickly on the leadership ladder. Ironically, Swift’s skill at speaking with crowds extemporaneously or speaking to her colleagues from the floor of the Massachusetts Senate had not prepared her for a news journalist’s candid photo or the impersonal eye of the news camera. Looking back, she ruminated, “the fact that I was so good at that sort of in-person public speaking and communication made it harder for me to be good [on television].” Swift began to understand that how she looked and how she spoke affected her ability to lead.

In the end, when I decided that whether I liked it or I didn’t like it, it [attractive public appearance] was part of the job and . . . succumbed to the reality, it actually became
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less of a problem and issue for me.

In some respects, Swift was savvy about using the camera to enhance her image. She knew that preconceived notions held about women could be beneficial. School visits where the female governor could interact with children provided an “instant credibility” that was especially effective on television.

Playing to stereotypes, when you do it, has some value in exploiting visual forms of media . . . . When people see [a woman playing with children], it will resonate with them because it does play into what they perceive [is a woman’s role].

While in the process of learning how to deal with reporters and the attributes of the mass media, Swift was ordered to bed rest by her doctor when premature contractions began at the end of April. Swift checked into the hospital and ignited a firestorm of controversy that no amount of media management seemed to ameliorate. She announced that she would utilize technology to continue running the state both while in the hospital and during an eight-week “working maternity leave” (Goldberg, 2001, May 11, para. 8) at her home in Williamsburg. Reporters asked how the governor could be considered competent to run the government when anesthetized from the waist down during Caesarean delivery (Goldberg, 2001, May 11). Her Democratic Governor’s Council, composed of largely opposition party members, challenged her ability to run the government from her hospital room via speakerphone and asked the Massachusetts Supreme Court for a ruling on their contention. Suddenly, some members of the press turned on Swift’s detractors. The Democratic party, standard-bearer for issues important to women, was being accused of sexism.

Put simply, it’s impossible to imagine we would be having this discussion if Jane Swift were a man. Earlier this year, the governor of Rhode Island was laid up at home
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for more than a month, recovering from surgery for prostate cancer. No one demanded he surrender his powers. Ronald Reagan recuperated from a gunshot wound while president. Dwight Eisenhower suffered a heart attack, a bout with ileitis, and a minor stroke. Keep in mind these two were men with their fingers on the proverbial button. We accept their incapacities but not hers? Take it as proof that, though we've made great progress toward gender equity, we have not yet arrived. (Pitts, 2001, paras 10-13)

The members of the Governor’s Council eventually backed down. Yet, one month later, The New York Times published an article headlined “The Year of the Stork,” in which reporter Gail Collins wrote, “The state’s mum-in-chief somehow managed to give birth to her first child and make her way through a challenging second pregnancy without even slightly endearing herself to the people of Massachusetts” (Collins, 2001, May 11, p. 2). Elizabeth Sherman, senior fellow at the Center for Women in Politics and Public Policy at the University of Massachusetts, Boston’s McCormack Institute was struck by the negative tone women reporters used to write about Swift and her child-care issues. Sherman speculated that women reporters “resented Swift’s air of entitlement in grabbing the perks of political office to solve her child-care needs — perks of the sort the reporters themselves would have loved to have available to them” (Kennedy, 2000, para. 14). Others speculated that Swift’s poll numbers would go up as a result of public sympathy for her situation; and briefly they did.

Unfortunately, Swift had little time to pull her state back on her side. In August 2001, her approval numbers spiraled downward to single digits when reporters discovered that Swift and her husband had lied on their 1994 marriage license. Her husband, Charles Hunt, had admitted to only one previous marriage. Swift was actually his fourth wife. Swift called a
press conference to explain that her husband wanted to maintain his privacy, calling their act a "misguided decision" (Mehren, 2001, August 20, para. 4). Swift and her husband each paid the maximum $100 state fine for perjury on a marriage license; but the ruckus -- and from some quarters, ridicule -- once again focused attention on Swift's personal life, “a subject she has stumbled over repeatedly. ‘Four Better or Worse,’ trumpeted a front-page headline this week in one local paper” (Mehren, 2001, August 20, para. 5).

**Leadership style.** Governor Swift was distanced from building congenial relationships with legislators and the public but not by choice. The impact of limited time and crisis circumstances impeded her opportunities for extended networking. She was governor for less than two years while coping with motherhood, an economic crisis, and hi-jacked airplanes that flew out of Boston’s airport to attack the World Trade Center in New York City. Swift noted, “I’m not sure I ever got to the point where I had a . . . coherent leadership style.” The negative reporting took a toll on Swift’s effectiveness, particularly her policy initiatives. Swift believed her low poll numbers made it “very, very difficult” to push her agenda, especially when facing a crisis that she believed necessitated cutting state services.

Ironically, Swift had been extremely popular with colleagues during her years in the Senate. Some of her contacts remained in powerful positions when she became governor; but, of course, the relationship between them changed profoundly as Swift’s role in the leadership hierarchy shifted from colleague to executive, leaving her with few confidants. The people who were closest to Swift were members of her staff and female colleagues. Many friends outside the political arena offered her strong support.

However, Swift lacked a strategy and the necessary time to develop allies among powerful people, usually men. The typical support networks she would have built had she
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actually run for governor in a statewide campaign had never been constructed. As governor, Swift naturally began to meet the power brokers whose support she needed. Her tenuous ties may have strengthened over time, but the pell-mell pace of circumstances put her at a disadvantage. As Swift noted, “that’s when you need those personal relationships and strong ties to help you muscle through difficult times.”

Without close relationships to the distant and powerful, Swift cherished even more her ties to her personal staff members. Still, despite signing a “No New Taxes” pledge as one of her first acts as governor (National Governors Association, 2012b), Swift managed to mend a huge budget deficit for which she attracted further public kudos (Boulanger, 2002). Her handling of state affairs after the 9/11 crisis was dubbed “her finest hour” by The Boston Herald (Swift, 2003).

However, by the end of her term, she was extremely unpopular with voters in the state (Carlson, 2002, March 23), igniting a vicious circle of stalled policy initiatives that further spurred downward polls. Members of the media, some of whom referred to the governor in headlines as “Jane-Not-So Swift” (Cienski, 2001, March 3), speculated that her low approval ratings were due in part to her lack of effectiveness and in part to apparent abuses of her gubernatorial privileges. Swift had no illusions that the few admiring headlines she received during the state budget crisis or her handling of the 9/11 response would outweigh the legacy of her years as lieutenant governor.

I didn’t have as much support . . . and if you’re in politics, if you’re not seen as politically strong, which means popular, and you have low poll numbers, which you generally have if you’re getting bad press, it becomes very, very difficult to push through your agenda . . . particularly if what’s on your agenda are things that people
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 wouldn’t want to do anyway, like cutting services.

Swift believed that coverage challenging her ability to manage the state while mothering her children simply overwhelmed every other issue, including the crises she faced. She noted that even the best informed and most influential of her supporters defined her by the birth of her twins while in office.

It [The birth of my twins] was the dominant issue . . . . I gave a speech a couple of weeks ago and (a) person in the Boston business community said to me, “That’s right; I forgot you were governor on 9/11.” Now, I will tell you there’s not a single person who’s forgotten I had twins.

In 2002, she surprised her mentors, and even President Bush, when she pulled out of the governor’s race for election in her own right. Despite her supposed advantage as an incumbent, challenger Mitt Romney was ahead of her in polling 75% to 12% among Republican voters (Belluck, 2002, March 20). Described as “tearful and shaken” (Belluck, 2002, March 20, para. 2), and looking as though she had been “through hell” (Frank, 2002, March 21, para. 1), Swift announced her withdrawal from the race just hours before Mitt Romney declared his intention to run. Shortly after Swift’s announcement that she was withdrawing from the Republican primary race, Margaret Carlson wrote in Time, “Swift’s being a working mother might not have been such an issue if she hadn’t made it one” (Carlson, 2002, March 23, para. 3). Carlson added, Swift “commandeered a state helicopter” because of her child’s illness, but “being a worried parent doesn’t exempt you from the law” (Carlson, 2002, March 23, para. 4. Without mentioning the favorable ruling from the Massachusetts Ethics Committee in Swift’s case, Carlson clearly suggested that Swift had created an ethics violation. Swift later commented, “the irony is that [former Governor] Mike
Dukakis used to use the helicopter almost weekly. It (The controversy] was because I used it [the helicopter] for a family emergency.”

In 2007, from the perspective of history, one reporter wrote that Swift had been “dogged by maternal crises in office” (Ebbert, 2007, October 7, para. 25) that had led to her rejection by the Republican party in favor of Mitt Romney. “As one former member of her administration recalled, she was “‘thrown under the bus. Jane Swift was smart and talented and [now] she's a punch line’” (Ebbert, 2007, October 7, para. 27). In an article, headlined “Misogynist Massachusetts,” James Carroll (2010, January 19) wrote an appraisal of how female politicians are viewed in Massachusetts; he noted that the state “historically treats female candidates like dirt” (para. 1).

Whatever bitterness Swift felt about Romney’s takeover of the Republican nomination, she swallowed most of it. Instead, Swift attributed her withdrawal decision to being unable to balance “the political demands of running against a well-heeled opponent” (Belluck, 2002, March 20, para. 16) while dealing with the state’s financial crisis and the needs of her three young children. Although she clearly believed that given time and circumstances in her favor, she could have managed both her family and her state effectively, her first priority was, indeed, her children.

I walked out with three healthy and happy girls, and I left the Commonwealth in really good shape despite the fact we were still in tough times . . . . It’s kind of weird to say the highlight was in leaving; but it was in proving that I could, and did, do the job for two years; and, by the way, I was able to have other things in my life as well that were equally as important.
Life after elections. Swift has not run for public office since. In 2007, she was brought in as an education advisor as John McCain began his presidential campaign, suggesting the possibility of her political comeback if he won. Covering Swift’s appointment to the consulting job, reporter Stephanie Ebbert circled back to the Swift saga, first noting that Swift had “lost the baby weight that brought her mockery” (Ebbert, 2007, October 7, para. 3). Once again the ethics charges surfaced with the description of how Swift’s response, “defiant and defensive” (Ebbert, 2007, October 7, para. 25), had crippled her career; Swift, wrote Ebbert, was hampered by being “viewed as an inexperienced successor to a third-string Republican team” (Ebbert, 2007, October 7, para. 25), an assessment that still seems to haunt her.

Jane Swift continues to play an active role in state and national politics by serving on the Board of Directors of the Republican Leadership Council. She is Managing Partner at WNP Consulting, LLC, a firm that specializes in serving the education industry and, as noted previously served as an education consultant to Republican John McCain during the 2008 presidential campaign. Swift has taught public policy and education policy at Suffolk University and served as a Fellow at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. She is a Director of Brigham and Women's Hospital in Boston, Massachusetts and serves on the boards of several private companies as well as not-for-profit organizations, including The Republican Majority for Choice (Bloomberg Business Week, 2011, January 25).

Swift now feels her unique place in history has given her “an enormous opportunity to make a difference.” People remember her and the extraordinary story of her family’s
experience intertwined with that of the state she led. However, in Swift’s case, “extraordinary” did not necessarily mean a good thing.

**Christine (Todd) Whitman: Keeping Crisis at Bay**

Whitman’s ancestors, primarily farmers in rural New Jersey, moved into the upper class during the 19th century. Her maternal grandfather, Reeve Schley, was Vice President of Chase Bank; her paternal grandfather, John R. Todd, was a builder. Both were entrepreneurs who became pillars of New York society (Beard, 1996). Whitman’s father, Webster Todd, along with his father, John R., was commissioned to build and manage the Rockefeller Center in New York as well as Radio City Music Hall (Madsen, 2009). John R. Todd was also finance chair for the New Jersey Republican party and a key member of the Eastern Republican establishment.

John R.’s fundraising for Congressman John Kean started a relationship that lasted three generations. The Congressman’s son, Tom Kean, became Webster Todd’s “political apprentice” (Beard, 1996, p. 22); later, Webster Todd became state chair of the Republican party in New Jersey. Tom Kean became governor of New Jersey as well as one of Whitman’s political mentors. Self-made men like her grandfathers typified the realization of the American Dream. However, Whitman’s family wealth is a unique characteristic distinguishing her from the other women governors in this study.

Whitman was the baby of the family. With eight years separating her from the closest of her three siblings, she had the sense of being an only child, especially after her two brothers and older sister moved on to boarding schools and college. Whitman’s mother, Eleanor Schley, was nicknamed, “The Hurricane,” (Madsen, 2009, p. 52), a full-time homemaker involved in a host of volunteer and political activities; she was the chair of the
New Jersey Federation of Republican Women and vice chair of the Republican National Committee in the mid-1950s. Neither of Whitman’s parents sought political careers, but both believed deeply in public service.

Despite the family wealth, hard work and conservative spending governed the Todds’ home life. The family lived on an operating farm called Pontefract in Oldwick, New Jersey, approximately two hours from New York City, where Whitman and her husband live today. Growing up, Whitman learned to bale hay and appreciate the home canned foods her mother prepared from their garden. She was witness to lively debates at the dinner table that imprinted her consciousness with the purpose of politics. “It was about the public service part, the ‘polis’ part of politician/politics, and so I grew up . . . understanding that that’s what it was supposed to be about . . . giving back,” said Whitman. However, Eleanor also introduced Whitman to political power. Whitman first met President-elect Dwight Eisenhower at the 1956 Republican Convention in San Francisco when she was nine years old.

Whitman spent several years as the archetypal “poor little rich girl.” Her father was “famous . . . for the beatings he gave the boys” (Beard, 1996, p. 33), her older brothers Dan and John. Although Whitman escaped her father’s abusive behavior, she still accumulated an unhappy resume of attendance at a string of private schools. She was not the ideal student and as a teenager was “unruly and untamed” (Beard, 1996, p. 34). Whitman began to excel while attending Wheaton College (an all-women’s college until 1988, [Gore, 1993]), majoring in international government. She graduated with honors in 1968 and a degree in government (Madsen, 2009). In 1969, Whitman’s former roommate helped her get a job as an assistant to Donald Rumsfield, new head of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Wanting
to be more active in the Republican party, Whitman met the chair of the Republican National Committee by accompanying her father to a luncheon. There she pitched to the chair the idea of a Listening Program in preparation for the upcoming election in 1970, designed to get first-hand opinions from American citizens about the Republican party. She started the job a few weeks later, at age 22. At the end of the Listening Program, Whitman went off to Colorado to chair a congressional campaign (Madsen, 2009).

In 1971, she met John Whitman, her husband-to-be, who worked in the Department of Transportation. She was on the Committee to Reelect the President (CREEP) with her brother Dan, assigned to organizing Older Americans for Nixon. She served on President Nixon’s transition team in 1972, and she invited John to attend Nixon’s second inauguration with her. They were married in New Jersey in April 1974. Her first child, Kate, was born in England in 1977; her son, Taylor, was born two years later. Whitman’s wealth blended with her husband’s and made it easy for her to provide nanny care for her small children, whenever required (Beard, 1996, p. 175). Her husband was a successful private equity investor with political connections of his own. His grandfather, Charles S. Whitman, had served as governor of New York. Whitman’s entry into politics was fully supported by her husband. Her political career began when she was elected to the Somerset County Board of Chosen Freeholders on November 3, 1982. Her two children were ages five and three; she had just passed her 36th birthday (Beard, 1996). She served at the county level for three years, winning local kudos for her leadership. At the same time, her mother was lobbying then-New Jersey Republican Governor Tom Kean to obtain an appointment for Whitman to the Governor’s Cabinet. Impressed by Whitman’s performance at the county level, Kean
appointed her as president of the Board of Public Utilities where she served until she began thinking of running for governor herself in 1990.

By the time Whitman decided to run for governor, she had already challenged Democrat Bill Bradley for the US Senate during most of 1989. She lost in 1990; but she understood from the beginning that the Senate race would serve to introduce her to voters in preparation for a later run for governor. She lost with 47% of the vote, indicating she had made a positive impression on New Jersey voters (Beard, 1996, p. 162).

**Press coverage from members of the mass media.** Unlike other female governors in this study, politics and press coverage at a very high level had been a staple of discussion in Whitman’s family since her childhood. Her family members were wealthy and influential in state as well as national politics. She had moved in the highest channels of Washington politics since her childhood. After Bill Bradley defeated her for the New Jersey US Senate seat in 1990, Whitman turned her press savvy to her advantage when she began writing a weekly political column herself. For two years, Whitman wrote for the *Courier News* (Beard, 1996). She had a perfect platform from which to take aim at her future target for the state’s executive office, Democratic Governor Jim Florio. In 1993, she gave up the column to launch her gubernatorial campaign. She had no doubts that she was prepared to run and to lead (Beard, 1996).

Whitman approached the members of the mass media press corps with a practiced eye, determined to educate reporters about her policy agenda. She knew reporters would not be her friends, but she could not treat them as enemies. Her father had taught her early on to be cautious about her comments to the members of the press, reminding her more than once that to request a reporter to withhold information was not fair play of the political game. And
so Whitman shaped her approach to members of the media with respect and reserve. Despite her early intentions, Whitman’s relationships with members of the press corps during her campaign were less than cordial. She said, “You try not to have it too antagonistic, but I never . . . felt they would print what I wanted.”

However, Whitman knew what was coming when she announced in the wake of the Zoe Baird “Nannygate” scandal in the Clinton administration, that she and her husband had also hired a Portuguese couple who were illegal aliens. The story broke on the same day she announced her candidacy for governor in the Republican primary. For days headlines plagued her until her primary race opponent confessed his own problems with hiring illegal alien workers. The press had a field day with headlines such as “GOP Pot, Kettle Duel Over Illegals: Christine Whitman and Cary Edwards Swapped Shots Over Hiring Undocumented Workers. Democrats Loved It” (Enda, 1993, January 24). Whitman admitted her mistake and moved on to win the primary race.

According to reporter Michael Aron (1994), “Whitman won because she started off with more name recognition and more political IOUs than Edwards . . . . because she didn’t get rattled when she made mistakes . . . . and because she comes across well on television” (Aron, 1994, pp. 120-121). However, the issue of her wealth and privilege continued to haunt her in the general election. Her Democratic opponent, incumbent Jim Florio, charged “that I was too well-to-do to understand what the real people thought,” a strategy that Whitman tagged the “rich-bitch” tactic (Beard, 1996, p. 175). Characteristically, Whitman met the challenge head-on: “I don’t apologize for it [family wealth]. My father did well, and my husband has done well. So that’s OK; that’s what America’s all about, and it certainly didn’t hamper my ability to relate to people.” Florio also charged that she had claimed a farmland
tax exemption to which she wasn’t entitled, alleging that Pontefract was an estate, not a working farm. During the primary, Whitman had huge signs painted with “$19,866,” the amount of taxes she paid, and mounted the signs prominently. Aerial photos did not miss them.

We also . . . invited the press out here to see the farm. We . . . fed them a meal in the barn, and everything they ate came from the farm. They had hamburgers; they had corn; they had salad . . . . It certainly helped. There was no longer any issue. They didn’t pay much attention to it when he [Florio] started to try to beat that drum again.

Still, Whitman could not get reporters to take her policy statements seriously. Whitman felt the members of the press were far too interested in her fashion sense. "There were times when you sort of thought, at least I did, that I was running for prom queen instead of chief executive officer (CEO) of a state of eight million people,” she said (Ackermann, 2010, p. 2). Conclusions were drawn about her based on her style preferences. She remembered one characterization in particular, when a reporter wrote that she looked “too perfect with my hair in place in a tweed suit,” to ever relate to the average citizen.

Whitman recalled that the reporter called her a “Tom Kean [the former governor] in pearls.” She pointed out that the appearance of her male opponent was never mockingly described. “If they’d said that my opponent was a Christie Whitman in cufflinks or that he wore just another predictable blue suit with a power tie . . . that would have been OK, but they didn’t,” Whitman said, adding, “and I never wore pearls again.”

Looking for an edge, Whitman hired Republican advisor Ed Rollins to guide her strategy (Beard, 1996). In 1983-84, he was national campaign director for the Reagan-Bush 1984 campaign, winning 49 of 50 states. He brought stability to what was otherwise
described by her incumbent opponent as an “amateur” (Beard, 1996, p. 178) campaign. However, Rollins brought as much controversy as control. On Rollins’ advice, Whitman hired Larry McCarthy as her media consultant. McCarthy was known for the infamous “Willie Horton” political advertisements that targeted Michael Dukakis in his presidential campaign against George H.W. Bush. Whitman was not happy about the choice; and when African-American groups and the press “jumped all over Christie” (Beard, 1996, 178), she dismissed McCarthy. The campaign continued with a *New York Times*/Gallup poll showing at one low moment that Whitman trailed behind incumbent Florio by 21 points. Despite the fact that her polling data contradicted Gallup data, Whitman said “... it was the only time I finally did cry” (Beard, 1996, 178).

In August, Whitman finally found her stride with her campaign message on tax reduction, the chief criticism she had thrown at Florio since the beginning of the campaign. She pledged to cut income taxes by 30% and reduce spending at the same time (Garfield, 1996). Her promise was generally ridiculed by Florio and the members of the press corps. Reporter Michael Aron related a memorable exchange during Whitman’s tax cut announcement, when she promised to release specifics about how she would make such dramatic reductions “in the future.”

About a half dozen of us in the press seats up front challenged her . . . .”When?” several of us shouted. Whitman stared at me sternly in the front row and shot back, “When-I’m-Ready!” which brought down the house and had her husband in stitches. (Aron, 1994, p. 180)

Despite initial skepticism about the promised tax cuts, once Whitman developed her message, “it started to resonate” (Beard, 1996, p. 186). Her speeches became more focused
on details of her tax plan, and her campaign picked up new energy. Ultimately, her wealth
did not hamper her from besting Florio in a tight election at age 47, winning 49.3% of the
vote (Martello, 2010).

Less than a week later, she was plunged into a campaign scandal, generated by her
campaign manager Rollins. He bragged in front of group of journalists in Washington DC
that he had used “tough” (Beard, 1996, p. 189) tactics to win the campaign, some of which
turned out to be questionable, if not illegal, including bribing African-American ministers
and campaign workers to suppress voter turnout in the election. Naturally, all of those
reporters in attendance reported the story. Headlines included “Dirty Tricksters in the Garden
State” (The Chicago Tribune, 1993, November 12) and “Naacp [sic] Urges Whitman To
Delay Taking Over As Governor Of N.j. [sic]” (The Chicago Tribune, 1993, November 14).
Shortly thereafter, Reverends Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton announced that they were
gathering supporters to march on Whitman’s transition team headquarters. Whitman released
campaign records that disputed Rollins’ story. Meanwhile, cynical reporters noted that
Rollins retracted his statements “while covering the Earth with apologies to Whitman, the
Black ministers of New Jersey and right-thinking citizens everywhere” (Daley, 1993,
December 5, para. 166).

Whitman went on the offensive, checking personally with African–American
community members to find out if anyone had actually participated in Rollins’ scheme; but
no one came forward publicly to support the story. Whitman then confronted Jackson and
Sharpton. She told them she had found no one to back up Rollins’ story, promising that if
they found anyone who had participated, she would call another election (Beard, 1996). She
also said that she was outraged on behalf of the reputation of Black ministers who were being
smeared with the charge that they would take money to throw the election. Reporters may have regarded Rollins’ mea culpa as “a convoluted statement . . . that does not pass the laugh test” (Daley, 1993, November 14, para. 2), but Chicago Tribune’s Clarence Page, a highly influential African-American columnist, declared in a headline, “N.J. Vote Flap Is A Flash In The Pan,” (Page, 1993, November 14). Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton decided not to march. Whitman’s political savvy as well as her head-on approach to meeting and speaking directly with African-American members of her community probably saved her in a way that a mere “amateur” could not have survived. Over a decade later, she reflected on the tenor of the media coverage during her first campaign for governor. “It was pretty nasty, but that’s the way it is. This is a tough state. In this state, it’s a blood sport. It was one of those things.”

Whitman’s win surprised many. She had beat an incumbent, which was extremely unusual (Palmer & Simon, 2001). She was tagged a “rising star” (Scheibal, 1995, April 28) in the Republican party. In 1994, she became the first woman to deliver the Republican response to the President’s State of the Union speech (Cary, 2009). New Jersey Democrats were stymied. Whitman had introduced a new concept regarding tax issues (i.e., cut wherever possible). During her term in office, Whitman proved she was a woman of her word. Whitman used her first State of the State speech to introduce a stunning commitment to reduce the New Jersey personal income tax by 30%, an announcement that took many, including the state’s legislators, by surprise.

I didn’t want them to know about it because I knew they were going to start to try to back me off it. So . . . they were startled; I don’t think they liked it much. It was probably the wrong thing to have done. I probably should have given them a head’s up at least a few minutes before, but . . . I wanted them to hear it from me.
Whitman also wanted the public to hear from her the declaration about personal income tax reduction. She was counting on public pressure to shore up her initiative “because if we just did it on the inside basis, it probably never would have gotten done.” According to Garfield (1996), the marginal tax rate on the median income fell from 2.5% to 1.75%. The top tax rates fell from 7% to 6.37%. The average family saved nearly $200 per year in income taxes. She rolled back taxes in less time than she had initially promised, an act that earned her a great deal of political capital, along with national attention.

Whitman’s tax reductions were paid for, in part, by cuts in state government that reduced state services as well as the work force by 3,350 employees, or nearly 5% (Peterson, 1995). But the real Whitman “miracle” was that her first budget cut taxes while closing a huge deficit left by her predecessor. In order to do so, Whitman offset the tax cuts with reduced payments into the state’s pension system to keep New Jersey’s budget balanced (Foser, 2011). Whitman’s actions were a huge risk. She, in effect, gambled that the state economy would remain stable well into the future to allow paybacks into the retirement system. At the time, Whitman was criticized by experts who predicted that any downturn in the economy would end up slapping future taxpayers with huge pension debt (Sloan, 2005, December 20). In fact, the experts’ predictions came true. Interestingly, the current New Jersey governor, Chris Christie, is using the shortfalls he faced in the pension fund when he arrived in office to justify cutting pensions and, at the same time, cutting taxes (Foser, 2011).

**Leadership style.** Governor Whitman was very aware of the “inclusive” expectations for female leaders. Knowing that key legislators in the New Jersey legislature were used to having coffee and creating policy together with her predecessor, Whitman maintained the tradition but carefully controlled the results.
As far as inclusiveness, I think the legislature would probably say I wasn’t as inclusive as they would like, because I was not one of the “old boys.” I had coffee with them on a regular basis, talked about issues with them, but didn’t always take their advice; and so they didn’t always like that.

During Whitman’s administration, a woman at some point held every top policy-making post. Governor Whitman stated that in her experience, definite advantages existed to appointing women to leadership roles in her administration. In her judgment, “women are more flexible, more open to compromise, more focused on getting the issue . . . addressed.” She also added that women are less interested in getting recognition and more interested in getting something done.

She was re-elected to a second term in 1997. She was best known for her successful environmental policy initiatives in the most populated state in the Union. She resigned as governor when appointed as the Director of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the first administration of President George W. Bush. She took office on January 31, 2001. Whitman was to face one of her biggest political and personal crises as EPA Chief.

**Education policy and leadership.** Education was not an issue that Whitman championed during her gubernatorial campaign, although she had definite ideas about the education policies she wanted to see implemented once in office. While her plans included charter schools and vouchers, Whitman did not discuss these issues with voters on the campaign trail. Instead, Whitman focused her campaign on state economics.

It [education] was something that we took up immediately after I had been inaugurated . . . but no, it was not one of the issues we addressed during the
campaign. The campaign was all about taxes. That’s what people cared about. They were leaving the state in droves.

Whitman took office in January 1994, the year that would become known for the “Republican Revolution” in Congress led by Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich. Whitman’s first term in office coincided with the national push to require student testing and teacher accountability, fueled originally in response to the Reagan administration’s report, *A Nation at Risk* (Thomas, 2012, paras 1-3). Whitman began her own revolution in the New Jersey schools. She started from the premise that “you can’t measure progress if you don’t know where you start,” directing her secretary of education to begin a process “from the bottom up” to involve educators in developing core curriculum standards.

Within her first year in office, the Whitman administration had established core curriculum standards in seven different academic areas where no standards had been set before, including the arts and a foreign language program that started in kindergarten. The curriculum standards were initiated through the State Department of Education and so were implemented fairly quickly. Such was not the case with other plans that involved the legislature. “For charter schools and for magnet schools you have to go through the legislature. And there was enormous resistance to it by the teachers’ union, and so it was . . . a big fight.”

Complicating the issue was *Abbott v. Burke*, a school finance equity lawsuit. The first *Abbott* ruling in 1985 found the New Jersey Supreme Court in agreement with the plaintiff that the state’s system of school finance provided inadequate funding to ensure a “thorough and efficient education” (Mead, 2009, p. 3) on behalf of children in 31 of the state’s highest
poverty school districts as required under the New Jersey constitution. Twenty decisions later, the matter was still unresolved when Whitman moved into the governor’s office.

Ironically, the New Jersey the anti-tax fervor that had propelled Whitman into office had been fueled when, in response to the *Abbott* ruling, Governor Jim Florio had pushed through a new funding law to pay for its implementation. Not only was Whitman ushered into office to kill the tax increase, but members of the public also gave her majorities in the Assembly and Senate to make it happen (Yaffe, 2007).

With a court order to equalize funding in New Jersey’s poorest schools now in her corner, Whitman began her second year in office by devoting her State of the State address exclusively to education, “the one issue that will determine, more than any other, what kind of a place New Jersey will be in the 21st century” (Whitman, 1996, para 1). Whitman used the occasion to affirm her commitment to providing world-class schools for all New Jersey students. At the same time, instead of asking for more money to meet the court directive, she outlined her intention to lower the costs of education. She called for a new method of funding entitled the Comprehensive Education Improvement and Financing Act (CEIFA) that would establish the required costs of following the state’s new core curriculum, give that amount to districts, and provide not one penny more.

We must reject the notion that education will improve if every district spends the maximum amount possible. Instead . . . we have to address this question: "What must each district spend to provide a system of education that is both thorough and efficient?" (Whitman, 1996, paras 27-28)

Whitman reserved mention of her Charter School Plan for the last two paragraphs of her speech, saying only that the necessary legislation was on her desk and that she would sign it.
The state legislature and the governor had eventually compromised, and 13 charter schools opened in New Jersey during the fall of 1997 (Barr, Sadovnik, & Visconti, 2006).

Whitman also had her way in 1996, when New Jersey enacted CEIFA. Hopes were high that the program would define, legislatively, the parameters of a “thorough and efficient education,” (Mead, 2009, p. 5) and establish a funding system to would satisfy the court order. CEIFA also established a new category of funding for half-day pre-K programs in 132 of the state’s neediest districts. The system looked good on paper, but it did not stop suburban districts outside the Abbott districts from improving their own revenue streams for schools. As a result, funding inequities remained; in 1997 the New Jersey Supreme Court declared CEIFA’s funding mechanism for the Abbott districts unconstitutional (Mead, 2009).

Whitman’s administration sought to comply with a combination of private and nonprofit child care centers since most school districts lacked space to accommodate the numbers of children eligible for preschool services. The problem, however, was quality since many private and nonprofit facilities did not require certified teachers. As a result, the state and the Abbott plaintiffs ended up back in court over pre-K programs.

Meanwhile, in 1995, the Newark Public Schools and two other districts, Jersey City and Paterson, were taken over by the New Jersey Department of Education. Whitman knew the action would be highly controversial.

It was taking away local control, which people feel very strongly about. And, of course, it could be characterized as kind of a plantation mentality: White woman from Trenton taking over the Black school system . . . . Most people recognized that it needed to happen . . . it was just unconscionable to let kids try to learn in those kinds of environments.
In an effort to reach out to the community, Whitman brought her entire cabinet with her to the various neighborhoods in the Newark district and to others nearby, despite death threats to affected school superintendents. She and her directors visited schools and spent weekends on clean-up teams. “We tried to establish the new relationship with the community-at-large and said, ‘Look, we care about this. This is not about exercising power. It’s about trying to get kids an education.’” Whitman was clear that her expectations for an immediate welcome to the neighborhood were limited at best. She acknowledged that her efforts had been aimed more at engendering a long-range impact than an overnight transformation.

There’s a lot more than just the academics in the classroom when you’re dealing with an inner city situation . . . . You’re dealing with trying to find kids a place where they can learn after school . . . . You need to get them food so they can eat . . . because you can’t learn if you’re always hungry and tired. There are a lot of socio-economic things going on that need to be addressed at the same time.

Other initiatives important to Whitman were the restructuring of the governance systems for higher education to give the institutions more control. She also instigated a voluntary mentoring program that demanded close work with teachers unions “because we found out that a lot of the teachers who were fresh graduates were getting dropped into a school like Newark. They’d say, ‘Here’s your classroom; see you!’ That’s a pretty tough thing to have somebody deal with.” The mentoring program has continued to grow in New Jersey schools over the years.
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One area of school reform where Whitman declared defeat involved vouchers. She had initially opposed vouchers, but her stance had changed when challenged by a woman from a minority neighborhood who confronted her with a powerful question.

“Why shouldn’t I get the same choices for my children that you have for yours?” I stopped and thought, ‘You know what? She’s absolutely right.’ And so I came around to thinking vouchers were a way to do that.”

Members of the New Jersey teachers union did not agree, however, and found significant support from both parties in the legislature. No stranger to the finer points of political horse-trading, Whitman appraised her chances of implementing a voucher system and decided to move on. The Newark School District was another challenge that proved to be beyond an easy fix. The Newark district had operated under a state-appointed superintendent reporting directly to the Commissioner of Education (Jeffries, 2010), and in 2012 continues to do so (Newark Trust for Education, 2012). Unfortunately, Newark’s schools, including the charters and others in New Jersey’s poorest neighborhoods, have made no significant improvements over the years (Kean, 2011). In fact, the “charter school performance is lower on average” (Barr, Sadovnik & Visconti, 2006, p. 308). Currently, the state’s budgeting problems, a holdover from Whitman’s diversion of nearly one billion dollars from the state pension fund to cut taxes during her term, have forced curtailment of Pre-K and Kindergarten programs (Mead, 2009). The State of New Jersey is set for yet another confrontation with its Supreme Court, which ordered full funding of all Abbott district schools in May 2012 (Newark Trust for Education, 2012).

Life after elections. After the destruction of the World Trade Center Twin Towers, dust and debris created considerable concern about the safety of residents as well as
emergency personnel in the area. On September 18, 2001, Whitman released a statement as EPA chief declaring the results from air monitoring tests in New York which showed "their air is safe to breathe" (Environmental News Service, 2007, June 26; US Environmental Protection Agency, 2001). Nearly two years after the attacks, the EPA’s inspector general concluded that Whitman’s September 18th assurance and others were based on insufficient information. Multiple studies have documented health problems among 9/11 emergency responders and workers. The report also noted that EPA press releases were softened under pressure from the White House (Rood & Sauer, 2007, May 18; US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of the Inspector General, 2003, August 21).

Within a year, a group of New York City residents filed a class action suit against Whitman and the EPA charging that thousands of city residents as well as workers were exposed to contamination (Lombardi, 2006, February 14). The suit alleged that the EPA and its administrator made false statements about air quality and failed to carry out its cleanup duties. In the meantime, Whitman announced her resignation as EPA chief in May 2003, effective June 27, citing her desire to “spend time with her family” (Fox News, 2003), although four years later she would cite her real reason as continual conflicts with Vice President Cheney over pollution standards (Becker & Gellman, 2007, June 27, para 11). The class action law suit was later dismissed by the 2nd US Circuit Court of Appeals in April 2008. The court justices wrote that “legal remedies are not always available for every instance of arguably deficient governmental performance” (Neumeister, 2008. para. 3), noting that no defendant had been charged with an intention to harm anyone and that Congress had created a special fund to assist people injured in the attacks.
Christine Todd Whitman is currently the President of The Whitman Strategy Group, a consulting firm that specializes in energy and environmental issues (Grizzle, 2007). She published a *New York Times* best seller *It’s My Party, Too* (2005) in which she charged that “demands of the far right on a series of key wedge issues” would “further fuel the fires of overheated polarization by pushing positions that alienate tens of millions of Americans” (Whitman, 2005, p. 1). As co-chair of the Republican Leadership Council, Whitman called on the Republican Party “to return to its traditional, fiscally conservative roots” (Republican Leadership Council, 2009, para. 5).

The Republican Leadership Council (2012) website listed the membership activities of Governor Whitman as follows: Steering Committee, The Cancer Institute of New Jersey; the Board of Trustees, Eisenhower Fellowships; the Board of Directors, Council on Foreign Relations; the Governing Board, Park City Center for Public Policy; and the Board, New America Foundation. She was also the Co-Chair for the Council on Foreign Relations’ Task Force, *More Than Humanitarianism: A Strategic U.S. Approach toward Africa* as well as the Aspen Health Stewardship Project. She co-chaired Clean and Safe Energy (CASE) with Dr. Patrick Moore. Governor Whitman also served on the Board of Directors of S.C. Johnson, Texas Instruments, and United Technologies Corporation as well as advisor to the Aspen Rodel Fellowship Program.

**The Consequence of Crisis**

As has been discussed earlier, men and women are judged by members of the public to possess certain gender-based characteristics. For example, women are generally believed to be more honest, compassionate, and moral than men (Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2007). However, women also face the constant challenge of proving they are “tough enough” to
handle the job of leadership. As leaders, their assumed characteristics can hurt or help them, depending on the issues they face (Herrnson, Lay, & Stokes, 2003).

James and Wooten (2005) have described a crisis as, “Any emotionally charged situation that, once it becomes public, invites negative stakeholder reaction and thereby has the potential to threaten” (p. 141) not only the organization, but its leadership. These three elements are common to most definitions of crisis: (a) a threat to the organization, (b) the element of surprise, and (c) a short decision time (Seeger, Sellnow & Ulmer, 2003, p. 8). Nowhere do the stereotypes about women become more important than in a crisis, defined in this case as an attack on image that has the following two components: 1) An act has occurred that is considered offensive; and 2) the accused is held responsible (Benoit, 2004, p. 264).

The credibility of the organizational leader is examined from many critical perspectives including the ability to respond quickly, problem-solve, and get results or resolve the crisis (James & Wooten, 2005). Examining the actions of the governors who faced crises in their terms revealed a range of leadership competencies within the trust-building processes that include integrity, positive intent, capability, mutual respect, and transparency (James, 2008) as well as how they were hindered or helped by female stereotypes.

Both Martz and Whitman had campaigned for the governor’s office and been elected in their own right. Thus, they had resources and political capital upon which to draw when confronted by crisis. They also had familiarity with members of the press corps who were covering the stories. However, in contrast to Whitman’s handling of the election crisis with the New Jersey press corps, Martz seemed stunned by the “gotcha” game she found herself
playing with Montana reporters. Her expectations revealed a certain naivété. For example, her statement that she had acted on maternal instinct when responding to her chief of staff’s drunk-driving situation made sense to her. She did not hesitate to offer the rationale for her actions when she let him stay at her home and laundered his clothing. As a woman who venerated motherhood, she apparently expected to have her actions within that domain, if not praised certainly understood. Because her reality had her being straightforward with members of the press, she expected that her pronouncements would not only be accepted but that she also would be acknowledged for her honesty and treated with respect. Thus, she was confounded by the fact that when she spoke from her heart, her statements only led her deeper into the thicket of public doubt and ridicule. And once she had spoken from the depths of her conviction, what else could she offer up in her defense? She did not develop an approach that allowed her to “get in front of the story.” Therefore, she found herself constantly on the defense and ultimately victimized, although ultimately proven innocent of any intention of a cover up by police officials.

Whitman was press savvy from the beginning of the media storm sparked by Rollins’ braggadocio. She knew the members of the press gave no quarter, and she expected none. She immediately issued the expected denials but strategically went on the offensive: She risked everything she had gained by stating if she found proof of her campaign being tainted with “walking money” she would call for a new election. She put her integrity front-and-center and underscored the message that someone with her strength of character would not break the rules. At the same time, her confidence and toughness did not run roughshod over the demand for racial sensitivity. In the middle of a very tense situation, she skillfully redirected the slanderous focus of the charges against her to the reputations of African
American ministers, decrying what she implied were racist assumptions that such upstanding men of the cloth would take bribes.

No matter how dramatic the dimensions of their crises, both Martz and Whitman were able to focus on their jobs rather than their families, which reduced the emotional turmoil they faced. Swift, however, faced crisis because of her family situation and was constantly torn between priorities that concerned the welfare of her children or her state. Plus, she was in new territorial waters as the first woman governor, topped by giving birth in office to twins, circumstances that had no political precedent; even the ethics charges brought against her were rooted in actions she had taken to facilitate care of her children. She was also governing in an era marked by intense political partisanship, the polarizing bitterness of which some have compared to the level of divided sentiments experienced during the American Civil War (Brownstein, 2007; Pew Research Center, 2010). Her reputation was not helped by the discovery that she and her husband had lied about the number of his previous marriages, an act that combined easily with the two ethics charges against her to diminish seriously any benefit that might have accrued to her as a result of her gender.

In the case of Whitman, stereotypical presumptions about female honesty and morality may have contributed to her success in overcoming her election crisis. The stereotype was reinforced when coupled with her dramatic claim to cancel the election results to honor her personal integrity as well as that of the political process. However, Whitman lost her moral high ground, the so-called “virtue advantage” (Barbara Lee Family Foundation, 2011, June, p. 35), once the public believed that she had lied about the safety of returning to Ground Zero after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The consequences of that public judgment, despite the lack of criminal prosecution, may have continued to affect her political career.
Swift and Martz seemed to suffer from public perceptions of women as weak leaders in crisis and, in fact, fed the stereotype by their reacting to charges against them with emotion and defensiveness. Neither was able to harness the press coverage to her advantage. Ultimately, Swift’s career was broken by her circumstances, and she has never recovered. Martz served only one term and was consistently criticized for her lack of education as well as polish. However, Martz, despite her troubles in Montana, went on to chair the Western Governors Association and to lead the organization in a protest against the federal No Child Left Behind legislation, completing her term with low approval numbers. Whitman, despite scandal early on, took control of her image. She managed to implement significant environmental cleanup in her state as well as reforms to the New Jersey educational system that included the introduction of charter schools and the takeover of the Newark schools. Whitman’s solid political pedigree and relationships formed over generations of power and influence may have also contributed to her successful management of the crisis.
Chapter 6: Not “Man-Enough” for the Job

In Chapter 6 the author presents the experiences of two governors who attempted to implement tax reform in their states that ended in failure. Governor Barbara Roberts (D-Oregon) began her term in office with a stunning surprise on the night she was elected that threw the state budget into chaos, further complicated by the failure of her tax initiative, the collapse of the timber industry, and three recall attempts. In contrast stands the unusual tale of the extraordinary approval ratings that Governor Olene Walker (R-Utah) enjoyed from members of the press and the public, even spilling over to support her tax-reform proposals, but to no avail; her successor refused to take up her tax reform initiatives and they quietly disappeared.

In contrast to the women in Chapter 5 whose leadership legitimacy was undermined by “media messages suggest[ing] that women do not belong in politics” (Loke, Harp, & Bachman, 2010, p. 208), Olene Walker was truly beloved by the members of the Utah news media. Hers was a positive example of how the mass media shaped the public response to her leadership (Klenke, 1996). Ironically, however, despite Walker’s chart-topping approval numbers, she was spurned by her own Republican party when she put in a bid for election to the governor’s office in her own right. Walker’s case was also influenced by her age and her health, issues that were not necessarily important in the elections of Ronald Reagan, who was age 69 when first elected President, or Dick Cheney, who suffered five heart attacks from the age of 37 onward and brought a pacemaker with him into the White House (Karl & Travers, 2010). Interestingly, after Walker’s bid for re-election was denied by her own Republican party, the members of the state’s Democratic party hosted a dinner to honor her 25 years of leadership and service to the State of Utah.
Olene Walker

Olene (Smith) Walker was born November 15, 1930, in Ogden, Utah; the second of five children, in the house where her father was born and where he eventually died. Utah is drenched in its religious history and carries the nickname the “Beehive State” or the “Mormon State,” (Netstate.com, 2009), thanks to its industrious Mormon population. Olene Walker’s family was no exception to the dominant religion. Her father served as Stake President in the Church of the Latter Day Saints of Jesus Christ for 25 years, a length of tenure that Walker described as “very unusual.” Her maternal and paternal grandparents both had eighth grade educations, but Walker’s parents were both schooled. Her father served as the principal of the elementary, junior high, and high school in the Ogden School District before becoming Superintendent of Schools there for 24 years. Walker’s mother was a teacher.

Walker described her early life as “a lot of work.” Indeed, it is hard to imagine when her family slept. Her parents faced education career demands that competed for attention with three different farm operations. The family raised dairy cattle, beef cattle, pigs, horses, and cash crops that included sugar beets, potatoes, tomatoes, and alfalfa. In addition, the family tended 1.5 acres of vegetable garden and shared its yield with neighbors. Walker remembered that her early life experiences carried several lessons. “What we gained from our parents was the fact that it was important to know how to work and that education was important. They also instilled in us the importance of giving to the community.”

Walker grew up with her parents’ expectation that she and her siblings would attend college. She attended a small rural school where she excelled early on. She won a debate scholarship to then Weaver State College (now Weaver State University), from which she
transferred to Brigham Young University (BYU) in her sophomore year. There she majored in political science and minored in history; she also held student office at BYU. She says she enjoyed her social life a little too much but managed to graduate Magna Cum Laude. Planning to teach at the university level, she went on to Stanford University for her master’s degree. She ultimately obtained her Ph.D. from the University of Utah, switching her major to educational administration. She is the only participant in this study to have attained a doctoral degree.

Olene Walker met her husband, Myron, at BYU shortly after he returned from a Church mission. He was the student body business manager directing floats for the homecoming parade, and she was an attendant for the homecoming queen. She was pinned to someone else at the time, the college equivalent of “going steady,” but soon was engaged to Myron. Over the next years, they produced seven children together. Olene Walker went to work part-time around 1970 when her youngest was in pre-school. He was four years old; she was 40. She worked with the Salt Lake City School District and Utah State University as a consultant for a private company under the direction of the US Office of Education dealing primarily with the needs of students who were determined to be “at risk” of failing or dropping out of school.

It gave me a lot of insights to some of the problems people had who lived in poverty . . . . I spent quite a bit of time working with the homeless issue . . . trying to find solutions and helping them realize that without an education a lot of these kids will never have productive lives.

Along the way she found time to serve as Parent Teachers Association (PTA) president of every elementary, junior high, and high school her children attended. In 1980, an
open legislative seat in her district prompted some of her colleagues to urge her to run for office. The seat was open; and on the last day to declare her intention to place her name on the ballot, Walker decided to register. During her campaign, she was surprised to learn she was already a household name thanks to serving in the PTAs of all her children. She won.

Walker served in the Utah House from 1980 to 1989, winning the unusual appointment to Appropriations Committee chairperson during her second term. She was assistant majority whip from 1985 to 1987, and was elected majority whip during her last two-year term in the House. She opted to join Mike Leavitt’s ticket as the candidate for lieutenant governor; and in 1993 they won. She served with Governor Leavitt for the next 10 years. During that time she was responsible for supervising the state’s elections and documents since Utah does not have a secretary of state. She was the first lieutenant governor to serve as chair of the National Association of Secretaries of State. She also served as chair of the National Association of Lieutenant Governors.

In an interesting coincidence of timing, the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) chief Christine Todd Whitman, who is also part of this study, chose to resign from her office on May 21, 2003 (SourceWatch, 2009); and Governor Mike Leavitt of Utah was appointed to the post. Those actions left Olene Walker situated to assume the governor’s seat at the age of 73 with 17 months to decide whether she would run to claim governorship on her own.

**The beloved “Aunt Bee.”** Relationships with the members of the mass media press corps were a priority for Walker, who pointed out, “Reporters, TV or written, are human beings; they like to be recognized for their abilities. So I think it’s important to get to know them.” She made a special point to welcome a new reporter, or a “new kid on the block, by
taking a moment to let him [or her] know . . . you’re glad that he’s [or she’s] part of the media team in the state or community. That’s very important.” Attributing her concern for positive relationships with reporters to “more of a female trait,” Walker also stressed “the knowledge and authority that you know what you’re talking about is equally as important. That may be considered male. I hope not . . . . I think both the attributes can be acquired by the individual.”

Walker was no stranger to the members of the press corps who covered state politics. While waiting for the US Senate to confirm outgoing Mike Leavitt’s appointment to the EPA, the members of the press corps speculated about their new governor-to-be. With no juicy scandals from Walker’s past to resurrect, the press reviewed her political resume, education attainments, and family history. Her status as mother of seven, grandmother of 25, and wife to Myron for 48 years was recounted in detail. The public also learned that among her legislative colleagues, Walker was known as “Aunt Bee” (Sappenfield, 2004, April 28). Walker’s aides regaled the press with stories of her down-to-earth nature and constant activity including “instances when, as lieutenant governor, Walker would save time by sticking her head out the car window on the way to work to dry her hair” (Sappenfield, 2004, April 28, p. 1). Even her political opponents, spoke admiringly about her (Madigan, 2003, September 29).

Despite her popularity with members of the Utah press and public, Olene Walker knew that a significant number of her Republican colleagues considered her too liberal to support because of her push for more funding for public education and her veto of school vouchers. She put campaigning for her private ambitions on hold although speculation continued to grow about whether she would decide to run for governor. The Utah Democratic
party chair, Donald Dunn, was quoted as hoping she would run. "I think we have a better chance of beating Olene Walker for the Governor's race than any other Republican nominee" (Wheelright, 2003, para. 12).

For months, Dunn’s comment seemed the harshest she suffered in the press. "I've been pleasantly surprised with how the news media has covered me. I look better in print though,’ said Walker, jokingly referring to her physical appearance” (Wheelright, 2003, para. 4). The Utah Republican party chair speculated that members of the media “cuddle the Governor and rip the Legislators. You never hear anything negative about the governor. It's very rare to see aggressive reporting” (Wheelright, 2003, para. 10). The public responded to her leadership with approval ratings well above 70% (Sappenfield, 2004, April 28). Walker knew that she had significant political capital at her command. “I was conservative . . . . I was still part of the [Republican] party and had a great deal of respect.”

Her choice was to allocate her considerable resources toward her campaign for governor or to tax reform on behalf of improved funding for public education. The fact that she chose the latter was influenced by factors such as her health and age. Still, the decision was not an easy one. Only the value she placed on working with people for whom she felt great esteem made her resolve possible and “very rewarding because [of] all these things I could put into action.” Shortly afterward, she announced her intention to run for governor at the end of Leavitt’s term (Bernick & Genessy, 2004, March 7). Her announcement took several Republican colleagues by surprise (Bernick & Spangler, 2004 May 6), seven of whom had intended to run for governor themselves. Pollster and political consultant LaVarr Webb predicted that press coverage of Walker's governorship would change.

She's had kind of a honeymoon,” Webb said. “She's been everybody's grandma. Most
people have expected she was just going to finish out this year, so there's no use in getting in fights with her. Now that she's going to be a candidate the gloves will come off. (Bernick & Genessy, 2004, March 7, para. 18)

Walker’s Republican challengers were the first to strike. With the Republican convention slated for May 8, 2004, headlines began to appear in the few short weeks after she announced her candidacy such as “Override of Walker vetoes possible” (Bernick, 2004, April 6); “Campaign is heating up” (Spangler, 2004, April 27); and “GOP leaders play dirty, Walker says” (Bernick & Spangler, 2004, April 27).

Ironically, one of Walker’s main reasons for campaigning for the job was a belief that she could not discuss forthrightly: very simply, that more women should run for office. As the only woman in a leadership role in the Utah House and Senate, she had seen the impact of making gender an issue. “I remember there was another senator who was a very strong feminist. She never became a real player.” Governor Walker had learned to marshal her opportunities to make a difference.

I didn’t want to . . . turn it [the campaign for governor] into a total gender issue. But I did say this was a different era than we’d had in the past; and more and more women were emerging, and I felt that . . . my history as governor [proved the point].

Walker’s Republican colleagues were unimpressed. Six months after her succession to office, the Republican Party convened to choose candidates. Without significant Republican allies lined up to support her nomination for governor, Walker took the news philosophically when her party snubbed her by selecting millionaire philanthropist Jon Huntsman as the Republican candidate. “I knew it was an extremely long shot,” she said. Suffering from pulmonary fibrosis, an incurable lung disease that hampers the ability to breathe, and the fact
that she was 74 years old, led Walker to reject a battle for the nomination. “It didn’t seem like I had anything to win and something to lose . . . . I just didn’t have anything I felt I needed to prove.” A newspaper account of the convention results showed a touching tenderness toward Walker.

But the day also was full of sadness. Gov. Olene Walker was knocked out of contention. Utah's first female governor is the first sitting chief executive to lose an election bid in 48 years. "It's some relief to be going back to just being the governor," said Walker. "I would not have done anything different. I am just delighted I have a few more months to be governor." (Bernick & Spangler, 2004, May 9, paras. 3-6)

Walker faced the limitations of her current term realistically. She had approximately 14 months to engineer an increase in spending for education. Walker saw an important difference between her public education policy priorities and those of her male counterparts. Although both she and male governors agreed that education was extremely important, Utah was at the bottom of the US states when ranked on per-pupil spending (US Census Bureau, 2005). Walker thought the state’s tax policies should guarantee a strong future for public education, and she was willing to sacrifice in other areas to provide additional funding. For example, she was willing to adjust funding streams to use the bulk of the income tax for public education. “It was do-able within the budget. I was . . . willing to step out further. I kept saying to the legislators in speeches, ‘My one hope is that I live long enough to see us 49th in the per-pupil expenditures!’” When Walker assumed the governorship, she was very familiar with the issues surrounding Utah schools. She had long-held opinions on the value of the institution.

I view education as the great equalizer. All the early attendants were men; schools
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(were) for men not women, property owners, not the general population. The trend has been to include everyone. And . . . that has been the nucleus for making America great- that everyone had a chance and an education.

Ironically, Utah students tend to test very well on most evaluative instruments. For example, according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 85% of Utah’s fourth graders perform at or above basic proficiency, a level that has steadily increased over the last decade (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2011). Additionally, despite Utah’s population ranking in the lower three of the 50 US states (US Census Bureau, 2009), in 2009-2010, Utah produced 4,618 entrants for National Merit Scholar recognition. A total of 89 students qualified as semi-finalists, while 157 achieved semi-finalist status (National Merit Scholarship Corporation, 2011).

However, Walker chose to examine student needs based on demographic shifts predicted for the future. Her concerns focused on greater numbers of minorities attending public schools, especially Latinos. She identified the elementary reading and mathematics programs as targets that were “not complex.” She wanted to ensure that third graders would be able to read by the end of their term. Additionally, Walker intended to have all sixth graders proficient in mathematics by the end of their school year, until she realized the money just was not in Utah’s budget as the biggest recession in US history began to signal its arrival. Undaunted by the formidable challenge ahead of her, Walker initiated one of the biggest political risks of her career, one that certainly few politicians of the 21st century would dare to contemplate. She decided to reform the state’s tax system to pay for the increases she wanted for public education.
Effective strategies to create legislative support. Because she had spent several years working with members of the Utah legislature as a colleague and as lieutenant governor, she expected that the majority of them knew her well enough to know that she would follow through on her policy commitments. She also expected that “there was always a little idea that, ‘We'll test, and see how far she'll go.'” Walker stated that, when working with legislators, it was important to meet with them regularly and to know their interests, and their goals as well as why they ran for the legislature. Such meetings were also strategic opportunities to let the legislators know the same information about her. She believed that mutual understanding enhanced their abilities to work together.

From her years as chair of the Appropriations Committee, Walker was extremely familiar with Utah’s budget. Her meetings with legislators were always framed within the realities of the budget, an understanding she found that many legislators lacked. Her knowledge about the budget always gave her a strong negotiating posture as well, a distinct advantage when pushing for her new funding plan for education. “Finally, I just went into the caucus and said, “Don’t waste your time. It’s $30 million. You knew that from the beginning. Here’s where you can get it.”

Walker assembled a number of volunteers from the private sector and local universities to help her devise a tax system that could provide necessary funding for her reading program. She and her team had taken on the untouchable issue of tax reform and discovered an extra $317 million available due to a rebound in the economy and some revenue neutral changes in the code. She recommended a 5% increase for public education and other earmarks such as maintenance for public buildings (Roche & Bernick, 2004, November 20; Bernick, 2004, December 11). Although she produced a surprising plan in
terms of how effectively the limited dollars were allocated for education programs, “In retrospect, it really alienated a lot of people. . . If I'd really been politically astute, rather than [committed to] my sole purpose, that is an area that would be difficult to tackle.”

Although some reporters suggested that the tax proposal could be a starting point for then Governor-Elect Jon Huntsman, Jr. and the new GOP-controlled Utah legislature to discuss equalizing the state’s revenue sources; “It's hard to imagine a new governor taking on tax reform as one of his first acts as governor” (Cortez, 2004, November 23). Walker’s old nemesis, Senator John Valentine, immediately questioned “should more money go to education and infrastructure, or some to tax cuts? That will be the key part of the 2005 Legislature's budget discussions” (Bernick, 2004, December 11). Despite news coverage that reflected support for tax reform, by the end of 2005, headlines indicated that no major tax reforms would be implemented (Bernick, 2005, November 3). Ultimately, her tax proposal was not championed by the new governor; and the plan fell to the wayside.

Walker’s personal mission had been finding ways to increase school funding, the prime motivator for her to take on the issue of tax reform, a topic most governors avoided. She also knew she had the least to lose. “I felt I probably won’t be governor; and if not me, who?” The question was answered after she left office with the resounding “no one.” Utah was back on the bottom of the list of states for the funding of public education. Walker was not surprised.

They [the legislators] took all the positives . . . and none of the negatives. And in our view, passing the total package, you had the positives to negate the negatives . . . . So we're in deeper financial problems now than had they not done anything. But they'll soon figure that out. (laughs)
Life without elections. Walker served as governor from 2003-2005, until the end of Leavitt's term on January 3, 2005. By the time Walker left office in January 2005, one headline read “Walker exits sky high in state popularity poll” with approval ratings at 87% (Bernick, 2005, January 9), except with her own party. Six years after Walker left office, she was honored with the first distinguished service award ever given by the Utah Democratic party (Haddock, 2010, May 17).

Walker said although her reason to retire from the battlefield for leadership of her own party may have sounded “faint-hearted,” the decision made sense to her and her husband; they wanted to make the best of their remaining years together. Walker said those years have “turned out marvelously.” She and her husband continue to travel together to visit family members and grandchildren. Walker still speaks and writes on education issues. She is the co-chair of Citizens for Education Excellence, “still working to bring greater reasoned intelligence to the legislators and others to put education as the future of Utah. I spend a lot of time dealing with income tax issues” as well. As of the latest US Census Bureau data available, unfortunately, Utah remains in last place of all 50 states for per-pupil funding (US Census Bureau, 2010, June 1).

Barbara Roberts: Reinventing Oregon

Barbara (Hughey) Roberts was born December 21, 1936. Roberts’ father was a foreman in the local machine shop and the master of the Masonic Lodge. Roberts grew up in small-town Sheridan, Oregon, attending a one-room school with no running water or flush toilets. Despite the challenges posed by contending with outhouses, Roberts fondly recalls her early life in that small town. When Roberts was 14, her mother became a reporter for a weekly small town newspaper. She often excitedly recounted at the family dinner table her
occasional brushes with politicians who stopped in to visit her editor. Robert’s parents were very active in the community; but neither was inclined to run for office, although they never missed voting in every election. Roberts was taught early on that voting was the requirement of every good citizen.

Despite the fact that she was an honor student, won several competitions in speech, and edited the school newspaper, no special plans existed for Roberts’ future. “I had a lot of skills, and I was a bright kid. Nobody ever suggested that I go to college. It just was the times.” No objection was raised when Roberts announced her desire to marry before she graduated from high school. Her fiancé planned to be stationed in Europe, and Roberts was thrilled at the notion. They married over Christmas vacation when she was a high school senior and he was on leave. He left for military assignment immediately after the wedding, but the hoped-for posting to Europe never materialized. Instead, the couple found themselves stationed in Texas for the duration of his four-year enlistment. After his discharge, Barbara’s husband took advantage of the G.I. Bill. Barbara wanted to be close to her family so they moved back to Portland, where he took a job at a television station and entered the university. By the time Roberts realized she wanted a college education, “it was a little late.” Although she took several courses over the years, she never received a college diploma.

Barbara Roberts entered politics spurred by the fact that her first-born son, Michael, was not permitted to attend public school (Oregon Historical Society, 2007). He and other children like him were described as “emotionally disturbed,” facing a lifetime of institutionalization. The situation created considerable strain on her marriage. Unlike all of the other women in this study, Roberts launched her political career while her personal life
was in shambles. Her husband had left her for a new life in California with a new wife, Roberts’ former best friend. Roberts, who described this period of her life as “a B-grade movie” was on her own, a single mother with two boys, approximately 10 and eight years of age, and a meager income as a bookkeeper. Her son, Michael, had been diagnosed as autistic by this time, requiring private schooling. Worse, Roberts was being blamed for his diagnosis.

It was caused by “refrigerator mothers,” cold, uncaring, unfeeling mothers . . . these children had a syndrome that was similar to the aftermath of those who had been in the Nazi prison camps . . . . They told me that. And if I wanted him to get better, I had to change. It was just unbelievable.

Roberts was galvanized into action to get help for her son and others like him, however uncertain the process. In 1971, no federal law granted education rights to autistic children. Finally, a group of parents got together and decided to go to the Oregon legislature. Barbara Roberts was the only one brave enough to talk to the lawmakers.

I was newly divorced. I was supporting two kids without child support, and one day a week I became a lobbyist in the Oregon legislature. I had no idea what I was doing. I was not familiar with the legislature except from afar. I always describe it as not even knowing where the women’s room was.

Their local legislator befriended the parent group and introduced legislation on their behalf. Roberts gave up a paid day of work every week when she went to lobby on behalf of the bill. At the end of that legislative session, Oregon had the first law in the United States that required special education for children with so-called “emotional disturbances.” It had taken Barbara five months to help achieve this monumental legislative success. Along the
way, Barbara discovered her passion for politics, and a new love interest Oregon legislator, Frank Roberts. The process of creative problem-solving appealed to Roberts, and she found she was good at it. She had launched a political trajectory that would land her in the governor’s office in January of 1991.

She decided to run for her local board of education in 1973 to keep an eye on the implementation of her newly won legislation on behalf of special-needs children. She served 10 years on the Parkrose Board of Education in Portland and, during that time, was elected to a concurrent term of four years on a community college board. She was also appointed to fill a nine-month vacancy on the Portland, Oregon, County Commission. For the first time, she received a salary for her political work, work that she loved. “Oh, and I forgot to mention a step there in-between. [In 1974] I married my legislator (laughter)!”

Roberts ran for legislative office herself in 1980. She became Oregon's first woman House majority leader during her second term (Oregon Secretary of State, 2010), an unheard of speedy ascension to leadership and a major acknowledgment of the respect with which her colleagues regarded her. In 1984 she was elected secretary of state. She was the first Democrat elected to that post in 114 years. She chose the best choral group in the state, The Portland Gay Men’s Chorus, to sing at her swearing in ceremonies. “The other reason I chose them was that I thought if you stood for something that was hard to stand for your first day in statewide office, you’d never be afraid to stand again” (Madsen, 2009, p. 24). Despite dire predictions that such an act of courage would kill her chances for re-election, voters sent her back to the secretary of state’s office for another term in 1988. She won every county in the state that year. The next year, she was elected the first female governor of Oregon.
Uncertain victory. On election night, Oregon voters passed Measure 5, which established constitutional limits on property tax rates. The measure had a devastating impact on the Oregon budget. Voters forced the state to pick up the tab for public schools that ultimately drained $2 billion from Oregon’s $7 billion state operating budget. Dramatic cuts were forced to the k-12 system as well as higher education and community colleges, Head Start, and all of the other education services in the state (Oregon Blue Book, 2011).

At the same time, the House of Representatives in Oregon, which had been under Democratic control for nearly 20 years, shifted that night to Republican control. As Roberts reflected ruefully, “I had a Democratic Senate; and I had a Republican House that did not want me to succeed at anything. So that was . . . the framework I came [with] into office.” Another economic crisis with equally destructive impact occurred as well. The Clinton Administration’s Environmental Protection Agency issued a ruling as part of the Endangered Species Act to preserve Oregon’s Spotted Owl habitat. The order reduced the timber industry in Oregon with consequences similar to Michigan’s recent automobile crisis. Roberts seemed to relish moments that might have paralyzed a lesser force of nature. As a strong environmentalist, she supported the Clinton Forest Plan. She was forced to come up with employment alternatives for a population that had timbered for so many generations sap ran in their veins. Calling upon the courage she had demonstrated throughout her career, Roberts traveled to face the angry members of her state’s communities, meeting them eye-to-eye and explaining to those who wanted her to block a federal mandate that she could not. Rather than reproaching short-sighted voters for creating Oregon’s budget catastrophe, she immediately took responsibility for averting an impending disaster.

I was willing to do the hardest things . . . . I went all over the state into timber
communities where they hated me and . . . talked about what we needed to do and
talked about the jobs . . . . I knew how they felt about me; and I knew they thought it
was my fault. But I told people at the end of my term as governor, history would be
my friend. And it has been.

However, waiting for historical judgment was not an option at the time she was in the
“hot seat” serving as governor. Circumstances, each more trying than the last, seemed to
bring new frustrations every year she was in office. Rather than being terrified by the
challenges she faced, Roberts committed early on to being open and honest with her
constituents about the tough job ahead. She said she felt it was a good thing she was in office
because she was not afraid to take action. Roberts considered the state’s crisis a “window of
opportunity.” She vowed to take every advantage of each situation.

Her first order of business was to tackle the budgeting nightmare looming on the
horizon. Working with her department heads and other stakeholders, Roberts fashioned a
remarkable new system to reduce state spending. She utilized the Oregon Benchmarks, a
budgeting system initiated by her predecessor to make the budget forecast and necessary cuts
for the entire four years of her term. “I took them; I adopted them; I became their mother,
their grandmother . . . their wife, whatever it took.” Based on its effectiveness, the system
won a 1994 Innovation Award from the Harvard John. F. Kennedy School of Government
(Harvard Kennedy School of Government, 2012); moreover, the National Governor’s
Association also adopted and presented the program to state executive officers across the US
(Lewis & Dunkle, 1996).

Press coverage from members of the mass media. As the first woman to assume
the Oregon governor’s office, Roberts was careful to present herself as someone competent
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who could be trusted to lead. Governor Roberts felt that “women are not judged the same as men in political leadership, and you just understand that.” Taking the harsher judgment into account, Governor Roberts realized that her image would have to reflect her commitment.

It’s silly; but if we want to be considered serious, we have to look serious . . . . Men can wear bad toupees and belt buckles the size of Texas and blue jeans and cowboy boots and be [considered] serious. Women can’t begin to do that . . . . It’s not equal, and it’s not fair; but it’s true.

Governor Roberts was indeed serious about addressing Oregon’s complicated financial and environmental issues. Ironically, she received much more attention outside Oregon than within the state for her innovative policies. Inside Oregon, members of the press seemed only dimly to understand Roberts’ achievements beyond the context of picturing her with a visiting celebrity.

I’d get one picture with Al Gore, and then that would be it. It [Issue coverage] would go away. You couldn’t describe it [the issue] in a sound bite, and that was the problem. It was very complex government, and it was very complex policy. It was integral, many faceted; and it wasn’t a sound bite.

Roberts was not really surprised by the relative indifference the members of the press corps accorded to her success. After all, when she was elected the first female in the state’s history to become majority leader of the Oregon House, Roberts received an acknowledgment from the local newspaper similar to that of Governor Martz. “The press never said a word about it—no a word, not a word. Never was printed anywhere.”

Although Roberts never trusted representatives of the mass media to tell her story as she wanted it told, she described the members of Oregon’s press corps as “for the most part .
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. . fair” when she was governor. Roberts was a veteran of several years of elected public service before she ran for Oregon’s highest office. Many reporters were on a first-name basis with her after covering her earlier campaigns. She firmly believed that honesty was the best policy with members of the mass media. She strategized heavily with her press and policy staff members to make sure her points of view were presented coherently and consistently although she was usually disappointed with the news summaries that ended up before the public. She felt that members of the media tended to assign stereotyped expectations to women leaders, and they really did not expect her to know very much at all.

They [Members of the press corps] did not expect you to understand the “boy stuff” – industry, manufacturing, exports, agricultural production. Those are kind of “boy subjects.” “Girl subjects” were kids, schools, senior citizens, maybe divorce law; they’d give you that. There was no sense that women knew these other things.

Perhaps in part because she worked so hard to be prepared, Roberts was also very secure in dealing with members of the press. Once a reporter asked her about a rumored tattoo she wore and where on her body the icon might be located.

I just stood on there for a second; and then I said, “Shame on you.” And he went, “I’m sorry” (laughter). . . . Well, I don’t think a male governor could have done that. It was so motherly. And it was OK to be motherly in that case, and I didn’t have to answer the question.

After making emergency budget cuts in the amount of nearly $2 billion, Roberts spent a year traveling around her state conducting “The Conversation with Oregon.” She met with thousands of Oregonians in a town-hall meeting format, listening to their suggestions and demands for state operations as well as services (Oregon State Archives, 2011). She also took
the opportunity to teach her constituents how the tax structure worked. From the beginning, members of the mass media press corps discredited the program and her efforts, predicting that Oregonians would not participate. “Every step of the way, the press believed it wouldn’t work;” but Roberts persevered. She believed passionately in the value of education, and she believed Oregon citizens were capable of understanding the issues upon which they would be asked to vote. “I can’t have this conversation with them as voters if I don’t have this conversation with them as citizens first,” she declared. At the end of the year, she used the results of her collaboration with Oregon’s citizens to fashion their input into a tax-reform program that she presented to the members of the legislature. The Senate passed the proposed tax reforms, but the program was rejected by the Republican-controlled House of Representatives. “A year of work went down the tubes. It was probably more than anything else, the biggest political loss I ever had.”

The loss also forced her to think creatively to counter the limitations on education funding imposed by the voter-mandated Measure 5. “So if I wanted money for any part of education, I was going to have to figure out how . . . to get some of that done in the framework of economic development.” Roberts initiated highly inventive approaches to funding to avoid critical cutbacks in Oregon’s education system. She felt her commitment to preserve the system from massive cuts was exactly opposite the way her male counterparts approached education reform in the 1990s.

Well, look at it. It [Male approaches to reform] will often be ways to save money in the public education system, that is, different ways to reimburse the teachers . . . different class sizes . . . . They want to get rid of collective bargaining for teachers . . . . That, in my mind, is not education reform.
Roberts learned of an impending, and very dramatic, personal loss during her second year in office when her beloved husband was diagnosed with terminal cancer. He was a member of the State Senate and did not want his illness known so that he could continue to work as long as possible. Only their immediate family knew their sad secret; yet, somehow, Roberts continued to push ahead through Oregon’s tough challenges.

On January 30, 1994, Roberts announced she would not seek another term. She denied her decision had anything to do with the challenger from her own party whom she trailed by 34 points in the polls just three months before the state's Democratic primary. Her husband had died the previous October; her sister suffered from lung cancer, and her mother was debilitated by a stroke, all factors she pointed to as primary reasons for her withdrawal (Oregon governor decides, 1994, January 30).

**Policy initiatives regarding public education.** One positive factor that was already in place when Roberts took office was an organizational structure called the Progress Board, created to set the standards for Oregon’s future progress environmentally, socially, economically, and educationally. Prominent community members with substantial influence served as staff members to the board. In the Progress Board, Roberts saw the solution to her economic nightmare. Roberts leveraged the Progress Board goals to create a structure called, “Oregon’s Work Force Quality Council,” that won support from the members of the legislature. The Council brought all the elements that involved education and the work force together. Linking education and work force training unlocked funds generated for economic development through the state lottery. Roberts also engineered a paradigm shift in education policy. The Work Force Quality Council introduced the need for education beyond the traditional commitment to pre-school, k-12, and higher education by including training and
work force transition programs for people exiting the welfare and prison systems. The legislation also improved the status of disabled workers. For the first time in Oregon, work force training and education had finally become a single policy initiative.

**Working with legislators.** Roberts stated that the key to dealing effectively with legislators was two pronged: The first and most important element was to give legislators respect for their office by using their titles. The second was to know everything about the person. Roberts recommended a dossier for the governor on every single member of the legislature. “Think what a difference it makes when you say, ‘Senator Smith, as a father of three children . . . .’ Think about that versus, ‘Well, Senator Smith’ . . . . It’s just a huge difference.”

**Life after elections.** Barbara Roberts served one four-year term. At the end of her third year in office, her husband and mentor, Frank, died of cancer. Looking back on that moment, Barbara recalled that she wanted very much to run again, and her husband’s dying wish was that she do so; but ultimately she refused. At the time, she trailed her main Democratic challenger, John Kitzhaber, who had a two to one lead advantage in polls of likely voters (Oregon Governor Trails in Poll, 1994). “I couldn’t figure out how you could be a full-time governor, a full-time candidate, and have any time to grieve.” In 2002, she published a book about that experience called *Death Without Denial, Grief Without Apology: A Guide for Facing Death and Loss*. Following her term as governor, Roberts spent 10 years at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government and the Hatfield School at Portland State University focused on state and local government leadership. Among the many acknowledgments of her contributions are the naming of the Department of Human Services Building in Salem in her honor, the Barbara Roberts High School in Salem, and two
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honorary doctoral degrees. In 2011, Oregon State University Press released her memoir, *Up the Capitol Steps: A Woman’s March to the Governorship*. She continues to be an active speaker and commentator on state and national affairs.

**Party Invitation Revoked**

During their tenures in office, both Republican Walker and Democrat Roberts were strong, innovative, and dedicated leaders of their political parties. Both women decided that tax reform was necessary to pay for the educational opportunities they wanted their states to provide resident children, and they both worked diligently to create well-crafted, viable tax plans. Roberts’ plan was stopped only by members of a Republican House who had vowed to fight her programs. Walker’s plan engendered a great deal of media support; yet, despite the incumbency of the two women and their credible track records of performance, their political parties decided that one term was enough for each of them. Party officials welcomed wealthy male candidates to the primary race to challenge the female incumbents well before the women had completed their terms.

The decision by party officials to field challengers against a sitting governor runs against trends where office holders are considered to have a significant advantage as incumbents. As Ansolabehere and Snyder, Jr. (2001) noted, incumbent office holders tend to win by significantly high vote margins, a number that has grown four times greater since the 1950s. The trend is notable in all offices, both at state and national legislative and executive levels. Examining the declining competition in US House elections, Abramowitz, Alexander, and Gunning (2006) determined that the substantial increase in the number of House districts that are safe for one party was not caused by redistricting but “by demographic change and ideological realignment within the electorate” (p. 75).
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Interestingly, female gender has been shown to be an advantage for incumbents. Incumbent female mayors of American cities have been determined to possess a 6 to 7 percentage-point advantage when compared to male incumbents (Ferreira & Gyourko, 2011), and female Congressional candidates typically enjoy a statistically significant electoral advantage of about two percentage points of the vote (Milyo & Schosberg, 2000). When women incumbent governors are compared with their male challengers on a range of traits, the voters gave women an average 12-point advantage over male incumbent governors on such positive attributes such as “does the right thing” and “gets things done,” although that number drops beneath the male average on toughness (Barbara Lee Family Foundation, 2011). Research (Milyo & Schosberg, 2000) has also shown that women in politics face a 10 to 30% increase in the probability of being opposed in their own party primary or by a major party challenger. Examining the circumstances that surrounded the departures of both Roberts and Walker provided interesting comparisons and contrasts to national trends.

Roberts herself attributed the election in 1990 of Republican House members who opposed her in Oregon to a more conservative electorate. She believed voters were influenced by the tax-cutting agenda that led to the Republican Revolution in Congress four years later. During her term in office, Roberts also faced three recall efforts that never made the ballot mounted by the timbering industry as well as anti-gay and anti-abortion organizations. However, Oregon party officials did not put a more conservative Democrat against her in response to the mood of the electorate.

Roberts’ successor, Democrat and former Senate Majority Leader John Kitzhaber M.D., was a strong environmentalist and author of a state-funded health plan that Roberts supported. In fact, his policies were remarkably similar to those of Roberts. He sported
cowboy boots and blue jeans, exactly the outfit Roberts noted that she, as a female governor, would never have been allowed to don. His election brought him face-to-face with a Republican majority in both the Oregon House and the Senate. By the end of his second term, he had issued 203 vetoes earning the moniker “Dr. No” (Buntin, 2012, May, para. 9). Exhausted and disillusioned, on his way out of office he announced that Oregon was “ungovernable” (Buntin, 2012, May, para. 9).

Kitzhaber later campaigned and returned to office for a third term. Interestingly, he told reporters that this time he had “a crystal clear idea of why I was doing it” (Buntin, 2012, May, para. 28), causing one reporter to reflect that his statement was “a tacit acknowledgement [sic] that his goals were less clear back in 1994” (Buntin, 2012, May, para. 28), suggesting as well that the Democratic party had no substantive reason to support Kitzhaber against the incumbent Roberts. Facing the withdrawal of party favor, Roberts was too emotionally drained after her husband’s death to respond to the charges of her critics, a challenge she had relished in the past, or to fight for her office.

The boys decided they wanted the Governorship back . . . . If I hadn’t had a primary, I think I would have run again. If I’d been OK in the primary, I would have had five or six more months to get my act together to get through the grieving process a little bit. I think I would have done that. But I didn’t, and I’ve never regretted it.

Similarly, Governor Walker found herself torn between the desire to run for the governor’s office in her own right and the reality that her party wanted someone else, despite her enormous popularity with Utah voters and the press. Because of her truncated term, Walker was distracted from political gamesmanship by her desire to make a significant
impact on policy while she had the chance. By comparison, her main rival had begun
maneuvering himself into position to run years before the seat was vacant.

I knew Jon Huntsman had been working for three years entertaining delegates from
former years at, he called it his “cabin.” It was really a huge, nine bedroom, indoor
swimming pool, multi-family rooms at Park City. That had been going on for three
years so my expectations were not overwhelming. Maybe that’s the reason I take it
without a lot of trauma because others pretty realistically knew where things were.

Walker’s case was influenced more by the changing mood of Republican party
leaders than by voters who gave her a 70% approval rating shortly before she left office
(Sappenfield, 2004, April 28). Walker attributed her uneasy relationship with Utah party
officials in part to the increasingly conservative pull to the right. “Some of the real
conservative right-wingers in the Republican party considered me to be too liberal because of
my education and many other issues . . . (but) I was conservative so I was still part of the
party and had a great deal of respect.” Her determination to provide a tax plan for enhanced
funding to support public education, particularly for minority students, won her no points.
“The extreme conservative always viewed public education as a negative. There was strong
support for vouchers, and they knew that I wouldn't support vouchers.”

Walker was clear that her indecision about seeking office may have left her party’s
leaders in the dark about her intentions. When she finally announced her interest in the
office, she surprised several prominent Republicans who had already pledged their allegiance
to others or who planned to run themselves. In the end, Walker did not feel that her party
deserted her because she was female. Rather, competing against the wealth and health of Jon
Huntsman proved to be factors that tilted her decision to withdraw.
Here I am 74 years old with a disease — there’s no cure, no treatment, no knowledge of why you have it . . . It didn’t seem to be worth it to go out and battle in a campaign . . . (with) a Democratic candidate . . . and Huntsman who had endless money and his name was all over the state.

However, what Roberts and Walker have most in common is that neither received an appeal from anyone in their respective parties asking them to run. Given the most recent research (Ansolabehere & Snyder, Jr., 2001; Barbara Lee Family Foundation, 2011), the women could have successfully defended their offices against their challengers. As Roberts noted ruefully, “Part of what happens if you don’t run for re-election, you never get to tell your own story. That’s part of the reality. People remember the conflict.”

Both women were exhausted by physical and emotional challenges. They were handicapped by perceiving their political positions to be weakened by their party’s abandonment; they knew any decision to take on the primary would extend beyond the opposition party to include their own political parties. They were both unwilling to fight for resources and support from the parties they had ably served and, ironically, were supposed to be leading. However, those resources had already had been granted to others impatient for the office to be vacated. Therefore, without the courtesy of a party invitation, the women felt they had no choice but to RSVP regrets and leave the race.
Chapter 7: Findings and Themes

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to determine from the personal perspectives of female former governors whether gender had an impact on their leadership experiences and, if so, how. In earlier chapters, detailed and rich descriptions were presented from in-depth interviews with seven female former governors detailing the perceived impact of their gender in the following areas: 1) The impact their gender had in shaping their perceived leadership options and strategies when dealing with members of their staff and legislatures; 2) their perceptions about the gender-bias in the press coverage they received from members of the mass media press corps; and 3) how their gender influenced their priorities for public policy, particularly in the area of public education. The field of public education was selected to give the governors specific reference points when considering the impact of gender on their policy agendas and leadership actions; education has also been a domain associated with the particular interests of women leaders (Carroll, 2003b).

In this chapter, the most important findings are identified from the rich descriptive chapters. Excerpts from interviews with the former governors and other supporting documents supplement the text. The chapter is organized into sections that correspond to the research questions and within which major themes are presented. The first section includes findings from the governors’ responses to the first research question concerning leadership style. In the second section, findings from the governors’ approaches to generating public education policy are documented. The governors’ perceptions about the coverage they received from members of the mass media press corps are presented in the third section. Lastly, in the fourth section the governors reflect on the impact of their gender on their decision-making and leadership functions overall.
The themes presented for analysis are broadly separated into the two categories of desire and consequences. The themes within the category designated as “Desire” focus on the forces that inspired or motivated the women to seek leadership roles and describe the leadership style favored by the women governors. The themes included in the category of “Desire” consider leadership from the governors’ initial motivations to seek executive office as well as their perceptions of their leadership preferences (or styles), and are defined as follows: 1) to serve in an effort to make positive change; 2) to lead “as a woman;” 3) to prove oneself and/or the capacity of women; and 3) to protect self, family, and friends from the stresses of the governor’s tenure. After the women became governors, the themes reflect the consequences of their decisions to enter office and the ways in which they exercised leadership. The themes within the designation “Consequences” include these: 1) policy interests; 2) mass media press coverage; and 3) impacts of gender. A discussion of the findings and themes is presented with critical supportive detail that “renders the data meaningful” (Emerson, Fetz, & Shaw, 1995, p. 168).

Leadership

To begin, the women who became governors did not see themselves as “born leaders.” They did not initially step into politics with the ultimate goal of seeking executive office. In fact, they, like so many other elected women leaders, hesitated before entering any sort of public life, often after educating themselves for a number of years to prepare for other careers entirely.

The desire to serve to make positive change. The first finding of this study revealed that all of the women participants described their motivations for seeking elected office as a way to make positive change through their service as leaders. Although this claim is made
by both male and female politicians, as noted earlier in Chapters 2 and 3, women must summon great courage (Palmer & Simon, 2006) as well as overcome greater obstacles to their entering politics. Research (Dolan, 2006; Lawless & Fox, 2008) has determined that women are often occupied with child care and do not have the necessary time required to participate in politics; women also do not see many role models for female participation in a field typically dominated by men. Those two factors alone may convince women that they are not qualified to lead. Even highly trained professional women, despite holding equal or sometimes better credentials when compared to male candidates, doubt their capacity to succeed in the political domain (Lawless & Fox, 2008).

With the notable exception of Governor Jane Swift (R-Massachusetts), all of the other former women governors entered politics initially with childcare concerns that they managed through hiring a nanny (Whitman), bringing children with them on the campaign trail (Collins), or recruiting volunteers from family and friends to babysit or provide meals as well as transportation (Kunin, Roberts). Martz and Walker delayed seeking office until their children did not require close supervision. In all cases, child care issues did not deter these women; nor did their doubts or fears about their own qualifications to seek office, although they had plenty of reason to wonder.

A closer look at the ways in which the women explained their motivations suggests the depth of their passion to make a positive difference with their lives. A naturalized citizen for whom the US had provided refuge from Nazi persecution, Governor Kunin grew up impoverished, learning English as a second language. She announced her candidacy for Vermont’s governorship affirming that “participating in the political life of this state is the most worthwhile thing I can do with my own life. It is the only way that I know to change
things for the better” (Kunin, 1994, p. 293). Governor Collins was from a southern state in a region that had few women leaders in any field (Dolan, 2006). Yet, the former home economics teacher, out of her commitment to move Kentucky from economic dependence on liquor and coal mines, boldly went where no governor had gone before to bring home a Toyota automobile manufacturing plant. Governor Roberts described herself as a most unlikely candidate from a blue-collar background with no college degree. Yet, her “passion for subjects I cared about,” namely the lack of education services for her autistic son, launched her political career. Governor Martz had driven a garbage truck for her husband’s business. Although Governor Whitman came from a wealthy background, her troubled childhood in and out of boarding schools gave no hint of the vision and stability required of a state leader; yet, she concurred with Kunin’s sense of purpose, saying, “Certainly the motivation I always had was for the difference that I could make.” Whitman ultimately absorbed and responded to her family’s long history of political leadership in the State of New Jersey, as well as the strong political influence of her parents’ message that “beyond winning, the goal is to serve” (Whitman as quoted in Beard, 1996, p. 13).

Governors Walker and Swift did not campaign for the office of governor. However, each of them came into office motivated by the same forces that had inspired them originally to enter politics. Governor Swift was attracted by “the role that politics and public policy played on the small-business owners [and] on education.” Governor Walker entered office with a laser focus on improving Utah’s funding for public education and for “all these things I could put into action.”

Interestingly, the governors distinguished themselves from male governors by stating expressly that their service motivation included the intention to lead differently than did
men. In some cases, the governors introduced systemic change that upset either formal or informal power structures early on. For example, Governor Whitman spoke at some length of her independence from the “Good Old Boy” system that had worked for past governors to set legislative priorities. All of the women except Governor Martz described their commitment to bring women and minorities into their administrations and appointed positions. They all saw themselves as emotionally sensitive to or able to “resonate” (M. M. Kunin, personal communication, November 27, 2007) with women and issues involving domestic abuse, child care, and education. And they all, with the exception of Governor Whitman, entered office intentionally shifting legislative priorities to bring an increase in education funding to the top of the policy agenda or, in the case of Governor Swift, to maintain previous increases. In some cases, (Collins, Roberts, Walker) the women pursued tax reform in order to fund their commitments to public education, although only Governor Collins was successful in passing tax reform legislation.

In the opinion of Governor Martz, the desire to make a positive contribution as governor was a factor that distinguished the service of women generally from that of their male colleagues. “I thought they [women governors] did it [became governor] because they really wanted to make a difference. Now men might do that, too; but my opinion of that is, ‘not so much.’” Thus, all of the women approached their terms in office offering more than lip service and platitudes to executive office. They defined making a difference uniquely and consciously as women; they uniformly saw their form of public service as distinct from their male predecessors and counterparts.

The desire to lead as a woman. All of the former women governors believed that their leadership styles were influenced by their gender. The women uniformly described
their leadership styles with terminology that expressed a belief in being inclusive or team-oriented. While Governor Roberts was the only woman to use the specific term “collaborative” to describe her leadership style, other governors chose words such as “inclusive” (Swift, Walker), “collegial” (Kunin), “close” (Martz), “consensus” (Whitman), and “team approach” (Collins), to indicate a desire to work closely with people in identifying issues of priority and possible solutions.

The leadership style evidenced by the former women governors included the following characteristics that have been identified by earlier researchers as uniquely female: 1) close ties to staff members and legislative colleagues; 2) the willingness to credit others for contributions; 3) the desire for results over personal aggrandizement; and 4) an effort to hire and appoint women as well as minorities to positions of authority (Cantor, Bernay, & Stoess, 1992; CAWP, 1991; Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2010; Jewell & Whicker, 1993; O'Toole, 1995; Rosenthal, 1998). These characteristics may be illustrative of some male leaders as well, including past US Presidents Clinton and Bush, and now President Obama. Hiring records for these leaders were discussed earlier in the Political Leadership section of Chapter 2, page 48.

**Close ties to staff.** According to Governor Kunin’s memoir, “Any political administration becomes a family and develops a special and enduring camaraderie” (Kunin, 1994, p. 9). However, Kunin pointed out that she developed unique, empathic bonds with her female staffers. A running joke on her staff was the need to schedule the emotional release of “crying time” (Kunin, 1994, p. 9). Kunin said she and her staff members knew instinctively the importance of such intimacies as well as the importance of guarding their
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private moments, “when we would be on display again in the men’s world” (Kunin, 1994, p. 9).

The familial aspect of the relationship between female governors and their staff members was underscored often in interviews with the respondents. Governor Whitman treated the members of her security detail “like family,” offering them her friendship, even inviting them to her children’s weddings long after her term in office. She pointed out that her predecessor, former Governor Jim Florio, “didn’t even know their [members of the security detail] names.” Governor Martz described her staff members as an antidote to loneliness. She explained that her husband had chosen to live at their home some 70 miles away from Helena while she lived in the Governor’s House: “9,500 square feet by myself. My people with whom I worked were my family.” Governor Swift appreciated the loyalty of her staff members who “really become like your family . . . . I think it has pleasantly surprised us, the degree to which we stay connected with so many of the folks . . . mostly on a personal level.”

The women governors found unique ways to express appreciation for their relationships. For example, an unexpected gesture was important to former Governor Martha Collins. She adopted a practice of making coffee for her staff members when she got to the office before they did. “I dare say the male governor would not have made the coffee . . . or he would have had somebody else do it. I made the coffee.” Governor Walker noted that in her legislative role as majority whip she regularly made dinner for evening meetings with her male leadership colleagues. She thought of the meal as a convenience she could offer to make their meetings less stressful. The dinners ceased only after the male speaker of
the Utah House finally noted that it was not fair to Walker to depend on her crockpot, no matter how conveniently located to the Capitol building.

**Crediting others.** Governor Collins always made sure to credit her staff members and state employees when they reached her administrative goals, pointing out, “I didn’t do it [reach the goal] myself.” Governor Whitman felt that collaboration with her staff members was critical and made sure to credit them for good ideas; Governor Martz pointed out that governors always get the credit for staff efforts because the whole system of communications and public relations is set up to make sure that every positive achievement is attributed to the governor’s leadership.

**Seeking results.** All of the governors expressed their willingness to keep open minds to staff suggestions regarding policy, or even to change their minds if the staff members presented good reasons for doing so. However, all of the governors also expected their staff members, no matter how close, to accept the governor’s word as the last on any subject. Such was not the case, nor could it be, when dealing with legislators.

The women were unusually adept at working with legislators and male governor colleagues, stressing the respectful use of titles, social coffees, and other public acknowledgments of the value they granted to male influencers. If that process did not work to sway support to their legislative agendas, the women often came up with creative ways to circumvent claims that their programs were too expensive or impossible to achieve. All of the women were determined to overcome whatever obstacles they might encounter to implementing their policies and practices, even at the risk of their political futures. They were most prepared for objections from “Good Old Boy” networks and worked to make men their allies rather than enemies, whenever possible.
All of the governors spoke of their determination to get results, meaning to get their agendas implemented while in office. Results were considered far more important than public adulation, or even gratitude for a job well done from members of the public, the typical lack of which was never mentioned in any of the interviews. Governor Martz set aside concerns for her public image in the Montana press to work on what she considered more important affairs of state. Governor Walker was in office a mere 14 months. She decided to push for improved reading programs and tax reforms that would increase funding for public education, saying, “It took a lot of work to get these projects started and moving and . . . I felt that was my focus then, getting things done.” Roberts considered Oregon’s financial and environmental crises a “window of opportunity,” crises she vowed to turn into advantages. Whitman offered an interesting insight into her preferred way of getting results from her staff members. She rejected a hierarchical issuance of orders from her office in favor of persuading people “to do what you want them to do because they want to do it. You’ve got to convince them they want to do this.” She described the process as an “art” that demanded much more from her than a mere directive, a strategy supported by Governors Collins and Martz as well.

**Hiring and appointing women as well as minorities.** Only Governor Martz stated that she made no special effort to recruit women or minorities to her staff. She maintained that she looked for the most qualified people for the job and kept a number of her predecessor’s appointees in their offices after she was elected. Governor Swift said, with more time, her goal would have been to make more diverse appointments. Every other former woman governor indicated that she had brought more women, and in some cases
members of minority groups as well, into the state leadership roles through hiring or appointments.

In contrast, Governor Walker reported more women than men headed her critical departments. Whitman diversified appointments so that “many more women were appointed to positions of leadership and responsibility . . . minorities as well.” In just a single four-year term as Oregon governor, Governor Roberts made 2,013 appointments that included minorities as well as women. Governor Roberts received a letter of complaint from one Oregon county bar association that she was appointing too many female judges. Roberts replied with a list that proved in actuality she had appointed more men than women. Still, not everyone was as pleased as Roberts at the end of her term when “the court looked different when I was through.”

During Governor Whitman’s administration, a woman at some point held every top post in New Jersey. The governor’s choices did not go unnoticed among male politicos. Whitman recalled that, "Very early on, the men started muttering about the ‘Estrogen Palace’" (Ackermann, 2010, p. 3). Governor Whitman stated that in her experience, definite advantages were apparent to appointing women to leadership roles in her administration. She added that women are less interested in getting personal recognition and more interested in getting something done. Given the drive of the women in this study to get results, not surprisingly, they hired other women to do the job alongside them.

All of the women governors clearly demonstrated leadership styles that reflected a team approach to developing policy initiatives, but collaboration was regarded as a process in collecting and sharing information or deliberating over options, not making final decisions. All of the women governors stated that they made the final decision and expected their staff
members to support whatever decision they as governor made. All of the governors were committed to working with their legislators to get their agendas implemented. At times, when that willingness was not reciprocated by individual legislators, the women governors did not express anger about assaults on their personal power, tending rather to express frustration by delays or interruptions to initiatives they felt would have improved circumstances for citizens of their states.

**The desire to prove women capable.** When Governor Collins took office in Kentucky, she believed some of her constituents worried that disaster was just around the corner, based on the fact that she was the first woman to hold the state’s highest executive office. One of the main reasons Governor Walker was excited about the opportunity to fulfill her predecessor’s term was to prove in the process “that a woman could be governor.”

Both Governors Kunin and Collins noted that a double-standard existed for women when compared to expectations for male governors. “I think that you have to work harder; you have to be better briefed and better informed [than men] . . . and I don’t think that [situation] will ever cease.” Governor Kunin added, “It’s probably still true that you have to be somewhat better than the man who had the job before you . . . . I think competency is the best defense.” Governor Swift identified the highlight of her leaving office as “proving that I could and did do the job for two years.”

Governor Roberts noted that women often have to prove their competency in ways not expected of male leaders. She had developed a rhetorical structure she called “credentialing,” designed to remind listeners of her past experience in whatever area was being questioned to prove her answer would be credible. “A man could make the statement without the credentialing,” said Roberts. “Women sometimes have to credential first.”
Governor Martz agreed that “women are judged totally differently” explaining, “We have to work harder at . . . leadership . . . . We can’t afford to make mistakes because there is a glass ceiling still. We have not arrived.”

All of the governors indicated that their female gender handicapped them in some ways from garnering the respect and the creditability required to implement their agendas. The women indicated that they typically worked harder or tried to compensate in some way for their gender. They all chose strategies and actions they felt proved their competency to gain the trust and respect that would forward their policy initiatives.

The desire to protect family. All of the female former governors worried that their political careers interfered with their obligations as mothers and wives or that their involvement in politics had a negative impact on their families. Despite these concerns, or perhaps because of them, most of the family members and spouses of the governors supported their decisions to run for office and had remained steadfast in their support during the women’s tenures in office. The mothers of Governor Collins, Governor Martz, and Governor Swift were exceptions who did not want their daughters to suffer the controversy or criticism they eventually endured while in office.

During the years leading up to their governorships when their political careers were just beginning, all except Governor Walker made decisions to curtail attendance at meetings or experienced anxiety about adequate and timely meal preparation or running the household generally. Governor Walker raised seven children but never ran for office until her youngest child was 13. Governor Roberts, the only woman who had been divorced, spoke of her challenges when making trips to lobby the Oregon legislators as a single mother with an autistic child. Her bookkeeper paycheck was docked for every day of work she missed.
Governor Collins’ children were six and nine when she was handling the gubernatorial campaign for her mentor, Wendell Ford. She took her children with her on the campaign trail. However, the governors could not protect their children or their husbands from every stress they sometimes endured. The younger the children, the more outwardly they expressed their feelings. Governor Kunin related the tale of running for lieutenant governor when her children found the brochures of her opponent and stomped on them. Kunin’s daughter was humiliated before her high school classmates in an assembly when her mother’s rival for office spoke mockingly of running against a woman (Kunin, 1994, p. 224). On one occasion, her husband lost his temper defending her policies. The crowd booed Kunin’s husband, and the whole incident ended up on television, mortifying their children (Kunin, 1994, p. 308). Most importantly, no way existed to know the impact of the emotional stress on their families until long after the chance to correct the situation. As Governor Collins pointed out, she feared her regrets “at age 90 in her rocking chair.”

By the time the women in this study had become governors, their children had grown beyond the age of requiring constant attention, except for Governor Swift. The majority of the governors most often felt concern for their husbands. While Whitman and Walker both had funny and charming stories to tell about their spouses in the role of “First Husband,” Whitman experienced one of the more pernicious attempts to diminish her stature because of her husband’s job. Rumors began circulating soon after her election that Whitman’s husband, an equity investor, was most likely the person who had created her tax policy. Whitman publicly ignored the slight except to stagecraft the appearances of her husband. He simply was never seen with her in the state capitol of Trenton until eventually the rumor died.
Another way life in the Governor’s Mansion strained families was the stress of living apart. Governor Martz and her husband felt the impact of her decade of service as she lived apart from her spouse for the entirety of her term, as did Governor Swift, both only returning home on weekends. Governor Swift felt her daughters were well cared for by their stay-at-home dad; but when both her husband and child fell ill, she felt compelled to helicopter home to help with their care, an action that ultimately led to her facing an ethics inquiry.

At the opposite end of the spectrum of dramatic family situations, Governor Roberts’ husband became terminally ill with cancer a little more than half way through her term. He wanted no one to know of his condition, and Governor Roberts acquiesced to his wish to hide his declining health. For nearly a year, “I was living with that secret, that personal secret.” After his death, she faced her last year in office struggling to perform while containing her grief.

I decided that I could not run again. I wanted to, and Frank wanted me to. He was hoping that when he died . . . I would decide to run again. But it was too much, too much. I just didn’t think I could do it.

Governor Collins’ husband actually went to jail as a result of his conviction in 1993 on influence-peddling charges. Her protestations of his innocence to the contrary, his prosecution began within a few years of her leaving office. Governor Collins considered his sentence an ironic twist to the spotlight she had occupied for four years as a female governor. Had their positions been reversed, she believed no one would have thought her influence on him worth a fig of examination.

If a man is elected to . . . office, they [members of the press] don’t necessarily go back to the wife’s financial holdings or background . . . but they do if it’s a female in
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office . . . . The husband gets more scrutiny.

Only Governor Whitman’s daughter has made an attempt to follow her mother into politics. Kate Whitman made a failed run for a Congressional seat in 2009.

Policy Interests

I chose to examine the aspect of women’s political leadership from the policy framework of public education. I was especially interested to know whether the women themselves saw a difference in the ways they approached public education policy in comparison to their male counterparts. In this section, the former women governors’ attitudes and beliefs about public education and the formation of appropriate policy are presented. Their perceptions about the differences between themselves and male governors are presented in sub-themes including the following: 1) important factors; 2) the power to make change; 3) policy agenda priorities; 4) finding additional money; 5) taking risks on behalf of policy commitments; and 6) exceptions.

Important factors. To begin, the women former governors enumerated several important and necessary factors they considered when developing effective education policy including social skills (Kunin), the impact of hunger as well as learning styles (Whitman), special needs (Roberts), or remedial needs (Collins). Equal opportunity for all students as well as student competency, graduation, and drop-out rates were also policy areas of interest for them. Interestingly, none of the women governors cited gender equity issues as a priority in their reform efforts.

The women believed that they shared the same priorities for students in many respects as male governors. However, when asked to evaluate the impact of their gender on their education policy initiatives, the women governors believed they took a different
approach overall to creating or reforming education policy than did their male gubernatorial counterparts. In the next sections, the women governors’ perspectives are discussed further.

The power to make change. The main difference between the women and men governors, according to six of the seven respondents (excluding Governor Whitman) lay in the degree of emphasis they placed on the importance of public education and the lengths to which they were willing to go to correct the shortcomings of their state systems or to supply services they believed were crucial. As an example of the emphasis the former women governors placed on public education, Governors Whitman and Kunin devoted the entirety of their second State-of-the-State speeches to education. Governor Swift created a special State-of-Education speech, which she elevated to the stature of the State-of-the-State to emphasize the importance of education to the future of Massachusetts. Governors Collins, Kunin, Martz, Roberts, and Walker all made funding increases to public education a budget priority.

The exception, Governor Whitman, maintained that the most important difference between her and male governors lay in their approach to educational policy from a less nurturing vantage point. She clarified that opinion by saying: While “[men’s] concerns [on behalf of children] were all there,” in Whitman’s view, male governors tended to focus on outcomes without considering “what it takes to get to that outcome in terms of nurturing or . . . an environment that encourages and allows the flexibility in the system to meet the different ways of learning kids have.” In short, Whitman felt that men often equally emphasize the importance of public education along with women but tended to overlook important factors that make learning possible. “A child who comes to school hungry is not going to have as successful an outcome as a child who gets a meal. But they understood that [the idea] once you explained it to them.”
The policy agenda. The women also felt their policy agendas demonstrated significant difference when compared to the priorities of men governors. Governor Swift opined, “I don’t think it’s so much that men don’t get it [the importance of so-called women’s issues such as education] . . . . It’s just what gets put on the agenda when the agenda is dominated by men.” The female governors found they could shape their policy agendas in unique ways because they somehow saw connections their male predecessors had missed. Governor Collins achieved enormous success in diversifying Kentucky’s economy and enhancing the public education system when she combined the two priorities rather than separating them as had been done in the past by male governors. “My two priorities were education number one, and economic development number two,” said Collins, noting that previous male governors had not pursued economic development as a top priority; nor had they seen the relationship between education and skilled workers as a way to attract new business to Kentucky.

Finding the money. Female former governors tended to fold their education policy issues into larger system reforms. Such reforms, either on a large or small scale, usually required new or diverted revenue streams. In all cases but one (Governor Whitman), the female governors in this study attempted to allot new dollars to support their education policy initiatives. One of the most dramatic efforts included the willingness to seek new funding sources through tax reform.

Governor Walker committed to reform Utah’s tax policy in order to pay for changes she wanted to institutionalize beyond her term, requiring heroic effort. “We were in tough times so I would have to find the money.” She believed that enhanced funding would continue and expand the education programs she had implemented, but her term ended before
she could introduce the legislation. The next governor did not further her dream. Walker was not surprised, noting “no politician in his or her right mind deals with tax reform.”

Yet, these women governors continued to press the volatile policy initiative of rewriting tax code on behalf of public education. Governor Roberts tried to implement tax reform to counter the limitations imposed by the voter-mandated Measure 5. When that initiative failed, she generated creative policy connections between work force training and education to avoid critical cutbacks in Oregon’s education system. Roberts believed her actions ran exactly opposite of the way her male counterparts approached education reform in the 1990s. “You look at some of the male governors who have taken on education reform; it’s not really reforming the education system, it’s a cost-cutting venture.”

Whitman agreed that men “tend to pitch problems more on the esoteric dollars and cents, what’s working, what isn’t, rather than the human ‘what’s happening to the child?’” As Kunin explained, “It’s not that other people, or men, don’t care about these issues (e.g., child care, education, etc.). Some do put them at high priority; but women can resonate with other women because of their own experiences.”

**Risky business.** In fact, the women governors were often willing to introduce bold, visionary, and politically risky public policy initiatives on behalf of public education as well as other areas. Governor Martz very specifically acknowledged the importance of taking risks as a leader. She symbolically institutionalized her belief by wearing a favorite bracelet ringed with images of a turtle, explaining “The turtle is significant for this [reason]. It only goes forward when its neck is stuck out. So I had that turtle with the state seal and my name on it.” Governor Martz instituted a program to counter the rural isolation of Montana’s far-flung school districts by additionally compensating teachers willing to teach in those small
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towns and by providing extra professional development days. She also “led the charge” of
the Western Governors Association in opposing the federal imposition of No Child Left
Behind (NCLB) legislation, based on her conviction that NCLB was aimed more at
assisting students in urban schools than meeting the needs of students in Montana’s largely
rural districts. She took this stance despite the fact that Republican President Bush was the
head of her party.

When Governor Kunin vowed that Vermont families would have access to free
kindergarten, she heard from legislators that the expense was just too great for state
intervention. However, Kunin’s team figured out a way to provide low-interest loans to
school districts to provide new facilities for kindergarten. The program “worked beautifully,
right away.” Governor Collins lined up business-community support for a corporate-license
tax to pay for additional reforms in Kentucky such as increased salaries and longevity
bonuses for teachers, reduced class sizes in lower grades, and the attachment of teacher pay
to performance.

The exceptions. Governor Swift was one exception who did not see the necessity for
additional education policies or funding when she assumed office, primarily because much of
her policy handiwork was already in place. As a legislator, she had worked for six years
devising reforms to the Massachusetts education system before becoming governor. When
she took office, the policies she had created were just being implemented, designed to reduce
the disparities of wealth and property-tax reliance, and requiring significant investment of
state financial resources. She was grateful for the continued support of the legislators who
were still in office, who had been her colleagues in devising the Massachusetts legislation
and who did not waiver as the reforms initially met with controversy.
Governor Whitman was another exception in the sense that the reforms she introduced, although sweeping, did not depend on an increase in tax revenues. In fact, Governor Whitman was known for her tax cuts.

None of the governors included gender equity as a priority for their state classrooms. To be fair, much of the research conducted on the impact of gender bias in American schools was conducted and published in the 1990s. Most of the governors completed their terms before the validity of such research could be established or translated into viable state policy. Only Governors Martz, Swift, and Walker served in the decades following the turn of the 21st century.

Mass Media Press Coverage

The third section of this chapter includes themes that arose from the perceptions the governors held regarding the press coverage they received from members of the mass media press corps. This section includes examples recalled by the governors to illustrate ways in which they were influenced by the news coverage they received. The sub-themes in this section include these: 1) becoming a public figure; 2) painful consequences; and 3) crisis coverage.

**Becoming a public figure.** Each of the women former governors understood clearly the need for a relationship between members of the mass media and those who aspire to and/or those who actually attain the Executive Office of the Governor. However, each of the women met with different levels of success in creating, fostering, and maintaining such relationships. Some of the women, notably Governors Whitman, Roberts, and Walker were more comfortable during their gubernatorial terms with members of the press; they were strong personal spokespersons for their own administrations.
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Others such as Kunin and Collins, early pioneers as female governors in the 1980s, were stung more than once when their attempts to communicate honestly with representatives of the press created headlines that both women consider examples of their early missteps; but they both learned from these experiences. In fact, they both became quite adept at press relations. Swift and Martz both had serious problems in attempting to manage crises in their administrations, and the media portrayals of them contributed to their decisions not to run again for office.

All of the female governors reported that press coverage from members of the mass media incited their concern, distrust, or anxiety and caused emotions within them ranging at times from uncertainty to distress, and even pain. The governors reported feeling “defensive” (Collins) and “paranoid” (Kunin) when dealing with reporters. They described the press coverage they received as “brutal” and “nonsense” (Swift), “frustrating” and “close-minded” (Roberts), “superficial” (Walker), “antagonistic” (Whitman), and “lies” (Martz). While Governor Swift’s case was notable for the intensity and duration of the animosity exhibited toward her by members of the mass media press corps, in fact, none of the women governors felt truly comfortable dealing with the press. Often the governors interpreted questioning reporters as disrespectful, as they probably were to fulfill their roles as governmental watchdogs.

However, the governors detected another troubling component that continued to linger even after establishing successful working relationships. As Governor Roberts commented, “That is the difference . . . that I noticed more than anything else . . . . They [Members of the mass media] still don’t see us as leaders.” As a result of their experiences with the members of the press corps, a majority of the women former governors, in fact all
except Governor Walker, felt that members of the mass media were adversaries who obstructed their policy initiatives or deliberately sensationalized incidents that occurred during the governors’ terms in order to garner profits for their companies. As Governor Martz phrased it, “negative news sells; good news does not.”

However, press relationships tended to improve over time with certain governors as each became familiar with the needs and routines of the press corps and even granted some reporters first-name status. Governor Collins, who initially referred to members of the press corps as “sharks” and “piranha” (Braden, 1996, p. 99), felt that her hostility to members of the press had ameliorated by the end of her term. She had created a relationship with reporters marked by mutual respect. Roberts and Kunin had similar feelings that evolved toward members of the press as their terms ended.

Governor Walker’s overall warm relationship with members of the Utah press corps stood in sharp contrast to the experiences of her female colleagues. Walker acknowledged that she received “surprisingly little criticism.” Walker may have been a beneficiary of the new gender-neutrality in coverage evidenced by media reporters at the beginning of the 21st century. However, Walker was also unique among the women interviewed in this study. She was 73 when she assumed the governor’s seat with over a decade of public service, a nearly-revered status as mother of seven, grandmother of 25, and wife to her husband Myron for 48 years. She was also known among her legislative colleagues as “Aunt Bee” (Sappenfield, 2004, April 28). Up until her decision to run for the governorship in her own right, she had been viewed largely as a caretaker in the governor’s office, a factor that may have accounted for the lack of significant criticism from the press corps. Interestingly, however, press editorials supported Walker’s calls for tax reform during the short period that she was
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governor. When she failed to win her party’s nomination for governor, a newspaper account of the convention results marked the day as “full of sadness” (Bernick & Spangler, 2004, May 9).

All of the women former governors except Governor Walker believed that the source of their antagonism toward members of the press was the strong tendency of reporters to view women leaders through a prism of bias. Six of the seven governors believed they received press coverage that was stereotyped or in other ways different from the reporting accorded to their male colleagues during their campaigns and/or after their election to the governor’s office. Ironically, Governor Walker felt her generally warm relationships with Utah state news reporters might have been the case precisely for the reason that other women felt short-changed; she said, “Maybe it was the fact that I was a woman.” Walker did not perceive bias in the coverage she received from members of the press corps.

Each of the other governors, again except Governor Walker, felt gender-biased coverage was reflected in the following four characteristics of news stories about them or their administrations: 1) stories slanted toward personal appearance rather than issues of state governance; 2) smaller amounts or less respectful press coverage than the reporting accorded to male competitors or “back-page treatment;” 3) misrepresentation or caricatures of their intentions; and 4) hostility to female leadership.

Appearance. The female governors often found the members of the mass media press corps far more interested in their appearance than in their policies. Modest skirts were part of Roberts’ required wardrobe adopted after Oregon constituents complained about her lack of ladylike attire when she wore a pantsuit to the office. Therefore, she saved long pants for trips to logging sites. She also was careful to wear conservative jewelry and clothing.
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However, even dressing in a suit could be framed in a news story in such a way that the overall impression of a candidate’s image as a serious professional was diminished. Governor Martz shared a typical example of how members of the Montana press corps reported on her in 2000.

When I announced that I would run for Lieutenant Governor with Mark Racicot, the newspaper [reporter] said, “Judy Martz drove up in her red corvette with her blue suit on.” And I said, “What importance is that? Would you do that to a man?”

Whitman charged that the members of the press were far too interested in her fashion sense. When her style preferences were said to reflect her ability to govern fairly, she set aside her pearl necklace as a symbolic commitment to leadership of all the people, not just rich friends.

Governor Jane Swift suffered dramatically in the cross hairs of media coverage. She was seven months pregnant with twins when she became the first female governor of the state, two premier moments for the Massachusetts governor’s office that were not met with applause by reporters. Swift was very aware of the critical eyes. “The kind of media scrutiny you get is different; it’s very personal; it’s very focused on your appearance and your hair.” After Mitt Romney garnered higher public approval numbers heading into the Republican primary, Swift pulled out of the race to win a full term in office in her own right. Republican strategist, Rob Gray, described another complication she faced beyond Romney’s challenge saying, “Ms. Swift was also hampered by a less-than-telegenic persona” (Belluck, 2002, p. 3).

However, even a highly “telegenic persona” can be problematic as Governor Collins discovered. A former beauty contest winner in her college days, Collins found herself
referred to as an “icy blonde” (Braden, 1996, p. 97) in her campaign coverage. Governor Roberts had a different kind of problem with appearance. Following a tall, handsome man into the governor’s office, Roberts felt she literally never measured up to his successes. “I had those skills, but I don’t think they could see me that way. I just think they looked at me, this kind of short, 5 foot 2 [inch] woman, and I didn’t look like “Oregon Comeback!”

(laughs)

*Misrepresentation.* Governor Roberts was determined to acquaint her constituents with the complex issues that confronted Oregon and the importance of being well-informed voters. She spent hours preparing herself and her staff members for press briefings, with each staff member responsible for presenting thorough knowledge about a particular issue. Ironically, members of the mass media press corps typically ignored offers of in-depth briefings. Reporters preferred to ask questions that sounded deceptively simple, suggesting that the answer should be simple as well.

They wanted to know “Well, are you going to fix it?” . . . “What’s the Clinton Administration going to do to fix the Timber Spotted Owl?” Give me the one sentence about fixing this thing it took 100 years to create.

Governor Kunin recounted a similar Alice-in-Wonderland quality to the relationship she held with members of the mass media press corps. “The words I said and the words that reporters quoted me as saying frequently seemed unrelated” (Kunin, 1994, p. 275). She was not unprepared for criticism from members of the press corps but often felt that her intentions were misconstrued and that such misrepresentations were “probably the hardest part about politics.”
Governor Martz experienced an even more painful and surreal conflict with reporters in Montana. Her situation was potentially a more serious legal pillorying. Governor Martz found herself accused of a cover-up concerning her staff member’s culpability in a drunken-driving incident. Her repeated denials of wrongdoing were typically discounted. Even after a police investigation had cleared her of any inappropriate actions, Governor Martz noted that members of the press continued to speculate about her motivations in the incident. Similarly, Governor Swift never escaped repeated mentions of ethics charges that had been filed against her as Massachusetts’ lieutenant governor.

“Backpage treatment.” Three of the women governors had their perceptions of disrespect from members of the press corps heightened by the way their actions were reported in local newspapers. Governor Collins sensed that reporters gave her less space because they doubted her viability as a candidate. After her election as governor, her coverage increased, although her press secretary personally had to request that members of the press refer to her as “Governor” rather than as “Mrs. Collins” in newspaper articles. Governor Martz found her historic election as the first female governor of the state buried in the mid-section of her hometown newspaper. When Governor Roberts was elected the first female in the state’s history to become majority leader of the Oregon House, the benchmark was not just buried, it never was mentioned at all. In fact, Governor Roberts received much more attention from outside Oregon than from within her state. She won a number of awards for her innovative policies and received attention from prestigious universities as well as federal officials that seemed to escape the notice or comprehension of local news officials.

Hostility to female leadership. Governor Collins believed men got more “second chances” than women. “You know, if a woman goofs up, she’s goofed up. That’s it.” One
example of Collins’ belief was Governor Jane Swift, who might have preferred indifference from members of the press rather than the treatment she received. From the very beginning of her term, Swift found herself castigated as a woman who used her motherhood to abuse her position as governor. No other female governor in this study endured the harsh critical reporting that was heaped on Swift for the duration of her short term in office. Articles about her often mentioned the ethics charges filed against her when she was lieutenant governor but did not always mention that one of the two charges had been dismissed by authorities; moreover, local reporters did not examine the interesting fact that ethics charges brought against Swift were unique to her status as a first-time female governor with young children, a circumstance clearly not anticipated by state standards for official conduct.

Governors Collins and Martz, initially unfamiliar with the give-and-take of a critical press corps, had routinely unpleasant encounters with reporters from newspapers. They were unprepared with short sound bites or rehearsed “messages-of-the-day” that more experienced politicians had learned over years of legislative or political encounters, including Governors Kunin, Roberts, Walker, and Whitman. Martz went so far as to refuse to answer any questions from print reporters, two in particular, unless they were written in advance. Kunin and Martz both pointed out that newspaper headlines could be completely misleading.

The governors had inconsistent views about the impact of television on their administrations. Governors Whitman and Walker regarded the medium as more superficial than print forms of media. Governor Kunin was infuriated when television reporters spoke over her picture, thus removing her direct access to her constituents. Governor Swift was not happy that so much of her image depended on attractive television pictures that emphasized hair, body shape, and interaction with the camera rather than a live audience. In contrast,
Governor Martz much preferred television news to the print medium because constituents could see her smile and grasp for themselves her personality and intent. They could see when she was joking. She felt certain print reporters were vindictive and did their utmost to print her comments in such a way that they did not reflect her intentions at all.

The women governors experienced the impact of news coverage from representatives of the mass media press corps personally, professionally, and legislatively. Under some circumstances, the stress of handling reporters’ questions was emotionally taxing but typical; and the women generally reported adapting over time to the give-and-take of the press conference ritual. Some governors confronted crises situations during their tenures in office. Afterward, they believed coverage of those incidents curtailed their professional careers due to widespread negative press coverage at the time.

Despite the challenges of dealing with reporters from the press corps, the former governors realized that media coverage was essential to their task of implementing policy. Even though they often felt misrepresented by members of the press, they did not expect favors. As Whitman said, “I always took the attitude ‘they’ve got a job to do, and I had a job to do.’”

**Painful consequences.** One interesting consequence of critical news coverage was the phenomenon of pain. The women governors used metaphors that crossed a spectrum of pain intensity to describe the impact from the negative press coverage they received, starting with feelings of powerlessness. For example, Governor Kunin’s earlier experience as a journalist made no difference in dealing with members of the press corps once she became governor. “They immediately look at you as another kind of human being . . . . You’re totally vulnerable” (Braden, 1996, p. 100). Governor Kunin also described her job as
“exhausting emotionally and physically.” Governor Collins described her reaction to critical reporting in terms of a minor physical pain. “I never wanted real thick skin. I wanted to be sensitive enough that I still feel the prick when something happens, because it keeps you well grounded.” Yet, the negative press reports confounded her, especially when taking aim at what she viewed as her successes saying, “It seemed to me . . . that even when I did good things, there were bad editorials; and so it’s hard.”

Governor Martz compared her experience with members of the press to a physical altercation; her painful feelings were tolerable only when she remembered some of the most physically grueling moments of her Olympic contests or her labor during childbirth. Governor Martz also believed that she was scrupulously honest with the press corps; yet, she never felt that her candor won her any points. In fact, Martz was often mocked in news editorials as unsophisticated and too inexperienced to play the political game. She questioned whether members of the media were actually in search of the truth.

Governor Roberts believed in thorough preparation for briefings with members of the press. However, she too felt the metaphorical wounds she had received as a result of her belief that “honesty is the best policy” with members of the press corps. “Will you get some scar tissue doing it? You bet.” Governor Kunin was as confident as Governor Roberts that her legislative initiatives were well researched and believed as well that political leaders should be forthright with the public. Yet, she agreed with Governor Martz that, “I probably would have done better if I hadn’t always answered the question.” (laughs)

**Crisis coverage.** Thanks to intense scrutiny by members of the mass media press corps, mistakes were amplified when they became highly publicized with consequences for policy initiatives and career advancement. Governor Whitman speculated that the negative
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fall-out from a picture of her “fake-frisking” an African American youth might have killed her chances for a Vice-Presidential nomination during the 2000 Republican National Convention (Whitman, 2005, pp. 139-140). Governor Collins felt her “reluctance to schmooze with the media” (Braden, 1996, p. 98) probably limited her ability to influence the way reporters slanted their coverage of her administration. Governor Swift had faced ethics charges as lieutenant governor that members of the Massachusetts press corps, particularly newspaper reporters, never let the public forget. Governor Martz also experienced particularly negative press coverage with charges of a cover-up on behalf of her chief-of-staff, and an ethics charge. Although cleared of both charges, her popularity began to sink with her poll numbers; and when faced by three challengers from her same party, Martz decided not to run.

Impacts of Gender

As has been pointed out several times throughout this study, women are not equally represented in elected leadership or governance. In contrast to male candidates or colleagues whose pursuit of leadership is typically accepted as nothing out of the ordinary, females seeking or holding leadership roles are, first and foremost, regarded as unusual because of their inescapable bodies. As Governor Roberts pointed out, “I thought it was pretty apparent I was a female.” The apparentness of being female became the first attribute of culling the women from any group of candidates or leaders. Such attention at times had beneficial as well as negative results for the participants in this study, all of whom perceived themselves to be “different” or treated differently from their male counterparts both during their campaigns and during their tenures in office. In this section, the impact of gender on the former women governors is examined in the following themes: 1) being “different”; 2) gender denial; 3)
being tough enough; 4) willing to sacrifice; 5) gender advantage; 6) isolation; 7) achievement and satisfaction; and 8) no more elections.

**Being “different.”** As the first women to assume the executive leadership role in their states, the women were acutely aware of scrutiny from members of the press as well as their constituents. Their sense of difference was not exclusively focused on appearance, however, but included perceptions of difference in standards of competent and ethical performance, professional dress and conduct, judgments about their leadership qualities as well as their expertise and suitability for executive office. In all cases, the women felt themselves evaluated differently than when compared to their male colleagues, even in some cases to their advantage. The sense of difference was thrust upon the women often in response to a host of stereotyped assumptions and questions from their colleagues as well as members of the public about how they would manage their responsibilities for state and family.

They also had a sense that they were trailblazing on behalf of other women who would look to them as future role models. Governor Kunin spoke of inventing herself as a leader, “sobered” (Kunin, 1994, p. 10) by the fact that her actions would have historical impact, especially on those who followed her into executive leadership. In the same vein, Governor Whitman noted that her role as executive officer of the state gave female legislators a new sense of confidence, a feeling that was definitely a different experience for them. As an example, she pointed to a women’s health bill that had been sponsored by several women in the legislature. “A number of men were co-sponsors on it, but the women sponsored it. They told me afterwards that they felt empowered to bring it forward . . . because they had a female chief executive.”
**Gender denial.** Ironically, a paradoxical situation arose for the women during their campaigns and after their elections to office. Their historic achievement as the first women to attain the governor’s office in their states had to be “played down” in an attempt to neuter the impact of their gender and their difference with constituents, legislators, and especially members of the mass media press corps. Governor Collins, who held office in the mid-1980s along with Kunin, sensed that her ability to issue orders was limited because “being the first woman governor, there were people who probably wouldn’t follow me if I just said, ‘Do it.’” As she explained, “I tried very hard to not be a ‘woman governor.’ I tried to be a governor to the people so I could . . . just let people realize that women could handle the job.” Governor Kunin pointed out that 95% of the governor’s job responsibilities are the same no matter the gender of the governor, but even 5% of difference could be significant in terms of the way she conducted her administration. She never discussed such matters publicly.

It has been a male club, and the men don’t like to admit it . . . . They’re so sensitive about that; it’s kind of amusing . . . . Doesn’t mean the club has been bad, but it’s been made up of boys; and here we were the girls, and that was different.

Governor Collins agreed that any emphasis on her historic gender role could distract her from meeting her goals in office. “If you make it a female thing, then everybody else is going to do so. Frankly, I tried to play it down.” Governor Roberts stressed that she never talked about being the first woman governor except in very private settings with certain women’s groups. She was careful to make sure no members of the press corps were present. “I never talked publicly about being the first woman governor of Oregon -- never, never, never, never, never.”
Walker found herself in an awkward situation when considering whether to run for the governor’s seat in her own right. She wanted very much to serve as a model and encourage other women to consider pursuing leadership roles as she had but found herself uncertain about how to advocate clearly for herself or other women in the future without turning the campaign for governor into “a total gender issue,” which she identified as a negative. A decade earlier, Governor Kunin learned to refrain from discussing gender during her campaigns and tenure in office because the subject was simply too volatile and too easily misunderstood. Similarly, Governor Swift never challenged the press corps on obsessive coverage of her looks or caricatures of her pregnancy. Governor Whitman quashed rumors that her husband was charting her tax policies by keeping him away from her office in the Capitol. Indeed, all of the women often swallowed whatever reporters dished out as the poison preferable to a public discourse on female leadership and double standards.

**Being tough enough.** Yet another paradoxical aspect of gender denial surfaced when the women governors, trading pant suits for ladylike skirts (but hiding their pearls), had to somehow prove they were “tough enough” to be governor. Every one of the study participants reported grappling with the issue of how to portray the appropriate measure of “toughness” to colleagues, constituents, and/or members of the mass media press corps. The question, “Is she tough enough?” was typically encountered during the first campaign and was usually measured by assessments of dress, appearance, delivery, and campaign style. During Whitman’s first run for New Jersey governor, she had refused to run negative advertisements against her opponent for the office, incumbent Democrat Jim Florio, despite the barrage of negativity his campaign had launched at her. “I think people had been afraid that I wasn’t tough enough to be governor because I hadn’t fought back at all.” Whitman
eventually countered with a negative spot of her own, which she defined as a public message that made fun of her opponent rather than dealing strictly with the facts of her platform. However, a clear definition of the word “tough” as applied to female leaders, especially the female governor, is lacking. Just what does feminine toughness look like?

Governor Kunin reflected at length on the question of how to express appropriate female strength because of her experiences interacting with members of the public on the campaign trail. She had lost her first bid for the governor’s office. On one occasion, a male audience member confronted her after a debate to request that she stop attacking her male opponent because, “you remind me of my wife” (Kunin, 1994, p. 280). In 1994, Kunin felt that there was “not yet an acceptable model for women to follow in defense of the truth” (Kunin, 1994, p. 280). A decade later, Kunin carved into being her own model of female leadership that did not include toughness at all; instead the model incorporated the qualities of being concise, decisive, and specific. Similarly, Governor Whitman concluded that people want to see strength in a woman leader defined as being “able to stand up to things.” Governor Roberts agreed. “I don’t think they [women] need to be tough. They can be strong, but they don’t need to be tough.”

Whatever the uncertainties about how to define toughness, the governors were quite clear about what the term was not. For example, Roberts strongly cautioned against women creating a public display in anger or using inappropriate, coarse language. She also counseled sensitivity toward gestures that could be perceived as “too stern, too much like a mother, too much like the nun or the teacher who taught them in school.” Governor Whitman declared that people do not want to see a woman leader display a “nasty, hard edge.” Governor Collins advised developing a professional demeanor that never became “shrill” or “abrasive.”
Ironically, Kunin found that female reporters with whom she interacted were themselves confronting the issue of “being tough enough.” As research supports (Weaver, 1997), Kunin felt women reporters were often more critical of her than were male reporters. “Sometimes women have to prove how tough they are as reporters and . . . almost bend over backwards to prove that they will not be biased in favor of women.” However, Kunin acknowledged that her perception of the overly harsh press coverage she and other women received likely would be met with skepticism from reporters. She noted, “They [reporters] would say it’s their job.”

Willing to sacrifice. Often, the women were aware that their aggressive commitment to reaching their goals could harm their political futures. Frequently, the women confronted the potentially negative impact of their policy choices by asking themselves, in effect, “If I’m not willing to take this action, who will?”

Governor Walker realized that with the decision to pursue tax reform she was stepping farther away from election in her own right to the governor’s office. “I knew this, but I felt I probably won't be governor; and, if not me, who?” Even while recounting the pain she experienced from news coverage she perceived as unfair, Governor Collins maintained, “But I keep saying, ‘Somebody’s got to do this.’” Reflecting on the enormous obstacles she faced with little political clout at a time when Massachusetts was suffering grave economic challenges and the 9/11 crisis, Governor Swift noted, “Somebody had to do it; but, at the time, it was hard to be effective and get attention in a way that would make me more successful in politics.”

When angry constituents demanded that Governor Roberts fight the federal government to save their old jobs in the lumber industry, the governor boldly promised new
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industries and new jobs. “If it meant that I was only going to serve one term as governor, at least I was going to do what I felt needed to be done during that period of time.” Roberts went on to beat back three recall initiatives before they made the ballot, the first governor in Oregon to face even one. And Governor Martz finally refused to worry about her public image in the press in favor of doing what she felt was the right thing for the State of Montana. “I decided not to fight all those things. I decided to keep my eyes on the goal; and that goal was to lower taxes, give more money to education to do the things that were right.”

Gender advantage. The women felt that, in some circumstances, their gender could provide some advantages to them as well. Collins noted that when she was the only female governor in the United States, she was a memorable figure, particularly during her trips to Japan. “They didn’t forget my name. They did not get me mixed up with the governors from Virginia or Connecticut, or Texas or Kansas.”

While most governors tended to shy away from bringing gender into a campaign, neither Governor Swift nor Governor Whitman shrank from taking advantage of their gender during their campaigns. In fact, both advised candidates to play to stereotypes when the pre-conceived image was to their advantage, although both also advised building well-rounded credentials. Governor Roberts also saw an advantage in being able to administer a “motherly” scolding to certain members of the press who might push beyond what she considered propriety, as in the case of her rumored tattoo. Roberts also felt her gender allowed her to speak about a subject concerning adolescent children that was generally avoided in public schools. Working with parent groups, educators, and school administrators, Governor Roberts received support and spoke often about the need for teen sexual responsibility and education about birth control.
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Of course, it [addressing the students about sex] was risky; but it was amazing how minimal - what could have been a huge thing. Maybe because I was a woman I could talk about it. Maybe a man would have had more trouble talking about what I was talking about.

Governor Whitman was able to parlay her gender into an advantage in the following way: During her first-ever campaign for the New Jersey US Senate seat, Whitman’s request for a debate with the favored male candidate was routinely ignored. She decided to leverage her status as a lightweight contender into a heavier class by claiming her rival must be afraid to debate a woman. She got instant results, and the debate she requested. “I only played the gender card a few times; but if you accuse someone of being biased against women, that gets their attention really fast.” However, she lost the election.

Isolation. All of the governors acknowledged that they had mentors on the way to the governor’s chair, usually male; but not all of the women continued those relationships once elected to executive office. Only one of the seven study participants, Governor Whitman, stated that she had male mentors to turn to for political advice once elected to the office of governor. Even when the women found support from male mentors during their early careers, the support was not always whole-hearted. Collins had campaigned on behalf of her mentor, Wendell Ford, who gingerly returned the favor. “He was one of my mentors who did not do a whole lot openly for me.” In contrast, Kunin’s legislative mentor was Representative Emory Hebard, a conservative Republican. In an era when members of opposite parties could be colleagues, Hebard lobbied for Kunin to replace him as chair of the House Appropriations Committee after he was elected state treasurer (Kunin, 2008, p. 55). Governor Walker credited her Speaker of the House as a mentor when she first entered
Utah’s legislature as a freshman and later other male colleagues counseled her on her run for lieutenant governor. Governor Roberts married her mentor, influential state legislator Frank Roberts, who unfortunately died mid-way through her term as governor. Governor Martz identified “my brother – he was really the mentor of my life.”

Governors Walker and Swift did not campaign for governor and, as a result, did not have strong alliances built with supporters to bolster their transition into leadership roles before they entered the governor’s office. However, even the women who had run and won the governor’s office on their own did not acknowledge close ties to either male or female mentors. In some cases seeking assistance from female mentors was a challenge because no other women were serving as governors. Governor Whitman, a Republican, did not confer with Governor Anne Richards, a Democrat, and the only other woman governor in office at the time. Governor Collins was the only woman governor in the US until Madeleine Kunin was elected mid-way through Collins’ term. From Montana, Governor Martz watched the drubbing of Governor Swift going on in the Massachusetts press with a great deal of sympathy; but she had pressing media-related issues of her own to attempt to resolve. Even though Governor Swift felt she could ask the former governor, who had been her mentor, for assistance, as Ambassador to Canada he was literally out of touch with her situation. Ironically, Swift believed her status as governor made her even more vulnerable if she sought a mentor, not less.

Because of the nature of my career path, I had not established a mentoring relationship with anybody prior to becoming pretty high-profile, and I think that’s a hard thing to do once you’re in [office]. When you’re the CEO, particularly when you’re the young female mom CEO . . . needing help is kind of perilous. And so, I did
Governor Swift found her husband, who farmed their property in rural Massachusetts, to be her most level-headed and compassionate counselor. In most cases, the women trusted their staff members for insight and counsel about the political issues they faced.

However, no staff member could ever fully comprehend the pressures the governor must confront. Moreover, no male mentor, even if available, could ever fully appreciate the circumstances a woman faced. In the years succeeding her term, Swift has considered often the formation of a women governors association.

I think it will happen at some point, but that would be . . . a really great way for women to have other women, or even just other women’s networks, that folks could call upon when they needed . . . external folks to bounce things off.

Along those lines, Governor Kunin advocated establishing a mentoring “bank” of women for women. “A mentoring bank would ask present and former elected officials, at all levels, and other prominent women in the community to agree to be listed as mentors” (Kunin, 2008, p. 211). Kunin suggested that as a member of the mentoring bank every elected woman make a pledge to find a candidate to replace herself if she decided not to run for reelection.

**Achievement and satisfaction.** Despite the challenges of each governor’s tenure, all of the women felt a sense of having set and accomplished important goals during their terms in office. In fact, for most of them, letting go was hard to do. Governor Kunin provided an honest appraisal of the strong attraction to remaining in office.

Public life provided ceremony and status and gave constant reassurance that one’s life had purpose and meaning. Only when I contemplated its loss did I fully understand power’s grip. Now I know why dictators fight to the death. I, too, was capable of
At the time she left office, Governor Martz was honored to be one of only seven Republican women governors in US history. Noting that her picture was in school history books, she agreed that the call to seek office was strong saying, “I would never have wanted to quit what I was doing even when I didn’t run again . . . [but] I was in Helena 10 years so it was time to come home.” Governor Roberts was not ready to retire at the end of her term. Had she been given time to grieve her husband’s death, she would have run again.

I would have liked to have had that second four years, but it was not the right time for me to run again. I already had a Democrat filed against me in the primary. The President of the Senate had filed against me, and “the boys” decided they wanted the governorship back.

Now past the age of 70, Governor Roberts enjoys “what I think of as the status of a senior statesperson now. I think time has shown that leadership is not just in the governor’s office, that it extended way beyond that.” Governor Collins is also involved in Kentucky economics as well as issues near and dear to her heart. “I have a legacy; it’s good for women. It’s something that’s very positive for women . . . . I’m still trying to do the things that I think will be helpful for women.”

No more elections. One area where the difference between male and female governors seemed uniquely drawn was seeking a second term. Only Governors Kunin and Whitman served more than one term. Contrary to the long-held traditional practice of party support for incumbents who happened to be male, Governors Martz, Roberts, Swift, and Walker noted that their fellow party members, both Democrat and Republican, had fielded candidates to run against them in their second-term primaries. “They [Opponents for office]
will take on a woman, I think, more readily than they will a male who’s already in the office. I think there’s some truth to that.” Governor Collins was limited to just one term.

None of the women continued to seek elected office after completing their terms. Roberts attributed this trend, in some ways, to another gender issue that is not discussed often. She believed that women are much more limited by their age when they want to run for office.

Men can stay in public office and run for public office when they’re much older. Women have more trouble as they age being accepted in public office. The fact that you’re a grandmother is not particularly an asset.

Governor Collins reported that her friends and neighbors have asked her to run for Mayor of Lexington and other offices, but she steadily rebuffed the suggestions saying, “’Let’s let somebody else have some of that fun.’ I’ve had my share. And I’m older; I don’t have the drive.” Collins thought a lot about running for office after she left the governor’s desk but had promised herself she would not run as long as “my mother or my husband’s mother was alive. I don’t want them getting up and reading the newspapers and worrying . . . mothers worry about that kind of stuff. The kids are OK, but now I’ve got grandkids.” However, Collins stated that if she “ever got fire in the gut again,” she would run.

Governor Martz observed that since leaving office, “there’s not a day that someone doesn’t spot me somewhere and say, ‘Oh, I wish you were still in office. Would you run again?’ And my answer is, ‘Why?’” Martz considers politics today too polarized to entice her participation. She is content to reflect on her experiences and move on.

It was a wonderful, wonderful journey. Even in spite of . . . those negatives, the three or four negatives that blew up, you could let those blow you out of the water or you
can keep your eye on your goal. Which one are you going to take? . . . . I’ve had a great life. I look back, and I think of what I’ve been able to do.

Governor Kunin stated that leaving office should not be seen as “giving up” because “another life exists outside of politics.” Still, when she left office after six years of service, she reported feeling a heavy sense of loss.

I was mourning the loss of the quest. Ironically, it was the quest to govern differently, as a woman, that had given me the courage to enter the political world, and, ultimately it was my womanhood that helped to alienate me from that world. (Kunin, 1994, p. 13)

Even after retiring from office, the women continue to serve in various capacities. Some have established private foundations to pursue interests ranging from environmental issues to sustainable communities or fair housing. All continue to speak publicly at various conferences or when called upon for comment on local issues in their homes states. Governor Kunin went on to serve in President Clinton’s Administration as Deputy Secretary of the US Department of Education and later as Ambassador to her birthplace, Switzerland. She, like the other former women governors, has “never given up the kind of spirit that led me into public life: Still wanting to make a difference, still wanting to have an impact.”

Interestingly, Governor Swift said she has used the power of the governor’s office more effectively on behalf of families, working mothers, and women’s advancement since completing her term than when she actually held office. Like other governors, she is still interested in making a difference.

There [were] a lot of other things for which I was responsible that I couldn’t build support and attention for because of the gender and cultural issues. But now I actually
feel it [her term as governor] gives me an enormous opportunity to make a difference.

Governor Roberts agreed that staying active on many fronts that are important to her personally is critically important, including women’s rights and gay rights. Her words echo those of her female cohort: “I have continued to make a difference.”
Chapter 8: Implications, Recommendations, and Conclusions

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to determine from the personal perspectives of female former governors whether gender had an impact on their leadership experiences and, if so, how. The women participants were asked to describe their individual leadership styles as influenced by their family backgrounds; expressed by their relationships with staff and legislative colleagues; their approach to education policy interests; the coverage they received from members of the mass media press corps. These areas were assumed likely to reveal how the governors perceived that their gender influenced their leadership actions.

I used narrative inquiry within the conceptual framework of feminist ethnographic and media theory to gather qualitative data from seven female former governors. Resultant data were organized into categories that corresponded to female and male leadership characteristics determined by earlier researchers as discussed in Chapter 2. Data were then coded and analyzed into categories that corresponded to the conceptual framework, as depicted in Chapter 2. The study was based on the research questions described in Chapter 3, which were answered by the findings presented in Chapter 7.

The results of this study have provided insight into the personal perspectives of female former governors. The women in this study uniformly believed that their gender had an impact on their leadership experiences, which they perceived to be quite different from that of their male colleagues in the following areas: 1) their leadership styles; 2) their approach to public education policy; and 3) the coverage they received from members of the mass media press corps. Further details are supplied in the summary below.
Summary Response to Research Questions

The research questions in this study provided the foundation for participants’ narrative responses from which emergent themes for analysis were derived. A brief summary of the research questions and the frames they provided for discussion are presented below.

1. How do female governors perceive the impact of their gender on their leadership experiences? Research questions were open-ended and invited the former governors to respond broadly to the experiences that were most important to them and carried the greatest impact. The governors discussed their relationships with staff members and legislative colleagues as well as their pursuit of legislative goals. The discussion of gender prompted inclusion of their childhood memories, family influences, and their progression through maturing relationships as well as career experiences to adult leadership roles. The governors’ personal experiences as women were influential in shaping their policy agendas as were their political ideologies, the historical events that occurred during their growth to adulthood, and the social as well as cultural forces of family, region, and nation that were most influential during their lifetimes. The fact that they were all exposed to the feminist ideals of equality and agency that were culturally transmitted during their youth seems to have influenced their desire to serve their communities and to do so uniquely (i.e., to lead “as women”) even if they did not regard themselves, or wish to be labeled, as feminist.

The female governors in this study all reported their leadership style as collaborative, using descriptive words such as team oriented and staff responsive, particularly in the formative stages of policy initiatives. They typically distinguished their leadership style as significantly different from their male governor counterparts, to whom they ascribed less interest in hiring women and minorities, hierarchical and off-putting relationships with
subordinates, and authoritarian or “good old boy” relationships with members of the legislature. The women were also keenly aware that they had to “work harder” to be accepted as a competent female governor, and that the stakes were higher for them if they made a mistake. Analysis of the narratives resulting from this broad discussion led to the organizing themes of desires and consequences that were applied to their leadership experiences.

2. On what factors do women governors focus when generating public education policy initiatives? The women governors were bound by their state constitutions to provide quality educational opportunities for the children and some adults in their states. Aside from constitutional requirements, the women assigned high priority to public education policy, a domain that Carroll (2000) revealed to be of substantial interest to both men and women leaders.

Personal experiences as mothers influenced the women’s beliefs overall that they were more sensitive than their male counterparts to such nuances as the importance of sleep, healthy diet, and other requirements of nurturing to make learning possible for children. They also described themselves as more committed to reforming education to benefit teachers and children, rather than using the term “reform” to justify mere cost-cutting. Although Governors Swift and Whitman chose policy approaches influenced by conservative Republican ideology that contradicted the more progressive policies of the other governors, they still perceived a difference between their approaches to education and those of their male colleagues.

The women were also influenced by their personal educational experiences when generating policy initiatives. For example, Governor Whitman’s stint at private schools gave her a strong belief in the efficacy of school uniforms, same-sex environments, and other
characteristics she later admired when authorizing charter schools, including the absence of teacher unions. Governor Martz, who did not share a passion for education and, in fact, dropped out of college eventually to work in her husband’s garbage business, nonetheless sought additional funding for public education. She had a great affinity and understanding for the loneliness of Montana’s far-flung school districts; therefore, she supported enhanced funding for teacher development and other incentives to encourage teacher loyalty to the state’s educational system. As a Born-Again Christian, she also heavily supported home schooling.

Governors Collins, Kunin, Roberts, Swift, and Walker were passionate advocates of public education who attended public schools long before President Reagan discredited them as centers of American crisis; these five women sought additional funding for schools, sometimes at great risk to their careers. Political ideology was a powerful influencer for Republicans Swift and Whitman, strong advocates for students who saw the public school system as “broken” and worked to revise progressive educational theories radically in favor of conservative-preferred standardized testing and accountability systems.

Whatever their political differences, the former women governors overall supported education as the acknowledged pathway to their own success. They clearly understood the importance of a well-educated citizenry and work force for their states.

3. **Do women governors perceive gender-bias in the press coverage they receive from members of the mass media; and, if so, how does the perceived bias affect them?** Images of women are pervasive across all forms of American mass media including news, entertainment, and advertising. According to Lindner (2004), a relationship exists between the stereotypes about the proper roles for women and the ways women are portrayed that
influence how women are eventually treated by others. For example, images of women that emphasize sexuality are linked to increased aggression in males. Since images emphasizing female sexuality are those most commonly communicated through mass media advertising and entertainment, professional women running for elective offices clearly start at a disadvantage termed an “image deficit” (Niven & Zilber, 2001b, p. 159). In fact, women leaders may be parodied as incompetent or overly dictatorial for entertainment value, a phenomenon particularly powerful during the 2008 presidential campaign when Hillary Clinton and Sarah Palin were regularly lampooned on Saturday Night Live (Flowers & Young, 2010). When Palin later announced her resignation from the Alaska Governor’s Office, she cited as part of her reason the mockery her family had endured (Rucker & Saslow, 2009, July 4). Since role models of women as leaders are rare in American society, images portraying female leaders in the least flattering manner are not easily counterbalanced by more accurate depictions of professional women, especially when male leaders remain the dominant stereotype.

Every woman governor in this study reported that the coverage they received from members of the mass media press corps was critical to their success in being perceived as credible to constituents and members of other publics. The women were all aware that members of the mass media press corps did not have many models of female leadership to consult when covering their campaigns or their tenures in office. Understandably, all of the former governors reported some degree of distrust and anxiety. Governor Walker expressed the least concern about perceived gender bias and stereotyping by members of the press as well as a perceived preference among reporters for stories emphasizing conflict.
Every governor, including Governor Walker, cited examples of negative coverage from the mass media press corps that she had received or reported fears of the negative coverage that she might receive as a result of her gender. These incidences of negative coverage often caused the governors emotional upsets, since they felt powerless to influence the ways they were presented to the public. Their distant, often discordant, relationships with members of the mass media press corps, excepting Governor Walker, were the result of attempts to protect themselves from making a misstatement that could end up in the headlines. However, their inability or refusal to glad-hand as “one of the boys” meant they had little influence with reporters, a situation that ultimately hampered their clear communications with the public regarding their administrative competence and/or policy intentions. Nevertheless, except for Governors Martz and Swift, most of the women were able to gain a sense of confidence by the end of their terms in dealing with members of the press corps and even reported a semblance of mutual respect. This relationship seemed possible only after the women’s performance in office had proved to be competent overall.

4. How do other influencers, such as legislators, staff, family, and coverage from the mass media, affect their leadership experiences? The seven governors in this study held office from 1983 to 2005. Governors Collins and Kunin served during an era that preceded the heavily polarized nature of today’s politics. They were, without doubt, the most effective in forming alliances and coalitions that supported their legislative initiatives.

Governors Roberts and Whitman held office in the 1990s, when the Republican Revolution was gathering momentum in Congress and across the nation. Roberts, a Democrat, was stymied by her Republican House when she attempted to reform the tax code to provide a more secure funding stream for Oregon schools, even though her legislators
understood full well the stakes. Without her creative cobbling together of a jobs bill that focused on education and training, Oregon schools would have truly faced a monumental crisis. Governor Whitman fared much better with her strong Republican majority in both Houses of the legislature in revising state education systems and the tax code.

Governors Martz, Swift, and Walker governed after the turn of the 21st century, when enhanced partisanship began to deadlock most legislative bodies. Swift faced a strong Democratic legislature that was loathe to cooperate with her cost-cutting efforts to balance the state budget and found her guilty of the appearance of an ethics violation for having aids babysit for her children. However, even if the legislature reflects a clear party majority, philosophical differences exist within particular parties (Beyle, 1996), which the popular Governor Walker encountered when her Republican majority refused to nominate her for governor. Martz was able to reduce environmental regulations and increase funding for education in Montana, to some extent, thanks to her Republican majority. But, she lost on her bid for a new tourism tax to help fund her big ticket request for a $40 million withdrawal from the state’s rainy day fund aimed at school improvements; she ultimately ended up cutting services.

All of the women professed themselves satisfied and proud of their achievements by the time they left the governor’s office, although none of them ever ran for another elected office again. Governors Kunin and Whitman went on to administrative posts in the Clinton and Bush administrations. However, out of the seven women in this study, only Governor Kunin ended up retiring from politics on her own terms.

Many of the governors’ challenges became, in essence, bloodless battlefields. Interestingly, the power of their office did not protect them from these five problems for
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which they were unable to develop viable solutions: 1) awkward relationships with members of the mass media who demanded only easy answers; 2) their own mistakes and errors of judgment; 3) their painstaking family sacrifices; 4) the ideological or competitive extremes of their parties; and, most certainly, 5) the necessity of leaving office before their service missions were fulfilled.

The problems that the women governors faced, cited above, might seem extraordinarily mundane, given that one expects an elected executive-level leader, male or female, to be extraordinary. The impact of the mundane multiplies, however, when factoring in the expectation that these women should be, would have to be, more extraordinary than their men colleagues; especially when one considers that, in some respects, all of the women seemed to incite at the very least insensitivity, and at the worst, remarkable indifference or hostility from members of the press and from their legislative colleagues, particularly when they made mistakes. Whatever the women’s ethical lapses, none was comparable in nature to the notable character flaws of their male counterparts including President Bill Clinton’s infidelity (Baker & Harris, 1998, August 18), New York Governor Eliot Spitzer’s illegal visits to prostitutes (Trotta, 2008, March 12), or Congressman Newt Gingrich’s inappropriate fundraising, for which the Congressional Ethics Committee fined him $300,000 (Murphy, 2011 December 20); an extremely short list of the significant transgressions perpetrated by men, after which they may or may not have been chastised or resigned, but eventually returned to the public arena.

Although all of the female former governors in this study believed that their gender did, indeed, influence their performance, none of the women used this factor as an excuse for their circumstances or for any of the challenges they faced. In fact, women themselves are
often the last to notice the strictures that bind them, since patriarchal forces curtailing female advancement are assumed to be the norm (Durst-Lahti & Kelly, 1995; Palmer & Simon, 2006; Rosenthal, 1998). However, a review of the circumstances encountered by the women governors in this study during their tenures in office revealed systemic fault lines that obviously disadvantaged women. The most dramatic case was that of Governor Swift, whose maternity painfully illustrated the favored male gender systems of the governor’s office.

Examples of Gendered Leadership Experiences

As a result of my privileged access to these unique women, I was allowed to report their individual intimate thoughts and feelings, often formerly private, about the impact of their experiences as wives, daughters, and mothers as well as their transitions into elected leadership. The ways in which the women reflected on their own gender-influenced tenures in office, the very words and phrases they used, often reflected unmistakable similarities across the cohort from their experiences on the campaign trail to their occupancy of the executive office. The female governors uniformly felt “different” from their male counterparts; the women were keenly aware that the members of various publics regarded them as women first and leaders second. They were automatically disadvantaged by their novelty in the larger American collective narrative that defines preferred leadership by applying a strictly male model. Ultimately, the women in this study believed their gender made an indelible impact on their leadership roles, reputations, effectiveness, and futures as elected officers of the state or nation.

A significant body of research has established that, in fact, gendered political systems and structures have existed and do exist at the state and national levels in the US (Jewell & Whicker, 1994; Kenski & Falk, 2004; Lawless, 2009) and that mass media press coverage
has been determined to exhibit gender bias even today (Braden, 1996; Dolan, Deckman, & Swers, 2010; Kahn, 1994). The following gendered examples of the former women governors’ leadership experiences were determined to be significant in supporting or contributing to current research:

1. None of the women grew up seeing themselves as leaders or entertaining dreams of political leadership. Once encouraged to run for office, the women perceived service to others and the opportunity “to lead as a woman” to be of critical importance and a prime motivator for seeking a leadership role.

2. All of the governors emphasized the importance of collaborative leadership and provided examples of “giving credit” to deserving staff or colleagues; all but Governor Martz were committed to hiring or appointing women and minorities to positions within their administrations.

3. All of the women believed they approached public education policy with a greater understanding of the issues involved than did their male counterparts. All demonstrated consistent willingness to risk or to innovate in order to problem solve on behalf of their policy initiatives, even at the expense of their future political careers.

4. All of the women, except Governor Walker, perceived gender bias in the amount, placement, quality, and slant of the news coverage they received, with press attention overly focused on stories about their novelty as leaders, their appearance, clothing, family status, and so on. All of the governors feared negative coverage if their gender became a major focus in a news story.
5. The women believed uniformly that they must carefully monitor language, demeanor, and dress in order to “play down” their gender and maintain credible leadership, particularly with members of the press corps.

6. The need to “find voice,” in other words, self-expression that characterized strength/toughness, honesty, and knowledge, particularly in dealing with the mass media press corps, was considered a critical skill by all the women.

7. The women believed that they had to work harder than men to become governor and that the consequences of their mistakes in office were regarded more significantly than those of their male counterparts.

8. The women accepted the fact that personal sacrifice and pain were a consequence of trailblazing the path for women to executive leadership; however, they all worried about, and tried to protect, their family members as well as friends from the negative impact of their jobs.

9. Four of the female governors (Martz, Roberts, Swift, and Walker) experienced abandonment by their party leadership during second-term primaries when other same-party members were allowed to challenge their incumbency.

10. None of the women ran for another elected office after leaving the governor’s chair; all except Governor Kunin had considered another run for governor or another office but felt hampered by age or uncertainty about the political opportunities and/or personal costs.

Discussion

This inquiry involving the seven women who became the first female governors in their states was a study of historic highs and sometimes shocking lows. Their experiences
were not all the same; yet, all of the women as leaders and governors were exposed to patterns of sexism and gender bias that are striking and consistent.

**Gender and identity narrative.** Each of the women in this study is a singular individual. Although all of the women share the similarity of Caucasian ancestry, each of their lives originated in a different part of the nation or the world during different eras of political turmoil or influence; moreover, they are from different backgrounds of family, religion, class, and education levels. Five of these women were elected to the highest executive office in their states. Two of the women succeeded male governors who vacated the seat. Yet, their narratives revealed accordant themes in a story they alone could tell, unique to their sex and to their individual lives, for no one else in their states had come before them in their roles as female governors. Cultural forces, not all of them known, understood, or anticipated, were unleashed when the women dared to challenge the image of the man as the appropriate leader and the woman as the submissive follower.

As Rabuzzi (1982) pointed out, the narrative of female life is not the same as that of the male. The classic story structure of the male Hero’s Journey, of questing to conquer, does not apply to women, whose duty through the ages has resided within the private sphere (i.e., maintaining the home and rearing the children while waiting for the male to return from the quest, the battle, the 9-to-5 p.m. job). The woman’s role of “repetition [of household tasks] and waiting” (Donovan, 2004, p. 186) does not inspire the compelling story line of the hero. Not surprisingly, traditional story telling is considered “a masculine construct” (Rabuzzi, 1982, p. 159) because typically only men are cast as heroes. However, the women in this study who sought and attained the governor’s office for reasons other than political conquest did not conform to either classical model of life story. As Governor Kunin phrased it, her
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personal mission had been “the quest to govern well, to govern differently as a woman” (Kunin, 1994, p. 12).

Women who are interested in becoming leaders in any capacity or in any field must confront the fact that the prevailing model of leadership is defined as a male-oriented one (Duerst-Lahti & Kelly, 1995; Lorber, 2005). As has been earlier noted, many women do not consider elected or appointed leadership to be a viable option due to the lack of female examples to the contrary. As research has shown (Sanbonmatsu, Carroll, & Walsh, 2009), “women candidates more often need to be recruited because they usually do not decide to run on their own” (p. 3). Thus, the recognition of themselves as potentially electable leaders was a necessary prerequisite to the women in this study taking the first step into a political career. Governors Collins, Kunin, Martz, Roberts, and Walker all related stories of being approached by a spouse or friends and colleagues who suggested that they run for office. Even Governors Swift and Whitman, members of families with strong political ties who had been active in campaigns throughout their young lives, left college seeking careers in fields other than elected leadership.

Indeed, so deeply ingrained is the male-dominant image of leadership that integrating the “being of a leader” into the psyche requires more than attainment of elected office. As a prime example, Governor Roberts did not recognize herself as a leader, despite winning three statewide elections and serving as majority leader in the Oregon House of Representatives, until after leadership training at Harvard University. “It was a huge awakening for me – politically, personally, emotionally. It was just amazing! ‘Look at me; I’m a leader!’”

Public and private narrative identities. Reflections on the impact of collective narratives are important because, of course, all of the women governors arrived in their state
executive offices as products of their regional and national cultures. They had already confronted sexism in various forms throughout their youth and dismissed its significance as an obstacle to attaining their goals. Each of the women approached the governor’s office with a sense of purpose and anticipation, a sense of what was possible. They entered carrying a very personal “narrative identity” (Thornham, 2007), a way that they “construct[ed] a concept of self through which to act in the world” (Thornham, 2007, p. 73). They were conscious of the measure the world would take of them as women leaders, and they were eager to prove they were up to the challenge.

At the same time, the women were confronting a “public narrative” (Thornham, 2007) about the role of women in society, leadership roles, and the political ideology of their particular party. All of these narrative strands share deep historical roots defined and dominated by the male model. Public narratives “are constructed by and in social power structures; they constitute the culturally available repertoire of narratives within which we are invited to locate ourselves and through which we structure our own stories of identity” (Thornham, 2007, p. 73). Baker (2006) cautioned that personal and public identities are merely parts of a much bigger collective or meta-narrative, transmitted through a variety of media outlets including television, film, and literature as well as organizations such as legislatures, news rooms, professional associations, education establishments, and other groups. Collective narratives are embedded in culture, acting to constrain or to shape personal and public identities, often outside the individual’s own consciousness.

On a conscious level, all of the women were aware that public narratives of leadership did not include a chapter on female governors. The women were writing such an entry as they stepped into the office for the first time--into a rarified atmosphere breathed for
centuries by men and men only. They were not na"ïve about the existence of sexism. They knew they were shattering the glass ceiling that had previously domed the executive office. Once again, they believed they were adequately prepared to sweep up the pieces of glass and move on. They all understood the legislative process and strategies. They were prepared to work hard and accept sacrifice in order to be a trailblazer for other women.

Additionally, the women governors anticipated certain fears and objections to their leadership from some members of their publics. They knew they would be compared to men but did not want to try to act like men; in fact, they were anxious to demonstrate the positives of female leadership. All of the women wished to portray themselves as feminine; yet, at the same time they had a strong sense of gender vulnerability that prompted them to be extremely strategic about their dress, hair, public statements, and comportment. They made jewelry, cosmetic, and “style” choices to please their publics rather than themselves – as Governor Roberts pointed out, men could wear a big belt buckle or gaudy boots; but a flashy pair of earrings would be political suicide for a woman. Such concerns were especially relevant in an age when communications to members of their publics were filtered through biased mass media forms.

However, their surface consciousness of the challenges they faced did not, could not, arm them entirely for the fight against their own cultural programming. As Thornham (2007) pointed out, “certain narratives of femininity — those of romance fiction, for example — even though they no longer reflect either our personal experience or contemporary forms of social organization . . . remain powerful” (p. 75). Clearly, the women brought to the governor’s office their own definitions of personal privacy and obligations to family, professional leadership, dress, and behavior, and gendered limitations beyond which they
feared to tread; those understandings were shaped by the mores and norms they experienced during the eras in which they grew to adulthood. In essence, the governors created their own feedback loops whereby they formulated strategies to respond to the concerns they believed their publics possessed. For example, Governor Collins assumed she could not pick up the telephone and give a directive to a bureaucrat in her administration because no one would follow an order given in that manner by a woman governor. However, Collins may have felt uncomfortable wielding power directly, choosing instead a consensus-management style “emphasizing a group effort” (Rosenthal, 1998, p. 65).

Governor Walker believed she could not speak powerfully on behalf of women’s issues because she knew a female legislator who had been sidelined from power as a result of her feminist comments. Governors Roberts and Martz believed that women were freer to express emotions, even tears, because of their womanhood, while Governor Kunin reserved tears only for intimate moments with her staff members. At other times, of course, “public opinion” was direct, as when Governor Roberts received negative mail about wearing pantsuits, or Governor Swift surrendered to a makeover hairdo to find some peace from press caricatures.

The real and imagined public responses to their gender not only constrained the women governors but fundamentally confused them; they wanted to lead as women while “playing down” their gender. They could find no way to address sexism without sounding weak or complaining. They all concluded that the issues of female stereotypes were better left unsaid and certainly unaddressed with a potentially hostile press. Despite convictions that they would be able to handle sexist reactions to their leadership, they were handicapped by their inability to address the cultural narratives that, according to patriarchal or romanticized
definitions of femininity, placed their achievements outside the grasp of “real” women and, further, branded their efforts even to seek office as inappropriate. Their dearest wish, to prove capable of meeting the challenge of the governor’s office and of serving as an example for other women, could not be articulated. Their refuge was hard work, long hours, and a commitment to the future. They trusted history to speak for them and set the record straight in the future.

**Implications and Recommendations for Policy, Practice, and Further Research**

In 2012, the relationship between career Republicans and Democrats had devolved into partisanship so bitter as to be compared to the passions of America’s Civil War (Brownstein, 2007). The bitterness led to Congressional gridlock and trickled down to sear the emotions of the general population as well. Conflicts with the parties were exacerbated by extreme groups like members of the Tea Party and Libertarians who pushed the Republican party to the far right, a movement that has made irrelevant President Bill Clinton’s efforts during his term to bring Democrats more to the political center. Far-right Republicans with fundamentalist Christian leanings contrasted sharply with many Americans on the opposite side of the political spectrum who held quite liberal, secular views (Campbell & Putnam, 2011).

As discussed at length in Chapter 2, the roots of this ideological conflict lie even deeper in American history, from the days of the first colonists on the continent. Interestingly, the Puritans who arrived here to escape religious persecution promptly introduced their own religious doctrine; but then they drove from their colonies those who would believe differently (Morgan, 1958). Regardless, the early colonists were all imbued with a strong individualism that resonates today in contemporary divisions of the American
Interestingly, as Jacob Needleman, professor of philosophy at San Francisco State University explained at some length in *American Soul* (2003), contemporary interpretations of individualism, happiness, and freedom have strayed far from the understandings of the Founding Fathers who established this nation. Needleman contended in an interview with CBS Sunday Morning contributor Mitch Horowitz (2002) that today’s use of the word “freedom” actually cheapens the intentions of the Founders who wanted Americans to be:

. . . free to search for their own truth, for the truth of conscience, for a relationship to what is highest and best within themselves and under God. The founders were not connected to any particular sectarian religion, which they felt had degenerated into dogmatism and mental tyranny. They wanted people to be free to search for their own truth and to be able to associate with one another in a way that allowed that search to take place. (Horowitz, 2002, para. 6)

In other words, Americans today should ask the nature of their freedom. Needleman argued that the freedom to buy what we want or to say what we want, regardless of the welfare of others, cheapens America’s great national purpose. As discussed at length in Chapter 2, the 19th-century feminists who first demanded that women be considered equally as citizens threatened the uneasy truce between the conservative and liberal interpretations of American freedom and citizenship. The issue of equality was eventually extended to include former slaves and other people of color born on the American continent. Needleman claimed the first feminists took a sort of corrective action to make the nation live up to the Founders’ intentions, if not their written words. Equality for women and slaves was not necessarily
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anticipated when the nation was young; but the thrust of the phrase “all men are created equal,” in the American Constitution eventually was applied broadly.

In the election of 2008, Americans witnessed the first real contest among a Black man, a White man, and a White woman for the presidency, which was hugely symbolic of the cultural forces of freedom and individualism that have evolved to make such a contest possible. At the same time, the historic occasion provided targets as well as a forum for the racism and sexism still at play in this nation. As Nelson (2009) stated, “The contest elevated, yet simultaneously sublimated, Americans’ struggle with race, gender, religion and national origin” (Nelson, 2009, p. 743).

While women leaders are more frequently seen in the workplace and in political office in 2012 than has been the case in the past, more Americans still prefer male to female bosses according to Eagly (2007). Moreover, men are more likely to devalue women who hold traditionally masculine jobs or roles.

As a sampling of American voters revealed just before the 2008 election, “only slightly more than half of Americans indicate that the country is ready to have a female president. Because of the remaining prejudicial barriers, women face challenges as leaders that men do not face” (Eagly, 2007, p. 9). Thus, Clinton began her campaign at a disadvantage. For example, Clinton disappointed progressive supporters when she refused to state that she had voted incorrectly to authorize the war in Iraq; but she risked appearing weak and indecisive on national defense if she changed her mind, a stereotype she tried to avoid and one Obama did not face as a man (Carroll, 2009).

The Clinton-Obama contest illustrated that female stereotypes continue to influence voter opinion. Patriarchal power that still will not accept women as qualified or acceptable to
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represent the US as its President continues to exist within American culture. The 2008 race also pointed out that very little substantive difference existed in the qualifications for office between Clinton and Obama except for gender, especially when considering the strange possibility that Obama was actually advantaged by his race. Ironically, Clinton lost support among younger women who were not inspired by her or her feminism (Carroll, 2009).

The debate over feminism in the 21st century is often to define the term. The gender-biased attacks on Clinton and Palin in 2008 confused the discussion about the role of feminism because the hostile comments were often directed by younger women at Clinton and by traditional feminists at Palin. Groups such as the National Organization for Women (NOW) were accused of selling out the goals of female equality and choice on behalf of a far-left or liberal agenda.

Today, many women believe feminism is no longer needed to establish a woman’s right to do as she pleases – stay home and have children, or seek an education, a career, or eventually all of the above if not all at once. Younger women born in the 1980s onward tend to believe that gender is no longer a limitation (Donovan, 2004) and that initiatives separating the sexes are “sexist, not feminist” (Carolina Journal, 2011, para. 5). Further, young conservatives like S.E. Cupp have claimed that men are as qualified to speak on behalf of women’s issues as are women; Cupp saw discussions about difference on any level as inherently divisive.

I think the success of feminism is that we don’t need it any more. We should be acknowledging just how far women have come, just how many choices we have. And instead, what I think a lot of militant feminists are doing is spending time highlighting our differences, drawing lines in the sand between conservative women and liberal
women — what makes a woman a woman, which women are traitors to their gender. I don’t think that advances a productive storyline. *(Carolina Journal*, 2011, para 5)

Although a great deal of current research seems to support the argument that differences between men and women are less inherent than culturally influenced *(Hyde, 2005; Rosenthal, 1998)*, the fact is that men and women are still not on an equal footing in America. Despite the fact that women are overtaking men in acquiring the educational credentials considered necessary to enter the pipeline of political leadership, women are still disadvantaged through lower paychecks, higher rates of domestic abuse, and far less direct representation in state legislatures and Congress. Today, American feminist groups are largely concerned with preserving reproductive rights during the 2012 presidential campaign.

Increasing numbers of conservative lawmakers have been elected across the nation who are determined to make laws that remove what some women have presumed to be their rights. The false confidence that women are truly equal invites circumstances such as those that befell Governor Jane Swift, who believed she could inspire respect rather than the firestorm she encountered when she gave birth to twins while in office. These are the circumstances that perhaps concern Second Wave or even younger feminists, which anti-feminist women either do not address, or perhaps support because of conservative viewpoints.

As noted earlier, former female governors in this study who grew to adulthood during the Second Wave period did not evidence overtly feminist policy initiatives nor did they emphasize their battles with sexism to attain their positions. Once inhabiting the governors’ chairs, they all spent most of their time on the same jobs as their male counterparts. They did not feel the job demanded any qualities distinguished by biology. They did initially
experience some sense of dislocation from their social programming, to which given time, they generally were able to process and adapt. However, they did not demand that the job adjust to them structurally. They were eager to prove that such accommodations were not necessary. Their attempts to play down their gender in office meant that they sidestepped direct confrontation with the issues of inequality for women.

They believed they could do more for women by proving, without fanfare, that women could be trusted with the reins of power. Ironically, the role models they provided may contribute to the conviction of younger women that feminism is no longer needed, that women leaders provide nothing substantially different from men in the policy arena, and that those socio-economic differences women may suffer in comparison with men are not the province of government to address.

Today, debates over the difference made by the inherent natures of men and women may collide with the need to stand united in the face of the greater challenges of our moment in history. Warring political factions have left us powerless and paralyzed as a citizenry. Setting aside what divides us to appreciate the nation we have demands more of us than consumerism and the freedom to shout our opinions so loudly that we do not have to listen to all viewpoints. Perhaps it is time to turn again to philosopher Jacob Needleman, who urged us in his 2002 interview to understand the meaning of the sort of “happiness” our Founding Fathers charged us to pursue:

America can foster the search to become authentic human beings, for conditions that make human beings happy. The pursuit of happiness does not mean the pursuit of pleasure . . . . The quality that distinguishes Americans is their goodwill. (Horowitz, 2002, para. 12)
Happiness is realized through being fulfilled as human beings, acting together on behalf of what is good or, in other words, according the Needleman, virtue. Not only the original Founding Fathers, but leaders like Abraham Lincoln, Susan B. Anthony, and Frederick Douglass, all urged America forward by appealing to a sense of humanity, generosity, and conscience. Anthony did not attain the vote for women by herself. Lincoln did not free the slaves with just his pen. Douglass did not escape slavery to hide in Canada. Every one of America’s great leaps forward depended on common commitment to a great social goal between both men and women. All of the former women governors in this study can certainly stand as examples of American citizens who sought, as Needleman so eloquently stated, “a relationship to what is highest and best within themselves and under God” (Horowitz, 2002, para. 6). Perhaps such a relationship explains why the former women governors say they are at peace with their achievements despite the many frustrations, missteps, or unrealized opportunities they experienced while in office.

Policy impacts. As discussed earlier in the literature review, a profound dichotomy exists between conservative free-market Republicans and the progressives or liberal Democrats regarding education ideology; both interpret the purposes of public education quite differently. While none of the female governors in this study could be characterized as free-market conservatives, most of the women, including the Republicans, could be described as progressive in their attitudes toward public schools, meaning that they believed the institution of public education is critical to the transmission of democratic values. At the same time, all of the women believed that education is also a critical method of preparing young people for productive lives as American citizens, including their entry into the world of work.
Governors Kunin and Collins left office before the 1990 push for school accountability produced legislative demands for statewide curriculum and student-testing programs. They also avoided the tax-cutting initiatives that began with the Congressional Republican Revolution in 1994. Governor Kunin later stated that she was not necessarily opposed to educational standards, only to the NCLB methods that relied exclusively on test scores and punished schools for poor scores rather than assisting them to improve. Both Governors Kunin and Collins left their states with reform packages that included more dollars and more support for teachers, extended educational opportunities for students, and ledgers with balanced budgets.

Governors Roberts and Whitman were on opposite sides of the political spectrum. Governor Whitman was appalled by the poor performance and condition of several New Jersey schools. She was persuaded by thinking advanced by conservative Republican think-tanks, that public education was, in effect, held hostage by teacher unions, with administrators too rigid and mired in bureaucracy to change (Smith, 2003). Her question, “How can you know you’re succeeding without some way to measure?” found a common-sense answer in the evaluation of student performance against a state-imposed standard. Charters and vouchers were appealing because of the twin conservative supports for family and freedom. Her Republican thriftiness responded to the promise of operating with maximum efficiency and low cost along the lines of any successful business. However, Whitman took a financial risk that in the long run was counter to solid Republican budgeting in order to join the tax-cutting bandwagon of her era. She borrowed from the state retirement system, gambling that state revenue would make up for the shortfall over time. In the long run, the tax cutting fervor of her era left her state in a vulnerable position that continues to
haunt the current governor. Raising taxes today is a most difficult proposition, and the inevitable result of no new taxes is more budget cuts. Consequently, her actions have meant that in 2012 New Jersey cannot meet State Supreme Court orders to provide equal funding to Newark and other poor school districts (Mead, 2009; Newark Trust for Education, 2012).

At the same time, State Senator Jane Swift was working on legislation along the same lines for Massachusetts. However, Swift worked closely with other Massachusetts Republicans and Democrats as well as representatives of the teacher unions to create a plan that gave schools new autonomy, awarded new dollars to Massachusetts schools through a new funding formula, and at the same time negotiated accountability as well as state standards linked to a curriculum that has stood the test of time. Last year, Massachusetts schools were at the top of National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) testing for the fourth year in a row (Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 2012). Additionally, Boston charter schools have consistently led the state scores on student testing, although not all state charter schools out-perform those of the regular public school students (Dizikes, 2009).

Governors Roberts, Walker and Martz all supported additional funding for their state education budgets. As described earlier, Governor Roberts did not succeed in reforming tax law but did find innovative ways to support the schools without devastating budget cuts. Roberts left office in 1995, and charter schools entered Oregon under the administration of her successor in 1999. According to a 2011 report evaluating charter school performance, 59% of Oregon’s public schools and 32% of the state’s charter schools were considered “satisfactory.” However, 49% of the charters were rated “excellent” as compared to only 37% of the Oregon’s public schools (Inman & Bateman, 2011).
Governor Walker failed at her attempts as well to reform tax policies although she did succeed in increasing school budgets. While Utah is still at the bottom of US budget commitments to public education, students still test well in school performance. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 85% of Utah’s fourth graders perform at or above basic proficiency, a level that has steadily increased over the last decade (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2011). In 1999, Utah opened six charter schools, four years before Walker became governor. Two years after Walker left office (in 2007), Governor Jon Huntsman signed into law the nation's first universally available school-choice program; according to this law, every family in Utah received a voucher worth between $3,000 per child for the lowest income families and $500 for those with the highest incomes (Coulson, 2007).

Governor Martz resisted charter schools and fought No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements because she felt the former would take dollars from public schools and that neither would benefit Montana children. Martz continues to prevail although she left office in 2005. The current governor, Democrat Brian Schweitzer, the state superintendent of Montana schools, and the teachers’ union all oppose charter schools for the same reason that Martz did (Dennison, 2011). Despite pressure from some members of the legislature to provide charter school options, Montana remains one of nine states that have no charter school law. Interestingly, the nine states that do not have charter school laws are Alabama, Kentucky, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia (The Center for Education Reform, 2012). Fortunately, an “online academy” recently opened to offer distance learning options throughout the state. The Montana Digital Academy (MTDA) offers a virtual classroom across Montana’s considerable expanse to
students who might otherwise be handicapped by limitations in course options, a prime Martz concern during her tenure in office. In terms of student achievement, according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) review of national test results published in 2011, Montana schools rated an average performance when compared to other US states overall (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2011).

Based on the review of school policies introduced by the former women governors in this study, most shared a common ideology in the matter of public education, one that was likely influenced by their own experiences with public education. Their attitudes can be defined as more progressive in nature; they regarded public school education as a critical and trustworthy institution. Where schools were not adequate to the challenges of educating all students to competence, most of the governors felt educators should be assisted with the addition of extra funds; and, further, they felt that the needed financial assistance would be used wisely. In contrast, Republican conservative market theory could be considered a strong influencer on Governor Whitman’s policies, despite the fact that such policies have not proven providential to student performance or the long-term financial health of her state.

**Media theory.** One of the tenets of feminist theory is that male dominance is reinforced by the threat of violence against women. As has been pointed out in great detail throughout this study, the influence of the mass media is critical in the formation of public opinion. Members of most traditional schools of journalism have attempted to mend the past treatment of women candidates or leaders from the frame as wives and mothers or fashionista; yet, resolution is imperfect at best. Further, the erosion of traditional news outlets in favor of tabloid opinion and commentary has provided many opportunities for broadcasting blatant sexism with little censure.
Thus, the ways that women are depicted in news coverage, advertising, and entertainment emphasize the second-class role that women play in American society. The predominant portrayal as sexual object and/or victim, coupled with the realities women face as recipients of lesser pay and higher incidents of domestic abuse as well as sexual assault, all encourage women to accept a smaller voice and position in leadership roles. Therefore, the nature of the difference between men and women seems not to matter as much as the nature of the treatment men and women receive. In addition to daily message bombardment from media outlets, women also learn paradoxical lessons from childhood: 1) the potential threat men present to women’s safety; and 2) the potential safety offered by a strong man in his role as leader, father, or spouse who can protect a woman from predatory interests of other men.

These competing cultural forces were at play with the former women governors in their interactions with reporters from mass media news outlets. The negative experiences the former governors described in their interactions with reporters reflected concerns that their gender made them more vulnerable. They reported responses to press coverage that ranged from frustration to antagonism to paranoia (see “becoming a public figure,” p. 231).

I suggest that their fear was not only of loss of public approval but was rooted more deeply and profoundly in the acculturated fear that women experience with regard to men. Men solidly dominate the field of journalism. As Beyle (1996) pointed out, the role of reporter shifts after the candidate becomes the governor. Reporters may “slip the leash” of typical public restraint while performing their jobs, particularly in their investigative role. The shouting of questions and the aggressive nature of demanding an answer as well as a follow-up are attributes of hostile male dominant behavior to which women are culturally
conditioned to respond with deference, fear, submission. In other circumstances, a threatened woman may run to another greater male authority figure for protection, such as a police officer or strong male family member. The lone woman governor at the front of the room cannot turn to anyone for protection, least of all the male perpetrators.

Men may feel a conflicting sense of duty to come to the defense of the female “under attack,” leading to their own confusion in how to write about women leaders. But comments from the former female governors suggested that although they understood perfectly the role of the press, the pack behavior of reporters in a press conference became threatening and worrisome; the women, usually without training in managing a press conference environment, faced off with primarily male reporters for whom protocol in dealing with a female executive was uncertain. The terms the governors chose to describe their experiences with reporters are telling, suggesting a sensation of their “victim” status in relationship to the hostile, monolithic press. Probably the most graphic example was shared by Governor Collins, who first identified reporters as “sharks” and “piranhas,” metaphors that compared reporters to animals out for blood.

Interestingly, research (Pain, 1991; Valentine, 1989; Yodanis, 2004) has indicated that women not only experience fear whether or not they are attacked; but “women are more likely to manifest their feelings in terms of physical symptoms—nagging and vague complaints, headaches, dizziness, toothaches, cramps, and allergies” (Barreca, 2011, para 2). Governors Kunin, Martz, and Roberts all used pain as a metaphorical description rather than a literal symptom of the feelings they experienced in response to press coverage, but all the terms were reflective of the stress they felt as a result of dealing with members of the press.
Barreca (2011) further stated that fear can prevent women from attaining a sense of competence through setting goals and reaching them.

Tellingly, the former women governors generally reported feeling a mutual respect for reporters as they completed their terms and felt they had demonstrated competence in office. Those governors who did not weather crisis well, like Governors Martz and Swift, never attained a sense of competence or of a mutually respectful relationship with members of the press corps.

**Recommendations.** In 2012, only six women (12%) held governors’ seats, a number that has declined from a high of 9 in 2004 and 2007 (CAWP, 2012): Jan Brewer, R — Arizona; Mary Fallin, R — Oklahoma; Susana Martinez, R — New Mexico; Beverly Perdue, D — North Carolina; Nicky Haley, R — South Carolina; Christine Gregoire, D — Washington (CAWP, 2012). While this cohort may seem to be too small to address with practical policy recommendations, these women are the current key officers in place who can take action that will result in equitable representation of both sexes in the future. These recommendations, however, can apply to all governors who are entrusted with their constituents’ stewardship into a future of more possibility, not less.

1. **Establish and support a political “pipeline” that actively recruits, trains, and mentors women and minorities.**

   Our political system is founded on the belief that every American must be a well-informed and responsible citizen, a participant in our democracy. So far, the rhetoric of personal responsibility seems to stop short of encouraging women and Americans-of-color to be responsible for the welfare of their communities and their nation. Representatives of women or minority members of the United States make up less than 20% of Congress. In
state legislatures, women hold less than a quarter of the legislative seats; 8.1% of legislators are Black, and only 2.9% are Latino despite the fact that each of these racial minorities makes up about 12.5% of the American population (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2012). The local and state levels are precisely where female governors are in a unique position to make a powerful call to action for women and minorities to serve.

All of the women governors in this study came into office eager to make a positive difference by introducing legislation they felt had been overlooked by their male predecessors. They also brought a new approach to managing their administrations. Feminist theorists, particularly those within the strand of Marxist or structuralist feminism, have criticized the workplace as a male-dominated hierarchy, with inequalities throughout the organization that ensure roles of authority and power will remain inaccessible to women (Coleman & Rippin, 2000). The female governors in this study, except Governor Martz, made deliberate attempts to change those systems, hiring and appointing women and minorities and describing their leadership styles in ways that can be classified as a blend of “collaborative,” a non-hierarchical leadership style. Women respond to being asked to serve, and a majority of the former women governors in this study made it possible for other women to access representative power. Hopefully, minority community members will respond as well, particularly when training and support are offered.

2. Establish and support education curricula that teach gender equity.

Not all of the women governors in this study agreed about approaches to policy initiatives or implementation, even when they agreed the policy emphasis was critical, such as in the case of public education. Republican Governors Swift and Whitman were inclined to oppose teacher unions. Whitman favored the introduction of charter schools and voucher
programs. In contrast, Democratic governors uniformly recommended increases in funding for public education. However, they were joined in this instance by Martz, Walker, and Swift, also Republicans. The lines of party and ideology were not always sharply drawn, but gender clearly was not always the determinant of policy preference.

One area that should be addressed without ideological prejudice is the fair and respectful treatment of girls. Governors in this study did not introduce gender equity into the school curriculum. None of the governors addressed the issue of gender equity as a policy priority. To be fair, the American Association of University Women’s (AAUW) research on gender equity did not surface until after Collins, Kunin, and Roberts had left office. But it is difficult to imagine how the women governors in this study would introduce a policy element dealing with gender at the same time that they attempted to “play down” their own. We must remember that one strong thread throughout the governors’ narratives in this study was the emphasis on their own competence as the best way to garner respect as female leaders. Research (AAUW, 1992; Orenstein, 1994) has shown that a key predictor of female success for girls is the demonstration of their own competence in school, particularly in science and mathematics.

The positive role model that female governors present to young girls and women should be reinforced in classrooms across America. These two key elements suggest that a female governor may be especially effective in introducing and implementing education policy: 1) the fact that women in legislative leadership roles tend to practice consensus building, which contains elements of the highly effective transformational management style; and 2) the strong position of leadership granted the governor to synthesize the broad areas of policy inputs to create education policy.
According to Hyde (2005), girls in school succeed academically as well or, in some cases, better than boys with equal self-esteem; yet, girls are not stepping into leadership roles in great numbers once the classroom is behind them.

As can be seen in many advanced economies, high female academic achievement does not necessarily ensure women the full entitlements of citizenship in the labour market or in the polity. Equal distribution of education therefore is an essential condition for gender equality but it is not sufficient on its own to ensure these goals. Careful thinking about the nature of the curriculum, teaching and learning is also required. (Arnot, 2003-2004, p. 4)

A curriculum component that encourages female leadership development may help to counter the lack of powerful female leadership roles in the mass media or in everyday life that may discourage girls from considering advanced or elected leadership. Critical to this subject is the presentation to both boys and girls of a “discourse of gender” (Arnot, 2006, p. 145) in which the deconstruction of difference is the curriculum focus. Classroom teachers must also be instructed in gender-balanced pedagogies. Leadership from both sexes should be stressed as fulfilling forms of citizenship all people are privileged to enjoy in America. Aggressive recruitment and offerings of special training programs for young women, particularly in higher education, could prepare them to consider elective leadership roles. Girls and young women should be reassured that their leadership contributions are welcome and that the path is clearly marked for them to attain access to elected leadership.

3. **Adopt pro-active strategies for success with members of the press, including the mass media.**
One of the most challenging goals that confronted each of the women governors was the development of a respectful, working relationship with members of the mass media press corps. Every former female governor expressed some degree of mystification about the motivations of reporters and how to communicate with them effectively, including Governor Kunin, who previously had been a journalist. Everyone, except Governor Walker, who was very pleased with the news coverage she received, was surprised to see the misrepresentation of their words and intentions as they eventually ended up portrayed in “the news.” The governors on occasion felt that public opinion was controlled by hostile gatekeepers who, as Governor Collins stated, “don’t want a fact to get in the way of a good story.”

In fact, one of the most disturbing elements the women were forced to confront was their own assumption that only one “news” existed and that news reporters were not as they claim to be to the world, “accurate, objective, balanced, complete and fair” (Thornham, 2007, p. 86). Any expectations held by most of the women that being governor would bring them some semblance of respect from members of the press corps for their honesty, commitment to public service, or their historic achievement were dashed early on, except for Governor Walker. Only toward the end of their terms were Governors Collins, Kunin, Roberts, and Whitman able to claim a level of mutual respect with members of the press; these four women governors evidenced competence and achievements that made their leadership exemplary. Only Governor Walker was beloved to members of the press throughout her short term.

The findings in Chapter 7 that revealed the governors’ concerns about appearance, developing an image of strength, a strong “voice,” and the perceived need to “play down” gender to minimize stereotypes of weakness reveal the serious attention that must be paid to
developing public personas. The construction of a public image was largely a reactive process for the women in this study but one that taught lessons about the visual impact of their public image. Wardrobes as well as hair styles may seem frivolous but, as indicated by the experience of all of the former female governors, are critical to campaign and governance strategy. Public image, public “voice,” and professional deportment must be part of leadership training. Women who are interested in political careers or leadership at any level must recognize that developing one’s public image is part of the leadership role.

The finding that members of the mass media have significant power to affect the emotional and professional equilibrium of women leaders (and probably men leaders as well) reinforces other research (Benoit, 2004) that training on how to interact and manage members of the mass media press corps is vital. How to position one’s body and speak to a camera or an interviewer cannot be treated as a matter of mere ego. Women especially must learn how comfortably to address the public across a spectrum of environments (e.g., to command a crowded auditorium without shrieking as well as to speak firmly and warmly while turning aside a hostile question).

4. Find a strong and experienced mentor.

Research has shown that “traditionally women face a chronic lack of access to mentors” (Rosenthal, 1998, p. 72). The female former governors operated largely without male mentors or female models for guidance and so experienced intense isolation, particularly in times of crisis when staff members might not have been the most appropriate confidants. No staff member had the experience of having been a female governor. For that matter, neither did male mentors, even if they had served as a governor themselves. One can imagine the counsel a male mentor might have shared when he heard that Governor Walker
intended to reform the Utah tax code in fewer than 14 months; or that Governor Roberts was slated to talk publicly about birth control to high school students; or that Governor Whitman planned to mandate longer maternal hospital stays no matter what the insurance lobby had to say about the issue. Women governors might have confounded their male mentors fairly constantly by ignoring their advice. Therefore, it is especially important for women leaders to mentor other women, especially on the executive level. Female governors are in a unique position to call on schools and universities in their states to establish systems that connect women leaders who are available to mentor with women from youth through professional careers. An organized process for finding mentors, especially female mentors, and providing regular forums for sustained relationship building could encourage women to pursue leadership roles and, further, provide needed insights for women leaders on how to succeed, especially when facing the isolation of elected office. Governors Kunin, Martz, and Swift spoke wistfully of the idea that a female governor could find someone to turn to, other than her husband or a staff member, for consultation and support.

Further Research. Finally, certain implications for further research have been presented by this study. To understand more deeply the forces that shape the women who decide to seek office is critical, given the fact that only Caucasian women were participants in this research. The dynamics of demographic change and the impact of cultures that traditionally do not propel women outside of patriarchal family arrangements suggest the question of whether numbers of female leaders will increase or decrease as minorities become majorities in America. How women of color are motivated to lead, how they succeed and/or fail on the campaign trail as well as how they successfully implement their policy agendas provide fascinating opportunities for further study. Also, more exploration on the
ways women generally measure and internalize their own personal successes or failures in office is necessary. The legislative records of those who have served in the past may seem to portray failure or success; but as pioneers and trailblazers, they have much to contribute to the future growth of women’s leadership. To date, all of the accumulated insights that women governors have acquired about their leadership experiences are relatively scattered and lost to study since few have written or published about seeking and surviving political leadership.

Recent researchers have suggested that women, when they choose to run, are not disadvantaged when running against men. The fact that none of these women governors ever ran for election again after leaving the governor’s office despite being seasoned campaigners and experienced leaders opens a new front for examination. Are their patterns of holding one term or only the governor’s office typical? More research on this very select group of female former governors would be helpful in terms of understanding the furtherance of women’s political careers and, one would hope, staunch the loss of their collective political wisdom.

The finding that political parties tend to field male candidates against female incumbents suggests a fascinating area for further research. Contrary to past practices whereby male incumbents traditionally have not received challenges in primary elections (until fairly recently when moderate Republican incumbents have been considered too “liberal”) both Democrat and Republican party leadership allowed primary challenges to Governors Martz, Roberts, Swift, and Walker. Noting that none of these women were recruited by their political parties, never received party mentorship during their terms in office nor during various crisis periods presents significant research opportunities into the roles played by political parties in women’s leadership. Identifying party efforts or non-
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efforts to encourage, train, and sustain the success of women leaders would be most revealing.

A special area of research relates to the specific case of Governor Swift. Her circumstances were very interesting because her pregnancy and childbirth were so very public and so very controversial. Her ethics charges stemmed from an “appearance of impropriety” when her aides babysat for her children. She created uproar when she used the state helicopter to return to her home during what could be termed a family medical emergency. The ethics violation charges resulting from that incident were eventually dropped, but the damage had been done and continues to haunt her. Ten years later, Alaska Governor Sarah Palin managed to deliver a baby while in office, which no one noticed until she brought him onto the dais during the Republican convention. Given the hostility of the press to Swift’s pregnant appearance and the lack of any extra support for Swift from her legislature (in fact, just the opposite), the implications for women running in the future certainly suggest that pregnancy while in office is political dynamite, at least in certain regions. Are any legislatures anywhere in the US making contingency plans for the next pregnant governor?

The blend of ideology and gender makes for a fascinating brew. This study revealed no clear connection between the policy choices made by these former women governors and their party ideologies. Moreover, these women governors were not distinguished from their male counterparts by their agendas as much as by their personal commitment to implement their policy priorities, even at great personal risk to their political careers. Such passionate defenses of their policy commitments suggest a possibly significant difference between women and men leaders. Continued research into the impact of ideology on women’s policy
commitments, especially with new conservative women entering Congress, seems to be an imperative.

One of the most difficult tasks to completing this research was the location of women who had left the political limelight, and finding anything about them outside an occasional paragraph posted on the archive or history page of the state website where they had served. Wikipedia, certainly not the gold standard of research, at least usually had pictures. A compendium of the biographies and legislative records of all former women governors would be a monumental contribution to American history.

Conclusion

After careful reading of the verbatim interview transcripts and comparison of the results with research compiled in the literature review contained in Chapter 2, I have concluded that gender bias resulting from patriarchal cultural influences is the most likely explanation for certain circumstances that 1) shaped the leadership experiences of the women governors and 2) affected their abilities to exercise fully the power of elected executive office. This gender bias occurred despite their stature as the highest state executive leaders who had majority support from their constituents.

If we are ever to see an increase in elected women leaders, we need to focus our attention on what happens to the smart women who are courageous, creative, and, yes, tough enough to break through the glass dome over the governor’s office. Every one of these women endured the trials of being first buoyed by the thought that they were clearing a path for the women who would come after them. Thus far, very few women have followed a first-time female governor into office. Arizona’s Janet Napolitano succeeding Jane Hull is the only exception.
Perhaps, we can learn by observing the wounds of our pioneer female governors as well as their successes. Surely, we can think of ways to make their paths easier to follow, just as we build access points along dangerous highways so precious endangered life can safely cross.
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Appendix A: EMU Human Subjects Review Committee Approval

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

October 22, 2007

Deborah Havens
2449 Omega Drive NE
Grand Rapids, MI 49525

Dear Deborah Havens:

The Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Eastern Michigan University has reviewed and approved as exempt research your proposal titled, "Women Governors: Impact on Public Policy". The IRB determined that the rights and welfare of the individual subjects involved in this research are carefully guarded. Additionally, the methods used to obtain informed consent are appropriate, and the individuals participating in your study are not at risk.

Exempt research does not require reporting of continuation one year after approval if the project continues. However, should the sample or procedures change as to have an impact on human subjects, then UHSRC should be notified by using the Minor Modification to Research Protocol or the Request for Human Subjects Approval form depending upon the scope of the changes (see the forms online).

On behalf of the Human Subjects Committee, I wish you success in conducting your research.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Deb de Laski-Smith, Ph.D.
Interim Dean
Graduate School
Administrative Co-Chair
University Human Subjects Review Committee

Reference #: 071008
Appendix B: Letter to Former Governor to Request Participation in Research Study

2449 Omega Drive, NE
Grand Rapids, MI 49525
October 26, 2007

The Honorable Governor

Dear Governor ____________,

I am currently a doctoral candidate in the Education Leadership Program in the Department of Leadership and Counseling within the College of Education at Eastern Michigan University (EMU). I am looking forward to my dissertation research on “Women Governors: Impact on Public Education Policy.” Before submitting my dissertation proposal, my Dissertation Chair, Dr. Martha W. Tack, suggested that I contact potential interviewees to determine the feasibility of conducting this groundbreaking research.

As 1 of only 29 women who have served as governors in the United States throughout its two centuries of history, and the first female governor of the State of ______________, your life has definitely had historical import. However, surprisingly, no scholarly discourse exists to date, in which the impact of female governors on public education policy is presented or analyzed. Therefore, I am committed to eliminating this research void; and I hope you will be willing to assist me.

My early literature research shows a clear gender-based distinction between the kinds of public policy created by elected male and female legislative leaders at the state and national levels of government. Both Democratic and Republican women leaders tend to give priority to policies related to issues such as the following:

* care-giving  * health care  * the environment  * involving citizens
* the elderly  * housing  * children  * women’s rights  * education
You identified public education as critical to the welfare of your state and just as vital to our nation’s future. Since states are responsible for public education, and you served as the policy leader for your State, I hope that you, as 1 of only 12 women who have served previous terms as governors in the nation, will agree to contribute to this signal research into the difference that you made. Of course, I understand that your time is extremely valuable; I will be completely flexible around your schedule.

I will contact your office within a week to determine if you are willing to participate in this research project with me. If you agree, I will send the details (e.g., interview guide, informed consent form, etc.) to you once my dissertation committee and the EMU University Human Subjects Review Committee have approved my proposal and research protocol.

I am honored to be proposing this work with a pioneer of your stature and look forward to conducting a formal interview with you within approximately three to six weeks.

For more information, please contact either my dissertation chair, Dr. Martha W. Tack, Professor at Eastern Michigan University, at 734.487.0255 or Martha.Tack@emich.edu, or me at 616.885.2961 or at dhavens@comcast.net.

Sincerely,

Deb Havens

Attachments: Interview Guide / Havens’ Brief Biographical Sketch
Appendix C: Informed Consent Form for Former Governors

I agree to participate in a dissertation research study that focuses on how former women governors have influenced the development and implementation of public education policy. I understand that in this study the investigator will examine the impact of gender on leadership styles, relationships with representatives of television broadcast news as well as the process of developing and implementing education policy initiatives.

My participation will include at least one private two-to-three-hour recorded interview on both audio and videotape. After tapes from the interview are transcribed, I will have a chance to review and confirm the accuracy of the transcripts. I understand that transcripts will be sent to me via certified mail and will contain an approval form. I may fax or mail back the approval form to the researcher indicating my approval of the accuracy of the transcript. If I determine that the transcript results do not reflect my perceptions accurately, the researcher and I will negotiate until agreements are reached. In addition, when the study is completed, I understand that I may request a copy of the findings.

I am aware that my identity will not be kept confidential. I also understand that, as a former governor and public figure, my experiences are likely to be of great interest both to historians as well as other women who may be inspired by my example. In order to serve the interests of history and the development of future women leaders, excerpts from interviews may be published. I further understand that data collected may be used for presentations and publications and that my name will be associated with the presentations and/or publications.

For questions about this research, please contact Deb Havens, Doctoral Candidate, Education Leadership Program, Department of Leadership and Counseling, Eastern
Michigan University at 616.885.2961, or her dissertation chair, Dr. Martha W. Tack, Professor, Eastern Michigan University, at 734.487.0255.

This research protocol has been reviewed and approved by the Eastern Michigan University Human Subjects Review Committee (UHSRC). If you have questions about the approval process, please contact Dr. Deb de Laski-Smith, Interim Dean of the Graduate School and Administrative Co-chair of UHSRC (at 734.487.0042, or human.subjects@emich.edu).

I confirm that I know the purpose and parameters of the research study outlined above. I am aware that my participation is completely voluntary and that I may withdraw from the project at any time with no complications. I hereby provide consent for the use of my quotations and agree to participate willingly in this research endeavor.

____________________________________  ______________________________
Name (Print or Type)  Telephone

____________________________________
Signature  Date
Appendix D: Interview Guide

Introduction

Thank you very much for making this dissertation research possible. As you know, the purpose of this research effort is to obtain a deeper understanding of how former women governors have influenced public education policy by examining your leadership style as well as your relationships with legislative leaders, education policy experts, and representatives of broadcast television news. You will be invited to reflect on your personal experiences with public education, and to talk about how your own education influenced the development and implementation of public education initiatives when you served as governor. Additionally, we will discuss the source of your decision to pursue your political career; the catalyst that inspired you to campaign for the governor’s office; and how your gender influenced your experiences, including those on the campaign trail and in office. In addition, please think about how you were, or were not, able to use various strategies to overcome difficult situations to maintain your effectiveness as a leader and what you have learned from these experiences.

During the interview, please interrupt me if you need clarification about any question. For questions you do not believe are relevant or make you feel uncomfortable, please feel free to comment briefly or simply to ignore them. You are encouraged to focus on questions that you consider important, meaningful, and interesting to you. Please feel free to add your insights or comments at any time. Most of all, I hope you will find this interview process reflective and meaningful.
Appendix E: First Round Interview Questions

1. Please tell me about your life, (i.e. what would you want people to know about you?)

2. How did your term as governor reflect the kind of leader you are? Why?

3. How would you characterize your experiences as governor?

4. What role did gender play in your experiences as governor?

5. What was it like for you to be the subject of media scrutiny?

6. What kinds of policy initiatives were your priorities as governor?

7. What insights have you gained about women’s political leadership over the years?

8. Do you have any individual you would suggest I interview who could give me special insights into your experiences as governor?

9. Do you mind if I contact you again for more information or clarification?

10. Thank you very much for your participation.
Appendix F: Second Round Interview Questions

Relationship of Effective Women Governors with Mass media Personnel

1. How did your relationship with representatives of the mass media affect the planning and execution of your education policy agenda?

2. Please give an overview of how you utilized your press relationships to promote your education policy initiatives to your various publics. Which publics were your top priority in terms of communicating your education policy initiatives?

3. Did a difference exist between broadcast and print coverage of your education policy agenda? If so, how? If not, why not?

4. How did television news reporters respond to your public education initiatives?

5. How did newspaper reporters respond?
   c. How was technology/Internet used to cover your education policy agenda?

Impact of Gender

1. Many women leaders enter office with a conscious commitment to serve women, children, and families out of a belief that these groups have been underserved in the past. Please explain how you agree/disagree with this point of view.

2. Please describe any policies enacted by your male predecessor that you immediately discontinued when you assumed office because such practices did not serve women, children, and families. Describe the reaction of internal and external constituents to your actions.

3. Describe any example of strong male opposition to any of your legislative policies in the area of education that you considered more favorable to women/children/families than practices current at that time. How did the male opposition “play out;” in other words, how did you handle the opposition?

4. In what circumstances were you able to form alliances with other women legislators that effectively promoted your legislative policies (especially regarding public education) to eventual enactment? Based on your experiences, how do you suggest that women form such effective alliances with other powerful women?

5. In what ways do you believe that public education systems currently serve the best interests of women/children/families? And should they?

The Impact of Women Governors on Education Policy
GENDERED GOVERNING: LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCES OF 7 WOMEN FORMER GOVERNORS

1. Women leaders often exhibit a strong commitment to serve women, children, and families out of a belief these groups have been underserved in the past. Did this viewpoint influence your public education policies at all? Why or why not? If not, what viewpoint did influence your public education policies?

2. How did you attempt to influence education policy through your leadership? Were your policies different from other governors at the time who happened to be male? If so, why? Or why not?

3. Did your thinking about the needs of students in the public education system change during your time in office as a result of your new vantage point from the Governor’s chair? Why or why not?

4. In what ways did your point of view differ from male leaders about how the public education system can best meet the needs of children, women, and families as well as the nation?

5. Some critics of public education policy note that historically the male viewpoint has been dominant in the formation of this important American institution. What are your thoughts on this point?

Advice

1. What insights have you gained about women’s political leadership over the years in the arena of public education policy?

2. What skills/strategies are the most critical if women are to succeed as leaders in this male-dominated arena? How can such skills/strategies be obtained/learned?

3. What advice would you give to a newly elected woman governor in terms of how to:
   a) work most effectively with mass media personnel in advancing her education policy agenda.
   b) work with legislative personnel (elected and hired staff members) to create support for the passage of her education policy agenda.

4. Gender is said to be a two-edged sword, sometimes positively viewed and sometimes negatively perceived. Under what circumstances do you suggest that a women use her gender to her advantage in the world of leadership and how can she do so? Conversely, how does a woman keep gender from being used against her in the leadership arena?
Appendix G: Transcript Approval Form

INTERVIEW WITH GOVERNOR __________________________

Conducted and Transcribed by Deborah Havens
2449 Omega Drive NE
Grand Rapids, MI 49525
PH 616.885.2961
FAX 616.608.3818

My signature on this document verifies that I have reviewed the transcript from my interview on the following date:

My response to the accuracy of the transcript is indicated below:

_______ I have read and approved the transcript of my interview, as presented.
_______ I have read and approved the transcript of my interview, as amended.
_______ I have read and do NOT approve the transcript of my interview, as presented.

Consultation with the interviewer is required.

Governor
__________________________________________ __________________________
Name (Print or Type) Telephone
__________________________________________ __________________________
Signature Date
Appendix I: Legend/Schema

Emergent Transcript Codes Organized by Research Question (*Adapted from Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008, p. 197)

The types of leadership style effective women governors use in formulating and implementing education policy.

C1 Inclusive
C2 Collaborative
C3 Collegial
C4 Close
C5 Consensus
C6 Team approach

2a. Governors’ perceptions of their relationships with personnel from the mass media, particularly television broadcast news reporters.

MR1 “Looks” count (clothing, appearance)
MR2 Media displays gender bias (Inappropriate titles, amount of coverage, story slant)
MR3 Public speaking must be shaped for technical and format needs of mass media
MR4 Honesty is the best policy with representatives of the media
MR5 Frame responses to protect female leadership (“play down” gender)
MR6 Media relationships can be fair, friendly, civil, respectful
MR7 Media representatives over-simplify, misrepresent, prefer conflict
MR8 Gender-biased media coverage incites governor distrust, anxiety
MR9 Media portrayals viewed as caricature, unrealistic
MR10 Negative media portrayals cause pain/distress
MR11 Concern for media impact on family / friends
MR12 Desire for results means focus on the job rather than press image
MR13 Media press corps less interested in good news about education
MR14 Plan press events to frame issues, influence positive media coverage
GENDERED GOVERNING: LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCES OF 7 WOMEN FORMER GOVERNORS

2b. How the relationship with members of the mass media press corps affects election results and legislative platform pieces (before and after election), especially education policy.

MMREP1 Media portrayals shape the governor’s image and credibility
MMREP2 Media portrayals of image / credibility affect governor’s power to move agenda
MMREP3 Media present / act on stereotypes that hurt or help governor’s agenda
MMREP4 Negative media portrayals (polls, articles, editorials) foster Party member betrayal, (i.e., challenges to incumbency)
MMREP5 TV coverage less substantial / Impact differs, not necessarily negative

3. Factors female governors take into consideration when generating education policy initiatives.

FGEP1 State geography
FGEP2 State economy / Growing jobs
FGEP3 District wealth / Tax base
FGEP4 Equal opportunity / Resources
FGEP5 Child welfare (hunger, health, social skills, learning styles) / Special needs
FGEP6 Student competency / Graduation rates / Drop outs
FGEP7 Reform system / Curriculum / Mandate Kindergarten
FGEP8 Union issues
FGEP9 Assign new authority / Accountability / Standards
FGEP10 Mandate curriculum / Tests
FGEP11 Teacher pay / Benefits / Support
FGEP12 Parent education
FGEP13 Tax Policies
FGEP14 Equalize / Increase spending
FGEP15 Reduce class size
FGEP16 Teacher training
FGEP17 School takeovers
FGEP18 Vouchers / Charters
4. **How gender influences the decision-making and leadership functions of the female governor.**

- **GP1** Collaboration / Power to serve others, make a difference / Seek results not rewards
- **GP2** Hiring women, minorities / Seek input from “outsiders”
- **GP3** Communication strategies (w/legislators, staff, constituents, speaking) / Finding “Voice”
- **GP4** Preparation / Hard work / Value what you know
- **GP5** Risk / Innovation / Agenda setting
- **GP6** Maternal / Domestic analogies
- **GP7** Demonstrate strong, tough, fighter
- **GP8** Practice compromise
- **GP9** Appearance concerns (hair, clothing) / Physical stature
- **GP10** Language / Demeanor / Emotions
- **GP11** “Play down” gender
- **GP12** Unique policy views / Respond to human, family need
- **GP13** Value female support
- **GP14** Sacrifice / Service to others
- **GP15** Cope with media: Stereotypical gender focus
- **GP16** Enhances Party member betrayal
- **GP17** Concerns for family, relationships
- **GP18** Desire to prove ability / Get results
5a. Female Governor perceptions of leadership differences from male governors.

FGLD1 Collaborate, compromise, credit others
FGLD2 Need to “play down” gender
FGLD3 Emotions / Demeanor / Physicality / Sensitivity
FGLD4 Need to work harder, be better informed
FGLD5 Desire to prove (female) ability / Get results
FGLD6 Agenda setting / Making a difference / Making change
FGLD7 Double standard / Glass ceiling / Negative biases
FGLD8 Uniquely memorable
FGLD9 Concerns for impact on family, friends, relationships
FGLD10 Lack mentors / Guidance
FGLD11 Sacrifice / Serve others / “Somebody’s got to do this”
FGLD12 Respond to human / women / family need
FGLD13 Unknown / No comparison possible
FGLD14 Lack of Party member respect for incumbency
FGLD15 Appoint / Hire women and minorities
FGLD16 Excluded from male activities
FGLD17 Political options limited by age

5b. Female Governor perceptions of education policy differences with male governors, particularly their predecessors.

PD 1 Definition of education reform / Concerns for child welfare
PD 2 Emphasis on importance of education
PD 3 Increased financial commitment to education
PD 4 Raise/Reform taxes
PD 5 Increase teacher training
PD 6 Increase teacher pay, benefits, support
PD 7 Reduce class size
PD 8 Mandate Kindergarten
PD 9 Expand curriculum (Technology, Math/Sci for girls, Remedial classes)
PD 10 Standards
PD 11 Charters/Vouchers
PD 12 School takeovers
## Appendix H: Significant Statements, Concept Clusters, & Final Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Statements</th>
<th>Concept Clusters</th>
<th>Final Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The most worthwhile thing I can do with my own life&quot;</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Desire to Serve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Look at me! I'm a leader!&quot;</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I made the coffee&quot;</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Constant care &amp; feeding of legislators&quot;</td>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Women can change the agenda&quot;</td>
<td>Different priorities</td>
<td>Desire to Make a Positive Change, Correct a Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;No politician in their right mind deals with tax reform&quot;</td>
<td>Taking risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Everybody realizes but doesn't...do anything&quot;</td>
<td>Doing the right thing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Always a question out there: Can she do it?&quot;</td>
<td>Gender bias</td>
<td>Desire to Prove Oneself/Women Capable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;You have to be somewhat better than the man who had the job before you&quot;</td>
<td>Working harder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Is she tough enough?&quot;</td>
<td>Finding &quot;voice&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;There is a glass ceiling still&quot;</td>
<td>Limits on power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;[not] too much like mother...nun...or teacher&quot;</td>
<td>Emotions, demeanor, language</td>
<td>Desire to Protect Self, Family, Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The media scrutiny you get is very personal focused on your appearance and your hair&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Looks&quot; count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The husband gets more scrutiny&quot;</td>
<td>Impact on spouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;My poor family...&quot;</td>
<td>Concerns for family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I was a big contrast&quot;</td>
<td>Being Different &quot;Other&quot;</td>
<td>Consequence: Being First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We never said this in public&quot;</td>
<td>Gender denial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;They never forgot my name&quot;</td>
<td>Gender advantage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Needing help is perilous&quot;</td>
<td>Isolation (lack mentors, staff need)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Someone has to do this&quot;</td>
<td>Sacrifice</td>
<td>Consequence: Pain (hidden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;It's [critical press coverage] hurtful&quot;</td>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Who do you think you are, woman?&quot;</td>
<td>Stereotypes, Ageism, Sexism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The boys decided they wanted the Governorship back&quot;</td>
<td>Party betrayal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorship is the last elected office</td>
<td>Career issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I got most of my legislation through&quot;</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Consequence: Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We can create an 'Old Girl Network'&quot;</td>
<td>Mentor other women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Data Summary Tables 6 - 8

Table 6

**Governors’ Perceptions of the Impact of Their Gender on Their Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governors’ Perceptions of Gender Impact on Leadership</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Collins</th>
<th>Kunin</th>
<th>Martz</th>
<th>Roberts</th>
<th>Swift</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>Whitman</th>
<th>Tally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotions / Demeanor / Physicality / Sensitivity</td>
<td>FGLD3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda-setting / Making a difference / Making change</td>
<td>FGLD6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to prove (female) ability / Get results</td>
<td>FGLD5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate, compromise, give credit to others</td>
<td>FGLD1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond / Relate to human, women, children, family need</td>
<td>FGLD12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double standard / Glass ceiling / Negative biases</td>
<td>FGLD7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to work harder, be better informed</td>
<td>FGLD4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns for impact on family, friends, relationships</td>
<td>FGLD9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint / Hire women and minorities</td>
<td>FGLD15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to &quot;play down gender&quot;</td>
<td>FGLD2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniquely memorable / Gender advantaged</td>
<td>FGLD8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / No comparison possible</td>
<td>FGLD13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice / Serve others / &quot;Somebody's got to do this&quot;</td>
<td>FGLD11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded from male activities</td>
<td>FGLD16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political options limited by age</td>
<td>FGLD17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack mentors / Guidance / Seeing self as leader</td>
<td>FGLD10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Party member respect for incumbency</td>
<td>FGLD14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 / 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

**Impact of Governors’ Relationships with Members of the Mass media**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Media Relationships Influence Election Results and Policy</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Collins</th>
<th>Kunin</th>
<th>Martz</th>
<th>Roberts</th>
<th>Swift</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>Whitman</th>
<th>Tally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media portrayals shape the governor's image / credibility</td>
<td>MRP1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media portrayals of image / credibility affect governor's power to campaign / move agenda</td>
<td>MRP2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media present / act on stereotypes that hurt or help governor's campaign or agenda</td>
<td>MRP3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV coverage less substantial / Impact differs, not necessarily negative</td>
<td>MRP5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media portrayals (polls, articles, editorials) foster Party member betrayal</td>
<td>MRP4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 / 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K, continued: Data Summary Tables 7 – 8

Table 8

Reponses from Governors: Educational Factors Considered in Policy Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Factors Governors Considered</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Collins</th>
<th>Kunin</th>
<th>Martz</th>
<th>Roberts</th>
<th>Swift</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>Whitman</th>
<th>Tally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal opportunity / Resources</td>
<td>FGEP4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child welfare (hunger, health, social skills, learning styles) / Special needs / Remedial classes</td>
<td>FGEP5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student competency / Graduation rates / Drop outs</td>
<td>FGEP6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform system / Curriculum / Mandate Kindergarten</td>
<td>FGEP7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalize / Increase funding</td>
<td>FGEP14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax policies</td>
<td>FGEP13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher pay / Benefits / Support</td>
<td>FGEP11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign new authority / Accountability / Standards</td>
<td>FGEP9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District wealth / Tax base</td>
<td>FGEP3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State economy / Growing jobs</td>
<td>FGEP2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State geography</td>
<td>FGEP1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union issues</td>
<td>FGEP8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate curriculum / Tests</td>
<td>FGEP10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training</td>
<td>FGEP16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School takeovers</td>
<td>FGEP17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vouchers / Charters</td>
<td>FGEP18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>FGEP12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce class size</td>
<td>FGEP15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1 / 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K, continued: Data Summary Tables 8

Table 9

The Impact of Gender on Leadership and Decision-making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender-related Influencers</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Collins</th>
<th>Kunin</th>
<th>Martz</th>
<th>Roberts</th>
<th>Swift</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>Whitman</th>
<th>Tally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appearance (hair, clothing) / Physical stature</td>
<td>GP9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration / Power for results / Give credit</td>
<td>GP1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication strategies / Finding &quot;Voice&quot;</td>
<td>GP3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk / Innovation / Agenda setting</td>
<td>GP5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language / Demeanor / Emotions</td>
<td>GP10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cope with media: Sterotypical gender focus</td>
<td>GP15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation / Hard work / Value what you know</td>
<td>GP4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice / Service to others / Ethics</td>
<td>GP14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique female policy views / Respond to human, family needs</td>
<td>GP12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring women, minorities / Seek diverse input</td>
<td>GP2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal / Domestic analogies</td>
<td>GP6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice compromise</td>
<td>GP8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate strong, tough, fighter</td>
<td>GP7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Play down&quot; gender</td>
<td>GP11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances Party member betrayal</td>
<td>GP16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value female support</td>
<td>GP13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns for family, relationships</td>
<td>GP17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 / 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Born and reared in west Michigan, Deb graduated from Western Michigan University with a B.A. in Secondary Education and taught high school English for a number of years in Jacksonville, Florida. During that time, she received her Master of Education Administration degree from the University of Florida in Gainesville.

Returning to Michigan, she was a news reporter and talk show host for an all-news radio station in Grand Rapids, later moving to television station WZZM, to produce documentaries, investigative reports, and to host public affairs programming.

After producing the entertainment show PM Magazine for WNEM, the NBC affiliate in Saginaw, she moved to California where she freelanced for the NBC affiliate KRON-TV4 in San Francisco. She later accepted a position with the PM Magazine National Office in San Francisco, the largest prime access show in over 100 markets across the US at that time. As a consulting producer, she was responsible for the programming output for national broadcast of client television stations in small, medium, and major markets. She traveled extensively to meet with local production crews to consult on staff performance standards and story product development for the national cooperative.

She returned to Michigan and continued to freelance for several corporate clients, including Walt Disney World, before accepting a position as Communications Specialist for Van Buren Public Schools in Belleville, Michigan. She also team-taught television production at Belleville Senior High School. She was recruited to create the curriculum and teach the groundbreaking Television Productions Program in the Arts and Communications Academy in Southfield Public Schools.
In 2000, she chaired the Education Policy Committee on behalf of Michigan Governor Jennifer Granholm’s successful primary campaign for office.

She is the founding and current Chair of the Board of Directors of the West Michigan Film Video Alliance, a 501c3 non-profit dedicated to promoting a thriving film and production community in west Michigan. Since 2005, the Alliance has worked with filmmakers, politicians, economic development experts, and trade organizations as part of an economic initiative to promote filmmaking in Michigan.

Deb has several certifications in education, management, leadership, and personal development training. She has two sons and three grandchildren; she and her husband live in Grand Rapids, Michigan.